DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 557 SO 008 321

AUTHOR Foster, Claudia C.
TITLE Manumission Societies and African Free Schools.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 24p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., April 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; *Educational History; Educational Opportunities; *Educational Quality; Negro Achievement; *Negro Education; *Negro History; Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; Social Integration; Socioeconomic Status; *United States History

ABSTRACT

Abolitionists in the late 18th and early 19th centuries contended that even though blacks had been debased under American slavery, they could and must be prepared through education programs to function as Christians and American Citizens. As a result of this education, the new Afro-American would merit and gain white America's respect and acceptance by proving his moral worth. However, the abolitionists' notion of education for acculturation was restricted from the beginning of their crusade. Through their moral reform efforts, abolitionists aimed to educate former slaves to dominant, white, Protestant values and patterns of behavior. Their understanding of acculturation did not include fundamentally changing the social structural participation of free blacks within the dominant American institutions. In addition, acculturation through educational programs meant the development of attitudes and values consistent with lower class working and living patterns. Little was done by the abolitionists to educate whites concerning the equal capacity of blacks and the moral wrongness of slavery through home visitations or campaigns to educate teachers. (Author/DE)

Session 26.08

Paper for Session on Social Purposes of Missionary and Philanthropic Work in Black Education, 1785-1930.

American Educational Research Association
April 3, 1975

"Manumission Societies and African Free Schools"

Claudia C. Foster, Wellesley College

In the forty-five years following the American Revolution, gradual abolition societies, or "manumission societies" as they were sometimes known, took form, not only in what were then the two largest eastern cities, New York and Philadelphia, but in smaller communities east, west, and upper south as well. At least twenty-five societies formed, flourished, or languished for longer or shorter periods in Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland.[1]

Members were predominately lawyers, physicians, successful merchants, manufacturers, and financiers, and in much lesser numbers, ministers, school teachers, booksellers, and writers. Most were descendants of English emigrants whose families had been established in their respective communities for three or more generations. Whites attracted to gradual abolitionism were among the most stable, financially secure, best educated, and most travelled members of American society. They were men accustomed to dealing from positions of political and economic strength in their own communities, on state levels, and in national government. Through their activities and concerns they shaped and controlled American political, economic, military, moral, and cultural life.

Some, men like Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, and John Jay, had national and international reputations as American statesmen. The most active members, however, were not men of national political notoriety. With the exception of Franklin, who died in 1790, and Rush, the primary importance of these national figures to the abolitionist cause rested in their personal prestige and reputations. Their affiliations guaranteed public sanction, and it was hoped, greater public support.

Although gradual abolitionists represented many Protestant denominations, in every society a preponderance were Quakers. In almost all of the smaller societies, for example in Burlington, N.J.; Chester County, Pa., and Wilmington, Del., the roll-call at an abolitionist meeting sounded like an echo from the Quaker meeting house. Membership was 100 percent Quaker. In the New York and Philadelphia organizations, the two with the largest number of non-Quaker affiliates, the dedicated, worker core was predominately Quaker.

The immediate problem prompting these white elites to organize abolition societies was that of preventing the kidnapping of freed slaves from the North for resale into slavery. But the societies' concerns extended beyond that immediate issue from the start. Gradual abolitionists united around the following beliefs.

* Slave trading and slavery must end
*Abolition must proceed gradually, over time.

* Abolition embraced more than legal freedom for slaves
* Abolition required a moral "transformation" of all Americans, black and white
* Education was the means to accomplish this "transformation"
* Their white societies had both the responsibility and capability to organize and lead a movement to achieve those objectives

This paper will focus on what kind of transformation gradual abolitionists envisioned and the role of their programs of black education in reaching those ends. It will show that their activities aimed at 1) the acculturation of freed blacks within explicit boundaries in a changing American socio-economic order and 2) the eradication of white prejudice--for abolitionists the primary "cause" of slavery. Limited acculturation of free blacks and the elimination of white prejudice were the means to the ultimate abolition of slavery.

The expectations and limitations of early abolitionist educational programs make sense only in light of how they 1) analyzed the causes of slavery 2) perceived the natures of Afro-Americans 3) understood white prejudice and 4) saw the role of education in social change.

Finally, this paper argues that in terms of stated objectives, these early philanthropists could claim success with some of their programs. However, their inability to acknowledge the truly transforming potential of their ideas and activities and act in ways consistent with some of their own assumptions about racial prejudice and social change was, in the final analysis, the tragic failure of their endeavors.

* * * *

For gradual abolitionists, slavery in America posed essentially moral problems. This analysis led them to search for moral solutions in abolishing it and determined how they defined white and black America's most urgent needs. They assumed that changes in the "moral realm" among both whites and blacks would trigger changes in their social relationships. Moral reformation of both races through programs of black education became the great goal, although the abolitionists felt that the causes of ignorance and immorality among whites and blacks were different.[2]

The reformers started from the premise that people were inherently good rather than evil. They believed that through processes of education on the question of slavery, they could arouse inherent, positive responses among white Americans. They maintained that white prejudice and exploitation resulted from a "deficiency of information." Prejudice was a void to be filled with knowledge.[3]

White man oppressed black, not because of fundamental human baseness, but from acquired and unchallenged social customs and selfish economic interests. The majority of their countrymen were prejudiced, the abolitionists explained, because their moral and intellectual sensitivities lay dormant--unawakened--unenlightened--not because they malfunctioned. The crusade among white Americans meant finding ways to stimulate natural predispositions for justice.[4]

On the question of the nature of blacks, abolitionists

were not refuting general notions that African culture was inferior, or that Afro-Americans, free or slave, were ignorant, immoral, and barbaric. They offered, however, alternate reasons for why this was so and some programs for changing matters in America.

Gradual abolitionists diverged from northern popular opinion by asserting that black peoples' immorality and ignorance were the sources, not the results of their inferiority; that this inferiority was acquired, not inbred; and, that those truths mattered when determining the question of whether or not blacks could rightfully be enslaved.[5]

By claiming that Africans had been bred to be inferior under American slavery, the abolitionists were saying that they were susceptible to environmental influences. That susceptibility, they further argued, proved they were human, and if they were human, they could change. The reformers' commitments to programs of "gradual" abolition, however, indicated to what extent they adhered to popular beliefs about African inferiority.

Using the concept of environmentalism (the idea that people's immediate environment determined their moral and social consciousnesses) the abolitionists explained Afro-American inferiority. They believed that in time, black Americans would provide proof of their equal capacities if nurtured in free and healthy social environments. The idea that white Americans could recognize the humanity of blacks,

admit to their immoral system of oppression, perceive their own prejudices, and simultaneously sanction slavery for economic gains was contradictory to all they earnestly believed about human nature.[6]

Abolitionists assumed that Afro-Americans were inferior because enslavement kept men ignorant, destroyed their humanity, and made them unfit as Christians and republican citizens. Moral reformation of free black Americans became a solution to one part of what they defined as the total social problem. But, equally important, they regarded their moral reformation campaigns for blacks as the most important means of changing white attitudes and opinions.

In the final analysis, the abolitionists thus found the source of the slavery problem within blacks themselves. They argued that the fastest way to change negative white feelings (the fastest way to stimulate white predispositions to justice) was to change what whites perceived: Afro-Americans themselves.

Their analysis of racial problems in large measure reflected conventional, humanitarian wisdom of the times. Poverty, unemployment, juvenile delinquency, drunkeness, and prostitution were all problems which philanthropists understood as moral in both roots and ramifications. The hundreds of relief societies, almshouses, free schools, and prisons constructed in the first decades of the 19th century pursued moral reformation as their primary goal.[7] And, the names of gradual abolitionists appeared in the minutes of the growing network of benevolent societies

dedicated to easing the sufferings of the poor and oppressed, the dependent and the deviant. America's social problems, for these humanitarians, found their sources among the poor and oppressed themselves.

Gradual abolitionists argued first, that legally freeing slaves, presumed illiterate, immoral, and unskilled, did not qualify them to live free lives. Furthermore, mere legal emancipation threatened social order in the new republic. Second, they said that Afro-Americans, whether already free or enslaved, were not culturally prepared for life in American society. Third, the reformers contended that even though blacks had been debased under American slavery, they could be and must be prepared through programs of education to function as Christians and American citizens. Fourth, that as a result of such education, a new Afro-American would merit and gain white America's respect and acceptance. Finally, the abolitionists asserted their own right and sense of confidence as the nation's corps of enlightened elites to play the major roles in directing and defining these changes.

And so, in their self-assigned philanthropic tasks, the reformers met with Northern free black to advance programs already worked out--programs designed to promote healthy social environments. The first objective which underlaid all their recommendations was that of having free blacks prove their social and moral worth to white Americans. "It is by your good conduct alone," the societies wrote,

> that you can refute the objections which have been made against you as rational and moral creatures, and remove many of the difficulties, which have occurred in the general emancipation of such of your brethren as are yet in bondage.[8]

In effect, abolitionists were demanding that black Americans, free or slave, but particularly the free, justify their right to freedom and give evidence of "proper" rational and moral behavior before they were granted the right to be born free. White America knew that "good conduct" distinguished the responsible citizen and worthy Christian. The reformers advised black America that the issue of freedom itself hinged on the manifestation of "good conduct." The freed slave must vindicate his or her freedom by worthy conduct, and by that process, destroy white prejudice.[9]

Worthy conduct meant attending church services and frequent reading of the Bible; responsible family life, including parental provision for instructing children in reading, writing, and in useful trades; and, it meant evidencing diligence, frugality, temperance, and respect for civil authority.

Reformers maintained that their own life experiences verified the values they tried to inculcate among free blacks. "Industriousness," they told northern blacks, had gained them their independence; "temperance" contributed to their good health; cultivating their minds had increased their capacities for discharging social responsibilities and for reaping

the social and economic rewards American society offered.

Through their own observations, abolitionists emphasized, idleness, gambling, and dissipation caused poverty and disgrace--analogous to the way intemperance caused premature death. Through healthy life experiences of their own, black Americans would be able "to test the truth of those precepts" for themselves. Through actual life experiences, ex-slaves would come to cherish such values--thereby transforming themselves morally, Americanizing themselves culturally, and simultaneously promoting their temporal prosperity and freedom.[10]

The philanthropists would set the stage. They would provide environments conducive to this mental and moral development. Their rationale of guardianship sanctioned their impulses to oversee black community development and to transmit their own values and life styles to former slaves.

Schools became the chief agencies for effecting abolitionist reforms. "Unquestionably," the philanthropists wrote, "the most efficient means of promoting the moral improvement of this degraded portion of the human family is the institution of schools."[11]

Like all humanitarians after the Revolution, abolitionists evinced an exaggerated confidence in the functions of schooling to accomplish their goals. In part, they turned to schools because they believed that free black families were incapable of overseeing the proper moral and mental development of their

children. In part, they turned to schools because they saw white masters, in whose homes apprenticed black children or servants resided, too often ignoring their legal responsibilities of providing for the physical and moral well-being of their charges. (Those legal responsibilities which were sanctioned by laws which gradual abolitionists were instrumental in pushing through state legislatures.)

Abolitionists told black parents, in essence, that their schools operated to give black children what they as parents could not supposedly provide them. To white masters, they were declaring that lack of time or inclination were no longer excuses for not meeting their legal responsibilities to black apprentices.[12]

The availability of schooling for blacks was not unique after the war for independence. What was different about abolitionist schools were 1) the stated purposes of such education and 2) its accessibility to greater numbers of freed slaves. Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries charity schools for the poor and catechetical schools for Africans and Indians operated under the sponsorship of different Protestant denominations in the colonies. These schools offered a segregated and simple literary and religious course of study for children and adults. The early church schools were not designed to prove African capacity or to serve as tools in an overall campaign for ending slavery.[13]

The sponsors' Christian beliefs were quite compatible with

their pro-slavery views, and it was not unusual for the missionaries themselves to own slaves. School instruction proceeded on the assumptions that Africans were incapable of pronouncing English properly; that they had little intellectual capacity, dull understanding, were slow to learn, and soon forgot what they did learn.[14]

Abolitionists, unlike earlier white church educators or the majority of their own contemporaries, said that they did not believe "blackness" itself, or African origins, or psychological damage caused by slavery indicated a lack of moral and intellectual capacity among black Americans. Those factors did not preclude the possibility of acculturation in America.

However, their notion of acculturation was restricted from the very beginnings of their crusade. No idea of acculturation beyond particular behavioral manifestations existed. Through their moral reform efforts, abolitionists aimed to educate former slaves to dominant, white, Protestant values and patterns of behavior. Their understanding of acculturation did not include fundamentally changing the social structural participation of free blacks within dominant American institutions.

The distinction here is one between what sociologist Milton Gordon describes as "behavioral assimilation" or acculturation and "structural assimilation." Programs for structural assimilation would have attempted to promote

the inclusion of free black Americans as equal participants in primary group relationships with whites. Black Americans remained marginal participants in the nation's dominant social and economic institutions.[15]

In terms of the goal of acculturation, which Gordon characterizes as one likely to be the first type of assimilation for minority groups in American society, abolitionists could claim some success in contributing toward the development of behavioral "Anglo-Conformity" among free blacks. Certainly by 1830 ex-slaves in Northern communities had proven that acculturation could take place without structural, civic, or large-scale marital assimilation occurring.

Despite their revised assumptions about the nature and causes of the Afro-American's inferiority, white reformers delegated free blacks to a lower caste status, a caste identifiable by color. They saw all black children--even the children of graduates of their schools--in need of the same, basic moral guidance that children from poor (i.e. morally unhealthy) white homes required. Their generalizations as well as their expectations for both groups--one distinguished by socio-economic status, the other by skin color--were the same.

Moral instruction in abolitionist schools, like moral instruction in schools for poor white children, aimed to make lives of "comparative independence" as painless and respectable as possible for all concerned. Abolitionist schools, like free schools for poor white children, were designed to prepare

psychologically industrious, orderly, and attentive domestic servants, waiters, coachmen, chimney sweepers, seamstresses, and day laborers. Acculturation through educational programs meant the development of attitudes and values consistent with lower class working and living patterns.[16]

As New York's abolitionists told a group of free black parents, there was "no disgrace incurred by the pursuit of any honest calling however humble. . . ." It was the "duty of everyone to do all the good in his sphere in which Providence has placed him."[17] Moral schooling aimed to equip black students for survival in a white world without their really being or ever becoming a part of it--except on the lowest economic levels possible.

Literary training too, was not in any direct way geared toward effecting immediate, or even long-range, significant social and economic change. "Practical" courses of study prepared students for "the common concerns of life." The calibre of schooling for black pupils, including the qualifications of the teachers, teaching methods, and the content of the curricula, was much the same as what was available to poor white students.

Thousands of black children and young adults learned to read, write, and do basic math problems. A few were given a smattering of English grammar, practical navigation and astronomy, and geography. Through class recitations and public examinations, a few developed speaking skills. The point is that

no matter what talents a pupil possessed, the course of instruction at abolitionist schools was simple and meagre.[18]

For the reformers, blackness was synonymous with impoverished. (And impoverished was synonymous with immoral). The equation was critical, in terms of what they did not set out to achieve. In their roles as philanthropists, they attempted no more and no less for the "objects" of their benevolence, than they and their fellow stewards promoted for native poor whites and immigrants. The goal, in all cases, was limited and controlled acculturation.

Assumptions about the permanence of poverty and poor classes in all societies, new republics included, set the limits of their programs of reform through education. They were not searching for ways to eliminate poverty or poor classes as separate entities. They considered that impossible, and contrary to the natural order of things. Instead, they searched for ways to make life on the lowest levels as tolerable as possible for those there, and as inoffensive as possible for the rich. Abolitionists reflected centuries of conventional, humanitarian wisdom which vindicated the "reality" of rich and poor as fixed components of society.[19]

Moral reformers, abolitionists included, did not make a causal connection between schooling and better jobs. They considered their educational programs moral preparation for those destined to perform the most simple jobs society offered. At no time did they claim that their elementary schooling would

open white society to free blacks on all job levels. Neither was such schooling supposed to prepare the brightest students for advanced education.

In short, abolitionist schools proved irrelevant with respect to bettering employment opportunities for free blacks in America. The future of the majority under the reformers' direct "benevolent protection" did not significantly differ from unschooled or unchurched free blacks.

Of the 672 boys admitted to its school in the ten years from 1813 to 1823, Philadelphia abolitionists could report on the progress of only 106 of the "most successful." 100 were "employed by respectable mechanics as apprentices"; four "taught schools"; one emigrated to Haiti and worked as a clerk for that new republic's president; one was a "merchant in Calcutta." [20]

In 1830, New York abolitionists reported a "few" African Free School graduates employed in trades (sail making, tin working, shoe making, carpentry, blacksmithing.) "Many" of the "brightest" boys went to sea as stewards, cooks, and sailors. The majority worked as waiters, cooks, coachmen, barbers, servants, and laborers. They cited five who became professionals--three ministers and two teachers. Emphasis on sewing and needlework for girls in the schools prepared them for jobs as domestic servants and seamstresses.[21]

Life for poor native whites and new immigrants in the 19th century was not easy. Since neither humanitarians nor

politicians in the decades after the Revolution perceived social problems in economic terms, no private or government-sponsored programs operated to strike at the heart of those economic problems. Moral reform projects, especially schooling, bore as little relevance to poor white hopes for economic and social advancement as they did for free blacks.

Yet, for third and fourth generations who descended from 19th century white immigrants, who gained more education and better jobs, economic success was the means to social acceptance and assimilation among middle and upper-middle classes. Economic success increased their options in life: it meant choices of better schools for their children, bigger and better homes, travel experiences, and the luxury of travelling comfortably, and opportunities to enjoy the cultural activities of their communities.

For black Americans, economic success was totally irrelevant to the matters of acceptance and assimilation. The children of wealthy blacks, along with the poorest, faced discrimination in housing, jobs, and schools; were denied admission to public parts, restaurants, hotels, and amusements; were segregated in public transportation. And, when their lives in America were over, they were assigned to separate burial grounds.[22]

What seems painfully ironic is how successful abolitionists' limited programs of acculturation proved. Thousands of young black Americans learned to read, write, speak, and spell the English language; to use currency and protect themselves in

business transactions. Thousands were encouraged, and many adopted dominant Protestant religions, and learned well to cherish and value virtues like frugality, sobriety, cleanliness, and honesty.

But of course people can become equipped to function successfully in a dominant culture while participating only marginally in it. And, to the extent that assimilation is a function of visibility, the black American's objectives remained elusive.[23]

Black peoples' blackness marked them as aliens, even in the eyes of their white supporters. And, for that matter, in the eyes of their more militant white friends in the two decades before the Civil War.

Intelligent, talented black men and women were "unique", exceptions to what gradual abolitionists "knew" about the moral impairment slavery caused. The emotional impact of the color difference remained as charged for them as it was for their white contemporaries, despite their opposition to slavery and their programs of acculturation. And so, however much abolitionists' conscious beliefs about the human nature of blacks diverged from the rest of white society, the emotional underpinnings of those beliefs--that complex mixture of fears, fantasies, guilt, and repressions--were shared in common with all of white America.[24]

* * * *

Gradual abolitionists promised no economic advancement or upward social mobility as results of their educational programs. They promised no direct changes in the country's production systems--changes impossible to accomplish with schools. Their objectives were not radical. In fact, their objectives were not even well defined in terms of the social and economic ramifications of their programs.

However, their claims that Afro-American "inferiority" resulted from circumstances, not breeding, were radical in the context of their times. Efforts to change white thinking on that issue represented an attempt at radical reform. Had they succeeded, unforeseen concrete changes in American society would have occurred.

But gradual abolitionists themselves were blind to the full implications of their claims. They were unable to acknowledge what changes their campaigns contributed toward--as restricted as those campaigns were.

Where did they succeed and where did they fail with respect to their own objectives? The reformers originally mapped out two great lines of moral attack: one directed at the oppressed, the other at the oppressors. They worked out detailed educational programs for changing the oppressed--schooling, home visits, meetings, lectures, pamphleteering. Their programs for the oppressors, however, were neither so well thought out nor so zealously pursued.

If the gradual abolitionists had such overwhelming

confidence in the powers of schooling to shape peoples' beliefs and dictate life styles, why did they not turn to them as a means of educating white children and their parents on the equal capacity of blacks or on the moral wrongness of slavery? There was no systematic attempt to reason with whites through home visitations or in churches; no campaigns to educate members of white school boards, private school teachers, or clergymen so that these educators could, in turn, influence their clienteles.

Abolitionist fears about upsetting established order and authority offer some explanation of their lack of sustained effort in educating their white countrymen. Public pressure and hostility further curbed their enthusiasm. Yet, earnest organized efforts to reach white Americans through home, church, and school education, and through the press would have been consistent with what they themselves believed were the best means toward those ends.

The reformers pointed to the need to change the opinions, attitudes, and values of the oppressors as crucial to the final success of their crusade. They were correct. But how sad that they were never able to acknowledge the very "proofs" of their own claims. That inability, in the last analysis, was the greatest failure of all.

1 These included The Connecticut Society for the Promotion of Freedom and for the Relief of Persons Unlawfully Holden in Bondage (1790); The Delaware Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, and for the Relief and Protection of Free Blacks and People of Colour, Unlawfully Held in Bondage or Otherwise Oppressed (1788); the Centerville (Delaware) Gradual Abolition Society (1818); The Maryland Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, and the Relief of Poor Negroes and others Unlawfully Held in Bondage (1789); Gradual Abolition Society organized in Caroline County, Maryland (1791); three small societies on the Eastern Shore: Chestertown, Kent County (1790's); society founded in Easton, Maryland (1818); New Jersey Society, for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery in Trenton (1788); district associations in Burlington, Salem, and Gloucester, New Jersey (1805); Society for Promoting the Manumission of Slaves and Protecting Such of Them as Have Been or May be Liberated, New York City (1785); The Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery; the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage; and for Improving Conditions of the Colored Race, Philadelphia (1784); Washington Society for the Relief of Free Negroes and others Unlawfully Held in Bondage, Washington County, Pennsylvania (1789); Columbia, Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, and the Relief of Free Negroes unlawfully Held in Bondage; and for the Melioration of the Condition of the African Race (1818); Chester County Society for Preventing Kidnapping, and for Improving the Condition of the African Race (Pennsylvania),(1820); Western Manumission Society, Centreville Abolition Society, Brownsville Abolition Society (Washington and Fayette Counties, Pennsylvania),(1824-1826); Providence Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, Rhode Island (1789).

Information on members compiled from minutes of the societies, early 19th century city directories, personal papers and biographies.

2 Discussions and analysis of slavery as a moral problem runs through the minutes of national gradual abolition conventions and local societies and the speeches of individual members. See for example, "Address to the Citizens of the United States," American Convention Minutes. . . 1794, 23. "Address to Abolition Societies," ibid. . . . 1797, 23. Elihu Hubbard Smith, Discourse. . . 1798. . . Before the New York Manumission Society (New York: T. & J. Swords, 1798).

3 "Report from the Columbia, Lancaster and York Abolition Societies," American Convention Minutes. . . 1818, 22.

4 See Smith, Discourse, 10-11. "Address to Abolition Societies," American Convention Minutes. . . 1797, 25-26.

5 By arguing that the immorality of blacks was a result of slavery, gradual abolitionists were inverting a major justification for slavery--that immorality and ignorance were reasons for enslavement. See Winthrop Jordan, White Over Black, American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press,1968), 281ff.

6 Jordan, White Over Black, 287-294. David Brion Davis, The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), 391-421. Also, "Report from the New York Manumission Society," American Convention Minutes . . . 1812, 5-6; "Address to Citizens of the United States," ibid. . . . 1794, 23.

7 Raymond A. Mohl, Poverty in New York 1783-1825 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 159-170. M.J. Heale, "Humanitarianism in the Early Republic: The Moral Reformers of New York, 1776-1825," Journal of American Studies, 2 (October 1968), 166.

8 See "Addresses to Free Africans and other People of Color," American Convention Minutes. . . 1797, 17; ibid. . . . 1804, 31, 32-33.

9 "To the Free Africans and other Free People of color in the United States," American Convention Minutes. . . 1796, 12-15.

10 "Address to the free Blacks and other free People of colour in the United States," American Convention Minutes. . . . 1805, 37.

11 "Address to Abolition Societies," American Convention Minutes . . . 1828, 29.

12 Pennsylvania Gradual Abolition Society, "Board of Education Minutes, 1819-1829,"Dec. 26, 1820, 38; "Board of Education Minutes, 1803-1819," Dec. 25, 1816, 172. New York Manumission Society, "Minutes," Vol. 6, Feb. 21, 1788, 97. "Constitution and Minutes of the (Wilmington) African School Society, 1809-1835," Apr. 1, 1814, 79-80. "Minutes of the Abolition Society of Delaware, 1801-1819," Jan. 8, 1806. "Report on Education," American Convention Minutes. . . 1797, 31.

13 For example, the activities of The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. See John H. Calam, Parsons and Pedagogues: The S.P.G. Adventure in American Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970).

14 Ibid., 194; 322-323.

15 Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 60-71.

16 Tensions over work habits in American culture and society are discussed in an insightful article by Herbert G. Gutman, "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," American Historical Review, 78 (June 1973), 531-588.

17 "Report from the Pennsylvania Abolition Society," American Convention Minutes. . . 1797, 31-32 and ibid. . . . 1812, 14; also, "Address to Free People of Colour and descendants of the African Race, in the United States," ibid. . . . 1818, 46.

18 Curricula discussed in Charles C. Andrews, The History of the New-York African Free-Schools, . . . (New-York: Mahlon Day, 1830), 69-123; in minutes of school committees of the societies and in reports to the American Convention.

19 Mohl, Poverty in New York, 23ff. David J. Rothman, The Discovery of the Asylum, Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), 155-179. On English and early colonial attitudes see Lawrence A. Cremin, American Education, The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783 (New York: Harper and Row, 1970).

20 Pennsylvania Abolition Society,"Board of Education Minutes, 1819-1829," May 26, 1824, 119.

21 Andrews, History of African Free-Schools, 113-123.

22 Leon F. Litwack, North of Slavery, The Negro in the Free States, 1790-1860 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961).

23 Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, 60-83.

24 Jordan, White Over Black, 469-475; 3-43.