

THE NEGRO COLONIZATION MOVEMENT IN OHIO: 1827-1860

Thesis
Submitted to
The Graduate School of Arts and Science
University of Dayton

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for
The Degree
Master of Arts in History

by
Charles Raymond Bennett

ALBERT EMANUEL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

Graduate School of Arts and Science
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio
July, 1969

Approved By:

Official Adviser

Official Reader

Official Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

 I. THE AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY 4

 II. THE FREE NEGRO IN OHIO, 1802-1860 20

 III. OHIO STATE COLONIZATION SOCIETY 36

 IV. AND HERE WE WILL DIE 58

 V. "I WILL BE HEARD" 66

 VI. CONCLUSION 75

APPENDIX 79

BIBLIOGRAPHY 87

INTRODUCTION

Professor Henry Noble Sherwood, in a 1912 article entitled "Movement in Ohio to Deport the Negro," states that "The Negro problem in some form has been constantly before the American people. Perhaps no other question has so often or so profoundly agitated the public mind."¹ The following study of the Ohio State Colonization Society is a reflection of the concern over the racial conflict which is as prevalent in contemporary America as it was when Sherwood's comment was made over fifty years ago.

A study of Ohio's role in a nineteenth century movement to colonize free Negroes in Africa is pertinent today because we still have the racial conflict colonizationists sought so earnestly to avoid. "Send 'em back where they came from" has long been a slogan, regardless of the practicality or fairness of it, used in connection with what is known today as the crisis of black-white relations. The Ohio State Colonization Society shared the belief of its parent organization, the American Colonization Society, that the leading social problem of that day, the presence of the free Negro, was a problem of race, not slavery. And they offered a solution for the good of both black and white--emigration. Today, the same problem,

¹Henry Noble Sherwood, "Movement in Ohio to Deport the Negro," Ohio Archeological and Philosophical Quarterly, VII (July, 1912), 53.

in all its manifest ugliness, is still upon us. Even more significantly, one of the contemporary solutions is a "Back to Africa" bill introduced in Congress in March, 1969, which would provide government financing for Negroes to resettle in Africa, this time introduced by a Black for the Blacks.

This study of a movement in Ohio between 1827 and 1860 to colonize free Negroes in Africa is then historically pertinent. Emphasis will not be placed upon the practical aspect of the movement, for this can be summed up with a statement from Elisha Bates, editor of the Philanthropist, who said in 1821 regarding colonization, "We may amuse ourselves with this project but it furnishes no solution."² Nor will the moral aspect of the movement be emphasized. Rather, this study will trace the historical development of a colonization movement in Ohio between 1827 and 1860. A brief account of the parent organization, the American Colonization Society, will be given, followed by a systematic study of that movement in Ohio. The work will deal first with the economic, political, and social condition of the free Negro in Ohio between 1802 and 1860. A detailed developmental look at the Ohio Auxiliary to the American Colonization Society will follow, emphasizing the great potential of such a movement in Ohio and the reasons why the Ohio State Colonization Society never took it to fruition. Also mentioned here will be the geographic and sociological patterns of colonization membership in Ohio. Quite necessarily the attitude of the free Negro in Ohio

²Philanthropist, January 6, 1821.

toward colonization and the struggle between colonization and abolition forces in Ohio will receive great attention.

Finally, a summation of the relative success or failure of the Ohio State Colonization Society, based in part upon a statistical analysis of funds collected and emigrants sent, will be given.

At this point, I want to extend acknowledgement and kind appreciation to several sources for aiding me in the completion of this study. To my loving and concerned wife, not only sincerest thanks must be given for her inspiration and drive given to me but a firm apology extended for my occasional loss of patience; to Dr. Joakim Isaacs, my advisor, who steered me through the Scylla and Charybdis of historical research and writing; and lastly, to the staffs of several libraries, including Mrs. Frances Hughes of the Oberlin College Library Anti-Slavery Collection, the Cincinnati and Western Reserve Historical Societies, the Ohio State University Library, the Cleveland Public Library, and the Case-Western Reserve University Library.

CHAPTER I

THE AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY

"'Introduced among us by violence, notoriously ignorant, degraded and miserable, mentally diseased, broken-spirited, acted upon by no motive to honourable exertions, scarcely reached in their debasement by the heavenly light, "the freedmen" wander unsettled and unbefriended through our land, or sit indolent, abject and sorrowful, by the streams which witness their captivity.'"¹ This dismal description of the free Negro was a fact to many people in the United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The free Negro, known as a major problem by society, was the object of a reform movement born in the early part of the nineteenth century to aid the plight of society.

The American Colonization Society, although formed in 1817 by men with various motives, was singly devoted to the colonization of free Negroes in Africa or any other place deemed suitable. The continued presence of the free Negroes was considered dangerous to the United States and stifling to the Negro. One of the original founders, Reverend Robert Finley, expressed clearly the guiding idea behind the Society.

¹African Repository, I (1825), 68; quoted in Leon Litwack, North of Slavery (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 21.

when he said that "entrenched prejudice and a sense of inferiority conspired to prevent any real improvements. Removal from the United States was the only answer." Finley believed life in Africa would not only give the free Negro the freedom and equality he would not get in America but also solve the larger problem of race relations.²

The Society's solution for the problem of the free Negro was quite understandable. "As a class the free Negroes were feared, mistreated and pronounced inferior to the slaves, whom it was believed they desired to excite to insurrection."³ However, the Colonization Society explained that "this [condition] is not the fault of the coloured man, nor of the white man, nor of Christianity, but an ordination of Providence and no more to be changed than the laws of nature."⁴ Most people felt simply that Negro prejudice was uneradicable, and to save society from inevitable social conflict, removal was necessary.

The Spirit of the Revolutionary War and the Declaration of Independence was not consistent with slavery, so several states began emancipating their slaves in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. However, some states demanded that the Negro leave the state upon emancipa-

²P. J. Staudenraus, The African Colonization Movement, 1816-1865 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), pp. 15-19.

³J. E. Cooke, Frederic Bancroft, Historian (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1957), p. 154.

⁴Leon Litwack, North of Slavery (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 21.

tion. Other states then responded with legislation to keep the freed Negroes from entering their states. Generally the South was against the emancipated black remaining in its territory. The problem was that while the North promoted emancipation it did not want the free black to come North whereas the South accepted emancipation but coupled it with emigration. We thus see a country willing to free Negroes but believing their presence to be a danger to the public. As the presence of the free Negro became a major problem, various solutions were offered, such as re-settlement in Africa. This solution gave birth to the American Colonization Society.

Originally the American Colonization Society was exclusively a Southern movement.⁵ The Northern appeal was based on benevolence and missionary zeal and Southern appeal was based on the hope of reducing the chance of slave insurrection. All the men who met to found the Society "attended because they hoped to find a painless way to remove the Negro from the United States."⁶ The Society was designed to appeal to numerous elements, from the slaveholder who would enhance the value of his property by eliminating the free Negro, whose presence was thought to be encouragement to run-aways and rebellions, to the patriot who would be doing his humanitarian duty, and included such men as James Madison, Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, John Marshall, and Francis

⁵Cooke, p. 157.

⁶Staudenraus, p. 28.

Scott Key. At the inaugural meeting Henry Clay warned that "colonization was for free Negroes, not slaves. He bluntly warned that colonization must avoid the 'delicate question' of emancipation."⁷ The Society, realizing the necessity of the good will of the slaveholders, made its constitution specific. The constitution made the colonization of free Negroes with government assistance its only official aim.⁸

The Society pledged itself not to interfere with the institution of slavery. Emancipation and improvement were termed areas beyond the scope of their work.⁹

Despite its promise and its stated official aim, the real motives of the Society have long been a subject of controversy and could in themselves require an exhaustive study. The American Colonization Society was many things to many people and great confusion arose as to its real intention. In the first year of the Society's official organ, the African Repository, three different positions are expressed, lending to this confusion. One position, attempting to give only a religious and benevolent tone, unfortunately gives cause to future Southern cries of abolitionism.

[The American Colonization Society] proposes to transport to Africa our free people of colour, and there enable them to govern themselves, and found the invaluable institutions of civilized society. . . . Nothing more than this, does the Colonization Society directly propose to accomplish. If, however, in its progress, it should exhibit the benefits which would accrue both to masters

⁷Staudenraus, p. 28.

⁸Cooke, p. 157.

⁹Litwack, p. 20.

and slaves by a voluntary dissolution of the bonds which unite them, should convince the Southern people and their legislatures, then emancipation might be both safe, practicable, replete with blessing, and full of honour, where in this great republic, is the candid and christian man who would regret the effects of its moral influence. . . . It is not the Colonization Society, as standing separate-- but as connecting its influence with mightier agencies-- not as singly great, producing results of the highest moment, but as acting a part preparatory to movements which may relieve this nation from the most terrible evil that afflicts it, while it confers on Africa inestimable blessings that we contemplate with heart-felt interest.¹⁰

A second position, to satisfy still another element, makes the same initial assertion regarding the Society's direct aim, but goes on to give credence to those who accused the Society of being pro-slavery.

Eminent individuals have, we doubt not, lent their aid to this cause, in expectation of at once accomplishing a generous and noble work for the object of their patronage and for Africa, and guarding that system, the existence of which, though unfortunate, they deem necessary, by separating from it those, whose disturbing force augments its inherent vices, and darkens all the repulsive attributes of its character. In the decision of these individuals, as to the effects of the Colonization Society, we perceive no error in judgment: our belief is the same as theirs. We can unite with them to effect their object.¹¹

In attempting to please several opposing forces and straddle the extremely emotional and sensitive slavery fence, the Colonization Society actually caused only confusion, alienation, and bitterness. Realizing the need for national support and seeking the path of least resistance, the Society at its 1826 annual meeting reaffirmed its real character and objects and created a third position in the form of two

¹⁰African Repository, I, 34-5.

¹¹Ibid., I, 227.

resolutions:

Resolved, that the Society disclaims, in the most unqualified terms, the designs attributed to it, of interfering, on the one hand, with the legal rights and obligations of slavery, and on the other, of perpetuating its existence within the limits of the country; and Resolved, that its only object is, what has been at all times avowed, the removal to the coast of Africa, with their own consent, of such people of colour within the United States, as are already free, and of such others, as the humanity of individuals, and the laws of the different states, may hereafter liberate.¹²

This reaffirmation still failed to free the Colonization Society from the quagmire of confusion which the Society itself had a hand in creating. Along with many other groups and individuals between 1820 and 1860, they sowed the dangerous wind of anti-slavery sentiment and reaped a whirlwind of invectives from many quarters.

In a discussion of motives for colonization, the desire to reduce the cursed African slave trade is essential. Colonization and resulting civilization of the African coastline was to serve as a deterrent to slave traffic, a seemingly more evil practice than the institution it fed. The light of Christianity piercing the darkness of African barbarism appealed to the benevolent nature of man. The spreading of Christianity became a motive stressed by the Society because of its widespread appeal and absence of legitimate opposition. As Kenneth Stamp points out, however, this motive was an enigma, for while the American Colonization Society's Liberian colony extends its positive influence down the coast of West Africa, reducing the volume of illicit slave-running, the American

¹²African Repository, I, 335-36.

Colonization Society at home will not go directly at the forced labor system which gives life to the very evil they fight through colonization in Africa.

The fairest judgment, then, of the American Colonization Society would be this: a benevolent movement, impractical in nature, which sought to avoid unavoidable racial conflict. It reflected the nationalistic, reform tone of the day, but, because of this very appeal to many elements, the movement was swept up by the cross-currents of slavery sentiment and alternately attacked as a device to strengthen the bonds of slavery or a device to promote abolitionism. Two of the Society's most reknown^d critics, William Lloyd Garrison and James Gillespie Birney,¹³ did not deny the original purpose or the sincerity of the founders but felt the aim of the movement had been adulterated into promoting white rather than black self-interest.¹⁴

Negro reaction to the Society was immediate. Most Negroes opposed the colonization movement because they saw it used to solidify slavery and exterminate the free people of color.¹⁵ The typical Negro attitude can be stated thus: Here

¹³Garrison was editor of the Liberator and founder of the New England Anti-Slavery Society. Birney, a former Southern slaveholder who was a Society regional agent, became disenchanted with Society accomplishments and converted to Garrison's abolition movement.

¹⁴Betty Fladeland, James Gillespie Birney, Slaveholder to Abolitionist (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955), pp. 86-87; Early Lee Fox, The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1919), p. 47.

¹⁵Louis Mehlinger, "Attitude of Free Negro Toward African Colonization," Journal of Negro History, I (July, 1916), 283.

we were born--here we will live by the help of the Almighty God--and here we will die."¹⁶ The Negro felt that if the Colonization Society was sincere and wanted to prove it, it should campaign for equal rights in the United States. If they believed in improvement, they should treat Negroes as equals and combat the conditions in America that cause prejudice and racial conflict.¹⁷

The idea of deportation was not new to the Negro. In pre-Revolutionary War days deportation of Negro criminals was a common practice. Thomas Jefferson and Fernando Fairfax of Virginia had both proposed similar colonization plans long before 1817.¹⁸ A Negro named Paul Cuffe had, by 1815, already transported a boat load of Negroes to Africa and was consulted by the Society founders.¹⁹ Another individual promoting African colonization was William Thornton, a native of Antigua who later became a physician and resided in Philadelphia and Washington.

The American Colonization Society had two major areas of difficulty--finances and the confusion over motives which caused the Society to be swept up in the slavery-emanicipation controversy. Let us deal with the financial problem first.

¹⁶Mehlinger, p. 286.

¹⁷Litwack, p. 26.

¹⁸Henry N. Sherwood, "Negro Deportation Projects," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, II (March, 1916), 491.

¹⁹Henry N. Sherwood, "Paul Cuffe and His Contribution to the American Colonization Society," Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, VI (1912-1913), 385-390.

Independent effort would not serve the larger needs of a national society. The Society realized large sums of money would be necessary to make an effective change in the free Negro population. As indicated in its constitution, the Society based all hope for real success upon convincing Congress to adopt African colonization as a national policy. The Society failed to gain direct government support but by emphasizing the Society's importance in curbing the slave trade, the board of directors did get indirect government aid through the Slave Trade Act of 1819. The President was authorized by this act to send an American naval squadron to African waters and establish an American government agency on the African coast for the re-settlement of rescued victims of the African slave trade.²⁰ This act, amending an earlier Slave Trade Act of 1807, provided \$100,000 to be used for enforcement of the new act. Regarding re-settlement, President Monroe appointed a Colonization Society member as agent of the United States government in Africa. The American Colonization Society thus received not only indirect aid but unofficial recognition from the federal government. This, however, was not enough and the Society knew it. The Society wanted the act amended to permit government purchase of territory and establishment of an African colony. But Secretary of State John Quincy Adams said the United States Constitution did not allow the establishment of a colonial system.²¹ The Society failed to

²⁰Staudenraus, p. 50.

²¹Ibid., pp. 51-52.

get official government sanction of colonization and their colony assumed the status of colonies of eighteenth century private trading companies.²²

The Society was now at a crucial point. Intending to rely on private contributions only until government aid could be obtained, the Society began to languish and had to come to a decision. They decided they could continue their work without government sponsorship and entered a new phase--private assistance through voluntary auxiliaries. The appointment of Ralph Gurley as secretary in 1825 marks the beginning of this new phase, this turning point for the American Colonization Society. Work now began on developing a national movement, utilizing systematic publicity through creation of their own newspaper, the African Repository. State and local auxiliaries were initiated all over the country, Ohio being especially fertile for Society efforts. Lebanon, Bellbrook, Oxford, Xenia, Eaton, and Germantown all had flourishing local colonization auxiliaries. Although never abandoning the hope of government support, by neglecting an all-out campaign to gain government assistance and relying on private funds, the Society doomed itself to failure. The project to which they had dedicated themselves was too large for private means to maintain.

In 1833 a last attempt was made to gain federal aid but Clay's Distribution Bill, giving receipts from public

²²Staundenraus, p. 66.

land slaes to the Colonization Society, was vetoed by Jackson. The political star had already fallen for the Society. The national mood had changed. Sectionalism was rising with all its conflicts. The opening of new cotton lands in the Southwest caused slavery to be even more firmly entrenched, while the dedication of William Lloyd Garrison and his New England Anti-Slavery Society made the issues of slavery, emancipation, and colonization inseparable. From 1833 on, anti-slavery agitation became the dominant topic of conversation, and colonization was shelved in the background.

The second major area of difficulty for the Colonization Society was its position regarding slavery and emancipation and the constant agitation resulting therefrom. The Society became trapped in a vicious circle: in the North, Garrison was steadily convincing the people that colonization and slavery were synonomous, whereas the Southerners felt that colonization and emancipation or abolition were linked together. The founders of the Society, while realizing that colonization would promote manumission and hopefully lead to eventual emancipation, agreed to emphasize only colonization of free Negroes. Throughout the controversy, the national Society refused to expand its official aim to include abolitionism. To the Society slavery was a national responsibility. The friendship of the slave owner was very important to the Society and they earnestly sought to avoid retaliation against slaveholders.²³ The American

²³Louis Filler, The Crusade Against Slavery (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 20.

Colonization Society tried to appear as a benevolent missionary effort to all--to the North who favored emancipation and to the South who wanted to rid itself of free blacks.

Many members felt free to give forth their own viewpoints on colonization. Some members hoped colonization would hasten the end of slavery. These deviations from the official stated purpose had the effect of blurring the distinction between colonization and emancipation in the public mind.²⁴ Because Northern direction and support began to dominate the colonization movement, emancipation became in the public's mind a part of the Society's official purpose.²⁵ Those for colonization did everything in their power to clarify their position. The most definitive explanation of the Society's plan was given by Ralph Gurley, secretary of the Society, when he said, "'The great question in regard to the perpetuity of gradual abolition of slavery, we (the Society) believe, must be decided by the Southern states themselves, yet we do hope that our plan will exert a moral influence favorable to voluntary emancipation.'"²⁶

The statements failed to soothe the Southern attitude. Southern leaders said they understood the purpose of the Society was only to remove beyond the United States the then freed colored element in the country. Otherwise

²⁴Staudenraus, p. 75.

²⁵Cooke, p. 159.

²⁶Staudenraus, p. 205.

they would not have joined.²⁷ In vain the Society declared they had always recognized the legitimate and constitutional existence of slavery. "They desired neither to destroy nor to perpetuate slavery. Colonization, they explained, opened the way to manumission, not emancipation."²⁸ By offering the Southern slaveholder a way to get rid of free blacks, the Society might indirectly encourage emancipation. The Society had no intention of interfering with slavery. The Southerner must first of his own free will emancipate his slaves, at which time the slaveowner may then avail himself of the Society's assistance. But nothing could prevail over the Southern conviction that colonization and emancipation were bedfellows.

Although Southern denunciation of the American Colonization Society was spirited, a much more passionate attack was launched by the immediate emancipationists.²⁹ Garrison took Society statements pledging to leave slavery alone and distorted them. Garrison was convinced colonization was a conspiracy to strengthen slavery and by his constant accusations of such made colonization and slavery one and the same.³⁰ Regardless of his questionable tactics and arguments, Garrison forced the Society to make clear their

²⁷Cooke, p. 159, quoting from Herman V. Ames (ed.), State Documents on Federal Relations: The States and the United States, p. 211.

²⁸Staudenraus, p. 174.

²⁹Cooke, p. 179.

³⁰Staudenraus, p. 200.

real intentions and speak openly about them.³¹

From 1833 on, the Colonization Society began to go downhill. The tight money policy caused by the Jackson-Biddle United States Bank recharter struggle and the Panic of 1837 saw Society contribution totals skid. The Society leaders could not agree upon the proper use of official organization publicity in answering Garrison's charges or reaching the people. "During the 1840's the strife-torn, debt-ridden Society fought for its very existence. As an effective, forceful movement, African colonization was virtually dead."³² The 1850's brought a new and final stage for the Society, a brief renaissance including practical endorsement by the Republican party and its first presidential victor, Abraham Lincoln.³³ Now they became only an emigration agency, only the mechanism by which colonists could gain passage to Africa. Because all schemes for wholesale removal were outmoded by the end of the Civil War and the resulting Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments, the American Colonization Society was virtually extinct by 1865. This is, however, historical hindsight which Rear Admiral Foote, guest speaker at the Society's forty-sixth anniversary (1863), did not enjoy. Foote said that the present condition of the country and the undefined status of the Negro made colonization now indispensable to the suffering black. Liberia, said Foote, was the

³¹Filler, p. 61.

³²Staudenraus, p. 240.

³³Litwack, p. 29.

only place where the Negro could "become a freedman, not only in name, but a freedman in deed and in truth."³⁴ He gave the Society renewed hope, telling them the times gave a significance to the movement never before enjoyed.

The American Colonization Society, however, did achieve certain ends. It enjoyed a large measure of public approval in the 1820's and was a failure only in the sense that it was unable financially to send larger numbers of Negro colonists to Liberia--approximately 16,000 colonists between 1817 and 1865. With the independence of Liberia in 1847, the Society finally achieved its greatest success, success for which it is generally not given just recognition. For while it is true that based upon its stated purpose, to send free Negroes to Africa, it was not numerically successful, the colony of Liberia prospered somewhat and showed great potential. In a report of the United States Congressional House Committee on Commerce in May, 1842, evidence of the profitable nature of the colony and its equally promising future potential was given. The colony made no significant reduction in the volume of African slave trade, but then civilizing and Christianizing the coastline of Africa in order to stop slave-trading was like curing pyromania by reducing the volume of matches in circulation. The Society also served as an influential national sounding board on slavery and as a moderating middle ground for sectional tensions.

³⁴New York Times, January 27, 1863, p. 8.

Organized by Southerners and earnestly seeking support from the slave and free border states, the American Colonization Society appealed to moderate men as a middle course. It had a philosophy that was relatively simple. The Society based its arguments largely on the condition of the free Negro and the doctrine of ineradicable racial inequalities. They saw the free Negro, whom they felt to be worse off than the slave, as the leading threat to American society. The colonists argued their's was the only humane and just solution. Through colonization the Negro would make a better place for himself in Africa and through this success abroad, raise his prestige at home and encourage more manumissions. No significant achievements could have ever been rendered by the American Colonization Society because although it enjoyed great support from the North as the most benevolent solution to problems of race relations, lack of staunch Southern support, government apathy and strong Negro resistance outweighed this Northern support.³⁵ There is no doubt the Society only intended to touch the area of slavery peripherally but unfortunately, after 1830, the issue could not be avoided.

³⁵Litwack, p. 28.

CHAPTER II

THE FREE NEGRO IN OHIO, 1802-1860

A study of the free Negro in Ohio during the first half of the nineteenth century makes clear one basic fact. The free Negro was a member of a servile race and was never a welcome inhabitant of the state. He was an orphan of society, unwanted and ignored. Events during the first fifty years of Ohio's existence as a state show an increasing opposition to the settlement of Negroes under any circumstances.¹ The North as a whole rejected slavery, but also seemed to reject embracing the free Negro. Much of the basis for opposition to the free Negro was brutally practical. The Negro seemed ignorant, shiftless, and irresponsible; and in point of fact he generally was--a system of forced labor does not foster in a man qualities of stability, ambition, and frugality. Slavery does not prepare a man for the industriousness necessary to overcome other man-made barriers such as prejudice and misunderstanding. Simply stated, in Ohio prior to the Civil War, although there was never any significant pro-slavery sentiment, there was wide-spread discrimination and second-class treatment given the free Negro which grew in proportion to the amount of Negro influx.

¹Charles Ray Wilson, "Negro in Early Ohio," Ohio Archeological and Historical Quarterly, XXXIX (1930), 7.

Long before Northern abolition attacks, pressure from home forced the South to defend slavery. Before 1830, there were many in the South who could not in good conscience participate in the "peculiar institution" and were willing to emancipate their slaves. Manumission, however, was coupled with the requirement in most states that the freed Negro must leave the state within a designated time period.² Slavery was above all else a form of social control, and the presence of the free Negro could only serve as a disruptive force.

Northern states were equally unwilling to receive the free Negro who emigrated. Restrictive Black Codes were passed by many Northern states to prevent the Negro from entering the state and to discourage him from staying once he had entered.³ Strangely enough, Ohio, carved from the Northwest Territory, which by the provisions of the Northwest Ordinance could be called "the valley of democracy," was the most stringent of all the Northern states with anti-Negro legislation. Ohio set the pattern which the rest followed.

Ohio's proximity to Canada and its 375-mile common border with the slave states of Virginia and Kentucky made it an attractive haven for fugitive slaves and free Negroes. Early fear of the Negro was evidenced in the debates of the Ohio Constitutional Convention in Chillicothe in 1802.

²Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution (New York: Random House, 1956), pp. 232-36. See also John Hope Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), pp. 185-242.

³Litwack, pp. 64-112.

Slavery had been outlawed by the Northwest Ordinance but at the Convention it was argued that the Ordinance applied only to the territorial state of development. Thus, slavery could legally exist in Ohio and a resolution to that effect missed passage by only one vote.⁴ Jacob Burnet, in Notes on the Early Settlement of the Northwest Territory, said great diversity of opinion was prevalent regarding the people of color, then numbering less than four hundred. Rather than split the convention, the Negroes in Ohio were not assumed to be parties to the Constitution.⁵ At the outset, then, Negroes in Ohio were legally free but achieved little else during the next half century. The unsympathetic attitude of the Convention members toward the free Negro was to be the dominant attitude for some decades.⁶ Professor Frank Quillin, whose study of race prejudice in Ohio is still the most comprehensive one even though it was written at the beginning of this century, said, "Negroes were not recognized as having any political existence and were given no political rights. They were to occupy the same relation to the government as Indians or unnaturalized foreigners. All the rights and privileges under the constitution were given to the white man."⁷

⁴Frank U. Quillin, The Color Line in Ohio (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1913), pp. 18-19.

⁵Jacob Burnet, Notes on the Early Settlement of the Northwest Territory (Cincinnati: Derby, Bradley, and Co., 1847), pp. 354-55.

⁶James H. Rodabaugh, "The Negro in Ohio," Journal of Negro History, XXXI (1946), p. 13.

⁷Quillin, p. 21.

The attitude of the white population toward the free Negro in Ohio was in part determined by the background of the white population in that area. The largest group of settlers were the Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania and southern areas such as Virginia and Kentucky. They located along the Ohio River counties, especially in the Symmes Purchase near Cincinnati. They were opposed to slavery on economic grounds; that is, they saw slavery as profitable to a relatively small number of large-scale plantation owners. To them, slavery was economically stifling to the vastly predominant non-slaveholding white and to the South in general. However, they were also opposed to the free Negro whom they saw as a competitive threat to the free labor market. Because of their predominantly Southern flavor and a memory of the Negro as a lazy, shiftless, ignorant and immoral person, they staunchly resisted the presence of the free Negro under any circumstances.

Another group was the New England contingent who settled almost exclusively in the Western Reserve region of northern Ohio or in Marietta. Their Puritan background caused them to oppose slavery morally. And as long as the free Negro remained only an idealist image in the mind, his image was a bright one. But when the people of the Marietta area came into contact with the Negro, the image became tarnished and they generally went along with the more practical but severe southern Ohio methods of dealing with the presence of the free Negro.

A third interesting and significant group were the Quakers. They came from Pennsylvania and from Virginia and

the Carolinas. They settled in the central and southeast counties and resolutely maintained their humanitarian idealism. Although aware of the Negroes' lazy and shiftless appearance, their strong religious belief enabled them to consistently fight for better treatment. They became an essential nucleus in the Ohio abolition movement in the 1830's and 1840's.

Taking into consideration the origin of many of the settlers in early Ohio and the location of most Negroes (three-fourths of all Ohio Negroes lived in Cincinnati during the first fifty years), it is not surprising the inferior treatment they received. There was a large group opposed to slavery only in Ohio. They believed the economic effect of slavery would force the better white elements of the South to emigrate to free soil. Others saw slavery as a necessary evil to be restricted only if the restrictive attitude did not anger the South and jeopardize commercial relations with them. Regardless, they had no love for the rights of blacks as individuals. The inhabitants of southern Ohio, especially in Cincinnati and the Brown county "camp" area, were aware of the free black's irresponsible and lawless reputation.⁸ Many Ohioans feared that because Ohio was an anti-slavery state, it would become a dumping ground for a group of people the white man thought by nature to be inferior and degraded.⁹

⁸Robert E. Chaddock, Ohio Before 1850 (New York: Columbia University, 1908), pp. 93-94. See also Emilius O. Randall and David J. Ryan, History of Ohio, IV (New York: Century History Company, 1912), pp. 119-120.

⁹Rodabaugh, p. 15.

Most Northern states attempted to prevent Negro immigration, either by incorporating prohibitions in the state constitution or by legislative law. Ohio's policy of distinct legal or political discrimination against free Negroes to discourage alarming immigration was basically carried out through the inhuman Black Laws, the first of which was initiated in 1804. Subsequent laws were passed in 1807, 1831, and 1838, and they can be summed up as follows: A Negro could not enter the state unless he had certified proof of freedom which he had to carry on his person at all times; once in the state, Negroes had to post a \$500 bond, signed by two bondsmen, to guarantee good behavior; Negroes could not vote, hold office, testify against a white man, serve on a jury, serve in the militia, attend public schools, or be admitted to public institutions, asylums, and poor houses.¹⁰ The Black Law most offensive was the one denying the Negro his "oath." The degree to which the black man was thoroughly exploited by being denied the right to testify against a white man in court is emphasized in A. D. Barber's Report on the Condition of the Colored People of Ohio, read before the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society at its fifth anniversary at Massillon, May 27, 1840. Several examples are given to show how much the white man abused the Negro and escaped punishment. This lack of legal redress of grievances and lack of protection under the

¹⁰A good study of Ohio's Black Laws can be found in Quillin, Chapter 2, and J. Reuben Sheeler, "The Struggle of the Negro in Ohio for Freedom," Journal of Negro History, XXXI (1946), 208-26.

law is not necessarily conducive to good citizenry but rather promotes the very qualities of lawlessness and shiftlessness used to justify the Laws' existence. The Black Laws, plus the state's constitution, serve to point out Ohio's official attitude toward free Negroes: prohibit slavery, keep the Negro out, degrade Negroes in the state, and allow slavery to continue outside Ohio. The Black Laws were undoubtedly engineered to keep the free Negro in a subservient position when he succeeded in entering the state and yet they failed to discourage immigration. Fortunately, they were generally ignored by enforcement officials and flouted by the Negroes. But their mere presence on the books served as a silent threat, and much more on occasion. As Barber stated in his Report: "It may be said that these laws are a dead letter. Then why not blot them from our statute books? The very existence of such laws must degrade the colored man."¹¹

It is essential the reader understand why the Black Laws were passed and how they managed to remain on the statute books until 1849, considering that at no time between 1800 and 1850 did the Negro population ever comprise more than 1.6 per cent of Ohio's total population.¹² Southern Ohio, with the attitude toward the free Negro explained earlier, was the most populated area of the state and consequently dominated the attitude of the state legislature.

¹¹A. D. Barber, A Report on the Condition of the Colored People of Ohio (Massillon, Ohio: 1840), p. 2.

¹²Bureau of the Census, Negro Population, 1790-1915 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918), pp. 51, 57.

Furthermore, commercial ties made southern Ohio sensitive to the concerns of their Southern neighbors and willing to pressure for legislative restrictions on Negro immigration, both fugitive and free. Most white people in Ohio, especially in Southern Ohio, simply did not want the Negro in Ohio and showed great antipathy and contempt for him. The Black Laws were designed to implement their contempt. "They justified themselves in their action on the ground that it was necessary for the preservation of the prosperity of the State and for the good of their posterity."¹³ Numerous quotations are available to substantiate the rationale behind Ohio's legalized discrimination. In 1832, a committee reporting to the Ohio Legislature on the condition of the colored population said: "We must exclude a people whose residence among us is degrading to themselves and fraught with so much evil to the community. The Negroes form a distinct and degraded caste and are forever excluded by the fiat of society and by the laws of the land from all hopes of equality in social intercourse and political privileges."¹⁴ An Ohio legislator, speaking before the House upon the above Committee report, said:

Never can we expect any elevation of moral sentiment from a people upon whom society has affixed the brand of infamy from their birth, with whom it is considered disgraceful for the meanest white man to associate. Are not these people excluded by our constitution from the right of suffrage and by our laws from the benefits and blessings of free schools; and this, too, from the dire necessity imposed by the feeling of the community that their very

¹³Quillin, p. 29.

¹⁴Ohio State Journal (February 1, 1832), quoted in Quillin, p. 30.

touch is contamination? Are not such as these the benefits accorded to those who are clothed by the sable skin of the African?¹⁵

As if political or legal discrimination were not enough, an unwritten code of segregation further confined the daily lives and opportunities of Ohio's Negroes. This was where the real motive behind discrimination against Ohio Negroes became apparent and where the problem appeared in its truest perspective--a Hydra's head, to be cauterized not by prejudice based on ignorance and racial superiority but by a willingness to change tempered with humanitarianism. The complete absence of any feeling approaching equality was attested to by the exclusion of blacks from public schools (public funds could be used to establish black schools if no one in the district objected, and blacks could establish and support their own schools if the area would tolerate it, which it many times would not); job discrimination (operating through the various mechanical associations) that usually prevented a Negro from obtaining any but the most menial of jobs; "Negro pews" in churches; and restriction or exclusion in hotels, restaurants, railroads, stagecoaches, theatres, and other public places. The Negro's color served as an impassable barrier which prevented the two races from ever being put on an equal footing. Their attitude was not based on prejudice but on color, on natural differences which provided distinctions too great for harmony; exclusion and separation were only the natural order of things. The most surprising aspect was the reaction of the Negro to this all-pervading

¹⁵Quillin, p. 31.

discrimination. One would be hard put to find any example of Negro protest against discrimination approaching forcefulness. A few petitions were initiated and circulated on the local and state level; but generally the Negro was willing to take the treatment, hoping for the day when the white man would smile upon him and grant him some measure of equality, an attitude forerunning the days of Booker T. Washington.

The hostility toward the free Negro varied proportionately to the density of Negro population, Cleveland and Cincinnati serving as cases in point. In northern Ohio, where few Negroes lived, racial prejudice was limited. As compared to the twelve counties of the Western Reserve which in 1850 had only 1321 Negroes, Cincinnati had 2258 Negroes in 1840, one-twentieth of the city's population, and 3122 Negroes in 1850.¹⁶ In southern Ohio, especially in Brown and Hamilton counties, feeling against the Negro ran quite high as the Cincinnati race riots of 1829, 1836, and 1841 demonstrated. The Negro of southern Ohio was usually less ambitious than his northern Ohio brother and was attracted by the Ohio River whose river boat traffic provided menial jobs. The northern Ohio Negroes were attracted mostly to the Western Reserve counties of Cuyahoga, Erie, and Lorain where the former two provided jobs around docks, railroad terminals, hotels, and barber shops, and the latter enjoyed the liberal

¹⁶Francis P. Weisenburger, The Passing of the Frontier in History of the State of Ohio, ed. by Carl Wittke, (Columbus: Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society, 1941), p. 45; Charles Cist, Cincinnati in 1841 (Cincinnati: 1841), p. 34 and Cincinnati in 1851 (Cincinnati: 1851), p. 46.

attitude of Oberlin College toward co-racial education.¹⁷

In the late 1820's Negro immigration into Ohio, centering on Cincinnati, increased alarmingly. For a commentary on the condition of Negro life in Cincinnati at this time, we turn to the autobiography of John Malvin, a Southern free Negro whose wonderlust beckoned him to Ohio. He said: "I thought upon coming to a free state like Ohio, that I would find every door thrown open to receive me, but from the treatment I received by the people generally, I found it little better than in Virginia."¹⁸ Before long, Malvin saw the condition of his race and read some of Ohio's Black Laws responsible for their condition. "Thus I found every door closed against the colored man in a free state, except the jails and penitentiaries, the doors of which were thrown wide open to receive him."¹⁹

Cincinnati grew uneasy as the volume of Negro immigrants increased between 1825 and 1830. This uneasiness was reflected in the formation of the Cincinnati Colonization Society in 1826, the membership of which read like the city's social register. By 1829, one resident out of every ten in Cincinnati was black. Fear of being overwhelmed by a veritable tidal wave of black immigrants led to hostility which soon spilled over into the violent Riot of 1829, the cumulation

¹⁷Weisenburger, p. 45.

¹⁸Allen Peskin, ed., North into Freedom, The Autobiography of John Malvin, Free Negro, 1795-1880 (Cleveland: Western Reserve University, 1966), p. 39.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 40.

of a decade of resistance. The trustees of the county decided to revive the Black Laws at this point, one of which required blacks to post a \$500 bond guaranteeing good behavior in order to remain in the state. Tremendous debate raged in Cincinnati over the righteousness of such a move. [The colored leadership sought to delay the deadline while the drive against the colored population continued, picking up support from various sections. Tension grew and the impatience of some of the city's rabble led to a violent raid upon the colored section.] The bloodshed and futility of this unprovoked attack pricked the conscience of many Cincinnatians who decided to recant. However, [many Negroes had already left; as many as 1,000, one-half of Cincinnati's Negro population, fled to Canada and formed the Wilberforce Colony, named in honor of the British Methodist Bishop who successfully led the struggle for West Indian slave emancipation.] The more prosperous, strong, imaginative blacks left while the weaker and less successful stayed behind. Some of the leadership remained, but the Negro community lost its "head-full of steam"; and Cincinnatians quickly became cognizant of the fact. This episode proved to be the most crucial point in the early history of Negroes in Cincinnati.²⁰

In contrast to Cincinnati where Negro prejudice grew virulent and where Negroes were virtually confined to menial

²⁰Richard C. Wade, The Urban Frontier (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959), p. 229. Also see Litwack, North of Slavery, pp. 72-74. For the text of the proclamation by the city of Cincinnati banishing the free people of color, see "Documents," Journal of Negro History, VIII, 331.

tasks, Cleveland Negroes enjoyed rather wide opportunities. Three basic reasons explained Cleveland's striking degree of racial harmony. First of all, as has already been mentioned, there was a correlation between the number of Negroes and the level of racial tension, and Cleveland had only a small number of Negroes. Secondly, the effect of the abolition movement, quite influential in the Western Reserve, was to assist in minimizing the prejudicial tone of the area; and lastly, the Negroes of Cleveland had an exceptional degree of group consciousness, promoting their own cause rather than simply accepting the white man's benevolence.²¹

Unfortunately for both the Negroes and the state, the passage of time in ante-bellum Ohio did not significantly improve the lot of the Negro. The enemies of the free Negro were still very much alive. In Mercer County for example, because it was further north in the state, it was supposed the Negro would receive better treatment, but he did not. In 1833, John Randolph, a brilliant but eccentric slaveholding member of a Virginia dynasty, former United States Congressman, and political thorn to several Presidents, freed his slaves. Manumission by a will was a practice not uncommon in the South at this time. Freedom was to be followed by compliance with state law which required emigration from the state within a designated time period. But in Randolph's case, problems over court litigation, land purchases, and estate executors delayed emigration until 1846. Even before

²¹Peskin, pp. 12-16.

the will of John Randolph directed his 400 emancipated slaves to be settled on purchased land in Mercer county, the people of that county, through the efforts of August Wattles, a philanthropist from Lebanon, Connecticut, had already seen the growth of a rural Negro community in their midst. The reception given these ex-slaves served to prove Ohio's continued hostility toward Negroes. Even before they were scheduled to arrive, a group of Mercer and Auglaize county white settlers passed several resolutions which made clear their position on the matter of Negro colonization in the area:

(1) Resolved: That we will not live among Negroes, as we have settled here first we have fully determined that we will resist the settlement of blacks and mulattoes in this county to the full extent of our means, the bayonet not excepted.

(2) Resolved: That the Blacks of this county be and are hereby respectfully requested to leave the county on or before the first day of March, 1847, and in case of their neglect or refusal to comply with this request, we pledge ourselves to remove them, peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.

(3) Resolved: That we who are here assembled pledge ourselves not to employ or trade with any black or mulatto person, in any manner whatever or permit them to have any grinding done at our mills after the first day of March next.²²

The Randolph Negroes, as they came up the ~~Miami~~-Erie Canal, were not exactly given a hero's welcome. Some of the Cincinnati and Dayton newspapers seemed to forecast doom or one of the Egyptian plagues if the blacks were allowed to settle. They arrived in the village of Bremen one Sunday in July, 1846, and within one week were escorted by armed white

²²American Colonization Society Annual Report, 1847,
p. 10.

citizens to the county line. Judge Leigh, executor of John Randolph's estate, took personal charge of the Negroes and took them by boat to Piqua, Ohio. Many stayed there and in Sidney, and it was supposed the rest would disperse themselves between Piqua and Cincinnati, wherever possible.²³ An interesting postscript to this whole episode is an article from the African Repository:

We are told by the Lynchbury Virginian, that John, the well-known and faithful servant of the late John Randolph, who, with the emancipated slaves of his master, went to Ohio, and were treated by the citizens in a manner of which our readers have been apprized, has returned to Charlotte with the intention of petitioning the legislature to allow him to remain in the commonwealth. He says, they have no feeling for colored people in Ohio, and, if the legislature refuse to grant his petition, he will submit to the penalty of remaining and be sold as a slave--preferring this to enjoying freedom in a free state.²⁴

Another indication that the passage of time did not significantly improve the condition of the free Negro in Ohio was that even with the revocation of the Black Laws conditions did not really improve. In 1849, the generally neglected but no less stifling and despicable Black Laws were repealed. In actual practice, however, they were still observed, and a look at the general attitude of Ohioans as seen in the Constitutional debates of the next year will show why. Petitions came in great numbers to the Convention delegates asking that definite limits be placed upon immigration of blacks; many of

²³For a detailed study of the Randolph Negroes in Mercer County, Ohio, see Alma May, The Negro and Mercer County (Thesis, University of Dayton, 1968), pp. 31-48.

²⁴African Repository, XXII, 321.

these petitions also suggested state aid to colonization for those already in the state. These petitions came mainly from southern Ohio regions where, as has already been mentioned, anti-Negro feeling ran higher. Regarding the attitude of the delegates, they preferred to avoid dealing with the Negro at all, à la 1802 Convention style. They chose to ignore his presence again by politically excluding him from society although his position and rights were subjected to thorough debate throughout the convention. Charles Hickok, in The Negro in Ohio, seemed to feel that the Negro's exclusion was dictated by practical considerations. Especially regarding enfranchisement, it was felt that a position favoring the Negro on this issue would prevent ratification of the new Constitution. The Negro had, over the years, gained many supporters, but the state, as a whole, was not ready for such a radical step toward equality. Hickok, in a possibly over-exaggerated evaluation of what certain currents running through convention debates meant to the future of the Negro in Ohio, said:

The Convention of 1850 had not materially altered the political condition of the Negro, either for better or for worse, but the question of his rights and privileges had been most thoroughly discussed, and thereby his cause had been really advanced. As a consequence he was in a much better position to secure more favorable laws in the future and ultimately to obtain political equality.²⁵

²⁵Charles T. Hickok, The Negro in Ohio (Cleveland: Western Reserve University, 1896), p. 68.

CHAPTER III

OHIO STATE COLONIZATION SOCIETY

Ohio's prejudicial attitude toward the free Negro was not unlike the attitudes of other northern states. Ohio's strategic geographic location made her a haven for runaway slaves and emigrating free Negroes. In the 1820's, the increase of Negroes caused Ohio great concern, especially in the southern Ohio region where the free blacks usually remained. It was natural then that a movement to colonize free Negroes in Africa attracted national interest and was particularly attractive to the state of Ohio. The movement took the name of the American Colonization Society and was founded in 1817 in Washington, D. C. The founders realized the inadequacy of privately supported funds to support such a large project, so the effort of the national movement in its early years was concentrated on gaining federal support. As indicated in Chapter I, the Society, in 1819, managed only to gain indirect financial support and unofficial government recognition. The Society began to languish, and a decision had to be made as to whether or not the Society could continue its work without government assistance. They decided they could and entered a new phase of development in 1825 with the promotion of private assistance through state auxiliary societies. They began to publish an official organ entitled the African Repository and

Colonial Journal which served to direct constant attention to the Society's aims and maintain interest in the movement.

Ohio contained many people who felt that the free Negro was not only a danger to domestic tranquility but also the leading social problem of the day. They sought the most painless way to ease the situation and were favorably inclined toward the colonization movement. In connection with the national society's emphasis on the development of auxiliary state colonization societies, the Ohio State Colonization Society held its first annual meeting in December, 1827, in Columbus. At this point, the many warm friends of colonization finally launched a state-wide movement to send free Negroes to Africa. Prior to this time, however, several local auxiliaries, noticeably concentrated in southern Ohio, had already been formed.¹ Sentiment favoring colonization was clearly expressed a few months before the formation of the Ohio State Colonization Society when the Ross County grand jury passed the following resolution:

Whereas the benevolent scheme to colonize the free people of colour, on the continent of Africa, merits the decided concurrence and the entire approbation of the members which compose the Grand Jury: Therefore resolved, That we, the members of this Grand Jury, do heartily concur in the great and benevolent plan instituted by the American Colonization Society at Washington city, for the purpose of colonizing the free people of colour on the continent of Africa; and do recommend it to the patronage of the good people of this country.²

The aim or object of colonization was clearly stated

¹See Appendix listing Ohio Auxiliary Colonization Societies.

²African Repository, III, 23-24.

in Article 2 of the Ohio State Colonization Society's constitution:

The object to which its attention shall be exclusively directed, is the colonization on the coast of Africa, (with their own consent) of the free people of color of the United States, and such as may from time to time gain their freedom; and this society will contribute its funds and efforts to the attainment of that object; by aiding free colored persons of Ohio, to emigrate to Africa, and by contributing its funds, not thus appropriated, to the treasury of the American Colonization Society.³

But considerable confusion arose over the motives behind this stated aim and had the effect of clouding its goal and hindering its progress. Only indirectly, colonization would "encourage" emancipation by removing the free Negro whose presence was thought to incite slaves to rebellion. This secondary effect of colonization made the real motive for colonization questionable. It became a vulnerable spot for the colonizationist and was attacked by both pro and anti-slavery forces. Colonization was not adequate or just enough to satisfy some abolitionists; and to the more uncompromising abolition elements, merely a device to strengthen slavery. Pro-slavery men quite naturally resented any tampering with the delicate system. Colonizationists compounded the problem by unsuccessfully seeking to appease the abolitionists in Ohio on one hand, and soliciting the support of the slaveholders with whom Ohio had valuable commercial intercourse on the other, all the while trying not to alienate either side. A neat trick if Ohioans could have done it, but regarding slavery, there was no neutral ground. Like all

³Sherwood, "Movement in Ohio," p. 81.

fence-sitters, colonizationists were alternately wooed and attacked by both sides, and their failure to free themselves of this middle-of-the-road aspect of their philosophy caused the colonization movement in Ohio to suffer.

Confusion over another motive centered around the question: "Was colonization for the betterment of black or white or both and should it not thus be represented?" In a pamphlet entitled A Brief Exposition of the Views of the Society for the Colonization of Free Persons of Colour in Africa, published under the direction of the Board of Managers of the Ohio State Colonization Society, the reason for this confusion over motives was clearly expressed. "The design of this Society is general--the benefit of the whole African race. Its plan of operation is specific--the establishment on the coast of Africa, of a Colony of free people of colour, from America."⁴ A movement to "benefit the whole African race" was quite commendable, but two paragraphs later it became clear that colonizationists had no real love for the African race and were actually benefiting the white race by their efforts. "The scheme of the American Colonization Society was devised and adopted by liberal and intelligent men of the South, and the North, as the plan and the only one, which could unite these two great divisions of our country, in any efforts for the removal, or even the mitigation, of the greatest evil, and heaviest curse, which afflicts our land."⁵ They continued to say that "a manumitted slave

⁴Sherwood, Movement in Ohio," p. 81.

⁵Ibid.

remains a negro still, and must ever continue in a state of political bondage; and it is obvious that he who is deprived of the inherent rights of a citizen can never become a loyal subject."⁶

For further expression of the confusion which arose over the real object of the benevolence of the colonization movement, let us turn to the address of Governor Jeremiah Morrow, president of the Ohio State Colonization Society, at its first annual meeting:

This Society is a voluntary one, as well as the parent institution, and the other auxiliary branches. Its objects and purposes are purely of a disinterested and benevolent character.⁷ The object contemplated, is no other than that provided for in the Constitution of this Society. It is exclusively that which has been avowed and publically declared to the world.⁸

These opening remarks seemed to justify colonization claims to be a white man's movement to promote black self-interests. The governor went on to clarify colonization's purpose and to explain why Ohio colonizationists sought to aid the blacks through emigration; and at this point colonization sounded as if it had been adulterated into promotion of white self-interests.

The object is to remove from us that unfortunate race of men, who are now, as aliens on their native soil.--A people who do not, but in a small degree, participate in the privileges and immunities of the community--and who, from causes in their nature inevitable, and reasons insuperable; never can be admitted to the full employment of those rights as fellow-citizens. . . . (Our plan) If

⁶Sherwood, "Movement in Ohio," pp. 82-83.

⁷My underlining; not in the original source.

⁸Ohio State Colonization Society, First Annual Report (December, 1827), p. 3.

executed on an extensive scale, our country would be relieved from an evil viewed in the light of moral and political effect as at present great, but in prospect still more threatening.⁹

Great pains were taken to show the compatibility of colonization and abolition, but with no great success. Colonizationists pointed out that many slaveholders were willing to free their slaves but did not want them to remain as an incitement factor to other slaves. By providing a way to remove free blacks, gradual emancipation would thus be promoted. This did little to assuage the abolitionist. Colonization was only a safe port in a storm from which one could either strengthen slavery by removal of an essential stimulant to insurrection or safely and conservatively dispose of a troublesome race. Because a whole chapter will be devoted to colonization versus abolitionism, suffice it to say here that because Ohio colonizationists were unable to counter abolitionism's untiring energies and constant attacks, colonization in the state fell far short of its proposed goals. An excerpt from a letter by Elisha Whittlesey, a devoted and unswerving patron of colonization in Ohio, lamenting the lack of colonization progress in Ohio, demonstrates the point. "The friends of colonization have been very unwilling to have the cause mingled with politics, and therefore, the efforts of the abolitionists have not been resisted or counteracted."¹⁰

Interest in colonization in Ohio was demonstrated by

⁹Ohio State Colonization Society, First Annual Report, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰African Repository, XXI, 51.

numerous resolutions from churches and the Ohio Legislature.

As early as 1824, the Ohio Legislature passed a resolution

. . . recommending the gradual but entire emancipation of slaves, and a system of Foreign Colonization; and the passage of a Law by the General Government, with the consent of the slaveholding States, providing that all children born of slaves thereafter, be free at the age of twenty-one; and recognize the evil of slavery as a national one, and the principle that all the States should share in the duties and burdens of removing it.¹¹

It is easy to see here how confusion over colonization aims and motives could be compounded by such well-meaning but harmful endorsements of colonization. Again in 1828, sympathy with colonization in Ohio was shown by the state legislature with this resolution:

That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested to use their efforts, to induce the Government of the United States to aid the American Colonization Society, in effecting the object of their institution, which is so eminently calculated to advance the honour and interest of our common country.¹²

Financial assistance from the state legislature for the state colonization movement was sought constantly thereafter, especially between 1848 and 1854, but with no success. What would have been more effective than a concerted, state-wide effort, its moving force centered in Columbus, cajoling, convincing the state legislature therein to assist the colonization movement? Unlike several other states, Ohio never was able to gain state assistance. The following state appropriations serve as examples: The Maryland Legislature in 1832 appropriated \$10,000 per year to be raised by a general county

¹¹African Repository, I, 251.

¹²Ibid., III, 351.

tax and taken from the general fund; the Virginia Legislature in 1850 granted \$30,000 per year to aid colonization in the state; Pennsylvania in 1852, \$2,000 per year; an Indiana settlement in Africa was promoted by Indiana legislative grants of \$10,000 in 1852 and 1855; New Jersey appropriated for colonization \$1,000 per year in 1852 and renewed it in 1855; Connecticut, \$1,000 in 1853; the Missouri Legislature in 1856 gave \$3,000 per year for ten years; and the state of Tennessee appropriated \$30 per emigrant.¹³ The only notable exception was the failure of the New York Colonization Society to gain official assistance from their legislature. In their official organ, the New York Colonization Journal, numerous attempts to enlist the state legislature's support were mentioned and always great optimism was demonstrated but never any success.

Churches throughout Ohio, through endorsements, showed a great affinity for the benevolent nature of the colonization movement. In June, 1827, the Ohio District Conference of the Methodist-Episcopal Church passed the following resolution:

That this Conference cordially approve the benevolent objects of the American Colonization Society; and that all the preachers within its jurisdiction be, and they are hereby earnestly requested to deliver public addresses and to take up public collections, in support of the Colonization cause. . . .¹⁴

And the endorsements continued: The Baptist General Convention of Ohio, May, 1827; the Luthern Synod of Ohio, June, 1827; and

¹³Found in various volumes of the African Repository.

¹⁴African Repository, II, 120.

re-affirmations by the Ohio Methodist-Episcopal Conference in 1835 and 1853.¹⁵ Increasing dependency upon the churches for support through donations was evidenced not only by appeals to Ohio churches by American Colonization Society agents but also by American Colonization Society reports of funds from Ohio found in the African Repository.¹⁶

The list of officers of the state colonization society reads like "Who's Who in Ohio." For a great part of its existence, the Society was led by the then current governor of the state, whose leadership was titular only. Governor Jeremiah Morrow was the first president, and later governors Robert Lucas and Wilson Shannon also served in that capacity. Ohio contributed liberally to the leadership of the parent society and often participated in the deliberations of the annual meetings. Ohio desired to maintain a working relationship between the state and national organizations and often sent delegates to Washington from the state organization and from several of the more active local auxiliaries. The prominence of the men from Ohio involved in the national society was quite evident and reflected the attitude of the wealthy and influential classes in the state on colonization. Ohio contributed nine Vice Presidents, including such well-known Ohioans as Elisha Whittlesey, Thomas Corwin, Samuel Vinton, and Jacob Burnet, several Life Directors and Board of Directors members, and over thirty-five Life Members

¹⁵African Repository, II, 315-316; XI, 332; XXIX, 314.

¹⁶See Appendix I.

(\$30 contributors). Elisha Whittlesey was on the American Colonization Society Executive Committee, and Judge Burnet was a subscriber to the Gerrit Smith plan (\$100 per year for ten years). It must be remembered, however, that the positions of many of these men, from whence came their prominence, required that they be in Washington and did not necessarily indicate great colonization zeal. It must also be remembered that Ohio's participation on the national level did not necessarily bring about colonization success on the state and local levels. The fact that the leaders were well known and capable men actually proved to be a disadvantage. Although their prominence lent credence to and drew attention to the movement, they were too prominent and active in their professions to provide the drive and cohesiveness requisite for any successful large-scale movement.

Given the factors favoring colonization, the movement should have enjoyed comparative success in Ohio but it did not. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a study of the ebb and flow of colonization efforts in Ohio, to see why colonization was not successful in the state.

Colonization spirit in Ohio generally formed along geographic lines, the greatest preponderance of auxiliary societies being in southern Ohio. The most successful way of soliciting funds and establishing these local auxiliaries in Ohio was through the use of paid agents, usually sent out by the American Colonization Society but occasionally dispatched by the state organization. The largest portion of

money raised in Ohio came from private donations and church collections, obtained by these agents and turned in to the parent society in Washington.¹⁷ It was difficult to keep a man in the field long, and Ohio's failure to cultivate the fertile colonization soil through more effective use of these agents was a reason for her relatively dismal achievements.

Early correspondence in the African Repository from Ohio citizens indicated great optimism and enthusiasm for the colonization project. An extract from a letter from a gentlemen in Ohio showed not only this enthusiasm for colonization but also the benevolent and religious basis for much of colonization's support: "We cannot but yield to the conviction, that we are approaching near to a glorious era, when humanity will no longer mourn over her sons, doomed to degradation."¹⁸ The state colonization society began optimistically by planning to issue an annual report (Their first annual report was also their last.) and publish their own colonization journal (which never got off the drawing board), for the purpose of not only capitalizing on colonization enthusiasm in Ohio, but stimulating the movement through education. Had the state society fulfilled these well-meant intentions, it would not have had to regret its inability to give a more favorable report in 1829 because of a lack of public attention to the nature of colonization and its aims

¹⁷See Appendix 1.

¹⁸African Repository, III, 18-19.

or purposes.¹⁹ Many people in Ohio either did not know anything about the colonization movement or else what they did know consisted of damaging distortions and misconceptions. Ohio's failure to propagandize the movement enough definitely reflected upon the degree of support they were able to muster. Unlike Ohio, the colonization societies of other states in their reports of annual meetings filled pages and pages of the African Repository and showed a degree of colonization organization on a state level that was conspicuously absent in Ohio.²⁰ The Ohio State Colonization Society only managed to have two or three annual meetings in their entire existence. Several states (Kentucky and Pennsylvania) gave money to support newspapers promoting colonization, and the state societies of Virginia, Maryland, and New York published their own colonization newspapers. Numerous items of correspondence in the African Repository showed a craving for knowledge of the progress of the movement in Ohio. The friends of colonization in Ohio were educationally starved by this lack of effective organization on the state level.

Early in its existence, the Ohio State Colonization Society was given a chance to make great strides by an 1829 Ohio Supreme Court decision making constitutional the Black Law requiring a \$500 bond of each free black in order to main-

¹⁹Ibid., v, 73, 84.

²⁰The Vermont Colonization Society, Thirty-Second Annual Meeting (1851); The New York Colonization Society, Twenty-Ninth Annual Report (1861); The Pennsylvania Colonization Society, Thirtieth Annual Meeting (1856); The Missouri Colonization Society, Eleventh Annual Meeting (1853).

tain Ohio residency. The city of Cincinnati took this opportunity to expel their bothersome free black population by enforcing the previously ignored Black Laws. Precipitated by a bloody riot, approximately two thousand free Negroes left Cincinnati. But rather than accelerating the colonization movement in Ohio by going to the only place they could-- Africa, they went to Canada and formed the Wilberforce community. Since opposition by the free Negro in Ohio to colonization is the subject of a forthcoming chapter, it is unnecessary to comment further on this development except to say that regardless of the intensity of black opposition to colonization in Ohio, a state society with more organization and drive would have been in a better position to have extracted some positive results out of this golden opportunity.

Throughout its career, the Ohio State Colonization Society was unable to maintain the fidelity of the local auxiliaries. The state colonization society's Board of Managers, in their Instructions to the Board of Managers of present and future local auxiliaries, indicated that the state organization would head the movement in Ohio and serve as the medium of communication between local auxiliaries and the national society. This it clearly failed to do. Most of the local colonization societies formed prior to the state organization continued their allegiance to the parent society in Washington. Of the dozens of local auxiliaries formed after the state society, only two (Springfield and Hamilton County) gave official loyalty through their constitutions to the state

society, and this corresponded with the reorganization of all three in 1839. This lack of loyalty was lamented by the State Society in its first annual report and became an ever-present problem for them as the colonization movement continued in Ohio.

The action of the Cincinnati Colonization Society is a good example of the Ohio State Colonization Society's inability to form and direct a cohesive colonization movement in Ohio. In 1831, at a meeting of the Board of Managers of the Cincinnati Colonization Society, the following resolution was passed:

Whereas, the Board of Managers of the American Colonization Society have authorized their agent, R. S. Finley, with the concurrence with the State Colonization Society of Kentucky, or the Cincinnati Colonization Society, to take measures for, and superintend the fitting out of an expedition of 130 emigrants from the western country, to sail from New Orleans. . . . Therefore, resolved, That this Board, in conjunction with the State Society of Kentucky, will take immediate measures to aid in preparing said expedition. . . .²¹

The above activity of the Cincinnati Colonization Society corresponded to a time when the state society needed reorganizing, one of several long periods of disorganization. An American Colonization Society agent reported in 1832 that he had visited Columbus during the session of the Legislature, and on inquiry he "found the state society had been disorganized for two years past; that is, they had not held their annual meeting--but still the zeal of the old officers had not abated, they were willing to cooperate with me in its

²¹Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette, September 8, 1831.

reorganization. . . . The State Society was reorganized . . ."22

This reorganization was short-lived, however, for at the formation of the Colonization Society of Antrim and vicinity in 1837, the following resolution was passed: "That this Society cordially approve the plan already suggested by the Xenia Colonization Society, for forwarding delegates from the different Colonization Societies of the State to Columbus, to form a State Colonization Society." The mover of this resolution went on to say that he had received a letter from the Xenia Colonization Society urging the various societies in Ohio to bring about an organization of a State Colonization Society. He hoped that Ohio would not be more backward than the other states in the United States and that "the subject might be fairly laid before the several societies of the State."²³ There was, however, no state colonization society organized at this point. From a gentleman in Ohio in 1837, the American Colonization Society received the following letter:

It is believed that many friends to the cause of colonization are to be found in the State of Ohio. They are, however, dispersed all over the State, and without unity of design, or concert of action, and in general in apathy for want of a proper stimulus. . . . The apathy with which the people are in general afflicted, I consider the greatest obstacle to the enterprise. Had we a tithe of the abolition zeal, we might do wonders.²⁴

Finally in 1839, the Ohio State Colonization Society was revived and reorganized again, adopting the original 1827

²²African Repository, VIII, 58.

²³Ibid., XIII, 143.

²⁴Ibid., XIV, 30-31.

constitution of the state society.

Once again, the state society fell short of the motivation and strong leadership required to survive as a meaningful, competitive movement. Extracts from correspondence to the American Colonization Society in 1845 from two of Ohio's most faithful colonizationists were very revealing regarding colonization progress in Ohio since the reformation of the state society in 1839. Judge Jacob Burnet wrote:

The chief complaint is in the want of a local agent to keep the subject constantly on the public's mind, and to solicit contributions in the sparse as well as the more dense settlements of the country. . . . Heretofore, but very little aid has been received out of our cities and towns. The great body of farmers and others residing in the country have not been sufficiently attended to. The colonization cause has many warm friends in Ohio, but they require to have their attention occasionally roused, and their feelings a little warmed by such communication as an agent ought to be able to give.²⁵

Colonization's most faithful supporter in Ohio, Elisha Whittlesey, added these comments in his letter: "Nothing has been done for some time past to revive the colonization societies. . . . As to future operations, I think the State Society should be resuscitated. I shall go to Columbus, and if possible assist in its reorganization."²⁶ Apparently Mr. Whittlesey was unsuccessful in his attempt to revive colonization in Ohio for a quotation from the Twenty-Ninth Annual Report of the American Colonization Society (1846) contained a most damaging statement: "In Ohio, no very thorough efforts have been made during the past year. The State Society has

²⁵Ibid., XXI, 50-51.

²⁶Ibid.

but a feeble life, if indeed it can be said to live at all."²⁷

The final attempt to breathe new life into the colonization effort in Ohio centered around a movement called "Ohio in Africa." In 1848, the American Colonization Society, realizing Ohio's great potential, appointed David Christy, an eloquent, tireless, highly successful agent for the parent society as agent to Ohio. This event, coupled with a \$5,000 bequest from Charles McMicken of Cincinnati toward purchase of land adjoining Liberia, increased emphasis on government and church support, and an Ohio Committee of Correspondence appointed by the American Colonization Society to give greater efficiency to the enterprise, brought about a renaissance of colonization interest in the 1850's. To kick off this new era in colonization for Ohio, David Christy in 1848 made an unsuccessful appeal to the colored people of the state. He said that there were only two ways the black man would ever gain equal rights; one, by amending the state constitution, or two, emigrating to Liberia. The latter, Christy emphasized, was the only certain way to gain these rights immediately.²⁸ In 1849, 1850, and 1851, Christy, with the firm endorsement of the Ohio Committee of Correspondence, petitioned for state assistance through memorials to the Ohio

²⁷Ibid., XXII, 38.

²⁸David Christy, "Address to the Colored People of Ohio," Collection of Pamphlets, Ohio History, Cincinnati Historical Society.

Legislature but achieved no success.²⁹ Christy was optimistic regarding the effect of the 1850 Ohio Constitutional Convention's refusal to grant the free Negro political equality and was encouraged by a meeting of colored citizens in Cincinnati in 1850 at which time colonization in Africa was given their blessing.³⁰ In 1849, the Ohio Legislature was petitioned by the Ohio Methodist Conference and the Old School Presbyterian Synod of Cincinnati to appropriate \$5,000 for ten years to aid the American Colonization Society in promoting African colonization, again with buoyant assurances but no funds.³¹ Even Christy's masterful lecture to the Ohio Legislature, promoting African colonization by emphasizing colonization's relation to the destruction of the slave trade and the practicality of colonization, failed to move the Ohio Legislature to appropriate funds. This lecture made up a fifty-six page pamphlet which was later published and distributed by the Society to promote their newly independent Liberian colony.

Although Christy's superhuman efforts to promote colonization in Ohio brought about a new spurt of colonization fortune and raised the colonization banner which had

²⁹African Repository, XXV, 69-70. See also Ohio in Africa, Memorial to the Ohio Legislature from the Ohio Committee of Correspondence, found in Sherwood, "Movement in Ohio," pp. 93-102; New York Colonization Journal (December, 1850); and C. W. Shunk, The Negro Colonization Movement in Ohio, Prior to the Civil War (Master's Thesis: Ohio State University, 1941), pp. 72-86.

³⁰African Repository, XXVI, 219.

³¹Ibid., XXV, 323-24. See also New York Colonization Journal (June, 1854) for an Ohio Colonization Committee address to the clergymen of Ohio for assistance in raising funds for settlement in "Ohio in Africa."

been sagging in the 1840's, he failed to gain the state financial support necessary to carry into execution an otherwise impractical plan. We see no sign of any significant black emigration from Ohio, but only continued local auxiliary frustration and an almost total lack of effective leadership on a state-wide basis. Unknowingly, the state's most active local colonization society, at an annual meeting, pronounced a fitting epitaph for the study of the colonization efforts of the Ohio State Colonization Society. The Zanesville-Putnam Colonization Society in November of 1853 passed the following revealing resolution:

That, whereas a 'Committee of Correspondence' some three years ago was appointed for this State (of which one of our number was one) from whom we have not heard since its organization (if indeed it even has been organized) that our Society be directed to make inquiries of the Secretary of the Parent Society on the subject; and further to suggest to the Secretary, and consult upon the expediency and propriety of forming a State Society in Zanesville or Xenia or some other place where friends can be found of sufficient ardor to keep it alive.³²

Anti-climactically, the Ohio State Colonization Society was reorganized for the fourth time and went on to equal the mediocrity of its predecessors.³³

As a state-wide movement for the expressed purpose of sending Negro emigrants to Africa, the Ohio State Colonization Society was a conspicuous failure. This concluding section analyzes the information in Appendix 1, which statistically supports the contention stated earlier that as a

³²African Repository, XXX, 25.

³³New York Colonization Society Journal, October, 1854.

colonization society, the Ohio State Colonization Society was unsuccessful and that one major reason for colonization failure on a state-wide scale was the state society's inability to provide the strong, effective leadership necessary to maintain any dynamic, cohesive, and successful movement. May it be mentioned here that the two other factors basic to the failure of colonization in Ohio, Negro opposition and the abolition controversy, are the subjects of the two remaining chapters and will not be dealt with at this point.

Although a considerable amount of money was contributed by Ohio to the national colonization effort, only a fraction of that amount, less than \$1,500 was collected and turned in by the state society to the American Colonization Society. Colonization fortunes in Ohio could be correlated with the varying sums of money totaled year by year in Appendix I. Only in the first seven or eight years and briefly after the reorganizations of 1832 and 1839 did the Ohio State Colonization Society appear as a contributor. Colonization in Ohio was relatively successful in the early and mid-1830's. The late 1830's and 1840's were hard times for colonization in Ohio because of abolition competition and economic stagnation after the Panic of 1837. Colonization in Ohio, sharing the economic boom years of the 1850's and bolstered by increasing church support and the sheer force-of-will of David Christy, experienced new life.

All this was well and good, but a close look at the constitutions of the state and auxiliary societies indicates

that the funds collected were to be employed in aiding the colored people of Ohio to emigrate to Africa. Ohio was always long on funds but short on emigrants. Records of the American Colonization Society show, for example, that in 1853, Ohio was eleventh out of thirty in contributions (\$3,200.33), but sixteenth out of seventeen in emigrants (2); in 1854, fifth out of twenty-nine in contributions (\$2,960.61), but ninth out of eleven in emigrants; in 1855, ninth out of thirty-two in contributions (\$2,128.25), but sent no emigrants; finally in 1857, seventh out of thirty-one in contributions (\$2,414.97), but again, sent no emigrants.³⁴ From 1827 to 1857, the state of Ohio managed to send only fourteen free Negro emigrants to Africa; this total ranked Ohio twenty-second out of the twenty-six states which sent free Negroes to Africa. With the removal of free blacks as its goal, this was a rather small accomplishment.³⁵ The explanation--very simple, according to an Ohio historian writing at that time: "Having very few free blacks, in the state for it to operate upon, little has been done here by it. In other words, having nothing to do, it has done nothing."³⁶ This writer is not quite that certain and cannot simplify to that

³⁴African Repository, XXX, 35, 38; XXXI, 36; XXXII, 33-35; and XXXIV, 82.

³⁵Ibid., IX, 57, 89, 126; X, 292. See also American Colonization Society, Seventeenth Annual Report (1834), 2; Forty-second Annual Report (1859), Appendix, 53-56.

³⁶Caleb Atwater, History of the State of Ohio, Natural and Civil (Cincinnati: 1838), p. 323.

extent.³⁷ Several factors explain the noticeable lack of colonization success in Ohio, one being the point of this chapter, that a lack of dynamic and effective leadership on the state level denied the movement the cohesiveness and inspiration needed to capitalize on Ohio's colonization potential and achieve any significant ends.

³⁷Negro population figures between 1820 and 1860 do not bear out Atwater's assertion. Ohio, for the twenty-year period between 1820 and 1840, during which time Atwater wrote his history of the state, had a 92 per cent average increase in Negro population. Although Ohio had fewer Negroes numerically, percentage-wise, each of the four other states compared in Appendix II decreased between 1820 and 1860.

CHAPTER IV

AND HERE WE WILL DIE

It is obvious that any large-scale movement to benefit a given group of people cannot command much success without the blessing and cooperation of the group for which it supposedly exists. It is curious, therefore, that the Negro in Ohio should oppose a benevolent movement designed to offer him a chance to pursue his own happiness. The attitude of the free black in Ohio was indicative of what success colonization could expect in Ohio and is therefore worthy of more than a cursory glance.

Shortly after the formation of the parent American Colonization Society, the Negro, at a public meeting in Philadelphia, made clear his hostility toward colonization; and almost invariably, this became the attitude expressed on future occasions. Further expression of the colored man's attitude toward colonization early in the development of the American Colonization Society came in the form of a song printed in the first Negro paper published in the United States called Freedom's Journal:

The Colored Man's Opinion of Colonization

Great God, if the humble and weak are as dear
To thy love as the proud, to thy children give ear!
Our brethern would drive us in deserts at home.

Home, sweet Home!
We have no other; this is our home.¹

By the time of the Ohio State Colonization Society's first annual meeting, the problem had already raised its ugly head and was a source of consternation to Society members. "It has not escaped observation that a great majority of the free People of colour, manifest a very great unwillingness to migrate to Africa." This unwillingness was somewhat of a paradox to colonization members considering the irreversable second-class condition of free blacks, not to mention the servile bondage of others of his race. The colonizationist explanation, however paradoxical, was that there had been a breakdown in effective public relations. "When we reflect on their ignorance and on the efforts that are made to produce unfavorable impressions, however false on their minds, concerning the designs of the colonization society, and the unpropitious nature of the climate and soil of Africa; we cease to be surprised at the strength of their prejudices against the proposed removal; yet it is not, on this account, to be the less regretted that such prejudices exist." The solution: "To remove false views and impressions from their minds is highly desirable, and for this purpose, it occurred to the Board, that nothing would be more likely to be successful, than the testimony and representations of one of themselves, in whom they could place full confidence."²

¹Freedom's Journal, November 2, 1827, quoted in Shunk, p. 26.

²Ohio State Colonization Society, First Annual Report (December, 1827), p. 7.

Several Negro representatives were sent to Liberia and came back with glowing reports. Occasionally a free black would speak in behalf of the colonization cause, emphasizing the white stigma put on blacks as a degraded caste.³

None of these efforts, however, had any significant effect upon promotion of Negro emigration to Africa. Some Negroes showed a willingness to investigate the subject, but did not want their open-mindedness to be misconstrued as acceptance of colonization. At a meeting of the Colored Freemen of Butler County in May of 1854, a resolution was passed which demonstrated this desire to be clearly understood regarding colonization:

That we are in favor of availing ourselves of all the information we can obtain, as to the advantages afforded to emigrants in the Republic of Liberia, and the inducements held out by that Colony to free colored people. . . and that in the adoption of any or all of these resolutions, we do not intend to be understood as committing ourselves either as Emigrationists or Colonizationists, but as honest inquirers after truth, and as men not afraid to investigate every question at issue in the great controversy in which we are involved.⁴

If the Negro saw that he had to go some place outside the state, Canada appealed to him most, and this did a great deal of harm to the colonization movement in Ohio.⁵ As previously mentioned, the free Negro population of Cincinnati found it necessary to leave the state and therefore sent delegates to negotiate with Canadian officials for a purchase

³African Repository, IV, 248.

⁴Ibid., XXX, 64.

⁵Sherwood, p. 71.

of land. Over two thousand of them departed Cincinnati in 1829 and founded the Wilberforce Colony, settled by the Canada Company in the Western parts of Upper Canada Province. Interesting sidelights to this Canadian emigration were two articles in the Cincinnati Gazette in June and October of the next year. The first reflects the guilty conscience of Cincinnati which was expressed in an editorial requesting "aid to the blacks whom we have driven from Cincinnati." The second article was a public notice from the Committee and Board of Managers of the Free People of Color in the State of Ohio disavowing further connection with one Israel Lewis, whom they had appointed as "an agent to solicit and receive donations to aid the free people of colour in emigrating to and establishing a colony in Canada."⁶ It appeared that Lewis was diligent in his soliciting but not so diligent in his sending of funds received.

Regardless of all efforts to allay the hostility of free blacks to colonization, the Negro remained adamantly opposed to emigration to Africa. Liberia was not proving attractive to the free Negro, and he detested its very name, much less being willing to live there.⁷ The few who would accept colonization as a solution to the conflict between black and white at no time accepted Africa as a place to

⁶Cincinnati Gazette, June 6, 1830 and October 9, 1830.

⁷Weisenburger, p. 43.

colonize.⁸ Whenever possible, they vocalized their hostility and made very clear their position. In 1844, the former Governor of Liberia, the Reverend J. B. Pinney, lectured to a Cincinnati audience on colonization, and to these lectures the colored population was invited. Their response is contained in several resolutions at a meeting and celebration dinner in Cincinnati:

We look upon the colonization scheme and the mis-directed and pseudo philanthropy of its advocates, as the greatest opposing cause to our enfranchisement in the United States of America. . . . Resolved, That we would most respectfully solicit all true friends of the oppressed to withhold their aid from the great negro-banishing conclave of American slavery.⁹

This attitude is further reflected in the resolution of a convention of colored men in Cleveland that met in 1846 to consider certain propositions concerning emigration to Oregon or California. Debate over the propositions became quite heated, and in anger, the party in favor of emigration withdrew. The remaining delegates, in a flush of victory, passed a bundle of resolutions declaring:

That in the present aspect of affairs, the condition of the colored race would not be improved by emigration; that colonization is, and ought to be condemned by the colored people; that the colored colonizationist is as bad as the white colonizationist, and that both ought to be condemned; and that it is the duty of the colored people to stay where they are, and continue to contend earnestly for their rights.¹⁰

⁸Hickok, p. 117. In the 1830's, 1840's, and 1850's, the westward movement of immigrants had considerable effect on the growth of the Pacific Northwest. If the free Negro had to emigrate, the rapidly developing Pacific Northwest was one choice because it was at least on the same continent.

⁹African Repository, XX, 316-317.

¹⁰Ibid., XXIII, 70.

The attitude of the responsible Negro leadership regarding colonization was best expressed in a series of state conventions. At the 1852 Convention of Colored Freemen in Cincinnati, a discussion of emigration began on one evening and was not completed until the following afternoon. When a final vote was taken on African colonization, "only two men in the whole body dared to record their vote in favor of the wicked scheme. On the subject of emigrating to some point on this continent en masse, [the colored people], the vote stood thirty-six in opposition to nine in its favor." A special committee majority report on emigration very clearly explained the free Negroes' reason for condemnation of colonization when it resolved:

That we believe the primary, secondary and ultimate object of the American Colonization Society, is the exportation of the free colored people from the United States, and thereby render the slave property more secure and valuable. We do, therefore, unconditionally, condemn the society and its advocates.¹¹

One final example of the Ohio Negroes' attitude toward colonization was a resolution of the 1857 State Convention of Colored Men in Columbus:

We are opposed to the agitation of colonization or emigration in every shape and form, if it means the removal of the colored people in the States to the North, South, Central America, Canada or Africa, believing such agitation to be detrimental to the best interests of the race and we do pledge ourselves to resist it . . .¹²

¹¹Proceedings of the Convention of the Colored Freedmen of Ohio (Cincinnati: 1852), pp. 5, 9. Found in Collection of Documents, Ohio History, Cincinnati Historical Society.

¹²Proceedings of the State Convention of Colored Men (Columbus: 1857), pp. 6-7. Found in Collection of Documents, Ohio History, Cincinnati Historical Society.

Despite the attitude manifested by these meetings and resolutions, some historians have said that the Negro appeared apathetic concerning colonization.¹³ However, evidence has shown that in Ohio, as in other states, the free Negroes made war against the colonization scheme; and because of the failure to gain approval of the majority of the colored people in Ohio, no great number was ever induced to emigrate. The free Negro was constantly told that Africa was his home, but he refused to accept this. He regarded America as his home--here he was brought and here he would stay. This, in fact, was the essence of the matter. The free black simply did not want to leave, and no amount of propaganda would remove him. Colonization to the free Negro was a way of strengthening the chains that shackled many of his brethren. And to leave while others of his race remained enslaved was considered an act of moral cowardice. The free Negro believed colonization only deepened the very feeling of prejudice that the system was designed to help him escape. If the white man was so benevolent and so concerned about race relations, he should assist the free Negro to gain equality within the United States. To the free black, colonization was his worst enemy, and he would oppose it where and when he could. This resolute opposition caused the colonization movement many a sleepless hour, reflected on several occasions in the African Repository. In reference to Ohio's latest effort to encourage Negro emigration, "Ohio in Africa,"

¹³Shunk, p. 33.

the following statement was made: "It is a well-known fact that heretofore the great body of the colored people in Ohio have been opposed to colonization." Ten years later, Reverend E. G. Nicholson, an American Colonization Society agent to Ohio, commented in an 1858 report:

I hoped to rescue some good colored people from Ohio for the November Expedition, and for this purpose have visited the African camps in Brown County, Guinea in Belmont County and the colored people about Boston, in Highland County. They are all ill-at-ease. Their condition is one of almost hopeless depression. To most of them the idea of colonization is repugnant.¹⁴

If these depressed Blacks had this attitude, one can understand how strong the antipathy for colonization must have been among other more fortunate Black people.

America was the free Negroes' native land; it was their duty to contend for their rights as Americans. The Negro in Ohio opposed African emigration as vigorously as he sought to gain his rights. Deep-seated racial prejudice, a prime motivating factor of colonization, would not be eradicated but only strengthened by partial Negro emigration. The general attitude was, therefore, that here they must stay and here they would die.

¹⁴African Repository, XXIV, 314; XXXIV, 347.

CHAPTER V

"I WILL BE HEARD"

The failure of the Ohio State Colonization Society to give concert of action to the colonization movement in Ohio and the hostility of the Negro toward colonization were two factors contributing to a decline in agitation for colonization in Ohio. A final factor was the interest aroused by the abolitionists in favor of immediate emancipation.

Abolitionists in Ohio were successful in embroiling colonizationists in the controversy over slavery. This involvement sapped colonization of vital strength needed to promote its own project. Most colonizationists hoped to remain on the periphery of anti-slavery agitation by indirectly promoting gradual voluntary emancipation. Colonizationists not only failed to stay outside the rapidly expanding slavery controversy, but once drawn in, they failed to counter successfully the abolitionists' assertions.

There were three basic abolitionist charges leveled at colonizationists, and their constant repetition made serious inroads into colonization support. Firstly, colonization was seen as a covenant with slaveholders designed to strengthen the bonds of servitude by removal of a class of people thought to promote dissatisfaction and incite slaves to rebellion. The American Colonization Society was founded by Southern

slave-holders and the movement continued to cultivate Southern favor, essential to the promotion of voluntary manumission. Secondly, colonization was accused of sanctioning a prejudicial and racial philosophy based on white superiority. Colonization promoted physical separation as the only practical solution to glaring political, social, and economic inequalities. Colonization made no attempt to revoke the pernicious and discouraging Black Laws and hoped to strengthen through emigration white self-interests. The racial attitude of both movements was questionable. Although Louis Filler in The Crusade Against Slavery stated that it was the contempt for the Negro held by most colonizationists that effectively separated him from abolitionist efforts, even the abolitionist did not accept social equality with the Negro whom he so fervently sought to emancipate.¹ Thirdly, colonizationists were accused of being inconsistent: promoting a plan which would send a degraded caste--a vile, immoral, ignorant, lazy, inferior class--to civilize and Christianize Africa.

The most fundamental difference, however, between the two movements was the issue of emancipation. The abolitionists sought immediate emancipation and would not tolerate any effort falling short of that goal. Colonizationists desperately sought a middle ground between pro- and anti-slavery forces, which, by 1835, no longer existed. Colonization hoped to work for the abolition of slavery indirectly, and thereby avoid the disruption of society and the Union.²

¹Filler, p. 22; Hickok, p. 133.

²Rodabaugh, p. 17.

The abolitionists were able to arouse considerable reaction and debate to their plan for immediate emancipation while at the same time successfully meeting the colonization challenge. Thus, despite colonization attempts to prove its compatibility with abolitionism, the two movements were ranged on opposite sides, which not only weakened colonization but, considering that both movements were supposedly designed to promote black interests, became a tragic waste of energy.

The conflict between the two movements can be illustrated by turning to the situation in Ohio. The two key centers of anti-slavery efforts in Ohio were the Connecticut Western Reserve where because of a New England and Quaker background an especially fallow field awaited the abolitionist, and Cincinnati and vicinity, whose proximity to the South and vital commercial ties made abolition a volatile issue. Slavery agitation had been carried on in Ohio since 1815 when Benjamin Lundy took an important step in developing Ohio's anti-slavery movement. Lundy organized the Union Humane Society at St. Clairsville, Ohio's first abolition society. In 1821, he began publishing the anti-slavery newspaper, Genius of Universal Emancipation, which was followed four years later by Charles Osborn's anti-slavery Philanthropist. In the early stages of both movements, no wide gulf existed between colonization and abolition such as was to develop in the 1830's. Lundy was an example of a man, who, for a time, believed abolition goals could be achieved through colonization because he thought that thousands of

slaves would be freed if assurances could be given their masters that the freed Negro would be removed from the United States. He also believed the slaves would readily accept this conditional manumission. In his early years, Lundy saw the American Colonization Society as a genuine anti-slavery instrument, imperfect as it was; but like most abolitionists, he became thoroughly disenchanted with the American Colonization Society although never giving up the hope of using colonization or emigration as an anti-slavery tool.³ Other former colonizationists who later converted to abolitionism included William Lloyd Garrison, Lewis Tappan, Gerrit Smith, and James G. Birney. Birney, who like Lundy favored methods which would lead to final emancipation of the slaves, became very active in the American Colonization Society as its agent in the Southwest, including Ohio. Like many other colonizationists, he later became greatly disillusioned with colonization because to him it simply tended to postpone indefinitely the emancipation of the slaves. In 1835, he began to publish an anti-slavery newspaper entitled the Philanthropist, and under great pressure of bodily harm from the people of Cincinnati, he continued agitation for immediate emancipation.⁴

³Merton L. Dillon, Benjamin Lundy and the Struggle for Negro Freedom (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961), pp. 27-28.

⁴Charles Theodore Greve, Centennial History of Cincinnati and Representative Citizen, I (Chicago: Biographical Publishing Company, 1904), p. 597-99.

The 1830's and 1840's were years of exceptionally great strife between colonization and abolition, years during which colonization declined and abolition grew steadily. Abolition received its greatest boost in 1835 with the formation of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society and the concurrent publication of Birney's newspaper. Abolition's growth in Ohio was prodigious. Within one year after the formation of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, over two hundred local auxiliary abolition societies had been formed. The proceedings of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Convention at Granville in 1835 showed the abolitionist to be a stauncher friend of the Negro than the colonizationist because of the former's defense of the free Negro. The point was emphasized that law and public sentiment forced the Negro into a position of ignorance and deprived him of every means of making an honest living. As the convention declared: "In reviewing (the Black) laws, we find all their bearings and provisions calculated to produce effects, the opposite of those for which our government was instituted;--viz: administering right and justice, to promoting industry and honesty by encouraging them."⁵ Thus he was relegated to extreme misery and drugery, from which stem white prejudice and Negro frustration. "Great injustice is done [the free Negro] by comparing them with the whole community."⁶ Unfortunately for the free Negro, there was no fair basis for

⁵Proceedings of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Convention
(Putnam, Ohio: 1835), p. 15.

⁶Ibid., p. 1.

comparison. To the contrary, colonizationists saw racial prejudice and racial conflict inevitable, and therefore sought to remove the free Negro rather than to strike at the conditions creating prejudice. Judge Jacob Burnet, Cincinnati's leading colonization supporter, believed the Black Laws to be both necessary and just; and colonization as a movement in Ohio made no attempt to revoke these Laws.

In 1834, an event very fundamental to the formation of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society occurred in Cincinnati. Ohio communities in the 1830's and 1840's, especially in the southern part of the state, were violently divided over the slavery conflict. Slavery was a constant irritant in the Queen City and loyalties were divided. Agitation over slavery became so pronounced in 1834 at the Lane Seminary, formed in 1829 for the purpose of training young men for the Presbyterian ministry, that a series of debates took place over colonization and abolition lasting eighteen consecutive days. Many of the students, especially the ones of southern antecedents, became converted to abolitionism and began to develop Sunday and day schools for the colored children of Cincinnati. This aroused the anger of the trustees, and they commanded that no more public discussion of slavery be allowed. Four-fifths of the students withdrew and for a few months set up their own institution in Cincinnati. In early 1835, Asa Mahan, a trustee recently resigned, and Professor John Morgan, formerly of Lane Seminary, took thirty students to Oberlin, where in 1833 a college on a very broad and

liberal base had been established, with the understanding that students should be admitted irrespective of color. Great significance is attached to this event in the development of both colonization and abolition. The author of the Centennial History of Cincinnati felt that the Lane Seminary and Oberlin movements were responsible for the formation of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society.⁷ Professor Albert Bushnell Hart believed that the Lane Seminary secession was practically the beginning of organized abolition in Ohio.⁸ Charles B. Galbreath left no room to doubt the significance of the Lane Seminary incident to abolition in Ohio and the effect, in turn, of abolition on colonization. In his History of Ohio, Galbreath made the following statement: "So far as Ohio was concerned, the fate of colonization as a panacea for the ills of slavery was sealed in the great debate in Lane Seminary."⁹

A large percentage of the people in Ohio favored colonization over abolition; but abolition's ceaseless, aggressive attacks on colonization combined with highly effective propagandizing, successful political forays, and unsuccessful colonization counteractions doomed colonization to a success considerably less than its potential would have

⁷Greve, p. 594.

⁸Albert Bushnell Hart, Slavery and Abolition, 1831-1841 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1907), p. 191.

⁹Charles B. Galbreath, History of Ohio, II (Chicago: American Historical Society, 1925), p. 206.

allowed. Colonization hoped to avoid a collision course with abolition, but when it came, colonization was not successful in controlling its competitor and consequently lost its ability to act as an alternate solution to the slavery controversy.

Excerpts from the African Repository clearly demonstrate the effect of abolition on colonization and the reason for colonization's inept refutation of most damaging abolition assertions. In 1835, former American Colonization Society traveling agent Reverend E. W. Sehon wrote: "In many parts of this State, the abolitionists have attempted to rally and introduce among our citizens their damaging doctrines. In no other place have (the abolitionists) seemed to gain more followers than in Circleville. Several of the most worthy citizens of the place, who were formerly warm friends of the colonization society have gone over to the camp of our enemies."¹⁰ At an anniversary meeting of the Xenia Colonization Society, it was noted:

. . . that the friends of Colonization, occupying neutral ground between the modern abolitionists and the new school on slavery, are often subjected to the attacks of either side. This has led the friends of Colonization, occasionally to ward off the shafts aimed at its character and life. In so doing they have acted on the defensive. From self-respect, and also from respect to their cause, they feel constrained to the use of mild and decorous language. Into the arena of political strife, they utterly refuse to go, or be driven. Their appropriate and exclusive sphere, as members of Colonization Societies, is that of voluntary benevolence; beyond this they cannot consistently go.¹¹

¹⁰African Repository, XI, 274.

¹¹Ibid., XIII, 294.

A letter from a colonizationist in the Western Reserve indicated that his colonization society had been

. . . struggling for the last four or five years against the current of abolitionism which has been setting strong against us. Our region has been literally flooded with abolition agents and publications. . . . We are but a short distance from Oberlin Institute where they manufacture the article by wholesale. . . . The efforts of our societies have been paralyzed; and as societies have ceased to act, and old societies are broken up, many have deserted us, and . . . we have had to meet the enemy single-handed, because there was not concert in action amongst us.¹²

In 1839, the Secretary of the American Colonization Society, Ralph Gurley, visited the state of Ohio; and his comment on colonization progress in Ohio was most revealing:

Of late years the hostility of abolitionists has been exerted with singular perseverance and violence in Ohio; and their efforts have doubtless prevailed to impede, to a certain extent, the progress of Colonization, and to diffuse doubts, suspicions, and sometimes prejudice, throughout the community, in regard to its principles, aims, and tendencies.¹³

Unfortunately for the movement, colonization chose to follow the Marquis of Queensbury rules in a rough and tumble, no-holds-barred power struggle. The abolitionists were far more politically astute and ethically unconcerned than the colonizationists. Thusly, colonization failed, in the face of determined action, to compete successfully with abolitionism and lost valuable support.

¹²Ibid., XIV, 150.

¹³Ibid., XV, 129.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Ohio was fertile ground for colonization and abolition because of its geographic position bordering Kentucky and Virginia for 375 miles. It was a haven for free Negroes and a trans-shipment point for runaway slaves. It had strong commercial ties with the South, and many hoped to avoid Southern anger by embracing milder forms of movements promoting emancipation. Many Ohioans saw unavoidable racial conflicts and believed the Negro could never remain in America and gain actual equality.

Colonization sought separation of the races. The free Negro in Ohio suffered under the confining and discouraging Black Laws. Because of these Black Laws, the free Negro was restrained from the political, social, educational, and economic advancement necessary to dispel the white prejudice that nourished colonization efforts.

To many colonization appeared to be a benevolent attraction, a religious and humanitarian solution for both races. The churches in Ohio, after 1830, generally gave their support to colonization efforts, and through collections contributed valuable sums of money for emigration.

Colonization societies in Ohio were arranged in a distinct geographic pattern. Colonization societies were

most numerous in the southwest quarter of the state, where the basically Southern population was greater, and where larger numbers of free Negroes resided. A fair number of societies were located in the northeast quarter of the state where, although they had become stalwart abolitionists by the mid-1830's, their Quaker and New England background caused them to reach early for the benevolence of the colonization movement. Colonization societies in Ohio at no time approached the number of abolition societies. The 1830's and 1840's were lean years for Ohio colonizationists and even though the 1850's witnessed a renaissance of colonization spirit evidenced by increased private donations, renewed church endorsements, and the "Ohio in Africa" movement, the movement in general enjoyed but slight success in Ohio. Between 1827 and 1860 only fourteen Negro emigrants from Ohio were sent to Africa. Even by the wildest stretch of one's imagination, this total cannot be considered but more than a mere token of what might have been done had colonization in Ohio been able to overcome certain obstacles.

Negro opposition, which proved to be the most deciding factor in reducing colonization effectiveness, originated from the attitude of colonizationists toward the supposed benefactor of their efforts. The free Negro would not leave his homeland and wanted assistance that would gain him moral, intellectual, and political improvement in America. Without the support of the group of people to which the movement was dedicated, colonization efforts in Ohio were destined to achieve rather sterile results.

Another factor that should be an essential element in any study of the failure of colonization societies in Ohio was a lack of dynamic, cohesive leadership on the part of the State Society. This factor has received little attention from historians, but numerous pleas from local auxiliary societies for knowledge of colonization's progress and countless supplications for concert of action clearly demonstrate the lack of a co-ordinated, state-wide movement and its effect on colonization fortunes in Ohio.

The final factor that accounted for the failure of the colonization societies in Ohio was their inability to withstand abolition encroachments. Abolitionists effectively used the political arena in which to do battle and along with the constant repetition of a few basic assertions, ground out a victory over colonization competition in Ohio.

Many colonizationists readily admitted that colonization was a wicked institution, but almost all colonizationists shared the feeling of racism and believed in the inherent inferior nature of the Negro. This immutable belief in Negro inferiority was the heart of colonization philosophy. They recognized the Negro's inferior condition, but failed to connect those deficiencies to the effects of slavery, State Black Laws, and various denials and prejudices. Colonization was a movement to get rid of undesirable, not underprivileged, people. Colonization sought relief, not for the Negro but from the Negro. Colonization sought to whitewash America, expunge itself from an increasing social problem, and cleanse

its conscience from several centuries of guilt. As the African Repository stated it: "The moral, intellectual, and political improvement of people of color within the United States, are objects foreign to the powers of this Society."¹

Colonization, whether well-meant or not, was an impractical plan without huge sums of money to subsidize its operations. Federal and state sponsorship was necessary in order to carry colonization to completion. In addition, other serious obstacles still faced colonization, regardless of the amount of financing available. The real failure of colonization lies in the rationale behind the movement. Solving a serious social problem by physically removing that group to which the blame was attached was a cowardly and prejudicial avoidance of the real problem. Colonization was a triumph of shortsightedness and faulty reasoning. Rather than save the limb of the infectious patient, amputation was contemplated.

¹African Repository, VII, 29; for an excellent expression of colonization attitudes toward the free Negro, see Dwight Lowell Dumond, Antislavery the Crusade for Freedom in America (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961), pp. 130-131.

APPENDIX I

Table 1. Funds Collected in Ohio for the American Colonization Society, 1826-1860.

(The totals listed in this table refer to the money officially received by the American Colonization Society from the four designated sources, as reported monthly in the African Repository. These sums represent the total amount of money collected in Ohio for colonization. If the money was given by a church or through private donations to a state auxiliary colonization society, that money was listed under the heading, "auxiliary society.")

| Year | Churches | Ohio State Colonization Society | Auxiliary Societies | Donations | Total |
|------|----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1826 | 54.64 | ----- | 25.75 | 94.44 | 174.83 |
| 1827 | 77.00 | 100.00 | 86.00 | 13.00 | 276.00 |
| 1828 | 77.81 | 30.00 | 466.00 | 106.63 | 680.44 |
| 1829 | 152.77 | ----- | 241.00 | 98.31 | 492.08 |
| 1830 | 294.94 | 270.92 | 211.33 | 843.17 | 1,620.36 |
| 1831 | 405.94 | ----- | 482.35 | 274.08 | 1,162.37 |
| 1832 | 448.19 | 400.00 | 1,031.47 | 551.20 | 2,430.86 |
| 1833 | 171.88 | ----- | 599.26 | 874.17 | 1,645.31 |
| 1834 | 491.21 | 147.32 | 931.42 | 454.77 | 2,024.72 |
| 1835 | 442.06 | ----- | 435.19 | 215.02 | 1,092.27 |
| 1836 | 83.00 | ----- | 426.84 | 161.48 | 671.32 |
| 1837 | 86.36 | ----- | 538.40 | 35.00 | 659.76 |
| 1838 | 77.68 | ----- | 485.90 | 61.00 | 624.58 |
| 1839 | 779.35 | 309.49 | 2,454.89 | 417.75 | 3,961.48 |
| 1840 | 65.10 | 119.02 | 792.77 | 250.50 | 1,227.39 |
| 1841 | 67.72 | ----- | 870.40 | 1,569.08 | 2,507.20 |
| 1842 | 21.05 | ----- | 363.15 | 817.31 | 1,201.51 |
| 1843 | 12.00 | ----- | 294.47 | 592.75 | 899.22 |
| 1844 | 38.83 | ----- | 184.75 | 2,476.15 | 2,699.73 |

| Year | Churches | Ohio State Colonization Society | Auxiliary Societies | Donations | Total |
|------|----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1845 | 64.25 | ----- | 331.18 | 464.05 | 859.48 |
| 1846 | 345.88 | ----- | 278.00 | 2,261.19 | 2,885.07 |
| 1847 | 128.11 | ----- | 196.63 | 446.07 | 770.81 |
| 1848 | 81.35 | ----- | 278.51 | 1,598.00 | 1,957.86 |
| 1849 | 188.50 | ----- | 229.69 | 1,897.85 | 2,316.04 |
| 1850 | 534.87 | ----- | 308.87 | 7,451.90 | 8,295.64 |
| 1851 | 463.96 | ----- | 203.73 | 3,048.80 | 3,716.49 |
| 1852 | 386.60 | ----- | 271.55 | 1,179.37 | 1,837.52 |
| 1853 | 259.40 | ----- | 238.58 | 2,545.20 | 3,043.18 |
| 1854 | 528.12 | ----- | 47.00 | 1,638.09 | 2,213.21 |
| 1855 | 198.37 | ----- | 31.25 | 1,734.74 | 1,964.36 |
| 1856 | 760.04 | ----- | 105.50 | 1,785.89 | 2,651.43 |
| 1857 | 208.84 | ----- | 56.50 | 2,025.16 | 2,290.50 |
| 1858 | 229.54 | ----- | 29.00 | 3,246.70 | 3,505.24 |
| 1859 | 139.59 | ----- | 32.77 | 1,889.31 | 2,061.67 |

Table 2. Ten Most Active Ohio Auxiliary Colonization Societies, 1826-1860

(Based on funds received by the American Colonization Society for colonization as compiled from financial statements reported in the African Repository)

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| 1. Zanesville-Putnam | 3,312.13 |
| 2. Cincinnati and Hamilton County | 2,650.11* |
| Ohio State Colonization Society | 1,376.75** |
| 3. Xenia and Xenia Female | 1,273.54 |

*These two societies worked in such close conjunction that it is impossible to separate their total contributions.

**The State Colonization Society is included for the purpose of comparison.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 4. Greene County | 912.50*** |
| 5. Urbana and Urbana Ladies | 565.00 |
| 6. Columbus and Columbus Ladies | 504.36 |
| 7. Springfield and Springfield Female | 437.18 |
| 8. Israel Township | 321.97 |
| 9. Kenyon College | 250.00 |
| 10. Dayton and Dayton Juvenile | 203.25 |

***This society worked closely with the Kenia Auxiliary Colonization Society, but it is listed as a separate society.

APPENDIX II

Table 1a. Negro Population by State

| | 1810 | 1820 | 1830 | 1840 | 1850 | 1860 |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Ohio | 1,899 | 4,723 | 9,574 | 17,345 | 25,279 | 36,673 |
| New York | 40,350 | 39,367 | 44,945 | 50,031 | 49,069 | 49,005 |
| New Jersey | 18,694 | 20,017 | 20,557 | 21,718 | 24,046 | 25,336 |
| Pennsylvania | 23,287 | 30,413 | 38,333 | 47,918 | 53,626 | 56,949 |
| Indiana | 630 | 1,420 | 3,632 | 7,168 | 11,262 | 11,428 |

Table 1b. Negro Population Percentage by State

| | 1810 | 1820 | 1830 | 1840 | 1850 | 1860 |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Ohio | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| New York | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| New Jersey | 7.6 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 4.9 | 3.8 |
| Pennsylvania | 4.2 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Indiana | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 |

Source: Bureau of the Census, Negro Population, 1790-1915
 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918),
 Table 5, p. 51 and Table 6, p. 57.

Table 2. Emigrants from Ohio to Liberia, 1827-1860

| Ship | Date | Number |
|--------------------|-----------|--------|
| Barque Rothschild | Jan. 1846 | 2 |
| Barque Chatham | May 1846 | 1 |
| Liberia Packet | July 1850 | 1 |
| Barque Ralph Cross | May 1852 | 1 |
| Ship Bonshee | Apr. 1853 | 2 |
| Brig. Gen. Pierce | Dec. 1854 | 7 |
| | Total | 14 |

Source: Compiled from reports of emigrants sent to Liberia
 as listed in the African Repository.

APPENDIX III

Table 1. List of Ohio Auxiliary Colonization Societies, 1820-1860

| | | |
|-----|--|------|
| 1. | Adams County | 1831 |
| 2. | Antrim (Guernsey County) | 1837 |
| 3. | Ashtabula County | |
| 4. | Athens (Athens County) | 1832 |
| 5. | Athens Female <i>Seminary Society.</i> | 1836 |
| 6. | Bainbridge (Geauga County) | 1827 |
| 7. | Batavia (Clermont County) | 1831 |
| 8. | Bellbrook (Greene County) | 1827 |
| 9. | Bellefontaine (Logan County) | 1832 |
| 10. | Bethel (Clermont County) | 1830 |
| 11. | Brown County | |
| 12. | Brownstown (Brown County) | 1830 |
| 13. | Cambridge (Guernsey County) | |
| 14. | Canfield (Mahoning County) | 1827 |
| 15. | Canton (Stark County) | |
| 16. | Cedarville (Greene County) | 1846 |
| 17. | Chillicothe (Ross County) | 1827 |
| 18. | Cincinnati (Hamilton County) | 1826 |
| 19. | Cincinnati Juvenile | 1830 |
| 20. | Circleville (Pickaway County) | 1832 |
| 21. | Clark County | |
| 22. | Clermont County | 1833 |
| 23. | Columbiana (Columbiana County) | |
| 24. | Columbus (Franklin County) | |
| 25. | Columbus Ladies | |
| 26. | Cuyahoga County | 1827 |
| 27. | Dayton (Montgomery County) | |
| 28. | Dayton Juvenile | |
| 29. | Fallcreek (Highland County) | 1827 |
| 30. | Fredericksburg (Wayne County) | 1836 |
| 31. | Granville (Licking County) | 1830 |
| 32. | Greene County Female | 1826 |
| 33. | Greene County Male | 1826 |
| 34. | Greenfield (Highland County) | 1832 |
| 35. | Guernsey County | 1832 |
| 36. | Hamilton County | |
| 37. | Hamilton and Rossville (Butler County) | 1830 |
| 38. | Harrison County | 1837 |
| 39. | Highland County | |
| 40. | Hillsborough (Highland County) | |
| 41. | Hudson (Summit County) | |
| 42. | Israel Township (Preble County) | 1830 |
| 43. | Kenyon College (Knox County) | 1832 |
| 44. | Knox County | |
| 45. | Lancaster (Fairfield County) | 1827 |
| 46. | Lane Seminary (Hamilton County) | 1831 |
| 47. | Lebanon (Warren County) | 1830 |
| 48. | Licking County | 1830 |
| 49. | Logan County | |

| | | |
|------|---|------|
| 50. | Madison (Hamilton County) | 1830 |
| 51. | Marietta (Washington County) | |
| 52. | Martinsburg (Knox County) | 1838 |
| 53. | Massillon (Stark County) | 1838 |
| 54. | Miami (Hamilton County) | 1831 |
| 55. | Miami University (Butler County) | |
| 56. | Montgomery County | 1827 |
| 57. | Mt. Healthy (Hamilton County) | 1830 |
| 58. | Mt. Maria Meeting House (Logan County) | 1832 |
| 59. | Mt. Vernon (Knox County) | 1832 |
| 60. | Muskingum County | |
| 61. | Muskingum Young Men | |
| 62. | New Athens (Harrison County) | |
| 63. | New Burlington (Hamilton County) | 1830 |
| 64. | New Carlisle (Clark County) | 1832 |
| 65. | New Lancaster | 1830 |
| 66. | New Richmond (Clermont County) | 1830 |
| 67. | Ohio State | 1827 |
| 68. | Oxford (Butler County) | |
| 69. | Piqua (Miami County) | 1832 |
| 70. | Poland (Trumbell County) | 1833 |
| 71. | Portsmouth (Scioto County) | 1833 |
| 72. | Reading (Hamilton County) | 1830 |
| 73. | Ripley (Brown County) | |
| 74. | Ross County Female | |
| 75. | Rutland Female (Meigs County) | |
| 76. | Rutland Male (Meigs County) | |
| 77. | St. Clairsville (Belmont County) | 1830 |
| 78. | Sharon (Hamilton County) | 1830 |
| 79. | Somerset (Perry County) | 1832 |
| 80. | Springfield (Clark County) | 1832 |
| 81. | Springfield Female | |
| 82. | Stark County | 1827 |
| 83. | Steubenville (Jefferson County) | |
| 84. | Stillwater (Belmont County) | 1837 |
| 85. | Talmadge (Summit County) | 1827 |
| 86. | Troy (Miami County) | 1832 |
| 87. | Trumbell County | |
| 88. | Urbana (Champaign County) | 1832 |
| 89. | Urbana Ladies | |
| 90. | Utica (Licking County) | 1837 |
| 91. | Wadsworth (Summit County) | 1833 |
| 92. | Warren (Trumbell County) | |
| 93. | Warren Female (Trumbell County) | |
| 94. | Wayne County | |
| 95. | Western Reserve College (Summit County) | 1831 |
| 96. | Wilmington (Clinton County) | 1832 |
| 97. | Wooster (Wayne County) | 1832 |
| 98. | Xenia Female (Greene County) | 1830 |
| 99. | Xenia Male (Greene County) | 1830 |
| 100. | Xenia Juvenile (Greene County) | |
| 101. | Zanesville-Putnam (Muskingum County) | |

Table 2b. Density Map, by County, of Ohio Auxiliary Colonization Societies



Source: Taken from Table 1, Appendix III.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Atwater, Caleb. History of the State of Ohio, Natural and Civil. Cincinnati: 1838.
- Bureau of the Census. Negro Population, 1790-1915. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918.
- Burnet, Jacob. Notes on the Early Settlement of the Northwest Territory. Cincinnati: Derby, Bradley, and Company, 1847.
- Chaddock, Robert E. Ohio Before 1850. New York: Columbia University, 1908.
- Cist, Charles. Cincinnati in 1841. Cincinnati: 1841.
- _____. Cincinnati in 1851. Cincinnati: 1851.
- Cooke, J. E. Frederic Bancroft, Historian. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1957.
- Dillon, Merton L. Benjamin Lundy and the Struggle for Negro Freedom. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961.
- Dumond, Dwight Lowell. Antislavery the Crusade for Freedom in America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.
- Filler, Louis. The Crusade Against Slavery. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Fladeland, Betty. James Gillespie Birney, Slaveholder to Abolitionist. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955.
- Franklin, John Hope. From Slavery to Freedom. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- Fox, Early Lee. The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1919.
- Galbreath, Charles B. History of Ohio. Vol. II. Chicago: American Historical Society, 1925.

- Greve, Charles Theodore. Centennial History of Cincinnati and Representative Citizen. Vol. I. Chicago: Biographical Publishing Company, 1904.
- Hart, Albert Bushnell. Slavery and Abolition, 1831-1841. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1907.
- Hickok, Charles T. The Negro in Ohio. Cleveland: Western Reserve University, 1896.
- Litwack, Leon. North of Slavery. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.
- Peskin, Allen, ed. North into Freedom, The Autobiography of John Malvin, Free Negro, 1795-1880. Cleveland: Western Reserve University, 1966.
- Quillin, Frank. The Color Line in Ohio. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1913.
- Randall, Emilius O., and Ryan, David J. History of Ohio. Vol. IV. New York: Century History Company, 1912.
- Stampf, Kenneth M. The Peculiar Institution. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Staundenraus, P. J. The African Colonization Movement, 1816-1865. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Tyler, Alice Felt. Freedom's Ferment. New York: Harper and Row, 1944.
- Wade, Richard C. The Urban Frontier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Weisenburger, Francis P. The Passing of the Frontier. Vol. III of History of the State of Ohio. Edited by Carl Wittke. Columbus: Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society, 1941.

Articles and Periodicals

- "Documents." Journal of Negro History, VIII (1923), 331.
- Mehlinger, Louis. "Attitude of Free Negro Toward African Colonization." Journal of Negro History, I (July, 1916), 276-301.
- Rodabough, James H. "The Negro in Ohio." Journal of Negro History, XXXI (1946), 11-25.

Sheeler, J. Reuben. "The Struggle of the Negro in Ohio for Freedom." Journal of Negro History, XXX (1946), 208-226.

Sherwood, Henry Noble. "Movement in Ohio to Deport the Negro." Ohio Archeological and Philosophical Quarterly, VII (July, 1912), 51-102.

_____. "Negro Deportation Projects." Mississippi Valley Historical Review, II (March, 1916), 484-508.

Wilson, Charles Ray. "Negro in Early Ohio." Ohio Archeological and Historical Quarterly, XXXIX (1930), 1-49.

Woodson, Carter. "The Negro in Cincinnati in 1830." Journal of Negro History, I (1916), 1-23.

Newspapers

African Repository. 1825-1860.

Cincinnati Gazette. 1829-1830.

Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette. 1831-1832.

New York Colonization Journal. 1850-1854.

New York Times. 1863.

Philanthropist. 1821, 1835, 1836, 1837.

Proceedings, Reports, and Other Source Material

American Colonization Society. Seventeenth Annual Report. 1834.

_____. Thirtieth Annual Report. 1847.

_____. Forty-Second Annual Report. 1859.

Barber, A. D. Report on the Condition of the Colored People in Ohio, 1840. Massillon: 1840.

Christy, David. Address to the Colored People of Ohio. 1848.

May, Alma. The Negro and Mercer County. Master's Thesis: University of Dayton, 1968.

Ohio State Colonization Society. First Annual Report. December, 1827.

Proceedings of the Convention of the Colored Freedmen of Ohio. Cincinnati, 1852.

Proceedings of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Convention. Putnam, Ohio, 1835.

Proceedings of the State Convention of Colored Men. Columbus, 1857.

Sherwood, Henry Noble. "Paul Cuffe and his Contribution to the American Colonization Society." Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, VI, 1912-1913.

_____. "The Settlement of the Randolph Negroes." Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, V, 1911-1912.

Shunk, Charles Wesley. The Negro Colonization Movement in Ohio, Prior to the Civil War. Master's Thesis: Ohio State University, 1941.