

11-2020

Colonizationism versus Abolitionism in the Antebellum North: The Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary (1836) versus the Hanover College Officers, Board of Trustees, and Faculty

J Michael Raley

Hanover College, raleyjm@hanover.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.valpo.edu/mssj>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), [Business Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), [Economics Commons](#), [Environmental Studies Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Geography Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), [Psychology Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Raley, J Michael (2020) "Colonizationism versus Abolitionism in the Antebellum North: The Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary (1836) versus the Hanover College Officers, Board of Trustees, and Faculty," *Midwest Social Sciences Journal*: Vol. 23 : Iss. 1 , Article 9.

DOI: 10.22543/0796.231.1030

Available at: <https://scholar.valpo.edu/mssj/vol23/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ValpoScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Midwest Social Sciences Journal by an authorized administrator of ValpoScholar. For more information, please contact a ValpoScholar staff member at scholar@valpo.edu.

***Colonizationism versus Abolitionism in the Antebellum North:
The Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College and Indiana
Theological Seminary (1836) versus the Hanover College Officers,
Board of Trustees, and Faculty****

J. MICHAEL RALEY
Hanover College

ABSTRACT

In March 1836, nine Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary students, almost certainly including Benjamin Franklin Templeton, a former slave enrolled in the seminary, formed an antislavery society. The society's *Preamble and Constitution* set forth abolitionist ideals demanding an immediate emancipation of Southern slaves with rights of citizenship and "without expatriation." Thus they encountered the ire of Hanover's Presbyterian trustees—colonizationists who believed instead that free blacks and educated slaves, gradually and voluntarily emancipated by their owners, should leave the United States and relocate to Liberia, where they would experience greater opportunity, equality, and justice than was possible here in the United States and simultaneously exercise a civilizing and Christianizing influence on indigenous West Africans. By separating the races on two different continents with an ocean between them, America's race problem would be solved.

The efforts of the colonizationists failed, in part because of a lack of sufficient resources to transport and resettle three million African Americans. Then, too, few Southern slaveholders were willing to emancipate their slaves and finance those former slaves' voyages, and most free blacks refused to leave the country of their birth. In Liberia, left largely to their own resources, colonists encountered disease, the enmity of local tribes, the threat of slavers, and difficulties in farming that left these former slaves struggling for existence, even if free blacks who engaged in mercantile trade there fared well. In the United States, the trustees' conviction that American society was racist beyond reform, together with their refusal to confront the system of slavery in the South in

* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to J. Michael Raley, 427 Mulberry Street, Madison, Indiana 47250; raleyjm@hanover.edu; (812) 866-7205.

I am grateful to Starla Raley and to the anonymous reviewers for reading drafts of this essay. Archivist Jen Duplaga made available documents in the Hanover College archives, and Patricia Lawrence and Michael Ellis of the Hanover College Duggan Library assisted with interlibrary loan requests.

hope of preserving the Union and their refusal to allow even discussion of the subject of slavery on the Hanover campus, left their central question unanswered: Would it ever be possible for people of color and whites to reside together in the United States peaceably and equitably? The trustees' decision exerted another long-term impact as well. Although today the campus is integrated, Hanover College would not admit an African American student until 1948.

KEY WORDS Slavery; Free Blacks; Colonizationism; Abolitionism; Liberia

Hanover College (founded in 1827) celebrates a longstanding, rich heritage of interracial equality. During its early years, Hanover welcomed a young African American student named Benjamin Franklin Templeton (1809–1858) to the campus, and for the past several decades, the college has been integrated. Currently, Hanover College proudly boasts 39 Benjamin Templeton Scholars who, as “exceptional students who have participated in or led programs that promote diversity, human rights or social justice for race, gender, religion, national origin, sexual orientation or gender identity, are invited to compete for a renewable, full-tuition scholarship award” (Hanover College 2020). In May 2015, Hanover College even awarded Templeton a posthumous Bachelor of Arts degree, and yet history also tells us that there has been a disconnect here, for between Templeton's departure from the Hanover campus (1836) and 1948, a span of 112 years, not one African American student was admitted to Hanover College. Further, it turns out even Benjamin Templeton was never officially admitted to Hanover College. Instead, he studied for three years in Hanover's Preparatory Department before entering Indiana Theological Seminary (ITS), the Presbyterian seminary chartered in 1829 on the Hanover campus that later relocated to Chicago and today is known as McCormick Theological Seminary (Cressy 1832:9; Dunn 1883:14; Hanover College and ITS 1833:6, 1834:10, 1834–35:10, 1835–36:3).¹

Templeton was an African American who had been born a slave in South Carolina in 1809 but then had been freed by his deceased master's will. In 1813, young Templeton and his family accompanied their former mistress, Ann Williamson, to Ohio when she relocated to escape slavery and to be near one of her sons, Presbyterian minister William Williamson. When the Chillicothe Presbytery consented in 1831 to fund a portion of his training for the ministry, Templeton enrolled at Ripley College, where John Rankin (1793–1886), an abolitionist, was chairman of the board of trustees and also active in the Underground Railroad (Hagedorn 2002:60–64; Rankin 1873:33). Though all went well at first, a racist steamboat worker named Franklin Shaw [Snow] soon attacked Benjamin, lashing him brutally with a cowhide whip, a vicious event that generated much controversy among the residents of Ripley. Threatened simultaneously with the withdrawal of the college's students from Southern slave-owning families who demanded Templeton's dismissal from the college, along with the refusal of Northern abolitionists to continue supporting the college financially if Templeton was not allowed to stay, Rankin decided to tutor Templeton privately in his home through the end of the 1832

spring semester. Rankin then sent Templeton to two of his friends—Hanover College founder John Finley Crowe (1787–1860) and president James Blythe (1765–1842), both conservative opponents of slavery—confident that they would treat Benjamin well. Templeton finished the three-year course of study in the Preparatory Department and studied for one additional year at ITS in 1835–36.

Templeton's early years at Hanover were uneventful, though racial tensions throughout the Ohio River valley were running high. In September 1836, following racial disturbances and turmoil at Hanover, Templeton left Indiana Seminary. Accepted as a candidate for the ministry by the Chillicothe Presbytery that fall, Templeton transferred to Lane Theological Seminary, where he earned his diploma two years later and afterward was licensed as a missionary by his presbytery. After serving briefly as a missionary at Ripley, Templeton founded the Sixth Presbyterian Church at Pittsburgh in 1841 and, from 1844 until his death in 1858, served as pastor of Philadelphia's Second African Presbyterian Church (Delaney 1852:126; Furnish 2014:199; Galbraith 1899:110; Hagedorn 2002:60–64; Lane Theological Seminary 1881:14; Peabody 1837; Presbyterian Theological Seminary 1939:40; Rankin 1873:17; Hanover College and ITS 1833:6, 1834:10, 1834–35:10, 1835–36:3).

Templeton's departure from Hanover was tied to a series of events that were unleashed in March 1836, when nine Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary students, almost certainly including Templeton, formed an anti-slavery society. The society's *Preamble and Constitution* set forth abolitionist ideals demanding an immediate emancipation of Southern slaves, with rights of citizenship and "without expatriation" to Liberia (McAuley et al. 1836). In so doing, they encountered the ire of Hanover's Presbyterian officers, faculty, and trustees—supporters of the American Colonization Society (ACS) who believed that free blacks and educated slaves, gradually and voluntarily emancipated by their owners, should leave the United States and relocate to Liberia, where they would experience greater opportunity, equality, and justice than was possible in the racist United States and simultaneously exercise a civilizing and Christianizing influence on indigenous West Africans (Tomek 2011:1–17). By separating the races on two different continents with an ocean between them, America's race problem would be solved. The efforts of the ACS failed in part because of a lack of sufficient resources to transport and resettle three million African Americans. Then, too, few Southern slaveholders were willing to emancipate their slaves and finance those former slaves' voyages, and most free blacks refused to leave the country of their birth. Meanwhile, in Liberia, colonists left largely to their own resources encountered disease, the enmity of local tribes, the threat of slavers, and difficulties in farming that left these former slaves struggling for existence, even if free blacks who engaged in mercantile and professional occupations there generally fared well (Burin 2005:148–57; Clegg 2004:144–50, 227–37; Liebenow 1987:16, 18–23; Tyler-McGraw 2007:127–28; Yarema 2006:21, 28, 36).

Here in the United States, the failure of the ACS's agenda, coupled with their decision not to attempt to reform white racism—indeed, their conviction that white American society was racist beyond reform, together with their refusal to confront directly the system of slavery in the South in the hope of preserving the Union—left

unanswered their central question: Would it ever be possible for people of color and whites to reside together in the United States peaceably and equitably? The trustees' decision to not allow any discussion of the subject on the Hanover campus exerted another long-term impact as well, for not until 1948 did Hanover College admit its first African American student, and, alas, even then not without controversy. In June 1954, however, the Hanover trustees officially removed any remaining bars against admitting African Americans, paving the way for the greater diversification found at Hanover College today (Baker 1978:196–97; Hanover College Board of Trustees 1949–68:47; Hanover College History Department 2018).

INDIANA'S BLACK LAWS AND THE INFAMOUS ARTICLE XIII OF THE 1851 CONSTITUTION

Despite their antislavery rhetoric, most Northern white evangelicals of the antebellum era did not welcome African Americans as their neighbors. Restricting the rights and freedoms of Indiana's free black communities along the Ohio River border region and further north during this period was a series of Black Laws—prohibitions against black suffrage, black militia service, African American testimony in trials of whites, and interracial marriages—that had been enacted by the Indiana state legislature and remained in force despite repeated calls by Free Soilers during the 1840s and 1850s to abolish them. Adding to the mix, the 1850 Federal Slave Act infamously allowed slave catchers and kidnappers to come north of the Ohio River in pursuit of fugitive slaves, much to the chagrin of many Northerners, and the 1850–51 Indiana State Constitutional Convention not only refused to repeal the Black Laws already in place but also added Article XIII, which stipulated in Section 1, “No negro or mulatto shall come into or settle in the State, after the adoption of this Constitution” (Indiana Historical Bureau 2020; Kettleborough 1916:1:360–63; Sewell 1976:180–82; Thornbrough 1957:68–73). Former Hanover Preparatory Department principal and college professor William McKee Dunn was the sole downstate delegate to vote against barring blacks from entering the state. In the ensuing referendum, the state's voters, including a majority of Jefferson County residents, overwhelmingly ratified Article XIII—113,828 to 21,873—in part out of support for the Union, coupled with apathy or a lack of sympathy for runaway slaves and general prejudice against blacks, to whom southern Indiana delegate William C. Foster disparagingly referred as “vermin” (Esarey 1915:1:460; Miller 1938:183; Sewell 1976:182; Varble 2014:66–71).

Though African Americans living north of the Ohio River had many friends in Southern Indiana, an inherent racism, coupled with a belief by white evangelicals of the benefits of colonizationism, predominated long before passage and ratification of Article XIII. We learn something of this from a record left by E. S. Abdy, an English visitor to Madison in May 1834 (Abdy 1835:2:363–74). Abdy had landed by steamer at Madison, intending to travel north to Indianapolis, but had been unable to do so because of the poor quality of the road north. While he was trying to determine how to proceed, he visited a barbershop run by a free black man in Madison's Georgetown district. There, in the midst of conversation about one of Abdy's fascinations, local race relations in the United

States, the barber told Abdy of a settlement of free black farmers just four miles from Madison, which Abdy decided to visit the next day. There, he found a family named Crosby, who had relocated from Kentucky some years earlier.

Though suspicious of her visitor at first, upon learning that Abdy was an Englishman, Mrs. Crosby opened up. She explained that although the blacks of their community had been treated well at first, this had gradually changed and for the past three or four years, their white neighbors had regarded them with “scorn and disdain.” In fact, she wished that her family had never moved from Kentucky. Even more disturbing, their white neighbors were now pressuring them to sell their farm and relocate to Liberia. This message had even been conveyed by white Sunday school teachers who were instructing the black children. The entire settlement was thus in a quandary about what they should do. The black settlers realized that the emigration plan “had nothing to recommend it, but the hope it held out of lessening their numbers, and their degradation.” At the same time, they clearly were no longer welcome in Southern Indiana. Aside from the race issue, their white neighbors had grown envious because the blacks had arrived early, chosen excellent land, cleared it of timber, and put it into profitable farm production (Abdy 1835:2:363–66; Cox 2018:45–46; Franklin and Schweninger 1999:189–99; May 1861).

COLONIZATION AS THE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF SLAVERY

Beyond the issue of race relations between free blacks and whites in the North, the United States had the problem of slavery in the South. Four potential solutions were proposed: (1) the immediate abolition of slavery and the emancipation of all slaves with citizenship rights proposed by “radical” and “reformist” abolitionists, with the former stressing the complicity of the North in the nation’s sin of slavery and the latter the North’s fundamental goodness; (2) the prolongation and expansion of slavery as an institution in the American South and West as advocated by proslavery interests; (3) letting everything take its natural course without interference; and (4) the education and Christianization of slaves, coupled with their gradual emancipation in the United States, proposed by more moderate abolitionists, and their relocation to Liberia or some other location as advocated by colonizationists or emigrationists and the slaves’ owners (Fox 1919:44–45; Krادitor 1989:7–10). In their discussions of race and slavery, as well as of theology, Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians alike were deeply divided. While the Southern branches of these denominations generally supported slavery, most Northern Protestants viewed slavery as evil yet advocated a slow, gradual, and largely voluntary process of education and emancipation, accompanied by the expatriation of former slaves and free blacks to Liberia, where they could exercise a civilizing religious influence upon the indigenous West African peoples (Longfield 2013:91–98; Thornbrough 1965:12–13, 16–17, 20–24). Most Southern Evangelicals, in contrast, considered slavery itself to be a Christianizing institution and merged the Golden Rule with their understanding of a divinely ordained hierarchical world, arguing, in the words of Southern Presbyterian spokesperson James Henley Thornwell, “The [golden] rule . . . simply requires, in the case of slavery, that we should treat our slaves as we should feel

that we had a right to be treated if we were slaves ourselves” (Adger and Girardeau 1871–73:4:429; Carwardine 1993:153–59; Longfield 2013:98–110).

Those Southerners who supported colonization did so because the American Colonization Society, founded in 1816 by New Jersey Presbyterian minister Robert Finley and others, initially had focused upon relocating free blacks to Africa. Free blacks, slaveholders argued, had never effectively been integrated into the American population, and their rising numbers now posed a serious threat to the continued existence of slavery in the South (Liebenow 1987:13; Yarema 2006:15–18). In contrast, Northern Protestants advocating colonization strove to reconcile white racism and blacks’ disadvantages with their own understanding of Christian liberty and belief in human potential. Simultaneously, they sought to address the citizenship questions and socioeconomic issues posed by emancipation through the relocation of African Americans to Liberia (Kraditor 1989:27–28; Thornbrough 1965:16–17). A broad emancipation seemed impractical to most colonizationists. Many doubted that the federal government possessed the constitutional authority to enact a general emancipation provision, and large numbers of uneducated, emancipated slaves suddenly having to fend for themselves in the United States would surely create a socioeconomic crisis. Further, given the inherent racism across America, African Americans would never truly be free in the United States, and the expatriation of freed slaves would lessen, if not eliminate, the danger of a race war in the South. If they could eliminate the free black population while gradually convincing slaveholders to emancipate their slaves and send them to Liberia, the evil of slavery would disappear, racial tensions would no longer be an issue in the United States, blacks emigrating to Liberia would thrive, and Africans would become civilized (Fox 1919:142–43; Staudenraus 1961:viii).

Even Quakers, famous for their support of the Underground Railroad in Indiana and Ohio, did not always relish the thought of having black neighbors. Whereas Levi Coffin’s network of Indiana Friends labored to help fugitives escape to Canada, Quakers in Pennsylvania and North Carolina supported the efforts of the ACS. As Claude A. Clegg noted, “One of the great draws of the ACS’s program for many Friends, and countless others, had been that it aimed to permanently remove both slavery and blacks from the country, as well as all of the problems of discrimination, citizenship, and security related to their existence in America. . . . [T]he natural inclination of the Quakers to seek a deliberated, conciliatory, and lasting resolution of their manumission dilemma meshed well with the claims of ACS spokesmen that free blacks had no real future in the United States” (Clegg 2004:137–8). Quaker Elliot Cresson of Philadelphia, a frequent spokesperson for the ACS and a humanitarian opponent of slavery, believed that educated blacks, who had little hope of escaping the racist yoke in the United States, would thrive economically and politically if only they were given an opportunity in Liberia. This argument was supplemented by the “civilizing principle” of Alexander Crummel and others, according to which the peoples of Africa eventually would become civilized and adopt Christianity through the influence of educated, Christianized free blacks and former slaves who relocated to Liberia. In sum, given the enormous religious, social, economic, and political concerns, along with the threat of secession and civil war, that loomed on the horizon and threatened to come to the fore with an immediate

emancipation, colonizationists opted instead for a more moderate approach that relied upon a combination of moral suasion and human reason to rid the North of free blacks and sought to work with and accommodate slaveholders in the Upper South by postponing and only gradually effecting the emancipation of slaves. Thus would they address the slavery issue and yet preserve the Union. Even Harriet Beecher Stowe, coming from a strong Presbyterian family, in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* supported colonization, along with the responsibility of Christians to educate and aid blacks' emigration to Liberia (Blackett 2008:14–15; Burin 2005:22; Fox 1919:143; Henry 2008:83–85; Moses 1975; Stowe 1910:2, 458–61, 472).

Of course, the ACS never had much chance of success. The colonizationists' argument ignored the facts that Africa is a large continent, rather than a country, that most African American slaves had been born in the United States, and that even those who had been born in Africa were likely from a region with a culture and language quite different from those found in Liberia. Further, state funding to support ACS expatriations in Virginia in 1833, for example, provided less than half the cost for an emigrant's passage and six months' sustenance (estimated at about \$75 per emigrant), a sum that was denied entirely to emancipated black slaves unless paid by their former owners or through them being hired out. As a result, from the 1820s through the late 1840s, the society became increasingly dependent upon donations. Meanwhile, ridding the country of free blacks without mandating emancipation of the slave population—the initial focus of the ACS and the ACS-affiliated Indiana Colonization Society (ICS)—when the very existence of free blacks, Southerners argued, enticed slaves to escape or, worse yet, to rebel or revolt, promised to allow slavery to continue unabated in the South (Blackett 2008:14; Fox 1919:88–89; Tyler-McGraw 2007:47, 57–59; Yarema 2006:29–30).

Support for the ACS among Southern plantation owners later waned as they saw the ACS's growing call for the gradual emancipation and emigration of slaves and an eventual end to the institution of slavery (Burin 2005:33; Yarema 2006:22). Moreover, most free blacks and slaves rejected the very idea that they should leave the country of their birth and citizenship, despite their treatment at the hands of whites, especially if required to do so without their family members, though the decision could be complicated if they faced the possibility of sale in the Deep South should they refuse manumission and expatriation upon the testament of their owners (Burin 2005:57–58, 61, 73–78; Staudenraus 1961:32–34, 188–93). Thus, wealthy black Philadelphia sailmaker James Forten rejected the methodology of colonization, insisting that if blacks were to emigrate, it would be on their own terms to a location of their own choosing, such as Canada, Haiti, or, after 1847, the Republic of Liberia. Frederick Douglass, in contrast, rejected both colonization and emigration altogether. Here in the United States, blacks faced racial discrimination, but a forced deportation would violate their civil rights even as the Trail of Tears had violated those of the Cherokee 1838 (Power-Greene 2014:6–16, 135).

Likewise, despite the argument of P. J. Staudenraus (1961:249) that the ACS had offered Americans one final opportunity to achieve a “gradual and peaceful obliteration of slavery” through a separation of the races that might have averted a civil war, the ACS claim that its plan would help sustain the Union never had any substantive basis in

reality. Elliot Cresson and his humanitarian associates who opposed slavery came under fire from immediatists because the emancipated slaves who arrived in Liberia were rarely adequately equipped and funded to colonize the region. In calling for gradual emancipation, “antislavery colonizationists became too conservative for the northern reform community, even though their antislavery stance made them too radical for the South” (Tomek 2011:130). Still, humanitarian colonizationists remained convinced that a successful colonial venture would affirm black worth and prove the ills of slavery (Kraditor 1989:4; Tomek 2011:100). Despite their moderate approach, however, ACS members seeking to eradicate slavery were making a far more radical argument that would transform the South into a “diversified free labor market economy, in which black Americans, bond or free, would play no role.” The threat of a free-labor all-white economy ultimately drew the ire of proslavery Southern Democrats because they recognized that the commercialization of the Deep South would mean the end of the plantation owners’ way of life (Egerton 2002:147–49, 158–59).

HANOVER COLLEGE FOUNDER JOHN FINLEY CROWE AND PRESIDENT JAMES BLYTHE

Like many Northern conservative evangelicals, most of the trustees and faculty of Hanover College and ITS opposed slavery, at least nominally, and favored gradual emancipation, accompanied by expatriation to and colonization in Liberia as a missionary effort on the western coast of Africa. In 1822–23, Presbyterian minister and future Hanover College founder and vice president John Finley Crowe served briefly as corresponding secretary for the Abolition Society of Kentucky, which called for “the abolition of slavery in a way which will consist with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth” (Crowe 1822–23:1(6):82). According to Crowe’s daughter, her father had long “doubted the righteousness of slavery,” but even as the young editor and publisher of the *Abolition Intelligencer and Missionary Magazine* (1822–23) at Shelbyville, Kentucky, his “abolitionism was mild” (Moore 1900:22–23). Kentuckian slave-owning opponents of Crowe, however, hardly viewed his abolitionism as mild; rather, they accused Crowe’s editorials and work on behalf of the Abolition Society of Kentucky of intending to “incite slaves to *rebellion!*” (Crowe 1822–23:1(3):33). Yet as a moderate emancipationist, Crowe declared in his first editorial (May 1822):

All . . . that the society can hope to effect is, to meliorate, as they may have opportunity the situation of free people of colour, by giving them proper aid and encouragement in the discharge of the great duties of morality and religion—to defend the rights of those who are legally free, but are likely to be still kept in bondage, and to prepare the public mind for taking the necessary preparatory measures for the future introduction of a system of laws, for the gradual abolition of slavery, as those degraded people may be prepared for the enjoyment of civil liberty. (Crowe 1822–23:1(1):1–2)

In the very next issue (June 1822), however, Crowe published the constitution of the Indiana Auxiliary American Colonization Society, which he would later join in the hope that it might give rise to a similar organization in Kentucky, and in July, he published the “Report of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church on Slavery,” which recommended “to all our people to patronize and encourage the [American Colonization] Society, lately formed, for colonizing in Africa, the land of their ancestors, the free people of colour in our country.” He also published reports from Sierra Leone and Liberia to keep his readers informed about their progress (Crowe 1822–23:1(2):22–23, 1(3):34–37, 1(5):71, 1(10):157).

One of the agents authorized to sell subscriptions to Crowe’s *Abolition Intelligencer* was none other than John Rankin, who at the time was serving as pastor of the Concord Presbyterian Church at Carlisle, Kentucky, one of the original 12 churches that formed the Kentucky Abolition Society (Crowe 1822–23:1(6):31; Hagedorn 2002; Rankin 1873; Ritchie 1852:19–26). Following repeated warnings and threats from Kentucky slaveholders because of his editorials, and also struggling from a lack of subscriptions, Crowe decided to abandon publication of the *Abolition Intelligencer* and by June 1823 had accepted a call as minister of the Presbyterian Church at Hanover, Indiana, “the land of civil and religious liberty.” There, in 1827, he would found the Hanover Academy (changed to Hanover College in 1833) and, as a member of the ACS, continue to advocate for the gradual end of slavery and the expatriation of educated, Christianized people of color to Liberia as colonist missionaries (Crowe 1822–23:1(11):113; Dunn 1883:9; Millis 1927:45–46; Moore 1900:23).

Two decades later, in June 1845, Crowe addressed the ACS, reminding his audience of the society’s principal goals before recounting the history of Liberia and the critical role that he believed it was then playing in the transformation of Africa. The goals of the ACS, he explained, were “the salvation of a continent of 150,000,000 of immortal human beings & the annihilation [sic] of the slave trade with all its unutterable horrors. The immediate, though secondary & incidental objects are the providing . . . [of] an honorable home for the expatriated colored man and at the same time furnishing a favourable theater for the development of his mental powers, and for giving a demonstration of his capacity for self government” (Crowe 1845:30). Founded in 1820, Liberia was now laying “the foundation of a free & happy government with all the appliances of education & religion.”

In Liberia, Crowe continued, one could find the hallmarks of advanced civilization: laws, courts of justice, civil institutions, churches, schools, the press, towns and villages, agriculture and commerce, comfortable houses, and increasing wealth, all without the slave trade. “In this way the minds of the nations have been changed in regard to the slave trade, and more has been done to remove this scourge of Africa, by the little colony of Liberia, than by the British nation with her Spanish treaty and all the world put together” (Crowe 1845:33). Not all went as well as this suggests, yet in answering his opponents, Crowe pointed out that some 2,000 African Americans had relocated to Liberia, where they were providing benefits to a continent heretofore dominated by “all the horrors of those intestine & interminable & bloody

wars, which have been instigated by slave trade,” and such evil could be counteracted only by “the civilization & Christianization of the native Africans themselves” (Crowe 1845:35).

James Blythe, slave-owning Presbyterian minister, former president of Transylvania University, and professor at Lexington Medical College, had told Kentucky Presbyterians in 1830 that church discipline should be applied to slaveholders only “for neglecting to treat their slaves as fellow beings and fellow immortals, or for neglecting to raise them up in the fear of the Lord.” Like many other Christians, he felt “compelled to hold slaves” even while striving to “bring about a total emancipation” (Feight 2014:36n.47; Ranck 1872:44–45). Blythe, “the leading Kentucky Presbyterian minister of his generation,” had served as moderator for the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1815 (Feight 2004:16–17). He was also a close friend of John Rankin; when en route to the Concord Church at Carlisle, the Rankin family stayed with the Blythes for a week during the annual Presbyterian communion season (Rankin 1873:17). Blythe also had been Crowe’s professor and a frequent preacher at the First Presbyterian Church when Crowe was a student at Transylvania University in Lexington, Kentucky. A fellow supporter of the ACS, Blythe called upon ministers of the West Lexington, Kentucky, Presbytery to preach in support of the ACS every July 4, and when he finally freed most of his slaves in 1832 prior to relocating to Indiana, he arranged for at least one of them to emigrate to Liberia through the ACS (Feight 2014:36–37; Ranck 1872:44–45). In his inauguration address at Hanover College on January 1, 1833, President Blythe proclaimed,

Christianity has taught the world to abhor slavery; to pity the black man in his chains; to take men of every clime and color by the hand, and call them brothers. She has enkindled a light on the western coast of Africa, which is at once to overwhelm that benighted continent in gospel glory, to convert the American master and tyrant into the negroes’ friend, and to mark the dark path of the most abandoned of all human character, the slaver. In all these things, the church acknowledges she has but begun; still the work is in glorious progress. Her motto is, “The regeneration of the world.”

Despite their plan to send blacks to Africa and to thereby save the Union, however, colonizationists increasingly came under fire from Southern slaveholders because of the threat they posed to the Southern economy and the Southern way of life. Beginning in 1831, they also came under intense attack from the other end of the spectrum: William Lloyd Garrison and the radical abolitionists. Just five years later, John Finley Crowe and President Blythe would have to respond to nine student abolitionists who had found their way to the Hanover College and ITS campus.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND THE RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS

William Lloyd Garrison, the abolitionist founder of the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS) and the editor of *The Liberator* (1831–1865), started out as a colonizationist but soon came under the influence of James Forten, who had become an opponent of the ACS following a meeting at the Mother Bethel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church in Philadelphia in January 1817, at which 3,000 African Americans unanimously rejected the society's plan to relocate free blacks to Africa. These free blacks were convinced that colonization would only perpetuate slavery in the United States (Katz 2015; Staudenraus 1961:33). Forten began a correspondence with Garrison that continued even as the newly formed American Society of Free Persons of Colour was meeting in Philadelphia and New York in 1831, both to address American racism and to denounce the colonizationist practices and teachings of the ACS (Power-Greene 2014:17–45; Tomek 2011:132–62). James and Charlotte Forten and their daughters and sons became so well known as a result of their efforts as antislavery activists that, during his tour of the United States in 1834, the Englishman E. S. Abdy made it a point to visit them at Philadelphia (Abdy 1835:3:129–32, 319–21; Winch 2007:152).

At the Second Annual Convention of the People of Colour, held at Philadelphia in June 1832, the delegates (with William Lloyd Garrison in attendance and also addressing the Convention) asserted, “the doctrines of the said [American Colonization] Society are at enmity with the principles and precepts of religion, humanity, and justice, and should be regarded by every man of color in these United States as an evil, for magnitude, unexcelled, and whose doctrines aim at the entire extinction of the free colored population and the riveting of slavery” (Williams 1883:2:75). In his *Thoughts on African Colonization*, published that same year, Garrison accused the society of apologizing for slavery, of recognizing slaves as property, of opposing the immediate emancipation of all slaves, of aiming at the expulsion of all blacks from the United States, and of denying free blacks any possibility of improving their plights in the United States. He also included many statements by prominent people of color, including a resolution adopted by the Colored Citizens of New York in 1831 in which they claimed “*this country, the place of our birth, and not Africa*, as our mother country.” They considered “all attempts to send us to Africa . . . as gratuitous and uncalled for” (Garrison 1832:1:I–X, 2:14).

An influential network was in the process of forming. Garrison and Northern abolitionists accused the ACS of plotting to “rivet the chains of the slave” (American Abolitionists 2020b; Fox 1919:141). In 1832, Garrison serialized John Rankin's *Letters on Slavery* (1826) in *The Liberator* (Hagedorn 2002:67; Rankin 1873:42–43; Ritchie 1852:29–31). Later, Garrison credited Rankin's collection for his “entering the anti-slavery conflict” (Griffler 2010:61–63; Hagedorn 2002:58). *The Liberator's* circulation reached students at Lane Seminary in Cincinnati, thanks to the wealthy merchant Arthur Tappan, later president of the AASS, who purchased additional copies of the paper and had them sent to the seminary. Other converts in Garrison's expanding network included Lane Seminary student and AASS agent Theodore Weld as well as the editor and owner of *The Philanthropist* in Cincinnati, James G. Birney (American Abolitionists 2020a,b). At Lane Seminary, Weld persuaded the students to host a series of debates on slavery in

February 1834 and then to form their own antislavery society. Later that same year, Weld and John Rankin embarked upon a yearlong tour, giving speeches throughout Ohio in support of abolition (Hagedorn 2002:68). James Birney, too, would become involved in the Lane Seminary episode, as well as in the Hanover story that followed two years later.

Birney and Weld corresponded with each other during the early 1830s and met face-to-face on the Lane Seminary campus in 1834 (Abzug 1980:87, 95–97, 105, 116–17). The impact was dramatic. Birney, a Kentucky native and former slave owner who had lived for 15 years in Alabama before returning home and being elected vice president of the Kentucky Colonization Society, had just been given an appointment as the official ACS agent for five Southern states. Now, in a stark turnabout, he renounced gradual emancipation and colonizationism in favor of immediatism and abolitionism. In his *Letter on Colonization*, which was addressed to Rev. Thornton J. Mills, Corresponding Secretary of the Kentucky Colonization Society, and published by the Office of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* in 1834, Birney documented his conversion to abolitionism and publicly challenged the ACS claim that free blacks were emigrating to Liberia of their own consent (Birney 1834:3–8; Yarema 2006:62–63):

If . . . this “*consent*” may lawfully be obtained by the imposition of civil disabilities, disfranchisement, exclusion from sympathy; by making the free colored man the victim of a relentless proscription, prejudice and scorn; by rejecting altogether his oath in courts of justice, thus leaving his property, his person, his wife, his children, and all that God has by his very constitution made dear to him, unprotected from the outrage and insult of every unfeeling tyrant, it becomes a solemn farce, it is the refinement of inhumanity, a mockery of all mercy, it is cruel, unmanly, and meriting the just indignation of every American, and the noble nation that bears his name. (Birney 1834:7)

Birney argued further that Robert Finley and the colonizationists had made the mistake of trying to remove the free blacks without addressing the underlying issue of slavery. Instead, “the *wrong practice* of oppression—the unjust denial to the free colored class of the charitable conduct of a refined and christian people, should have been boldly met by the *right principles* of men’s equality, and their duty to each other as social beings.” The real problem for Birney was that, whereas “the poet has said ‘man never *is*—but always *to be* blessed’—colonization, in substance, says, slavery ‘never *is*—but always *to be* removed’” (Birney 1834:30, 43–44).

In sharp contrast to proslavery advocates, radical abolitionists regarded slavery as a moral evil forbidden by both the U.S. Constitution and the Bible. In opposition to the ACS, the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society (1833) made it clear that the AASS sought “the entire abolition of slavery in the United States . . . [along with] its *immediate abandonment*, without expatriation.” Further, the AASS promised to “endeavor . . . to abolish slavery in all those portions of our common country . . . and

likewise to prevent the extension of it to any State that may be hereafter admitted to the Union.” In addition, the AASS aimed “to elevate the character and condition of the people of color, by encouraging their intellectual, moral, and religious improvement, and by removing public prejudice, that they may . . . share an equality with the whites, of civil and religious privileges” (Kraditor 1989:5). In short, Herbert Aptheker (1989) argued, these revolutionaries aimed at nothing less than bringing down the entire Southern slaveholding system and, along with it, the elimination of every manifestation of racism in American society through the immediate and unconditional emancipation of all slaves in the United States, with full rights of citizenship. This would have deprived the economically dominant and politically powerful slave-owning Southern plantation class of its property, wealth, and power without financial compensation (Aptheker 1989:xi–xviii). Aptheker’s assertion, coupled with Egerton’s argument (cited above), suggests that radical abolitionists and the ACS were despised by Southern plantation owners because each sought to replace the plantation economy of the South with a free market economy, albeit via very different methodologies, the former seeking to emancipate and employ the (former) slaves, the latter to remove the former slaves to Liberia.

At the same time that he was criticizing colonizationists and slaveholders, Garrison grew critical of the major Protestant religious denominations because with but rare exceptions, either they advocated moral suasion in pursuing a gradual emancipation through moderate abolitionism or colonialism or they supported slavery (Blight 2008:6, Sinha 2016:466). Unlike the Northern Protestant colonizationists who sought to preserve the Union at almost any cost and the Southern Protestants who talked of seceding to protect slavery, Garrison called for radical abolitionists to withdraw from the Union to escape the trappings and evils of slavery. “NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!” was the oft-recited motto of *The Liberator*. Yet his disunionism soon grew far more complex than this early formulation suggests:

But let it be understood that the call for a dissolution of the existing American Union is not addressed . . . exclusively to the non-slaveholding States, but to all the people, SLAVEHOLDERS included—to the whole country. It is a simple declaration, that liberty and slavery cannot coalesce or exist under the same government; that tyrants, and the enemies of tyranny, can never walk together on amicable and equal terms; that all contracts to uphold slavery are of a piratical character; that liberty should be proclaimed to all who are sighing in bondage. “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.” . . .

This revolution is to be commenced by *freemen*, carried on by FREEMEN, consummated by FREEMAN. IT IS THE GREAT LIBERTY MOVEMENT. The anti-slavery seceders from this pro-slavery Constitution and Union are the genuine LIBERTY PARTY—and all others, by

whatever name called, or whatever may be their pretensions, are PRO-SLAVERY PARTIES. Let us all unite in the cry—"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!" (Garrison 1833)

Garrison believed that the U.S. Constitution supported slavery and that both North and South were racist and proslavery in spirit: "A repeal of the Union between northern liberty and southern slavery is essential to the abolition of one, and preservation of the other" (Sinha 2016:470–71). Only a complete reform of American society, a national cleansing, could effectively eliminate Southern slavery and Northern racial prejudice to lead the nation down a new, reformed path. To do so barred any compromise, yet Garrison's brand of moral absolutism presumed that a transformation of society could indeed take place, one person at a time (Garrison 1844). David W. Blight thus observed, "Garrison sought a new order, not the absence of order" as colonizationists charged. "With this holy, utopian standard of human conduct, Garrison laid down his challenge: perfect thyself; do not return evil for evil; make all humankind your country; take responsibility for the nation's sins, past and present, and thereby free thyself by freeing the slave" (Blight 2008:10).

Garrison's argument notwithstanding, colonizationists such as Reverend Daniel Dana of New Hampshire resented what they viewed as Northern sectional interests that castigated the South and sought to exempt the North from any blame. Instead, Dana called for the entire nation to atone for a national guilt that had included slave ships, the forging in Northern iron blast furnaces and forges of the "fetters and manacles" with which American slaves had been bound, and perhaps worst of all, the growing wealth from Northern commerce related to the Southern slave industry. This national guilt had to be purged, first by accepting the guilt and then by offering an effective response and solution that would be accepted by all. Such a course of action had largely been overlooked by Northerners who had washed their hands of any guilt (ACS 1825:1(5):146).

Free blacks in Louisville, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, New York, and elsewhere resisted expatriation to Liberia, as did those living near Madison, Indiana, with whom E. S. Abdy had come into contact in 1834. Bishop Richard Allen, founder of the AME Church, wrote in 1829: "This land which we have watered with our *tears* and *our blood*, is now our *mother country*" (Cox 2018:46). Indiana's free blacks responded to the colonization project supported by the ICS by joining the Negro Convention Movement (NCM), which had originated at Philadelphia but had gained chapters at Madison and Indianapolis by 1842. In opposition to the ACS, the NCM rejected colonization and called instead for the immediate emancipation of all blacks, with full citizenship rights, including suffrage. In response, whites in New York and Philadelphia rioted and attacked the black communities of the two cities in July and August 1834. Edward Abdy returned to Philadelphia in September 1834, just after the riot there, and learned from James Forten himself that Forten's 15-year-old son had been badly beaten and Forten's own life had been threatened. Abdy (1835:3:319–24) reported, "One of the sufferers, a man of wealth and great respectability [perhaps James Forten], was told afterwards by a white,

that he would not have been molested, if he had not, by refusing to go to Liberia, prevented others from leaving the country.”

A few years later, Madison’s NCM chapter convened in January 1842 and sent the minutes from the meeting to the chapter at Indianapolis. In turn, the Indianapolis brethren invited the chapter at Madison to join them at a statewide meeting in Terre Haute that spring to select delegates to the upcoming NCM national convention. The Indianapolis chapter concurred with the Madison brethren: “[W]e believe no well informed colonizationist is a devoted friend to the moral elevation of the people of color.” They also affirmed “the importance of a general union among our people.” The call for the upcoming NCM convention at Terre Haute circulated among black communities statewide to mobilize support, but blacks were not the only ones who understood the potential impact of such a broad movement. The white editor of the *Indiana State Sentinel* warned “the lovers of the country to be on the look out” for the dangers posed by the pending state NCM convention at Terre Haute, whose delegates “hope to impose upon the country a ‘colored’ President” (Foner and Walker 1979:1:173–75). To many of Indiana’s white evangelicals, the dangers posed by the state’s free blacks seemed grave and abundantly clear.

THE LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY (1834)

In February 1834, under the leadership of Theodore Weld and the promotion of Arthur Tappan, President of the AASS, the Lane Theological Seminary students and faculty hosted the Lane Debates. The president of Lane Seminary was Presbyterian minister Lyman Beecher, father of Henry Ward Beecher and Harriet Elizabeth Beecher (m. Calvin Ellis Stowe in 1836), well-known supporters of colonization and acquaintances of Ripley College’s John Rankin (Hagedorn 2002:71; Rankin 1873:1, 59). Two questions were “discussed” during the Lane Debates:

1st. Ought the people of the Slaveholding States to abolish Slavery immediately?

2d. Are the doctrines, tendencies, and measures of the American Colonization Society, and the influence of its principal supporters, such as render it worthy of the patronage of the Christian public? (Stanton 1834:3)

The debates on each question ran for nine evenings, two and a half hours each evening, for a total of 45 hours of public debate and discussion. President Beecher, John Rankin, and several other notables as well as the faculty and students attended the sessions. James Birney, too, followed the progress of the debates. Seven of the students were sons of slaveholders, and another student, James Bradley, had been a slave himself until he had been able to purchase his freedom. At the end, the answer to the first question was an overwhelming *yes*, and to the second question, with but one exception, *no*. Many student and faculty colonizationists changed their minds in the course of the

debates and presentation of firsthand testimony and facts. This led Henry B. Stanton, who reported the proceedings, to conclude “that prejudice is vincible, that colonization is vulnerable, and that immediate emancipation is not only right, and practicable, but is ‘expedient’” (Birney 1890:135–37; Hagedorn 2002:68–71; Lesick 1980:79–84; Stanton 1834:3–5).

At the conclusion of the debate, 18 students who now supported abolitionism formed the Anti-Slavery Society of Lane Seminary. The society’s preamble stated its purpose, guiding principles, and means of accomplishment. Collectively, the students sought “the immediate emancipation of the whole colored race within the United States.” By this, the members meant “the emancipation of the slave from the oppression of the master, the emancipation of the free colored man from the oppression of public sentiment, and the elevation of both to an intellectual, moral, and political equality with the whites.” Rather than being required to emigrate to Liberia, emancipated slaves should “be employed as free laborers, fairly compensated,” in the United States. Slavery, the students continued, “paralyzes conscience, turns hope to despair, and kills the soul. . . . It tears asunder parents and children, husbands and wives, sisters and brothers, and consigns them to distant and hopeless bondage, desolate and heart-broken.” Moreover, slavery “cripples the energies of the whole nation, . . . makes our Constitution a mockery, converts our national Declaration into a rhapsody of sentimentalism, convicts us of hypocrisy at the bar of the world, neutralizes the power of our example as a nation, and checks the progress of republican principles.” Having observed the ills of slavery, the members of Lane’s antislavery society refused to hold their peace “while these, our brethren, are immolated upon the altar of prejudice and pride.” In opposing slavery, they pledged “to use only such means as are sanctioned by the laws of the land, the dictates of humanity, the principles of justice, and the Gospel of Christ” (Allan et al. 1834).

As these student activists filled the pulpits of black churches and instructed members of the local black community, public outcry grew. One Cincinnati declared, “The 19th century has not before witnessed so strange a compound of folly, madness, vanity, ambition, self-complacency, and total contempt of law and public sentiment” (Abzug 1980:98). President Beecher hoped that the entire controversy would go away quietly while he traveled in the east that summer to raise funds. Convinced that slavery would ultimately disappear by the end of the century, he saw no fundamental conflict between the ACS and Lane’s antislavery society; whereas the former was establishing a colony of free blacks in Liberia, the latter was laboring to emancipate slaves in the United States. Tensions, however, continued to simmer. In June, a committee of students informed the faculty that they would not abandon Cincinnati’s black community. In July, after the society had raised \$100 to print and post 1,000 copies of James Birney’s *Letter on Colonization*, members were caught in the act of preparing them for shipment by informants of the trustees. In August, while President Beecher was still traveling in the east, the executive committee of the trustees recommended banning all extracurricular student organizations and granting the faculty power to expel students without specification of cause. Their target was Theodore Weld, but their concerns went beyond the slavery issue to student recruitment and the stagnating flow of donations to the seminary. Conceding that he had lost control of the situation, in

October, Beecher signed the *Declaration of the Faculty of Lane Seminary*, which enshrined into law the restrictions approved by the trustees, henceforth prohibiting any discussion of slavery on the Lane campus (Abzug 1980:110–22). Whereas for the students, the central issues were freedom of speech and theological support for abolitionism, for Beecher, the central issue was the students' insubordination and lack of concern for the good of the institution (Lesick 1980:141). In a letter to the editor of the *Cincinnati Journal*, John Rankin publicly defended the students' actions against President Beecher (Hagedorn 2002:71–72). When discussions of slavery and the proper role of higher education in addressing such issues arose at Miami University, Kenyon College, and Illinois College, however, similar restrictions were imposed (Lesick 1980:145). Hanover College would soon follow suit.

At this point, 51 members of Lane's growing antislavery society, facing certain expulsion, chose to leave the seminary, but before doing so, they signed and published *A Statement of the Reasons Which Induced the Students of Lane Seminary to Dissolve Their Connection with That Institution* (Miter et al. 1834). An additional 20 students failed to return that fall, and 24 students later withdrew without recording their reasons. The students regarded "free discussion" as their "inherent and inalienable" right. The problem, from the students' perspective, was that the trustees recognized free speech "rather as a *privilege* which could be granted at the discretion of the faculty, than as a *duty* and a *right* above their bestowment." Worse yet, the students were being commanded to disband as a result of public opinion. "The *particular* reason assigned by the trustees in justification of their action at this juncture, is, '*the proceedings among the students on the SUBJECT of SLAVERY.*'"

In the past, the students had taken up various reform topics, including temperance, moral reform, and so forth, without issue, until they had come to slavery. Their discussions on this subject had been informed not only by a large selection of abolition pamphlets but also by colonizationists. Having decided that slavery was a sin, the members of Lane's antislavery society had dedicated themselves to filling pulpits and making schools, lyceums, and a circulating library available to Cincinnati's black community. They had fulfilled their seminary responsibilities, prayed and studied, and maintained cool tempers, despite accusations to the contrary by the trustees. In return, they had been commanded to cease discussion and to discontinue their antislavery society; if they refused, they would be dismissed from the seminary. The students informed the trustees and faculty that, morally and ethically, they could never comply with this command. "God forbid that we should abandon a cause that strikes its roots so deep into the soil of human interests, and human rights, and throws its branches upward and abroad, so high and wide into the sunlight of human hopes, and human well-being" (Miter et al. 1834:4–7, 16–18). Students at Marietta College and Western Reserve College also withdrew from their institutions rather than abandon the cause (Lesick 1980:146).

In the aftermath, many newspapers supported the actions of the Lane Seminary trustees and faculty, but ironically, the *Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph* asked whether the students at Lane did not have the right to interpret Scripture for themselves as Luther and Calvin had insisted (Lesick 1980:142–43). In the fall of 1834, Lane was left with only

eight students, but by the spring of 1837, the enrollment swelled to 41; as the fall of 1837 and the financial panic approached, however, it appeared that there would be none. The institution surely would have closed but for the heroic recruiting efforts of President Beecher, who convinced the trustees to rescind their new regulations and labored tirelessly to recruit and support new and returning students while simultaneously broadening the spectrum of the student body. He returned to campus with commitments from 13 students, and in the following year (fall of 1838), the seminary again had 35 students enrolled (Beecher 1837; Federal Writers' Project 1943:34–35, 290; Hayward 1904:79–80; Lane Theological Seminary 1837, 1881:14; Lesick 1980:131, 138–39, 234; Presbyterian Theological Seminary 1939:40). In January 1840, Beecher explained to his son George, “Our students . . . , a better class of young men in *talent, study, attainment, and contented, kind feeling* than we have ever had, . . . come to us . . . through two ranks of opposition—Old School and ultra Abolitionists, though . . . most of our students are conservative Abolitionists” (Beecher 1865:2:444–45; Phillips 2016:69).

Perhaps this explains how and why Benjamin Templeton would transfer to Lane after leaving Hanover in September 1836 and after having been accepted as a candidate for the ministry by the abolitionist Chillicothe Presbytery in Ohio in the fall of 1836. Perhaps John Rankin played a role in bringing Templeton to Lane; though he had been critical of the Lane trustees' and faculty's actions in 1834, three of Rankin's sons attended Lane, one of whom entered in the fall of 1837 (Hagedorn 2002:72; Lane Theological Seminary 1881:17).

Some of the Lane Rebels went to Oberlin, taking with them funding supplied by Arthur Tappan, and leveraged their collective bargaining power to accept black students, including James Bradley, which they agreed to do in a dramatic 5–4 decision, with the chair casting the tie-breaking vote (Lesick 1980:170). Forty-eight of these students were ordained as ministers, in which capacity they worked for antislavery causes. Eighteen Rebels were employed as paid agents for antislavery societies, including the abolitionist American Missionary Association, and many of the Lane Rebels served as delegates to antislavery conventions (Lesick 1980:167–69, 235). Weld became an agent of the AASS and went on a yearlong speaking tour with Rankin. Still others continued working in Cincinnati, teaching the free black community and helping fugitive slaves (Abzug 1980:123–49; Hagedorn 2002:72). None of this was lost upon the students at Hanover.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY OF HANOVER COLLEGE AND INDIANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY (1836)

Beginning in the 1830s and continuing into the 1850s, “ecclesiastical” abolitionists such as William Lloyd Garrison, John Rankin, and Lane Seminary product and interracial Berea College Founder Rev. John Gregg Fee “trained their fire on proslavery ministers.” Fee had studied at Lane Seminary in 1842–43 after President Beecher had moved the seminary into the New School camp (Presbyterian Theological Seminary 1939:48). Meanwhile, “political” abolitionists such as Alvan Stewart, G. W. F. Mellen, Gerrit Smith, William Goodell, and Lysander Spooner, many of them members of the Liberty Party during the 1840s, adopted an antislavery constitutional argument in opposition to

proslavery advocates and even the Garrisonians, who believed that the U.S. Constitution supported slavery. In contrast, political abolitionists stressed the Fifth Amendment, which mandates, “No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” Thus they interpreted the constitution as completely supportive of liberty. Divisions within the abolitionist ranks also followed other issues of the day, such as the Woman Question and temperance reform. Yet despite their internal differences, and unlike colonizationists, abolitionists were agreed on one thing: “No Christian fellowship with slaveholders!” (Bill of Rights 1789; Sinha 2016:462–78; Thornbrough 1965:18).

Though slavery remained a hotly contested issue throughout the Ohio River valley, a group of nine students at Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary formed their own auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society in March 1836. These students’ strong abolitionist stance was promoted throughout the Ohio River valley via the 16-page *Preamble and Constitution of the Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary, with Miscellaneous Articles on the Subject of Slavery*, published at Hanover by the future president of the Indiana Anti-Slavery Society and vice president of the AASS, James Morrow. The pamphlet’s wording, structure, and key points strongly suggest the students had before them a copy of the Lane “Preamble.”² Indiana Seminary students John McAuley and Joseph G. Wilson were elected president and secretary of the society, respectively, and Hanover College students Sylvanus Jewett and Abraham Fulton, managers. The other five members are not named, though one likely member was the former slave, Benjamin Templeton.

The *Constitution* declared, “The objects of this society shall be to effect, by moral and constitutional means, the entire emancipation of our fellow men, now in slavery in the UNITED STATES, and to elevate them to their *proper rank* as rational, accountable, and immortal beings; and thus to save our liberties from the grasp of tyranny, and our country from the judgments of Heaven.” Slavery was “utterly irreconcilable with the precepts of Christianity,” they insisted. Silence and complacency were inexcusable. “So long as slavery exists in our Church, or Government, Christians cannot hold their peace, and be guiltless in the sight of God.” Convinced that “God has made man free, and endowed him with certain inalienable rights,” they argued (following the Fifth Amendment) that slavery had wrested from those in bondage “the right of personal security, the right of personal liberty, and the right of private property.” In short, slavery undermined the Golden Rule, usurped the prerogatives of God by claiming human beings as property, annihilated earthly marriage, rendered parental authority null and void, and trampled the human rights of African Americans (McAuley et al. 1836:2–7).

Above all, the society’s members maintained, it was their duty as citizens, students, and Christians “to investigate and discuss the subject of slavery, and to use all constitutional and prudent means, to bring it to a speedy termination.” They dared not follow “those professors whose measure of morality is convenience and interest, may plot treason against humanity, break allegiance with Christ their king, and apostatise [sic] from God.” Rejecting the goals of the ICS, they insisted that immediate “emancipation without expatriation” was “the duty of the master, the right of the slave, and the only remedy at once safe and practicable, for the system of slavery.” To those who feared

anarchy might result, they explained that they were calling for former slaves to be granted full rights of citizenship, albeit “under the control and government of law.” They also believed that all blacks should be allowed to work as free laborers paid just wages (McAuley et al. 1836:5–6). Such a “just, adequate and safe” remedy for slavery would remove the evil from society and also ensure the safety of the former masters. Thus the nine abolitionists took their stand.

THE HANOVER COLLEGE TRUSTEES’ RESPONSE TO THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY OF HANOVER COLLEGE AND INDIANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

To the trustees’ thinking, the formation of the Hanover College antislavery society and the publication of its *Preamble and Constitution* called for a strong response. In his unpublished *History of Hanover College*, J. F. Crowe explained the board’s concerns: “As the whole West was just then deeply agitated by the organization of Abolition Societies, both in the Slave-holding & non Slave-holding States; by which Churches were divided & fierce political parties formed; the Board regarded the subject as being of sufficient importance to justify some investigation” (Crowe 1857:64). The Hanover College trustees subsequently approved a resolution prepared by a joint committee of trustees and directors of the ITS chaired by President Blythe, which had met to discuss an “an Anti-Slavery Pamphlet recently published in this place.” Their resolution was published in the *Cincinnati Daily Gazette* and then reprinted by James Birney in *The Philanthropist*:

Resolved, unanimously, that it is with deep regret, the Board of Trustees of Hanover College have seen a pamphlet, recently published, entitled “Preamble and Constitution of the Anti Slavery Society of Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary.”

The Trustees & Faculty of Hanover College simply desire the public to know that no such society is authorized by them; nor will be encouraged by those who are entrusted with the management of the Institution. They moreover have reason to believe that at least nine-tenths of the students connected with the Institution, entirely disapprove and condemn the course pursued by the said Society.

It has been the uniform wish and practice of the Faculty of the College, as far as may be consistent with the freedom of personal and private opinion, to discourage among the students the public discussion of all those exciting questions which at present agitate the American public. A leading principle with all the authorities of the Institution has been to impress upon the minds of the Students that

they come here, not to attempt to guide the public mind, but to be qualified to act an eminent and useful part in future life. They are taught to obey, that in [the] future they may be prepared to command.

In fine the Board are convinced that the most prudent & effectual plan of obviating any injurious effects, likely to result from the formation or the existence of such a Society, will be to leave it to the influence of the voluntary disapprobation of an enlightened public, of the officers & of the Students of the Institutions implicated. (Birney 1836, April 8; Crowe 1857:64; Hanover College Board of Trustees 1833–1844:66–69:March 29, 1836)³

Clearly, the trustees disapproved of the society and wanted to see it vanish from the campus, along with all public discussion of the slavery issue, and yet the odd ending here of leaving the matter to public and peer pressure begs explanation. Perhaps the trustees, hoping to avoid the disastrous results witnessed at Lane Seminary, felt that taking further action would only alienate the students further. When the slavery issue came up at Andover Seminary, for example, the students acquiesced to the faculty's demands without further incident. Whatever their reasoning, the Hanover trustees had set a precedent. Any open discussion of the slavery issue on campus or active involvement by the Hanover College faculty, trustees, or students in local or state abolitionist societies henceforth would be in opposition to the trustees and was to be discouraged (Crowe 1857:64–71; Furnish 2014:194–95; Lesick 1980:145–46; Millis 1927:57–58). To the trustees, it must have seemed that this chapter in the history of Hanover College was closed.

JAMES G. BIRNEY'S RESPONSE TO THE HANOVER TRUSTEES' ACTION

The action taken by the Hanover College trustees was not the end of the story. Believing their resolution would end the matter, the trustees were no doubt surprised to learn that editor James Birney had decided to not only reprint their statement of March 29, 1836, in *The Philanthropist* but also follow it with his own public critique of the trustees' position:

The above manifesto is more liberal—or rather less illiberal, than might have been expected—when it is considered, that the President of the College [Dr. James Blythe] is, even yet, after all the light that has been thrown on the sin of oppression, a *slaveholder*. . . . The Trustees and Faculty, it would seem, have not been altogether blind to the experience of similar bodies [e.g., at Lane Seminary], in the enactment of laws which would drive from the institution every young man who has independence of *soul* enough, to direct to its

Raley The Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College 101

proper use, the *mind* that God has bestowed upon him. . . . The proceeding on the part of the Trustees and Faculty . . . is certainly a new position, that they have assumed—formally arraying themselves against a portion of the students—and calling on the public and the remainder of the students . . . to take sides with them, and put down, by their concentrated disapprobation, what they, themselves, are not courageous enough to suppress. . . . The fact is, in the few remarks of the Trustees and Faculty may be found the true reasons of the general inefficiency of our college graduates. They are taught to “obey” that others may have the pleasure of “commanding”—with the promise, that some day, they also may be inducted into the generalship.

We trust, those noble minded young men will thank God, that they are thought worthy to suffer in his cause, and remember, that He is the commander, whom they are to obey. (Birney 1836, April 8)

President Blythe, who had owned slaves all his life, even as a Presbyterian minister, now found himself on the defensive, accused of continuing to own one or more slaves. Whether he still had slaves in Kentucky is not known, but he had left at least one elderly black female slave behind in Kentucky when he had come to Hanover in 1832, only to have her join him in Indiana the following year, perhaps without his having legally manumitted her before she left Kentucky (Feight 2014:36–37, n. 51).

Crowe, Blythe, and the trustees were also facing other issues at the time, including severe financial constraints, declining enrollment, contentious campus debates over controversial theological and political issues of the day, student disciplinary problems, divisions emerging within the faculty over administrative policy, and a major curriculum reform and reassignment of courses that left Blythe teaching an entirely new course in the 1835–36 academic year on top of his other responsibilities as president. This new course, entitled “Mental and Moral Philosophy, Evidences of Christianity, and Jurisprudence, Especially as It Respects the Constitution and Government of the United States,” with three new lectures to prepare each week, would have taxed even the most experienced professor, let alone one who was also balancing presidential duties (Crowe 1857:64–71; Furnish 2014:192–97; Millis 1927:57–58; Moore 1900:53). Given all this, the trustees’ resolution disavowing responsibility for the formation of the students’ antislavery society might have appeared fairly mild, if also divisive among the student body as a whole, but the abolition-vs.-colonization debate clearly had touched a nerve.

In the pamphlet in which they published their *Preamble and Constitution*, the officers of the student antislavery society had included three additional essays entitled, respectively, “The Right of the Colored Population to the Enjoyment of Freedom in America,” “Slavery and Romanism,” and “Bible versus Slavery.” In the first and most important of these essays, the students began by drawing a critical distinction: “The

people of this nation profess that all men are born free,” while in practice “two millions and a half are born slaves.” Those who dared expose the evils of slavery, the students continued, had been declared “reckless incendiaries.” The trustees’ “mild” disavowal of the society notwithstanding, all discussion on the subject had been forbidden. Indeed, in an exchange with Editor Birney in the fall of 1835 later referenced in *The Philanthropist*, Blythe had made it clear that he would never tolerate abolitionism on the Hanover campus.

“Slavery must not be brought to the test of truth,” the students had in essence been told, and “the privilege of making merchandise of immortal beings must not be called in question.” “Why is it,” they asked, “that reason is dethroned, and justice disregarded, and humanity outraged and heaven insulted, and all this by the professed worshippers of the living God?—while he who lifts a warning voice against this complicated system of wickedness and abomination is denounced as an enemy to the public weal. . . . Have we indeed become bankrupt to virtue?” The reason for such treatment, the students concluded, is that “*blacks have not a right to be free in this country.*” Instead, blacks and whites were to reside on different continents, separated by an ocean. Here the students attacked the core of the trustees’ position:

The notion has become prevalent, that this is the white man’s country, and must not be polluted by the foot prints of him, who has ever been a slave. ‘Let the Atlantic ocean heave its mighty billows between the two races.’ This is the charm which soothes the conscience, and perverts the judgment, and makes tyrants of freemen, and hypocrites of christians, and is deemed excuse sufficient, for practicing a system of iniquity, which is unexampled in cruelty, and unparalleled in crime.

Those enslaved in the United States were in fact “natives of this land, . . . citizens by birth.” In the United States, their fathers and mothers had lived and died, and in the United States, they wished to be free to live and marry and build homes and rear families. On what basis should such claims be denied and they be banished from their native land? Thus, the students concluded, “The law which deprives the black man of liberty is unjust. It is contrary to the law of God and the rights of man, and is a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of our own government” (Birney 1836, April 1; McAuley et al. 1836:7–9).

Two popular Hanover professors, Mark Niles and John Harney, and at least one board member (perhaps William Reed; see below) were equally incensed at the curtailing of classroom discussion of the political and religious controversies dominating the public discourse at the time. Meanwhile, Blythe proscribed any public discussion on “exciting subjects.” The professors threatened to resign if the trustees did not dismiss President Blythe, and they attacked him on the one point for which such an accomplished yet aging president might be deemed vulnerable—his mental aptitude—in order to replace him with a man who was younger and in the prime of life, without considering that the

college curriculum reform and other difficulties had placed upon Blythe an all-but-unbearable burden. In his *History of Hanover College*, Crowe (1857:65–66) explained that all had gone well during the first three years of Blythe’s presidency. In the end, however, Blythe was compelled to resign, effective at the end of the term in September 1836, though both Niles and Harney also left Hanover soon afterward. In a letter to the board dated September 5, 1836, Blythe explained that “until two months ago there was not the slightest difference of opinion in the Faculty as to the government of the college”; since that time, however, he had “stood alone.” Blythe believed that part of the reason for the opposition he had encountered of late was the conservative opinion that he held, which also confirms the students’ accusations:

That to admit the formation of any society for *debate*, in any college or public School, except such as hold their meetings with closed doors, is not only dangerous, but in the excited state of Society at large will ruin any institution. Closed doors are the only conservative principle in those Societies. True, this matter never was debated in the faculty; but opinions were given, & consequent practice pursued by the Students, directly at variance with this principle. I trust no one will suppose that this course gave me offence because it was contrary both to my opinion & practice; but it did wound me deeply because I thought I foresaw the very results that have been produced as it respects the Students.

I acted upon the above principle within two weeks after I became President of your college. Upon my own responsibility I interdicted *even discussion* on exciting Subjects. The subsequent tranquility of the house, on [the subjects of] New & Old School, Jacksonism & anti-Jacksonism, ought to be sufficient proof of the prudence of the course. (Crowe 1857:71; Hanover College Board of Trustees 1833–44:88–89)

President Blythe, with the support of Crowe and the trustees, had been the one to restrict debates on controversial subjects to behind closed doors, ostensibly for the good of the college. This proscription had applied to religious as well as political controversies and had been issued without much public outcry, but all that had changed with the formation of the abolitionist antislavery society, the staging of public campus debates on the slavery issue, and publication of the society’s *Preamble and Constitution* for wider circulation. This was more than Blythe, Crowe, and the trustees could stand, and in the end, it cost Blythe the presidency of the college.

Just four months after the Hanover College antislavery society experiment, a small group of “perhaps six or eight individuals” met together for three consecutive

evenings at South Hanover “for the purpose of discussing the sublime merits of domestic slavery.” During those three eventful days and evenings in July, the “commonly retired, pleasant and delightful village [of South Hanover] was in commotion” and “mobbing was the order of the day.” Discussions off campus must have continued, for the short-lived Jefferson County Anti-Slavery Society (JCASS) began meeting at the Carmel Associate Presbyterian Church on October 3, 1836.⁴ Many Northern white evangelicals, we have seen, regarded those who demanded an end to communion with slaveholders to be unchristian in their demeanor. The system might be bad, they argued, but slaveholders were good Christians entrusted with the conversion and proper treatment of their slaves. In contrast, Associate Presbyterians, also known as Seceders from their history in Scotland, refused to admit slaveholders to communion, though some favored gradual emancipation linked to colonization over immediatism.

Others underwent a transformation from colonizationist to abolitionist views during the critical years of 1834–37 when the JCASS was founded. Close ties must have existed between the now-defunct Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College and ITS, on the one hand, and the newly formed JCASS, on the other.⁵ Not only did the memberships of the two organizations overlap, but the JCASS members declared, as the student society had done previously, “Our object is, the entire emancipation of our fellow men, now in slavery in the UNITED STATES, and their elevation to their proper rank, as rational, accountable, and immortal beings. We desire to accomplish this object because, slavery as practised in America . . . is exposing our liberties to the grasp of tyranny, and our country to the judgments of Heaven.” The members pledged to “endeavor to effect the abolition of slavery, not by exciting discontent in the minds of the slaves—nor by denying the *legal right*, by which one million of *freemen* hold as *slaves*, two millions and a half of their fellowmen—nor by advocating congressional interference with the constitutional powers of the slave states . . . ; but by the use of such means only as are sanctioned by the laws of the land, the dictates of humanity, the claims of justice, and the precepts of the gospel.” Rather than violating the property rights of slave owners, they advocated using moral suasion to convince slave owners “that *emancipation* is the duty of the master, the right of the slave, and the only remedy, sure safe and practicable, for the system of slavery” (Birney, October 21, 1836, October 13, 1837).

The year of 1836, then, was clearly a pivotal moment in the history of Hanover College. Hanover’s nine abolitionists had challenged the trustees, directors, and faculty of the college and seminary by questioning their commitment to the antislavery cause. Even in advance of the trustees’ resolution, these students had posed the rhetorical question “Why is it that discussion is smothered, and the press manacled, and silence imposed upon all, concerning that subject [i.e., slavery], in which are involved the interests of this whole nation?” (McAuley et al. 1836:8). This suggests that James Morrow may have been warned against publishing any future pamphlets of the antislavery society. The trustees and faculty made it clear that they neither supported these discussions nor would tolerate such a radical abolitionist position among the students at Hanover College and ITS. In their defense, the Hanover trustees found themselves in a difficult position, for a substantial portion of the student body hailed from slave-owning families. Crowe, Blythe, and the trustees and faculty claimed, perhaps correctly, that nine-tenths of the Hanover

student bodies rejected the society's radical position. One of the Hanover College students recalled years later that some of the abolitionists on campus had even dared to cross the Ohio River to, like the Lane Seminary students, teach Kentucky blacks "to read the Bible in the Sabbath schools they started. This 'fired the southern heart,' and a number [of students] from the South left the college in disgust" (Gilliland 1883:50). This came at a time of "great pecuniary embarrassment," as Crowe put it, the near bankruptcy of the institution from Hanover's "manual labor system," which proved to be financially unviable after the college endeavored to supplement the students' labors with artificially high wages and was abandoned, leading to more withdrawals. Hanover's enrollment dropped from 215 in 1835 to 174 in the fall of 1836. At the same time, the college faced other serious issues as noted above (Crowe 1857:64; Dunn 1883:16; Hanover College and ITS 1835–36:11, 1836–37:15).

FREE BLACKS AND FORMER SLAVES WHO EMIGRATED FROM INDIANA TO LIBERIA

Only 85 blacks left Indiana for Liberia during the lifetime of the ICS (1820–64), of which 72 survived the journey (Henry 2008:210–11). Both Hanover College and the city of Madison supported the ICS, and though the numbers always remained comparatively low, Jefferson County ranked among the top three counties in the state with the highest number of blacks who relocated to Africa. Congress and state legislatures, including Indiana, appropriated funds to assist emigrants with the purchase of land and supplies, the construction of defensive forts, the payment of teachers, and the costs of their passage and first six months of living expenses (Henry 2008:123–44; Liebenow 1987:13, 18; Yarema 2006:36). Many of the donations to the ICS and ACS to assist African Americans emigrating to Liberia, however, came from Presbyterian women (Henry 2008:89–91). Likewise, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church proclaimed its support for the ACS. The Methodist Episcopal Annual Conference of New York, meeting in May 1834, resolved "that this conference view with increasing interest and favor, the truly noble and philanthropic enterprise of colonizing the free people of color of these United States, with their own consent, on the coast of Africa." The New York Methodists declared further, in company with other Protestant churches, "that each preacher be at liberty to take up collections on or about the 4th of July, for the benefit of the American Colonization Society." At the same time, New York Methodists proclaimed their disdain for the abolitionists who were voicing their opposition to the ACS (ACS 1835:10(4):127).

Throughout the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s, of course, the donations of the ACS were hurt by the increased opposition they faced from abolitionists, who opposed expatriation in the belief that the two races could coexist peacefully within American society and who argued that colonization was little more than a racist scheme to rid the country of blacks. Thus, the assistance rendered by the state governments, together with funding by the ACS and black slaves' former masters as well as donations by eastern merchants, shippers, and bankers seeking to capitalize upon the Liberian venture, was never enough. It should come as no surprise, then, that the early African American settlers who relocated to West Africa

endured a great deal of suffering and sacrifice. Most emancipated slaves lacked the financial resources needed to succeed in Liberia. Many relocated African Americans also suffered the ill effects of smallpox, malaria, and other illnesses on the ships and that were prevalent in West Africa, against which they had little or no immunity. The indigenous West African tribes did not welcome the African Americans to their shores (Burin 2005:148–50; Clegg 2004:144–50, 227–37; Tyler-McGraw 2007:128; Yarema 2006:21, 28, 36). Further, as Gus Liebenow (1987:16) noted, “The settlers and their agent did not appreciate that the concept of ‘sale’ of land had no meaning in societies where land was distributed communally on the basis of usufructuary right of occupancy rather than individual private freehold. Hostility intensified as the settlers later pressed tribal residents into service as field hands and household domestics and imposed American forms of speech, justice, and commerce in the area under their control.”

ACS managers lamented that the illegal slave trade continued along the West African coast with “undiminished atrocity and activity.” Despite the efforts of the U.S. and British navies, coupled with those of the ACS settlements, “slavers came and went along the Liberian littoral just as emigrant ships did” (Clegg 2004:101). Meanwhile, Liberian society quickly assumed a hierarchy not unlike that between the minority of emigrant settlers and the sixteen or so indigenous “heathen” tribes of the hinterland that constituted the majority, whom the settlers felt a responsibility to “civilize.” At the top of social hierarchy were the approximately 5,000 free blacks who had arrived early on, followed by about 7,000 blacks who had been emancipated or had purchased their freedom from their owners in the United States. Of 19,000 total arrivals through 1865, nearly 6,000 blacks at the bottom of Liberian society had been recaptured from slave ships by the U.S. Navy. These African “Congoes” had never set foot in the United States and neither spoke English nor were familiar with American customs (Burin 2005:152–54; Liebenow 1987:18–20, 24). As Claude A. Clegg (2004:6) has argued, “African American immigration to Liberia—and the fluid, ever-changing identities of the emigrants themselves—must be understood as being enmeshed in the constantly evolving meanings of slavery, freedom, colonialism, race, citizenship, and migratory patterns that characterized the development of nineteenth-century Atlantic cultures.”

The many difficulties that beset these early pioneers are reflected in their correspondence with those back in the United States. Between 1848 and 1854, the ACS chartered 41 ships that carried about 4,000 African American emigrants to Liberia (Yarema 2006:47). One former African American family, Peter and Harriet [Harriet] Clay Thompkins and their children, relocated from Hanover to the “Kentucky” settlement in Liberia in 1851 with John Finley Crowe’s support. Within a few months, however, Harriet Thompkins had lost four daughters plus her husband and a son-in-law, due in large part to an outbreak of smallpox on the vessel carrying them from New Orleans to the Liberian Republic. Desperate, with no housing or means of financial support and living “among strangers,” Harriet wrote to her “Frend Rev Dr Crow” from the Kentucky settlement in Liberia, pleading desperately for aid (Thompkins 1852; cf. Burin 2005:146–48). In response, Crowe and his friends at Hanover and Madison immediately collected \$30 and sent the sum to the national office of the ACS for the purchase of goods to be sent on to the widow Thompkins via the next ship leaving for Liberia, as none were scheduled to do so from New Orleans. Rev. William Wylie

McLain, once an ITS student and member of the JCASS at Hanover and now secretary of the ACS in Washington, DC, oversaw the purchases for Harriet Thompson and arranged for their shipment free of charge (Crowe 1852; Library of Congress [n.d.]; Lugenbeel 1852). Churches and schools of the various Protestant denominations, along with activity by their missionaries such as Lott Carey and Colin Teague, quickly became part of the landscape that dotted the coast of Liberia. Educated free blacks who had arrived early with capital, politics, law, and mercantile trade numbered among the preferred professions. Emancipated slaves who arrived later and lacked such means were left to struggle or else to farm, an existence that most Americo-Liberians disdained because it reminded them of the bonds of slavery they had experienced in the United States. Farming was difficult in Liberia, with excessive rainfall between April and October, insects that devoured crops, and soils that required different farming techniques to avoid depletion. Initially at least, it seemed that only the Congoes knew how to farm successfully under such conditions. Still, the colonists in Liberia enjoyed religious liberty and an absence of white racism in a beautiful country (Burin 2005:150–57; Clegg 2004:144–47; Liebenow 1987:20–23).

A year later, though still struggling, Harriet Thompkins was more adjusted and appreciative of the scenic land in which she was residing. She was now as content in Liberia as she “could be with eny [sic] country in the world.” Her health, along with that of her remaining children, was good. Her son, Josiah, was attending school, and she and her surviving daughter, Ann Eliza, had joined the local Presbyterian church. At the same time, however, she was still penniless and struggling to pay the rent for her house. War had broken out, and most of the men of the local militia had gone off to fight, leaving only a few at home to stand guard. The shipment of supplies and goods that Crowe and McLain had sent had been lost when the ship in which they had been sent sank off the coast of Liberia. Harriet Thompkins again asked Dr. Crowe for aid in the form of the barest of necessities: nails, soap, cotton calico cloth, secondhand clothing, some provisions, a small spinning wheel, and something to help her get her house finished (Anthrop 2000:13; Thompkins 1853). The following year she observed, “Every thing seems to prosper, Except that the late emigrants suffer & die by scoors [sic]. This is not caused so much by the climate as from exposure. Houses cannot be rented for them in any one settlement.” In closing she again asked for aid so that she might finish building her house (Thompkins 1854).

Harriet’s letters were in many ways typical of other emigrant letters from the period. As Marie Tyler-McGraw (2007:139, 165) explained, “Most frequently, newcomers wrote first of their delight in the landscape and their liberties. . . . But these letters were frequently followed by grim lists of those who had sickened and died and, especially among emancipated slaves, accounts of their difficulties in making an adequate living.” Harriet did not mention that the 1847 Liberian Constitution recognized only black male Liberian land-owning church members as citizens.

CONCLUSION

John Finley Crowe, James Blythe, and the Hanover trustees no doubt believed, or at least had convinced themselves, that in their support of colonization, they were not only helping to solve the race problem in the United States but also were acting in accord with

their Christian faith and the dictates of reason in encouraging the education and expatriation of free blacks and recently emancipated slaves to a land where they might experience greater opportunity, equality, and justice. Meanwhile, the colonists would exert a civilizing and Christianizing influence upon the indigenous peoples of western Africa. Ironically, though, at the same time that colonizationists claimed to oppose slavery, they also feared ending it too abruptly. Considerable anxiety stemmed from consideration of the potential short- and long-term effects of flooding the American labor market with large numbers of free blacks and the possible resulting massive unemployment of whites in mostly lower-paid occupations, as well as from Southern slaveholders' fear that their former slaves might rise up and seek revenge once they had been freed.

In sum, no matter how well intended their actions, by concluding that white American society was racist beyond reform—rather than striving to reduce tensions between free blacks and whites in the North, to confront seriously the system of slavery in the South, or even to allow any discussion of the subject on the Hanover campus—the Hanover trustees and other colonizationists of their day not only allowed the system of slavery to continue unabated in the South but also laid the groundwork for prolonged racial tensions in the United States that have continued to the present day. Meanwhile, the 13,000 African Americans who eventually found their way to Liberia between the 1820s and 1860s, rather than discovering a land of plenty, encountered disease, the enmity of local tribes, the threat of slavers, and difficulties in farming or else were compelled by necessity to work in low-paying occupations with poor housing conditions that left most former slaves struggling for existence, even if those free blacks who engaged in Liberian mercantile and professional occupations generally fared well.

Short-lived though it may have been, the Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary exerted a significant influence upon its members as well as upon the lives of those they touched, and even upon the college itself. Despite the continued Old School leadership of Hanover College, a minority of abolitionist New School Presbyterians were serving as faculty, trustees, alumni, and friends of the college by the 1840s and 1850s. While on campus for the August 1846 commencement, a group of them met secretly at night in the Philalathean Society Hall (today the Hanover Presbyterian Church). There, they expressed their support for a new weekly, *The Examiner*, which was about to be published in Louisville, Kentucky. Then, however, the conversation turned to the need to rename and relocate the newspaper to a safer venue—perhaps Washington, DC—where it would be less likely to suffer attack and the destruction of its presses. Just a few years later, in 1851–52, *The National Era*, whose new name had been coined by Hanover College professor Minard Sturgus, would publish Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* serially (Baker 1978:55–57). Publication of the book followed soon afterward, with 120 reprintings during the first year alone. The rest is history. Professor Sturgus was a strong abolitionist who had been a student at Hanover at the time of its antislavery society in 1836 and, by his own admission, had converted to abolitionism after having witnessed the mobbing of the antislavery society's secretary, Joseph G. Wilson, in July 1836 (*Philanthropist* February 19, 1839). Later, Wilson was active in the Underground Railroad and antislavery societies

in Medina and Huron Counties, Ohio, and served as an agent for the AASS (Drayton 1836:192; Furnish 2014:192). Anti-Slavery Society President John McAuley became a Seceder pastor who was active in the Underground Railroad at Rimersburg, Clarion County, Pennsylvania (Davis 1887:122). And Benjamin Templeton went on to serve black Presbyterian churches in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

In pursuing the expatriation of free blacks and emancipated slaves, colonizationists denied blacks who remained in the United States, throughout both North and South, the basic rights of U.S. citizenship guaranteed to them in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. As the recent police shootings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and far too many other African Americans, along with the rallies of the KKK in places like Charlottesville, Virginia, in 2017 sadly demonstrate, the fundamental problem of how whites and people of color might coexist peaceably and equitably in the United States remains unanswered.

Twenty-one years passed after the departure of Benjamin Templeton for Lane Seminary before another African American student was considered for admission to Hanover College. In 1857, another year of great financial uncertainty and heightened sectional and racial tensions, the Sloan Scholarship Fund was donated to support the education of an African American student at Hanover College. The donor nominated an outstanding applicant, Moses Broyles [Broiles], for admission under its terms. In response, the faculty passed a resolution, approved by the trustees, stating that, “considering the present circumstances of the institution, and its situation (locality),” admitting Mr. Broyles would be “inadvisable.” The trustees then refunded the scholarship to the donor.

Broyles had been born a slave in Tennessee, brought to Kentucky, where he purchased his freedom, and then attended Eleutherian Institute at Lancaster, Indiana, about ten miles north of Hanover, for three years. He joined the Baptist church and, in 1857, the same year that the Hanover faculty and trustees rejected his application, Broyles was called to be pastor of the Second Baptist Church at Indianapolis, where he also founded a school for African American children. In 1858, he helped found and assumed duties as the moderator of the Indiana Association of Negro Baptist Churches (Furnish 2014:376; Stott 1908:263; Thornbrough 1957:157–58).

Despite Broyles’s obvious qualifications, the reasoning at Hanover College had been clear for some time. In January 1851, Rev. W. W. Hill, Secretary for the Western Executive Committee (Louisville, KY) of the Board of Domestic Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the USA, had written to John Finley Crowe about the issue of slavery, which had flared up once more on the Hanover campus at the instigation of the new professor of natural science, Jared M. Stone. “Was sorry to hear that Mr. Stone had broached the slavery question in any shape,” Hill wrote. “All agitation of the subject in the College will do no good to the slave and will injure the College. Hundreds in slave states would rather send their sons to a free state if they are not annoyed by agitations of that question” (General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the USA 1850:606; Hill 1851; Millis 1927:203). This brief mention brings up several unanswerable questions, though it does appear that Crowe and the trustees thought along similar lines, namely that in striving to put the college first, they repeatedly refused to take a firm stand against the evils of slavery.

With the rejection of Broyles, President William Alfred Millis concluded in his *History of Hanover College* (1927:67), “the race question was settled.” Not until 1948 would Hanover College admit its first African American student, Alma Gene Prince. Still, despite the support of President Albert Parker and his wife, Katherine, Prince’s admission faced opposition from some of Hanover’s trustees. In June 1954, however, the trustees officially approved a new set of “Principles for Admission to Hanover College,” which contained no prohibition against admitting African American students. Although a second African American student would not be admitted until the fall of 1957, more followed in the 1960s and 1970s, gradually paving the way for the greater diversity found on the Hanover College campus today even if, as at many other institutions of higher learning, this process has been slower at times than many would have preferred and remains even now a work in progress (Baker 1978:196–97; Hanover College Board of Trustees 1949–1968:47; Hanover College History Department 2018).

ENDNOTES

1. Hanover College and ITS (1833–37) is provided in the reference list with a standardized author and title to represent the Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary academic catalogues issued between 1833 and 1837. In these publications, the title, city, and publisher varied slightly from year to year, as shown below.

1833

South Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary. *South Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary. Catalogue of the Corporation, Faculty, and Students. January, 1833*. Cincinnati, OH: McMillan and Clopper, 1833.

1834

South Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary. *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of South Hanover College, and Indiana Theological Seminary. February, 1834*. South Hanover, IN: Morrow and Bayless, 1834.

1834–35

Indiana Theological Seminary and Hanover College. *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Indiana Theological Seminary and Hanover College. 1834–5*. Hanover, IN: Hanover College Press, 1835.

1835–36

Indiana Theological Seminary and Hanover College. *A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Indiana Theological Seminary and Hanover College, 1835–6*. South Hanover, IN: Hanover College Press, 1836.

1836–37

Indiana Theological Seminary and Hanover College. *A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Indiana Theological Seminary and Hanover College, 1836–7*. South Hanover, IN: James Morrow, 1837.

2. A comparison of the wording of the two documents suggests a close relationship between them. For example, the Lane “Preamble” states,

By immediate emancipation, we do not mean that the slaves shall be turned loose upon the nation to roam as vagabonds and aliens—nor that they shall be instantly invested with all political rights and privileges—nor that shall be expelled from their native land to a foreign clime, as the price and condition of their freedom. But we do mean—that . . . they shall really receive the protection of law; that the power which is invested in every slaveholder, to rob them of their just dues, to drive them into the field like beasts, to lacerate their bodies, to sell the husband from his wife, the wife from her husband, and children from their parents, shall instantly cease; that the slaves shall be employed as free laborers, fairly compensated and protected in their earnings; that they shall be placed under a benevolent and disinterested supervision, which shall secure to them the right to obtain secular and religious knowledge, to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, and to seek an intellectual and moral equality with the whites. (Allan et al. 1834).

The parallel passage in the Hanover *Preamble* reads:

By emancipation we do not mean that the slave shall be “turned lose” to prey upon society, uncontrolled by law; nor . . . that they be admitted to all social and political privileges; but we do mean that they be admitted to the enjoyment of all their *rights*, and placed under the control and government of law; that all title of property in man immediately cease, that every husband have his own wife, and every wife her own husband, that parents have the control and government of their children, and that children belong to their parents, that they be permitted to consult their own interests, and to enjoy the proceeds of their own labor; the master having the privilege of retaining their services, by employing them as free laborers, and paying them just wages; that the acquisition of knowledge be no longer forbidden under severe penalties; and that ALL, wearing Jehovah’s image, be received and welcomed as brethren, by those who profess to be followers of Jesus Christ. (McAuley et al. 1836:6)

3. Present at the meeting of the Hanover College Board of Trustees on March 29, 1836, were Hanover College President Rev. James Blythe, D.D.; Rev. John Matthews, D.D.; Joshua D. Russell; judge and former speaker of the Indiana House of Representatives Williamson Dunn; Dr. J. M. Venable; William Reed; Robert Marshall; and Hanover College founder and vice president John Finley Crowe (Hanover College Board of Trustees 1833–1844:66). For a similar restriction placed on the literary societies of Hanover College, see the trustees' minutes from September 25, 1839 (Hanover College Board of Trustees 1833–1844:164–66). The trustees recognized “that the Faculty entertain no disposition to restrict in any improper manner the liberties and privileges of these societies, or unreasonably to interpose in their ordinary transactions, yet it is evident that whatever affects the character and reputation of the College and its power to accomplish the objects for which it is established, must fall under the general rule of being subject to the supervision and control of the Faculty and of this Board.”
4. The JCASS must have been short-lived, for on April 11, 1840, the members of the Neil's Creek Anti-Slavery Society at Lancaster considered organizing another Jefferson County Anti-Slavery Society (Neil's Creek Anti-Slavery Society 1839–1845).
5. Members of the JCASS included Carmel pastor and JCASS president James McConnell Henderson; Carmel elders Col. James Morrow (who had printed the Hanover College society's *Preamble and Constitution*) and JCASS treasurer James Anderson; Carmel church member and JCASS vice president Robert Taylor Sr.; Hanover Presbyterian Church elder, Hanover College board member, and JCASS vice president William Reed; David B. Reed; J. R. Swain; Madison Second Presbyterian Church member and future American Sunday School missionary and New School Presbyterian pastor William D. Rosseter; Madison Second (“New School”) Presbyterian Church pastor James H. Johnston; Scotland native and Hanover College Modern Languages and Indiana Theological Seminary professor of ecclesiastical history Rev. Oswald Hunter; Hanover College graduate and Indiana Seminary student Robert K. Simpson; Hanover College and Indiana Seminary Anti-Slavery Society members and Indiana Seminary students Joseph G. Wilson and John McAuley; and Indiana Seminary student William Wylie McLain, who later served for many years as the secretary of the ACS in Washington, DC. These all had known Benjamin Templeton, who had just left Hanover for Lane Seminary in September 1836 (Furnish 2014:213–15, 226; *Philanthropist* October 21, 1836, October 13, 1837). Another attempt to form a Jefferson County antislavery society came four years later (Neil's Creek Anti-Slavery Society 1839–45:April 11, 1840).

REFERENCES

- Abdy, E. S. 1835. *Journal of a Residence Tour in the United States of North America, from April, 1833, to October, 1834*. 3 vols. London: John Murray.

- Abzug, Robert H. 1980. *Passionate Liberator: Theodore Dwight Weld & the Dilemma of Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Adger, John B., and John L. Girardeau, eds. 1871–73. *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell*. 4 vols. Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.
- Allan, William T., et al. 1834. “Preamble and Constitution of the Anti-Slavery Society of Lane Seminary.” *The Standard.—Extra* (Cincinnati, OH). Retrieved June 2, 2020 (<https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbpe.24800600/?sp=1&st=text>).
- American Abolitionists. 2020a. “Birney, James G.” In *American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS)*. Retrieved June 2, 2020 (<http://www.americanabolitionists.com/american-anti-slavery-society.html>).
- American Abolitionists. 2020b. “Garrison, William Lloyd.” In *American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS)*. Retrieved June 2, 2020 (<http://www.americanabolitionists.com/american-anti-slavery-society.html>).
- American Colonization Society (ACS). 1825–50. *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*. 26 vols.
- Anthrop, Mary. 2000. *Indiana Emigrants to Liberia. The Indiana Historian*, March.
- Aptheker, Herbert. 1989. *Abolitionism: A Revolutionary Movement*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Baker, Frank. 1978. *Glimpses of Hanover’s Past, 1827–1977*. Seymour, IN: Graessle-Mercer.
- Beecher, Charles, ed. 1864–65. *Autobiography, Correspondence, etc., of Lyman Beecher, D.D.* 2 vols. New York: Harper & Bros.
- Beecher, Lyman. 1837. Advertisement for Lane Theological Seminary. *Cincinnati Journal and Western Luminary*, September 14.
- Bill of Rights. 1789. *National Archives: America’s Founding Documents*. Retrieved June 10, 2020 (<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>).
- Birney, James G. 1834. *Letter on Colonization, Addressed to the Rev. Thornton J. Mills, Corresponding Secretary of the Kentucky Colonization Society*. New York: Office of the Anti-Slavery Reporter.
- Birney, James G., ed. 1836–37. *The Philanthropist*, 1–2. Cincinnati, OH.
- Birney, William. 1890. *James G. Birney and His Times: The Genesis of the Republican Party with Some Account of Abolition Movements in the South before 1828*. New York: D. Appleton and Co.
- Blackett, Richard J. M. 2008. “‘And There Shall Be No More Sea’: William Lloyd Garrison and the Transatlantic Abolitionist Movement.” Pp. 13–40 in *William Lloyd Garrison at Two Hundred*, edited by J. B. Stewart. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Blight, David W. 2008. “William Lloyd Garrison at Two Hundred: His Radicalism and His Legacy for Our Time.” Pp. 1–12 in *William Lloyd Garrison at Two Hundred*, edited by J. B. Stewart. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Blythe, James. 1833. *Inaugural Address, Delivered January 1, 1833, by James Blythe, D.D., at His Inauguration into Office, as President of South Hanover College*. Cincinnati, OH: McMillan and Clopper. *Hanover Historical Texts Collection*. Retrieved May 15, 2020 (<https://history.hanover.edu/hhr/hhr5-5.html>).
- Burin, Eric. 2005. *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution: A History of the American Colonization Society*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

- Carwardine, Richard J. 1993. *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Clegg, Claude A. 2004. *The Price of Liberty: African Americans and the Making of Liberia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Cox, Anna-Lisa. 2018. *The Bone and Sinew of the Land: America's Forgotten Black Pioneers & the Struggle for Equality*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Cressy, B. C. 1832. *Appeal in Behalf of the Indiana Theological Seminary, Located at South Hanover, Indiana*. Boston: Peirce & Parker.
- Crowe [Crow], John Finley, ed. 1822–23. *Abolition Intelligencer and Missionary Magazine* 1(1–11). Microfilm, *American Periodicals*, Ser. 2, 1800–1850, No. 47.
- Crowe, John Finley. 1845. “Colonization Society Address.” June 30. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 5, Folder 9. Transcribed in *Hanover Historical Review* 11 (2010):30–36. Retrieved May 15, 2020 (<https://history.hanover.edu/hhrintro.php>).
- Crowe, John Finley. 1852. Letter to John King, Sen. March 29. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 3, Folder 6. Retrieved June 25, 2020 (<https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll24/id/2004>).
- Crowe, John Finley. 1857. *History of Hanover College*. Unpublished handwritten ms., Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 6, Folders 9 and 10.
- Davis, A. J., ed. 1887. *History of Clarion County, Pennsylvania*. Syracuse, NY: D. Mason & Co.
- Delaney, Martin Robinson. 1852. *The Condition, Elevation, Emigration, and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States, Politically Considered*. Philadelphia: Author.
- Drayton, William. 1836. *The South Vindicated from the Treason and Fanaticism of the Northern Abolitionists*. Philadelphia: H. Manly.
- Dunn, William McKee. 1883. *Early History of Hanover College*. Madison, IN: Courier Co.
- Egerton, Douglas R. 2002. “Averting a Crisis: The Proslavery Critique of the American Colonization Society.” Pp. 147–59 in *Rebels, Reformers, & Revolutionaries: Collected Essays and Second Thoughts*. New York: Routledge.
- Esarey, Logan. 1915–1922. *A History of Indiana from Its Exploration to 1922*. 3 vols. Indianapolis, IN: W. K. Stewart.
- Federal Writers’ Project. 1943. *Cincinnati: A Guide to the Queen City and Its Neighbors*. Cincinnati, OH: Weisen-Hart.
- Feight, Andrew Lee. 2014. “James Blythe and the Slavery Controversy in the Presbyterian Churches of Kentucky, 1791–1802.” *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 102(1):13–38.
- Foner, Philip, and George Walker, eds. 1979–80. *Proceedings of the Black State Conventions, 1840–1865*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fox, Early Lee. 1919. *The American Colonization Society, 1817–1840*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Franklin, John Hope, and Loren Schweninger. 1999. *Runaway Slaves: Rebels on the Plantation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Furnish, Mark Allan. 2014. "A Rosetta Stone on Slavery's Doorstep: Eleutherian College and the Lost Antislavery History of Jefferson County, Indiana." PhD dissertation, Purdue University.
- Galbraith, R. C. Jr. 1899. *The History of the Chillicothe Presbytery, from Its Organization in 1799 to 1899*. Chillicothe, OH: Scioto Gazette Book and Job Office.
- Garrison, William Lloyd. 1832. *Thoughts on African Colonization*. Boston: Garrison and Knapp.
- Garrison, William Lloyd. 1833. Speech of June 11 in Liverpool, England. *The Liberator* 3(42):1.
- Garrison, William Lloyd. 1844. "Gerrit Smith's Constitutional Argument. No. III." *The Liberator* 14(40):3.
- General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (USA). 1850. *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. Vol. XII. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.
- Gilliland, William W. 1883. "Recollections of Hanover as It Was in 1835–1839." *Hanover Monthly* 1(4):49–51.
- Griffler, Keith P. 2010. *Front Line of Freedom: African Americans and the Forging of the Underground Railroad in the Ohio Valley*. Repub. ed. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Hagedorn, Ann. 2002. *Beyond the River: The Untold Story of the Heroes of the Underground Railroad*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hanover College. 2020. *Scholarships, Awards, and Grants*. Retrieved June 15, 2020 (<https://www.hanover.edu/admission/financialaid/scholarships>).
- Hanover College Board of Trustees. 1833–44. *Minutes*. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, HC 1.
- Hanover College Board of Trustees. 1949–68. *Minutes*. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, HC 1.
- Hanover College History Department. 2018. *Learning in Black and White: Race Relations at Hanover College, 1832–1980*. Retrieved June 20, 2020 (<https://history.hanover.edu/texts/bnw/>).
- Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary (ITS). 1833–1837. *A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of (South) Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary*. Hanover, IN: Hanover College.
- Hayward, Edward F. 1904. *Lyman Beecher*. Boston: Pilgrim Press.
- Henry, Racquel L. 2008. "The Colonization Movement in Indiana, 1820–1864: A Struggle to Remove the African American." PhD dissertation, Indiana University.
- Hill, W. W. 1851. Letter to John Finley Crowe. January 3. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS 1, Box 3, Folder 4. Retrieved June 25, 2020 (<https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll24/id/3908>).
- Indiana Historical Bureau. 2020. "Constitution of 1851 as Originally Written: Article 13: Negroes and Mulattoes." Retrieved June 10, 2020 (<https://www.in.gov/history/2858.htm>).

- Katz, William L. 2015. "African America's First Protest Meeting: Black Philadelphians Reject the American Colonization Society Plans for Their Resettlement." *Black Past*, April 17. Retrieved May 26, 2020 (<https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/african-america-s-first-protest-meeting-black-philadelphians-reject-american-colonizati/>).
- Kettleborough, Charles. 1916–30. *Constitution Making in Indiana: A Source Book of Constitutional Documents with Historical Introduction and Critical Notes*. 3 vols. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission.
- Kraditor, Aileen S. 1989. *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism: Garrison and His Critics on Strategy and Tactics, 1834–1850*. Repub. ed. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Lane Theological Seminary. 1837. *Vermont Chronicle*, March 9.
- Lane Theological Seminary. 1881. *General Catalogue of Lane Theological Seminary, 1828–1881*. Cincinnati, OH: Elm Street Printing Co.
- Lesick, Lawrence Thomas. 1980. *The Lone Rebels: Evangelicalism and Antislavery in Antebellum America*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.
- Library of Congress. N.d. Rev. William McLain, Secretary, American Colonization Society, bust portrait. Library of Congress, Washington, DC, LOT 8553, no. 26. Retrieved June 30, 2020 (<https://www.loc.gov/item/2005689450/>).
- Liebenow, J. Gus. 1987. *Liberia: The Quest for Democracy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Longfield, Bradley J. 2013. *Presbyterians and American Culture: A History*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Lugenbeel, J. W. 1852. Letter from the Colonization Office in Washington, D.C., to John Finley Crowe. April 23. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 3, Folder 6. Retrieved June 25, 2020 (<https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll24/id/2038/rec/4>).
- May, Samuel Jr. 1861. *The Fugitive Slave Law and Its Victims*. Rev. ed. New York: American Anti-Slavery Society.
- McAuley, John, et al. 1836. *Preamble and Constitution of the Anti-Slavery Society of Hanover College and Indiana Theological Seminary, with Miscellaneous Articles on the Subject of Slavery*. Hanover, IN: James Morrow.
- Miller, Marion Clinton. 1938. "The Antislavery Movement in Indiana." PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Millis, William Alfred. 1927. *The History of Hanover College from 1827 to 1927*. Hanover, IN: Hanover College.
- Miter, John J., et al. 1834. *A Statement of the Reasons Which Induced the Students of Lane Seminary, to Dissolve Their Connection with That Institution*. Cincinnati, OH.
- Moore, A. Y. 1900. *History of Hanover College*. Indianapolis, IN: The Hollenbeck Press.
- Moses, Wilson J. 1975. "Civilizing Missionary: A Study of Alexander Crummell." *Journal of Negro History* 60(2):229–51.
- Neil's Creek Anti-Slavery Society. 1839–45. *Minute Book of Neil's [Neil's] Creek Anti-Slavery Society 1839–1845, Jefferson County, Indiana*. Indianapolis: Indiana State Library.

- Peabody, James A. 1837. Letter to John Finley Crowe. August 11. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 1, Folder 13. Retrieved June 27, 2020 (<https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll24/id/1351/rec/66>).
- Phillips, Christopher. 2016. *The Rivers Run Backward: The Civil War and the Remaking of the American Middle Border*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Power-Greene, Ousmane. 2014. *Against Wind and Tide: The African American Struggle against the Colonization Movement*. New York: New York University Press.
- Presbyterian Theological Seminary. 1939. *General Catalogue, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, (Chicago), Lane Seminary Affiliated*. Chicago: Presbyterian Theological Seminary.
- Ranck, George W. 1872. *History of Lexington, Kentucky: Its Early Annals and Recent Progress*. Cincinnati, OH: Robert Clarke & Co.
- Rankin, John. [1873] 1978. *Abolitionist: The Life of Rev. John Rankin Written by Himself in His 80th Year*. Huntington, WV: Appalachian Press / South Central Ohio Preservation Society.
- Ritchie, Andrew. 1852. *The Soldier, the Battle, and the Victory, Being a Brief Account of the Work of Rev. John Rankin in the Anti-Slavery Cause*. Cincinnati, OH: Western Tract and Book Society.
- Sewell, Richard H. 1976. *Ballots for Freedom: Antislavery Politics in the United States, 1837–1860*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sinha, Manisha. 2016. *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stanton, Henry B. 1834. "Great Debate at Lane Seminary." In *Debate at the Lane Seminary, Cincinnati. Speech of James A. Thome, of Kentucky, Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, May 6, 1834. Letter of the Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Cox, Against the American Colonization Society*. Boston: Garrison and Knapp.
- Staudenraus, P. J. 1961. *The African Colonization Movement, 1816–1865*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stott, William T. 1908. *Indiana Baptist History, 1798–1908*. Franklin, IN: Franklin College.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher. 1910. *Uncle Tom's Cabin, or Life among the Lowly*. Repub. ed. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Thompkins [Thomkins], Harriet [Hariat]. 1852. Letter from Kentucky (Monrovia), Liberia, to John Finley Crowe, January 26, 1852. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 3, Folder 6. Retrieved June 25, 2020 (<https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll24/id/2005/rec/1>).
- Thompkins [Thomkins], Harriet [Hariat]. 1853. Letter to John Findley Crowe, February 28, 1853. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 3, Folder 7 (<https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll24/id/4138/rec/5>). Transcribed without correction by Sadie Gilchrist Allison in January 1969 and published in the *Hanover Historical Review* 11(2010): 42–43. Retrieved June 25, 2020 (<https://history.hanover.edu/hhrintro.php>).

- Thompkins [Thomkins], Harriet [Hariat]. 1854. Letter to John Findley Crowe, August 22, 1854. Hanover College, Duggan Library Archives, Crowe Family Papers, MSS1, Box 3, Folder 9. Retrieved June 25, 2020 (<https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll24/id/3483/rec/4>).
- Thornbrough, Emma Lou. 1957. *The Negro in Indiana before 1900: A Study of a Minority*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau.
- Thornbrough, Emma Lou. 1965. *Indiana in the Civil War Era, 1850–1880*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau & Indiana Historical Society.
- Tomek, Beverly C. 2011. *Colonization and Its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania*. New York: New York University Press.
- Tyler-McGraw, Marie. 2007. *An African Republic: Black and White Virginians in the Making of Liberia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Varble, D. W. 2014. "Legislation and Its Effects on Race Relations in Southeastern Indiana, 1785–1860." Master thesis, University of Louisville.
- Williams, George W. 1883. *History of the Negro Race in America from 1619 to 1880: Negroes as Slaves, as Soldiers, and as Citizens*. 2 vols. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Winch, Julie. 2007. "Sarah Forten's Anti-Slavery Networks." Pp. 143–157 in *Women's Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation*, edited by K. K. Sklar and J. B. Stewart. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Yarema, Allan E. 2006. *American Colonization Society: An Avenue to Freedom?* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.