

# LECTURES

ON

**SLAVERY AND ITS REMEDY.**

---

**BY AMOS A. PHELPS,**  
PASTOR OF PINE-STREET CHURCH, BOSTON.

---

**BOSTON:**  
PUBLISHED BY THE NEW-ENGLAND  
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

---

1834.

## ERRATA.

Page 81, 17th line from bottom, for 'double meaning,' read *double dealing*.

Page 112, 3d line from bottom, for 'pungents,' read *unguents*.

Page 156, top line, for 'teach,' read *touch*.

Page 162, 11th line from top, for 'physical moral,' read *physico-moral*.

Page 165, 9th line from top, for 'trampled under foot,' read *trampled them under foot*.

Page 181, top line, for 'ah?' read *eh?*

# **THE OPINION OF ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR CLERGYMEN.**

## **TO THE PUBLIC.**

The following, as will be seen, is an expression of opinion from quite a number of clergymen, on the much agitated subject of slavery and its remedy. It is due to those, who have thus consented to come before the public as the advocates of immediate emancipation, to say, that they have done it at my solicitation as an individual, in my individual capacity, and not as associated with any particular society. They are not, therefore, to be considered as committed by this act to any society, or to any sentiments not expressed in the document to which they have annexed their names. The object, and the only object aimed at in this measure, is to secure a decided expression of opinion on these two *cardinal points*, 1. That Colonization is not an adequate remedy for slavery, and must therefore be abandoned for something that is; and 2. That the scheme of Immediate Emancipation is such a remedy, and is therefore to be adopted and urged. Such, as will be seen, is the substance of the following

### **DECLARATION OF SENTIMENT.**

'The undersigned, after mature deliberation, feel themselves constrained by a sense of duty to God and man, to make the following expression of opinion. We believe,

1. That Slavery in our land is a great and threatening evil.

2. That it is a great and crying national sin.

3. That every man whether he live at the North, South, East or West, is personally responsible, and has personal duties to discharge in respect to it.

4. That every man, who adopts opinions or pursues practices, which adopted and pursued by all others, would go to perpetuate this sin, does thereby become personally guilty in respect to it.

5. We believe that slavery, like other sins, ought to be remedied as soon as the nature of the case admits; and further, that the nature of the case admits the *possibility* and therefore imposes the obligation of *Immediate Emancipation*.\*

6. That such emancipation is both the duty and the interest of the master.

7. That although the people of the non-slaveholding States, have not the right of physical or legal interposition in the case, they have the right, and that it is their solemn duty to do what they can by 'light and love' to enlighten the public mind, arouse the public conscience, and change and elevate the tone of public sentiment on the subject, in every section of the land.

And *finally*, we believe that the grand obstacle, to the abolition of this sin, lies in the *will* of the slaveholder—that this will being changed, there would of necessity be a change in the various laws and other obstacles which have grown out of it; and that this will is to be changed, (1), by the power of public sentiment among non-slaveholders, and (2), by means of kind, candid, and thorough discussion with slaveholders themselves.

In respect to the scheme of Colonization, which at the North professes to be a scheme of gradual and ultimate, through 'incidental' emancipation, we feel constrained to say—

1. That whatever its merits are, it can never be an adequate remedy for slavery; and

2. That the time has now come when the friends of God and man ought to take a higher stand, and adopt and act on principles which lay the axe *directly* at the root of the tree.

\* For the explanation of this phrase see Lecture 3, pp. 177—179. I suppose all who have signed this document understand *Immediate Emancipation*, substantially, as it is there explained.

## MAINE.

Rev. George Shepard,	Pastor Cong. Church,	Hallowell,
" Thomas Adams,	" " "	Vassalboro',
" David Thurston,	" " "	Winthrop,
" Isaac Rogers,	" " "	Farmington,
" S. L. Pomroy,	" 1st " "	Bangor,
" Wales Lewis,	" " "	Brewer,
" Joseph R. Munsell,	" " "	Burlington.
" Josiah Pect,	" " "	Norridgewock.
" Isaac Z. Wilkins,	" " "	Fairfield,
" Geo W. Hatheway,	" " "	Bloomfield,
" Simeon Hackett,	" " "	Temple,
" John A. Vinton,	" " "	New-Sharon,
" H. Richardson, (late)	" " "	Sydney,
" Samuel Talbot,	" " "	Wilton,
" Alden Boynton,	" " "	Industry,
" J. P. Fessenden,	" " "	S. Bridgton,
" Charles Soule,	" " "	N. Bridgton,
" Josiah F. Hawes,	" " "	Topsham,
" Thomas Ayer,	" " "	Albany,
" Carlton Hurd,	" " "	Fryburg.
" Sylvanus Boardman,	" " "	New-Sharon.
" Willard Glover,	Pastor Bap. Church,	Bloomfield.
C. Newton,	Prof. Rhet. & Heb. Lang., Wat. Col.,	Waterville,
Wm. Smith,	Prof. Math., Bowdoin Col.,	Brunswick,
Joseph C. Lovejoy,	Licentiate Cong. Church,	Bangor,
E. L. Magoun,	" Bap. Con.	Burlington.

## NEW-HAMPSHIRE.

Rev. Calvin Cutler,	Pastor Cong. Church,	Windham,
" Broughton White,	" " "	Lempster.
" S. H. Peckham	" " "	Plaistow.

## VERMONT.

Rev. Kittredge Haven,	Pastor Cong. Church,	Shoreham.
" Wm. Arthur	" " "	Williston.
" J. C. Bryant,	" " "	Milton.
" O. S. Murray,	" " Bap.	Montpelier.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Rev. D. T. Kimball,	Pastor Cong. Church,	Ipswich,
" J. Curtiss,	" " "	Sharon,
" Jared Reid,	" " "	Belchertown,
" Wm. Twining,	" " "	Lowell,
" Amos Blanchard,	" " "	"
" Giles Pease,	" " "	"
" Asa Rand,	" " "	"
" D. S. Southmayd,	" " "	"
" D. Phelps, (former)	" " "	Haverhill,
" Aaron Pickett,	" " "	Reading,
" Ebenezer Gay,	" " "	Bridgewater,
" C. J. Warren,	" " "	Weymouth,
" John B. Cowles,	" " "	Princeton,
" D. Brigham,	" " "	E. Randolph,
" M. Thatcher,	" " "	N. Wrentham,
" T. Thatcher,	" " "	Boston,
" Martin Moore,	" " "	Cohasset,
" Luther Wright,	" " "	Woburn,
" Geo. Trask,	" " "	Framingham,
" Samuel Lee,	" " "	Sherburne,
" Elijah Demond,	" " "	Holliston,
" Jacob Ide,	" " "	Medway,
" Otis Thompson,	" " "	Rehoboth,
" J. M. S. Perry	" " "	Mendon,
" W. H. Bidwell,	" " "	Medfield,
" David Sanford,	" " "	Dorchester,
" Seth Chandler,	" 2nd "	Oxford,
" Jas. Barnaby,	" 2nd Bap.	Lowell,
" B. C. Wade,	" " "	Woburn,
" Ray Potter,	" " "	Pawtucket,
" A. D. Merrill,	" M. E. Church,	Lowell,
" Aaron Wait, Jr.	" " "	"
" P. Crandall,	" " "	Andover,
" L. Sunderland,	" " "	"
" H. Plummer,	" Chris. "	Haverhill,
" Abijah Cross,	" West. "	"
" Shipley Wilson,	Ed. Zion's Herald,	Boston,
" B. Kingsbury,	Ag. "	"
" E. Ireson,	Min. M. E. Church,	"

<b>Rev. E. M. P. Wells,</b>	Prin. Bos. Farm School,	Boston,
" <b>J. A. Brown,</b>	Bap. (Resident)	"
" <b>Joshua V. Himes,</b>	Christian Connec.	"
" <b>William Coc,</b>	"	Assonnet,
" <b>P. R. Russell,</b>	Pastor Lib. Cong. Soc.	W. Boylston,
" <b>E. Palmer,</b>	" South Cong. Church,	S. Natick,
" <b>N. S. Spaulding,</b>	Meth. "	Newbury,
" <b>E. Seagrave,</b>	Pastor Bap. Church,	Scituate,
" <b>S. Lawton,</b>	Prin. Monson Acad.	Monson,
" <b>D. Oliphant,</b>	Pastor 3d. Cong. Church,	Beverly,
<b>J. D. Crosby,</b>	Licentiate, (Cong.)	Ashburnham.

## RHODE ISLAND

<b>Rev. Henry Tatem,</b>		Harwick,
" <b>N. G. Potter,</b>		Coventry,
" <b>Thomas Williams,</b>	Cong.	Providence.

## NEW-YORK.

<b>Rev. O. Wetmore,</b>	Pastor Pres. Church,	Utica,
" <b>L. D. Dewey,</b>	"	New-York,
" <b>D. C. Lansing, D. D.,</b>	Pas. 2d Free Pres. Ch.	"
" <b>J. Parker, (late)</b>	" 1st " " "	"
" <b>Beriah Green,</b>	Prin. Oneida Institute,	Whitesboro',
" <b>J. Leavitt,</b>	Ed. N. Y. Evangelist,	New-York,
" <b>George Bouno,</b>	Pas. N. st. 3d. Dutch Ref. Ch.	"
" <b>J. Middleton,</b>	" East Bap. Ch.	"
" <b>C. W. Denison,</b>	Ed. N. Y. Emancipator,	"
<b>Elizur Wright, Jr.</b>	Sec. American A. S. Society,	"

## CONNECTICUT.

<b>Rev. Samuel J. May,</b>		Brooklyn,
" <b>Nicholas Branch,</b>	Bap.	Pomfret,
" <b>James Boyle,</b>	Pastor Free Cong. Ch.	New-Haven,
" <b>Elisha Atkins,</b>	" 1st " "	Killingly,
" <b>Wm. Bushnell,</b>	Colleague Pastor,	"
" <b>B. R. Allen,</b>		Plainfield.

## OHIO.

<b>Rev. John Keys,</b>	Pastor Pres. Ch.	Dover,
" <b>J. A. Peponn,</b>	" " "	Painsville,

Rev. Nathaniel Cobb, Pas. Pres. Church,	Hamilton Centro
" Henry T. Kelly, " " "	Kingsville,
" Daniel Millar, " " "	Farmington,
" Wm. Beardsley, " " "	Jefferson,
" John H. Russ, " " "	Gustavus,
" S. Crothers, " " "	Greenfield,
" E. Barber, " " "	Milan,
" J. J. Shipherd, " " "	Russia,
" H. Bushnell, " " "	Delhi,
" J. Monteith, " " "	Elyria,
" Asa Mahan, " 6th " "	Cincinnati,
" C. B. Storrs,* (late) Pres. Wes. Res. Col.	Hudson,
" John Morgan, Prof. Math. & Nat. Philos-	
ophy, Lane Sem.	Cincinnati,
T. D. Weld,	" " "
Rev. Wm. R. Weeks, D. D. Pas. 4th Pres. Ch.	Newark, N. J.
" S. Williams, " 1st Bap. "	Pittsburg, Pa.
" J. Morris, " Welch "	" "
" Thos. Cole, Pastor Pres. Ch.	Newport, Ky.
" Wm. Jenkins.	
" James Howey.	

It is due to the Anti-Slavery cause to say, that these are by no means all the individuals, who are known as taking the ground of immediate emancipation.

\* " On Tuesday the 10th inst. he made his last effort to guide a pen,—he ardently wished to sign his name to the declaration of sentiment to be printed with Bro. Phelps' Lectures forthcoming on slavery. His paper was ruled for him, and all things prepared. He took the pen—traced all the letters of his first name, but found that one of them was transposed—laid down the pen calmly and said—'I can write no more—I've blundered here—Brother, will you write my name, and give the date and place where I am?' 'Those principles,' added he, 'are eternal truths, and cannot be shaken.' 'I wish to give them my testimony.' 'This is an extract from a letter of Rev. R. S. Storrs of Braintree, to President Beriah Green, giving some account of President Storrs' last moments. The cause of the oppressed, 'the suffering and the dumb,' lay near his heart to the last. He gave it his *dying testimony*.



One word more. I have solicited the names of persons of various denominations, not to swell the number, but to make the impression at the outset that this, like the cause of 'Temperance, is a common cause—a common work.

To those who have given their names as above, I would here return my sincere and hearty thanks. The sentiments to which they have thus pledged themselves are at present unpopular, but 'in patience possess ye your souls.' They are the sentiments of truth and righteousness, and therefore, spite of the wrath of man, they will yet triumph over error and oppression.

‘ Men that love their vices say, that telling the truth bluntly doeth more harm than good, and filleth the world with evil, and setteth men by the ears. Men list not to be disturbed in their sins; and when one saith boldly, *Thou art the man*, men say that such an one lacketh in charity, and ought to be shut up as a troubler of the peace, when it is nothing but their sins that do trouble the peace.’—LATIMER.

‘ Ridicule and reproach have been abundantly heaped upon the laborers in this righteous cause. Power, wealth, talent, pride, and sophistry, are all in arms against them; but God and truth are on their side. The cause of anti-slavery is rapidly gaining ground. Wise heads as well as warm hearts, are joining in its support. In a few years I believe the opinion of New England will be unanimous in its favor. *Those who are determined to be on the popular side, should be cautious how they move just now: It is a trying time for such characters, when public opinion is on the verge of a great change.*’

‘ The only true courage is that which impels us to do right without regard to consequences. To fear a populace is as servile as to fear an emperor. The only salutary restraint is the fear of doing wrong.’—MRS. CHILD.

## ADDRESS TO CLERGYMEN.

---

*To the Ministers of the Gospel of every Denomination of Christians :*

**BRETHREN AND FRIENDS:** ❁

You will doubtless be ready to ask, why I should dedicate these lectures to you. It is not, I assure you, that I would presume to 'rebuke,' or set myself up as an instructor of those, who, in knowledge and in years both, are my elders. Far otherwise. I am governed in the matter by other and very different reasons. Permit me to state them. I dedicate these lectures to you then,

1. *Because Slavery in our land is a great and threatening NATIONAL evil.* The guilt and the danger involved in it are therefore in an eminent degree, a common guilt and a common danger; and the responsibilities and duties growing out of it are, to the same extent, common responsibilities and common duties imposed on all, but specially on ministers of the gospel, and others, who, like them, exert an extensive influence in swaying the public mind and controlling public sentiment.

2. *I dedicate to you, because this subject has been woe-fully and criminally overlooked and forgotten by ministers, who, of all other men, ought ever to be alive to it.* I

appeal to your own consciences. Who of you prays for the emancipation of the slave, the extinction of slavery, and the pardon of our sin in the matter, as often as *once in four Sabbaths*? Who of you preaches one sermon a year for the express purpose of arousing the public mind to the sin of this thing? Nay, who of you has taken the pains to *investigate* the subject even?

3. *I dedicate to you because it is specially true in respect to ministers, that every man, who adopts opinions or pursues practices, which, adopted and pursued by all others, would go to perpetuate this sin, does THEREBY become personally guilty in respect to it.* He does so, because such opinions and practices are an *abetting* of the sin; and indifference, silence, affected neutrality, &c., are such practices; and those, therefore, who cherish them do but *abet* the sin and involve themselves in personal guilt. This is a case in which *silence gives consent*.

4. *I dedicate these lectures to you, because I think you will be more likely to read them than you otherwise would.* The extensive change, which has recently taken place in the minds of ministers in respect to the sin of present slaveholding and its proper remedy, justifies the belief, that, if we can only get other ministers to read and investigate the subject, their opinions will undergo a similar change.

But the chief reason of this dedication is this: *Ministers are, in an eminent degree, the HINGES of public sentiment in respect to all prevailing sins.* Once get the public sentiment of the ministry right, and then inspire them with courage to speak that sentiment out, and you revolutionize the public sentiment of the com-

munity in a trice. I know that ministers, like other men, are sometimes turned aside from duty by fear, or self-interest, or some other sinister motive; that, too often, they are *covetous of a good living*—looking ‘to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter;’ or *lazy*—‘sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber;’ or *cowardly*—mere dumb dogs that dare not bark; and that this is specially apt to be true, when duty calls them to encounter a vitiated public sentiment, which tolerates and gives respectability to some prevalent sin. Still these same ministers are the *linges* of public sentiment. Let them get right, and then, let them muster the courage to meet that vitiated sentiment, and, with all its blustering, it will soon yield. And this is as true of slavery as of any other sin.

I am aware indeed, that the feeling is very prevalent, among ministers as well as others, that ministers ought to let this subject alone; that it is a political subject; a subject that touches the South in a very delicate and tender point; that the discussion of it in northern pulpits and by northern ministers especially, is fraught with most fearful danger to the South and to the nation; that northern ministers have not been on the ground, do not and cannot know the true state of the case, are therefore most unfit to discuss the matter or devise a remedy; and that, for these and other reasons, our mouths and our pulpits ought to maintain a studied silence—scarcely presuming to ‘mutter’ or ‘peep’ even, lest the Union should fly to atoms, or some more direful calamity befall us.

To such sentiments as these, I, for one, cannot subscribe. So far from it, I feel bound to protest against them, and pronounce them nothing better than those

cries of 'peace, peace,' which are the earnest of 'sudden destruction.' Pray, brethren and friends, when was there ever a time, in which the pulpit gave signs of awaking from its guilty slumbers, to the discussion of any prevailing sin, that the cry of 'hush, hush—it's a delicate subject—you'll make disturbance,' &c., was not heard?

The truth is, prevailing sins, sanctioned and made popular as they are by the practice of large classes of the community, are the *strong holds of Satan*. They especially, are *the means* by which he maintains his cruel sway on earth. These demolished, and the strength of his kingdom is demolished. Of course, when one of these strong holds is seriously assailed, it is to be expected, that he, and all who are personally implicated in the matter, as well as all others under their influence, will be very sensitive on the point, and withal very delicate in their feelings; and ten to one, if they do not make a 'fuss' about this impertinent intermeddling. But what then? Shall the minister of Christ hold his peace? It is his peculiar business, as a minister, to wield, in every possible way, those spiritual weapons, which, through God, are mighty to the *pulling down* of strong holds. Shall he forget his business or be frightened out of it? Rather, let him cry aloud and spare not, let him lift up his voice like a trumpet, and show the people their transgression; and if they complain, as did the Jews of Jeremiah, that 'he weakeneth the hands of the men of war,' and 'seeketh not the welfare of the people but the hurt,' so be it. The plea is false, and theirs is the guilt of making it.

This is a world lying in wickedness. The public sentiment of it, therefore, is in favor of wickedness.

Of course, in respect to all prevailing sins that sentiment is utterly wrong. It is a sentiment which tolerates and sanctions their existence. And now, it is the grand and special business of the ministry—their *professional* business—to see to it, that this wrong sentiment is righted. But how can the ministry ever do this, if they descend from the high ground of gospel truth, and, falling in with this vitiated sentiment, and re-echoing its stale pleas of ‘necessity,’ ‘expediency,’ &c., presume to ‘call evil,’ in present circumstances, ‘good, and good,’ in present circumstances, ‘evil,’ and thus really take sides *with* the very sentiment they propose to correct, and *against* themselves? Plainly this is no way to set a wrong public sentiment right. The high and uncompromising principles of the gospel must be brought to bear on the subject, and the ministry, instead of waiting for public sentiment to change itself, on its own principles of expediency, or to be changed by others, ought to put on the whole ‘armor of God,’ and having ‘no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness,’ lead the way, in every species of moral reform. They ought ever to be ahead of public sentiment, and, instead of strengthening the ‘hands of evil doers,’ by their silence ever, stand in the counsel of the Lord, and cause the people to hear *his* words; then shall they turn them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings.\*

To all this, I doubt not, every minister of Christ will give his hearty Amen, at least in theory. Let us come to practice then. Let us give our theories and abstractions some practical, tangible form. And here, breth-

\* Jeremiah xxiii. 22.

ren, with all due deference to the better judgment of those who may differ from me, allow me to say, that these remarks apply in all their force, to the sin of slavery; and to northern ministers as well as southern. Why not? Indeed, they apply to the former most emphatically. If slavery is ever to be remedied, it is to be done by the omnipotence of a correct public sentiment. And if that sentiment is ever to be gotten up, and its energies made to bear on the subject, the work of getting it up must begin at the North, with northern men, and especially northern ministers. They, of all others, are the men, whose special business it is to lead the way in this thing; not indeed as a political, but as a moral and religious matter. They are bound to go ahead of the public sentiment on this subject as well as others, and let in upon it all the light of the gospel, and all the influence and authority of the pulpit. Let me illustrate.

There are in the city of New-York thousands of impure men and women, the victims of licentiousness; and other thousands who wink at their iniquities, as a kind of necessary evil (not sin); and still other thousands, who, while they admit the sin, dare not say or do any thing decisive in respect to it, but content themselves with mourning over it, as an awful thing, indeed, but withal so '*delicate*' and '*difficult*,' that it cannot be touched with safety just now, though they hope it may be by and by; just as if the monster would lose his strength and become tame, as his giant form enlarges its dimensions and shoots out its hydra heads in new directions! And now you wish to start the work of '*Moral Reform*.' You call upon all the friends of morality and religion, and especially upon the ministers of



the gospel, both in country and city, to speak out on the subject—to break their guilty silence and change at once the tone of public sentiment. But hark! Don't you hear that outcry! How it rolls along like the voice of many waters and of mighty thunderings! 'O no! O no!' cry the impure; 'O no! O no!' add those who wink at their iniquity; and louder than all the rest you hear the cry of the alarmists—'O NO! O NO!—You are all wrong. The work of reformation must begin with us. We are on the ground. We are implicated in the matter. We see it as it is. We can take hold of it as *'practical'* men. We know when to begin, and how to begin, and where to begin. Do leave the matter to us. It is a most delicate matter—a most "difficult subject"—we assure you. You will only make it worse by your injudicious interference. Do let us alone. We'll take care of it. We want to get rid of it as much as you do.'

Now what say you, brethren, to this outcry? Shall the friends of morality and religion—especially shall the ministers of Christ, the *hinges* of public sentiment—shall they be frightened into silence, and so, virtually consent to the continued existence of the sin, and give the work of its reform over into the hands of those who are personally interested in its continuance, or who, from fear or something worse, dare not say or do aught decisive on the subject, lest forsooth it should make a bluster? What say you? Are these the only properly qualified reformists? Must I go to the brothel before I am qualified to decide or act on the question of 'Moral Reform'? Must I breathe the noxious atmosphere of a prevailing sin, and come under its bewitching influences, before I am qualified to decide or act on the question of its character and its remedy? On

this principle, the spotless spirits in heaven must be poor judges on all questions of reform.

Or, to take another illustration, must I visit the theatre, form acquaintances and friendships with its managers, proprietors, visitants, &c. partake of their hospitalities, eat at their tables, ride in their carriages, sleep on their couches; in short, must I rush into the very circumstances calculated, of all others, to warp my judgment and put myself under their almost resistless witcheries, before I can know the real state of the case and be qualified to decide and act on the question of theatrical reform? Are the theatre-going gentry, together with the actors, managers, proprietors, &c. the only properly qualified reformists in the case? And must every one else keep still and say not a word, and lift not a finger, until *they* deem it expedient and are disposed to act in the matter? Plainly not.\* Away then with the idea, that northern ministers are not qualified to

\* 'Nor must we forget the delightful stories told by individual visitors to the colonies; ladies and gentlemen who have absolutely seen the West Indies, sat in the house of the planter, and come home to describe Jamaica and the other islands as so many Paradises, and persuade us that the peasantry of our own country are far worse off than the laboring population of the West Indies. And pray whom did these ladies and gentlemen go to see, the planter or the slave? The planter.—At whose table did they dine? The planter's table.—On whose couch did they sleep? The planter's couch.—Whose friends were they? The planter's friends.—Whose wine did they drink? The planter's wine.—With whose daughter did they dance? The planter's daughter.—On whose horse did they ride? The planter's horse. In whose ship did they come home? The Liverpool merchant's ship. And yet these gentlemen who come home, and ladies too—for ladies do sometimes plead the cause of slavery—these parties think themselves perfectly qualified to draw a correct picture of slavery in the West India colonies.'—*Thornton's Lectures*, p. 68. Mr. T.'s remarks are as applicable to many christians and christian ministers here, as they were to the West India party in England.

decide and act correctly on the question of slavery and its remedy. And away, too, with the idea that we have nothing to do with the subject. Northern men and northern ministers, I had almost said, have every thing to do with it. It is ours to originate and rear up to maturity, such a public sentiment as shall lay the axe, with resistless energy, at the root of the tree. The language of Mr. Thompson\* applies here in all its force: 'Public opinion alone can break down the door of the prison house, and let the oppressed go free.— . . . 'T is your work,—'t is my work,—'t is every man's work,—and if in your hearts and consciences,—if in your mind and judgment the work ought to be done,—do it yourselves. It is a vulgar expression, but I will use it, however I may be censured for doing so,—what we now want is "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether."'

The plea that northern ministers have nothing to do on this subject is all a delusion. 'A common evil,' says Mrs. Child,† 'certainly implies a common right to remedy; and where is the remedy to be found, if the South in all their speeches and writings repeat that slavery must exist—if the Colonization Society re-echo, in all their Addresses and Reports, that there is no help for the evil, and it is very wicked to hint that there is—and if public opinion here brands every body as a fanatic and madman, who wishes to inquire what can be done? The supineness of New England on this subject, reminds me of the man who being asked to work at the pump, because the vessel was going down, answered, "I am only a passenger."'

\* George Thompson's (Eng.) Lectures on British Colonial Slavery, p. 67.

† Appeal, &c. p. 133.

Northern men and northern ministers, then, must awake to this subject. Sooner or later it must be discussed; and, from the very nature of the case, that discussion must and will begin with non-slaveholders. Is there danger in discussion? Will the South get angry? Will the Union fly to atoms? Will the slaves—the poor ignorant slaves, that cannot read and do not know enough to take care of themselves—‘*poor brutes—mere animals—that are so comfortable and love their masters so*’!!!—will they get hold of the newspapers, turn politicians, ‘organize an army of outlaws,’\* and declare a war of independence, &c. &c.? Grant it, absurd as is the plea, grant it. Still, sooner or later, these dangers, or others greater, must be met. The war of argument must come, or in its stead will come the war of arms. Is discussion, free, frank, and unrestricted, fraught with danger? Discussion smothered, rely upon it, is fraught with ten-fold danger.

Has it indeed come to this, that, while men have slept, an evil has grown up, in the midst of us, to such rank maturity, and embodied in itself such elements of

\* Dr. Porter, Andover. The Dr. in giving his views on ‘several important topics,’ connected with Slavery, begins by saying, ‘In all my intercourse with the South, I have rather avoided than invited discussion on the subject of slavery, because the *intrinsic difficulties* of the subject are great, and because the interference of northern, or of any foreign influence respecting it, is *attended with peculiar delicacy.*’ Indeed! This then is the way that going among slaves qualifies one to judge of it and its remedy? ‘Avoid’ the discussion of a subject because of its ‘*intrinsic difficulties*’ and ‘*peculiar delicacy,*’ and then, very gravely give one’s opinion upon it, as if the whole matter had been sifted to the bottom! A very summary way this, to dispose of difficult matters. Dr. P. is worthy of all respect, but if this is the way he forms his opinions he must not expect that those who think, will place much confidence in them. And, if this is the way one gets qualified to judge of slavery and its remedy by going into the midst of it, I, for one, am in favor of staying at home.

destruction, that we cannot touch it, even with the power of sober argument, without uncapping a volcano and whelming ourselves in utter ruin? Has it come to this? Then let us know it. It is time we knew it, and governed ourselves accordingly. If this is our real condition, why be ignorant of it? And if it is not, why not awake to timely discussion, and search out thereby a timely remedy? Silence will never mend the matter. The very evil, that threatens us with such ruin, is itself the creature of silence. It sprang up 'while men slept;' and while men have slept it has been putting on maturity and strength. Every day's silence hitherto has only been making the matter worse and worse. Shall we then go silently on to certain and not distant destruction, or shall we break the silence and commence discussion now, at the risk of all the evils attendant on it, and with the hope of averting greater evils? Plainly there is no other alternative. One or the other we must do. For, disguise or forget the matter as we may, slavery is one element in our political fabric. It is the element of discord; and already, on more occasions than one, it has shaken the whole fabric and set it a-jar. And it will do so, in time to come, just so long as it exists. There is no avoiding it. Undiscussed and perpetuated, it will originate collisions without end, and work out certain, if not speedy destruction to the Union and the nation. Liberty and slavery are, from their nature, discordant elements. They can never harmonize. They can never, for any length of time, co-exist in the same political fabric. Sooner or later they will fly asunder. 'Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand.' And where I

ask was there ever a kingdom more palpably divided against itself, than that, which attempts to incorporate in its political fabric, the two discordant elements of freedom and bondage? It is plain, then, that free, unfettered discussion must go on, enlightening the public mind and arousing the public conscience, even if evils do attend it, or we must make up our minds for evils still more dreadful.

For one, however, I anticipate no danger whatever, from discussion. It will indeed create some excitement and call forth some hard speeches, and give occasion to some threatening. But all this will amount to little or nothing. The great source of danger after all, is silence.

With these remarks, brethren and friends, I affectionately commend these lectures to your attentive perusal. Read them, for my sake, your fellow servant in the ministry of the gospel. Read them, for the sake of Jesus Christ, whose special errand to earth, was, among other things, 'to preach deliverance to the captives—to set at liberty them that are bruised.' Read them for the sake of two millions of your fellow beings, pining in cruel bondage at your very door. Read them; then read something better on the subject; ponder, pray, act, plead the cause of the oppressed, and the blessing of him that is ready to perish shall come upon you.

Yours with great respect and affection,

AMOS A. PHELPS.

# LECTURES ON SLAVERY.

---

## LECTURE I.

### DIRECT PROOF OF THE SIN OF SLAVERY.

MALACHI ii. 7.—‘The priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth. for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.’

Some may, perhaps, be ready to ask, why I, a minister of the gospel, do not attend to my appropriate business, instead of entering upon a discussion of so perplexing and exciting a subject as that of slavery and its remedy; or they may be disposed to start the old inquiry, ‘By what authority doest thou these things?’ If so, they have my answer and my authority in the words of my text—‘The priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they (the people) should seek the law at his mouth.’ Of all men, it is most incumbent on the minister of Christ to see to it, that, as for him, the ‘law of truth’ be in his mouth; that ‘iniquity’ be not found in his lips, and that he be not ‘partial in the law.’ On this authority, then, I claim that the discussion of the subject suggested is my appropriate business as a

minister of the gospel; and accordingly I proceed at once to an examination of these two inquiries:—

I. IS SLAVERY, IN ALL CASES, A SIN?

II. WHAT IS ITS REMEDY?

I am aware that these inquiries, in their various ramifications, cover a wide field of remark. I am sensible, too, that the general subject involved in them is one of vast importance and magnitude; that the responsibilities under which I speak are therefore of corresponding magnitude; and that a decided expression of opinion in the case ought to be the result of a thorough, candid, and prayerful examination. It is therefore due to myself to say, that this subject has long been one of no ordinary interest to my mind. The time has been when my views of it were essentially different from what they are at present. In changing them, I have acted with deliberation. For months the subject has been one of careful, and I think, candid investigation. And the conclusions to which I have come, and which I am now to present, are, in my estimation, the only conclusions which are warranted either by the dictates of enlightened humanity or the word of God.

It is due to myself, also, to say, that these conclusions and this expression of them, are not the result of hostility of feeling towards the South. So far from it, the very reverse is the fact. I have no wish to say aught, unnecessarily, to injure the South. Whatever I may say; however great the charge of guilt which I may prefer; and however unsparing my condemnation; God is my witness, that I breathe not the spirit of unkindness. A sense of duty alone constrains me, and therefore, however plainly I speak, I do it, not for the sake of injuring or irritating, but because I honestly believe what



I say, and so believing, am constrained to act on the principle, that 'open rebuke is better than secret love.'

With these introductory remarks, I proceed to the examination of the first inquiry, viz.—Is SLAVERY, IN ALL CASES, A SIN? And here we are met at the outset by the previous inquiry, *What is slavery?*

It is somewhat difficult to give a definition which shall be brief—cover the whole ground, and yet be free from all objection. The best as well as briefest that occurs to me, is this: *Slavery is an assumed right of property in man; or, it is the principle, admitted in theory and acted on in practice, that in some cases, each individual being his own judge in the case, it is lawful to hold property in man.*

To prevent misunderstanding, I will explain a little. I say, 'it is the principle,' &c. because the essence of all oppression lies in principles of oppression, rather than in their action. It is not this or that particular act of cruelty which constitutes oppression. Such particular acts become oppression only as they involve or are the acting out of some *general principle*, which, admitted as a principle of action, not only gives rise to these acts, in a given instance, but opens the door for their repetition, and also for the infliction of innumerable other similar cruelties, at the mere discretion or caprice of the oppressor. It is the principle involved in such particular acts of oppression, which is the 'very head and front of the offending,' and which mainly constitutes the oppression in the case. Whence arose the revolutionary war? It is true the three-penny tax on tea, and the stamp act, were the immediate occasions of it: but, after all, what was there in these worth contending for, aside from the *principle* involved in them? England claimed the right of taxing us at pleasure.

She adopted this as a lawful principle of action. This constituted the head and front of her offending, and fraught as it was with untold evils to the colonies, it was resisted unto blood. The war of the revolution was a contest for *principle*. Had the principle in question been yielded, who could have set limits to the acts of oppression growing out of it? So also in our war for sailors' rights, the bone of contention was, *the right of search and impressment*. The mere fact that a few seamen had been injured and abused, was as nothing, aside from the principle involved. This, in common with that of the revolution, was a contest for principle, and the oppression resisted was the oppression of principle. And further, whence the utter odiousness and the cruel oppression of the far-famed 'black law' of Connecticut? Not that Miss Crandall and a few colored Misses are subjected by it to certain shameful acts of cruelty and oppression. These are as nothing, comparatively, except as they involve principle; and the law, which allows and sanctions them, is itself comparatively harmless and innocent, except as it involves principle—principle which puts in jeopardy the rights of thousands. So in the present case; it is not this or that act of cruelty to this or that slave, which constitutes slavery. The question is not a question of *treatment*, one way or the other, kind or cruel. It is a question of *principle*. What if many masters do treat their slaves kindly? That is not the question. Do they not treat their horses and their hounds with greater kindness? What if many masters treat their slaves with cruelty? That is not the question, except as such cruelty involves the *principle* of property in man, which, admitted as a principle of action, wrests and withholds inalienable rights, and subjects its vic-

tims to untold acts of cruelty and oppression, at the mere caprice of an irresponsible master. The *principle*—the PRINCIPLE—the PRINCIPLE, that puts men, horses and hounds on the same footing; this is the head and front of the offending; this the climax of the cruelty in the case; and no kindness, however great, can ever annihilate or make amends for it, save that which yields the principle and restores those wrested but inalienable rights.

Again: I say, '*some cases, each individual being his own judge in the case;*' because no man, not even the slaveholder, contends that slavery is lawful in *all* cases. All admit that it is only in *some* cases that its existence is lawful—cases in which it is supposed there are some *peculiar* reasons for it. And then, all that is contended for even in respect to these peculiar cases, is, the *exercise of discretionary power in the case*. Give a man the liberty of holding his fellow men in bondage at *his own discretion*, and you yield him the fundamental principle of all slavery. Acting on this principle, he may hold him in bondage forever. Now it is this idea of acting *discretionarily*, that I mean to incorporate in my definition by the phrase, '*in some cases, each individual being his own judge in the case.*' And I do it for the special purpose of anticipating objections. Jewish servitude, authorized, as it is said, by God himself, is often quoted as a triumphant refutation of the doctrine, that slavery in all cases, is a sin. Now in respect to this, and all similar examples, it is enough to say, if a man acts by express authority from God in the case; or if, as in the case of crime, &c., he is called by authority of government to decide and act as *magistrate* in the case; so be it. This is not acting as

an individual, on his own responsibility, in the exercise of assumed discretionary power. It is not adopting or acting on the principle, that in some cases, the individual himself being judge in the case, it is lawful to wrest away or withhold inalienable rights; and is not, therefore, acting on the principle, which constitutes the essence and is the source of all slavery in practice.

And finally, by *holding man as property*, I mean holding him without any *will* or *consent* of his own, more than if he were a mere animal, or an inanimate thing, such as an ox or a hoe. I mean, moreover, holding him thus, when, like an item of property, he is guilty of no crime, by which, in the regular operation of equitable laws, his liberty has been forfeited.

Now whether this definition, thus explained, includes *all* that enters into the idea of slavery or not, is of little importance to my present purpose. Be this as it may, it includes, at least, the *starting point* whence all slavery originates—the *fundamental principle* on which it is based, and the *sustaining principle* by which alone its continued existence is secured. Had the principle, that it is lawful in *some* cases to hold man as property, never been admitted in theory, or acted on in practice, there had never been a slave, and slaveholding had never existed. Were it to-day to be universally denied in theory and in practice, every fetter would be broken, every slave go free, and all slaveholding cease. All slave-holding in practice *begins* with the admission in theory, that in *some* cases, for particular reasons, the individual himself being judge in the case, such slaveholding is lawful; and it is *continued* in practice by the virtual, if not professed admission in theory, that in *some* cases, for particular reasons, its continued

existence is lawful. In a word, the single principle, that in *some* cases it is lawful to hold man as property, admitted as a correct principle of action, is the originating and sustaining principle of all slaveholding in practice.

This point is too plain to need illustration; and yet it is important to dwell on it a moment, in order to see distinctly that this principle is not only the originating and fundamental principle of all slavery, but is its all-pervading and sustaining principle: so that the entire system of slavery is but the developement, the acting out of this one principle.

*Examine the statute book of slavery, and what find you there?* A system of most oppressive law—law, that in a thousand forms gives the master the same absolute and irresponsible power over his slaves which he has over his horses or his swine—law, which recognizes the slave only as property, and accords to him none of the rights of man unrestricted. In other words, you find a system of *legal* oppression, under which, without the violation of one of its laws, the master, if he chooses, may buy and sell and mortgage and lease human beings; may breed and fatten them for market; may exchange them in market for money or swine; may sunder at his pleasure all the ties of the family relation: separating the husband from the wife, the wife from the husband, the parent from the child, and the child from the parent; and selling the husband to the ‘Georgia men,’ the wife to the ‘Carolina men,’ and the child to the ‘Kentucky men:’—nay, if no white be present to witness and testify to the facts, may work and starve and whip and beat and kill, and in respect to the female, may violate the chastity of the

slave with perfect impunity. But what is this system of legal oppression? Is it slavery? Not at all. The thing itself lies further back. This whole system of legal oppression is simply slavery developed. It is slavery acted out in the statute book. It is the one principle, that in *some* cases it is lawful to hold man as property, originating laws for itself. And the whole system of law, which it thus frames to itself, is but a bulwark of defence, originated and erected by itself, for the purpose of legalizing and perpetuating its own guilty existence.

Again; *Examine slavery in actual life, and what find you there?* A system of most oppressive practice—mitigated, indeed in many cases, by the kindness or the interest of the master, or by both; yet, after all, most cruel and oppressive. That absolute and irresponsible power over the slave, which the master first usurps, and then, by his own enactments, legalizes to himself, is too frequently put forth in most terrific action. In actual life, as well as in the statute book, the slave is bought and sold, and mortgaged and leased—is bred and fattened for the market—is exchanged for swine\*—husband is separated from wife, and wife from husband—parent from child, and child from parent, and sold, one to the ‘Georgia men,’ one to the ‘Carolina men,’

\* A few years since, (whether the practice still continues I am unable to say,) traders from the western parts of Kentucky were in the habit of bringing immense droves of swine to the Atlantic States, to be exchanged for slaves. One of them informs us how they avoided the law prohibiting their introduction into the States. ‘An *oath* only is required that the slaves are brought into the State for the proper use of those who bring them, and the sale is then easily effected by *borrowing money* and giving the slaves in *pledge*, with the condition that in case the money is not repaid within a limited time, the *pledge* shall be forfeited’!!

and one to the 'Kentucky men'—the slave is worked and starved and whipped and beaten and killed, and made the victim of unhallowed lust; and yet the guilty oppressor walks abroad untouched.

Nay more, both in the statute book and in actual life, the slave in the slave States may be put to death, for *seventy-one* crimes, for none of which does the white man suffer any thing worse than imprisonment in the penitentiary. In Mississippi the slave may be put to death for about fifty crimes; the white for about twelve; in Virginia for near seventy, not one of which exposes the white man to death. But without pursuing the statement, what, I ask, is this system of oppressive practice? Is it slavery? No: it is only slavery acted out. It is a system of practice or treatment, based upon and growing out of the one principle, that in *some* cases it is lawful to hold man as property. So that slavery, in its origin and all its subsequent existence and developments, is no other than this one principle, admitted in theory and acted on in practice. This one principle, thus admitted and acted on by any man, makes him a slaveholder: admitted and acted on by a community, makes it a slaveholding community: admitted and acted on by the world, makes it a slaveholding world; and every man, who has the power, a slaveholder: and every one who has not, a slave. Its universal admission and action would dig the grave of equity and justice, put the reins of government and control, both among individuals and communities, into the hands of arbitrary and irresponsible power, make it the sole arbiter of right, and thereby ring the death-knell of freedom for the world. And on the other hand, this one principle, denied in theory and not act-

ed on in practice by the individual, and if a slaveholder, he ceases to be so at once; denied and not acted on by a community, and it ceases at once to be a slaveholding community; denied, and not acted on by the world, and arbitrary irresponsible power would cease to sway the sceptre or be the arbiter of right. Equity and justice would rise from the dead, and take the throne; and, instead of the death-knell, the shouts of freedom, triumphant over all oppression, would fill the earth.

This one principle, then, that in some cases, the individual himself being judge in the case, it is lawful to hold man as property, is *the* ground and the *whole* ground of debate between the advocates of freedom and bondage the world over. Adopt this one principle as a correct one, and however you may contradict and give the lie to yourself in other ways, you do in reality take the side of slavery. You adopt and defend its fundamental principle, and thereby whatever your professions to the contrary, you really adopt the thing itself and become its apologist and defender.

The main question then returns—*Is slavery, or the holding of man as property, in all cases, a sin?* The question, you observe, is not whether slavery in the general is a sin. In this sense it is so admitted, by universal consent. Put the question in the general abstract form, ‘*Is slavery a sin?*’ and every man’s answer is, ‘*Yes.*’ There is no difference of opinion here. But come to a case in hand—touch the system of American slavery—and then, indeed, circumstances alter cases: and though it is very hard and very wrong that the poor slave should be kept out of his rights, still it would be just as hard, and far more wicked, to



let him have them. Just at present, it really is not the master's duty to cease his oppression and forsake his wrong doing, by letting the oppressed go free. It would be a greater sin by far than to keep them as they are. How many reason thus!—I mean, *talk* thus! Absurd, however, as such talking is, it nevertheless proves one thing, viz. that there are multitudes, whose admission of the sin of slavery is a mere *abstraction*. Come to the case in hand, and they affirm and deny in the same breath. Sin though it be, and on their own admission, yet they will not apply that admission to any *actual case*. Slavery is always wrong in the abstract; but in practice—that, indeed, alters the case; in practice, it is never wrong; for in practice the justifying circumstances come in, so that the moment you attempt to catch the guilty creature he has evaporated. True, he is a great rogue, but you never can so *identify* him as to take him. The moment you attempt it, he is off

———'deseruit tenuesque recessit in auras,'

and your

'Ter conatus ibi collo dare brachia circum'

will be sure to result in a

'Ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago,  
Par levibus ventis.' —————

There is no such thing as catching him. He is a mere *abstraction*, as empty as the wind.

Now such talkers are plainly a contradiction to themselves. Their admission of the sin of slavery amounts to just nothing. For I hold it to be self-evident—to the child even—that, if in present circumstances it be not duty to emancipate, then *not* to emancipate is duty, and slaveholding, in these circumstances, is no longer sin, but duty. And where, I ask, was there ever a case of slavery in practice, in which these justi-

fyng 'present circumstances' did not exist and were not plead? It is important then to sift the real question in debate—viz. *whether slaveholding be not sin in all cases?* I remark, then,

1. *That slaveholding, in all cases, either is or is not sin.* In the larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, the question is asked, 'What are the sins forbidden in the eighth commandment?' And *man-stealing* is mentioned as one. In a note the General Assembly describe man-stealing thus: 'The law is made--for men-stealers. This crime among the Jews, exposed the perpetrators of it to *capital punishment*; Ex. xxi. 16, 'He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death:' and the apostle here (1 Tim. i. 10) classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends *all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or DETAINING them in it.* *Hominum fures, qui servos vel liberos abducunt, retinent, vendunt, vel emunt. Stealers of men are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and KEEP, SELL, or BUY them.* To steal a man, says Grotius, is the *highest kind of theft.* In other instances we only steal human property, but when we *steal or retain men in slavery, we steal those, who, in common with ourselves, are constituted by the original grant, lords of the earth.—Gen. i. 28.* Such was the authorized doctrine of the Presbyterian Church on the subject of slavery, from 1789 up to 1818. At that time, indeed, the priests' lips ceased 'to keep knowledge.' They had become 'partial in the law.' Some of them, it is to be feared, like the sons of Samuel, 'walked not in' their fathers' 'ways, but turned aside after lucre, and

*took bribes*\* and PERVERTED JUDGEMENT; and through their influence this obnoxious article was blotted out.

Be this, however, as it may, such *was* the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church on the subject; and now I maintain, that this doctrine is either true or false. If true, then slaveholding is in all cases wicked; unless, perchance, it be admitted that circumstances can change the very nature of things, so as to turn man-stealing, the 'highest kind of theft,' into honesty and innocence. But can this be? Are sin and holiness chameleons? Or rather, is there magic in circumstances to change one into the other? Why not change the devil then into a *real* angel of light, and done with it? Truly, there is no telling what the magic of circumstances and the process of time may do for him! For aught that appears, circumstances may aiter cases with him as well as with the slaveholder! Why not?† Plainly there is no alternative. A wicked thing, despite the mitigation of circumstances, is still a wicked thing. And slavery, therefore, either is or is not wicked in all cases—in one case as truly as in another.

2. *Slaveholding is, in all cases, falsehood in theory.* Its theory is, in all cases, a denial of self-evident truths.

\* Married '*wool-sacks*,' probably! Alas how many ministers of the gospel have done so, and thus come into the possession of slaves, and in this way been *bribed*—most effectually bribed—to pervert judgment. *Brethren, those slaves will meet you at the bar of Christ.*

† American Christians seem to have forgotten, at least in respect to the matter of slavery, that the only circumstances, that can ever come in, in mitigation even of crime, (much less to change it into innocence,) are want of capacity and opportunity to know duty and want of *natural* power to do it; and that these circumstances, when light has come into the world and men have refused to come to it, and loved darkness rather than light, so far from mitigating, do but aggravate guilt and consequent condemnation. 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida!'

Say the signers of the Declaration of American Independence, 'We hold these truths to be *self-evident*, that all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain *inalienable rights*—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their *just* powers from the *consent* of the governed: that whenever *any form* of government becomes *destructive* of these *ends*, it is the *right* of the people to *alter* or *abolish* it, and to institute a *new* government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to *them* shall seem most likely to effect their *safety* and *happiness*. Prudence, indeed, will dictate, that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shown, that *mankind* are more disposed to *suffer*, while evils are *sufferable*, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a *long train of abuses and usurpations*, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is *their RIGHT*, it is *their DUTY*, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.'

These, it seems, even to the 'right' and 'duty' of throwing off despotic and oppressive government, are all self-evident truths. But what one of these truths does slaveholding admit? Not one. Slaveholding, in theory and practice both, is built on a denial of the whole. It starts with the false assumption, that all men are *not* created equal, and are *not* endowed with certain inalienable rights; that there are cases, therefore, and those not cases of insanity or crime, in

which it is lawful to wrest and withhold from men, rights that would otherwise be inalienable ; and that it is neither right nor duty to resist and throw off such oppression. From first to last, its whole theory is at war with the self-evident theory of American Independence. To say nothing then of other self-evident truths, denying as it does these first principles of all freedom, slavery is always false in theory ; and therefore, until circumstances change falsehood into truth, it is sin.

3. *Slaveholding is, in all cases, tyranny in practice.* It begins, in all cases, in the taking away of inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And it continues, in all cases, by withholding them. This is too plain to need remark. Let the circumstances of the case be what they may, the slave in those circumstances is still a man. He has the body and the soul of a man. And being a man, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are his inalienable rights, and no man can hold him as a slave without being guilty before God either of taking away or withholding these rights ; and if this be not tyranny, what is ? Extenuate, bleach out its stains as you may, on the ground of circumstances—and yet it is evermore the tyranny of inalienable rights wrested and withholden—the very tyranny which our fathers resisted unto blood. It is, therefore, deep and crimson guilt.

4. *Slaveholding is, in all cases, a violation of God's law.* This gives to every being, considered simply as a being, just that place in the scale of existence which corresponds to his essential nature. It gives God, God's place. It gives every man, whatever his character, a man's place in the scale of being ; and in

all the circumstances of his existence, treats him as man—holds him responsible, and rewards and punishes him as man. But slavery evermore goes upon the opposite principle of action. In direct opposition to the law, it in all cases regards man, not as man, but as property. It gives man, not man's place in the scale of being, but, at the best, a horse's or a swine's place, or the place of some inanimate thing, such as that of a plough or hoe or keg of tobacco; and instead of treating him as a moral and accountable agent, it treats him rather as a brute, to be governed by physical force instead of motive. Indeed it makes a rupture in God's order of existences. It takes man out from the order of moral existences and puts him down into the order of animal and inanimate existences. It dares thus to lift its hand against God and his law, and blot out the image of man from the soul on which God has traced it, and write thereon, 'it is a thing.' This it does in all cases. No set of circumstances can exist, in which slaveholding does not regard and treat man as property; and so doing, it acts on a principle, which is at war with the divine law, and is, therefore, in all cases, a violation of that law.

But take a more practical view of the subject. Who does not see at a glance, that whenever and wherever men shall love the Lord their God with all the heart, and their neighbor as themselves, then and there all slaveholding will cease? Who needs to be told that whenever and wherever God's law ceases to be broken, then and there slaveholding will end? Will there be slaveholding in heaven? Why not? If certain circumstances render it lawful here, why may not circumstances render it lawful there? For the plainest

and best of reasons. Slaveholding is in all cases a violation of God's law, and that law is not broken in heaven. Will there be slaveholding in the Millenium? Why not? Man will be man then as really as now, and why may not peculiar circumstances exist to render it lawful then as well as now? But will it exist? Plainly not, and for the best of reasons; men will then universally obey the divine law: and the consequence will be that the habitations of cruelty will be broken up, violence will no more be heard in the earth, 'the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid: and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them—they shall not hurt nor destroy in all God's holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.' When men have done breaking God's law, they will have done with slaveholding. Slaveholding, then, is ever a violation of that law and as such is wicked.

5. *Slaveholding is, in all cases, a parent of abominations.* Extenuate the guilt of slaveholding, in given circumstances, as you may: throw it back, if you will, on former generations: say, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we had not partaken with them in the shedding of innocent blood: or urge in extenuation the circumstances which this sin has thrown around itself, and behind which it now entrenches itself for justification, as it moves on in its career of crime and blood: in short, extenuate as you may, and slaveholding is slaveholding still, bearing evermore the same bitter fruits of sin and woe. By its *fruits*, then, let it be judged. 'A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit.' Or, to suit the passage to the case in hand, a tree, that

in certain circumstances is lawful, cannot, in these circumstances, bear unlawful fruit.

What, then, are some of the fruits of slaveholding? It were vain to attempt to draw the picture in all its complicated and frightful features. I can only sketch some of its more prominent ones.

1. *Slaveholding originates and perpetuates the foreign slave trade, with all its attendant sins and woes.* The whole matter resolves itself into this simple process; the principle is admitted, as a principle of action, that in certain cases, at the discretion of the individual, it is lawful to hold man as property. This uncurbs the love of power and creates a demand for slaves; and this originates the traffic. It is in this case, as in all others, the demand that creates the supply. Who, think you, would manufacture or vend ardent spirit, if there were none to use it, and therefore no demand? Who then would traffic in slaves, if there were none to buy, and therefore no demand for them? The case is too plain for argument. Indeed, it is a sober matter of fact, so far as this western world is concerned, that slaveholding *did* originate this traffic. When the West India islands were first discovered, they were swarming with inhabitants. The Spaniards enslaved, and, by their rigorous treatment, exterminated them; and the next step was to send the slave-ship to Africa in order to keep up the system of slavery, already established in the islands. Thus was this traffic commenced in point of fact, and from that period slaveholding and the slave traffic have gone on, hand in hand; the one originating and perpetuating the other, and the other receiving in return those countless victims, which were necessary to sustain and perpetuate itself. The traffic, then, is the



mere creature of the system of slaveholding. To it, and it alone, is it indebted for its first and its continued existence. For its existence, then, together with all its connected sins and woes, is *that system responsible*. Shall I give you a single chapter in the history of this traffic? *Would you know how its victims are procured?*

For many years, the sheik of Bornou was almost continually engaged in war with the Felatah's and the Begarmis, two warlike nations in his vicinity. In the space of *eight* short years, this single chieftain carried into slavery more than thirty thousand of the Begarmis, besides burning their towns and villages. In *five* only of his war expeditions, or *ghrazzies*, as they are termed, as many as *twenty thousand* of the Begarmis were slain and *fifteen thousand* carried into slavery. In one of them, a reconnoitering party went out in the morning soon after day-light, and returned about 3 o'clock, P. M. with *eight hundred* women and children, most of the men having been slain.\*

Thus procured—(and this is but a feeble picture of the awful scenes that are enacted in the interior of Africa for this purpose), the wretched victims, chained together in herds, exposed to a scorching sun, oppressed with heavy burdens, and famishing with hunger and thirst, are marched from the interior to the slave ship on the coast. And now *would you visit that ship?*

'When I entered the Bay of Benguela,' says Capt. Benjamin Morrell, Jr., who was then on a southern voyage of trading and discovery, 'there were no less than four slave dealers from Brazil, waiting to complete their cargoes. One of these receptacles of human misery lay at anchor within fifty fathoms of the Antarctic, and

\* *Dobson and Clapperton's Travels in Africa in 1822—23 and 24.*

I was so distressingly annoyed by the shrieks and groans of its hapless inmates, the wretched victims of unfeeling avarice, that I resolved to visit the vessel, and make an offer of such medical aid as might have a tendency to alleviate the anguish of the sufferers. With this determination, I ordered a boat to be manned, and boarded the brig without ceremony; and, gracious Heaven! what a horrible spectacle was presented to my view!

'The slaves, perfectly naked, were stowed in rows, fore and aft, in a sitting position or crouching posture; and most of the men had their faces between their knees, either indulging in moody silence or mournfully chanting, in a low voice, some plaintive song of their native villages. The feelings of the females were of course more clamorously expressed, in spite of their tyrants' exertions to keep them quiet. In passing along the deck between these two ranges of despairing human beings, I encountered such mute imploring glances, such appealing looks of misery, such piteous supplicating expressions of countenance, such torrents of tears, that looked like pearls of ebony, as completely and totally unmanned me. My own tears fell like rain, and the poor negroes gazed on the strange phenomenon of a white man's sympathy with wonder, doubt and admiration. *Even the females had not been allowed a rag to cover their nakedness.*

'After having taken a cursory view of the whole heart-sickening scene, my attention was attracted to the after range of pens on the starboard side, which contained about one half the females then on deck. Here, as on the opposite side of the deck, the two sexes were separated by a partition or bulkhead eight feet in height; near which were two women evidently writhing in the agonies of death. Partly from the officers, and partly from their fellow sufferers, I gathered the shameful facts, that these dying wretches had been reduced to their present situation by repeated applications of the lash, as a punishment for their piteous cries and heart-rending wailings. This worse than

brutality had elicited those shrieks and groans which first arrested my attention on board the Antarctic. They were wives and mothers; their infants had been torn from their breasts and thrown upon the ground, either to perish with hunger among the grass, or to become the prey of beasts, or the reptiles—or, possibly, to be preserved and nourished by strangers. In the phrenzied paroxysms of maternal anguish, they had called for their infants—for their husbands—for their parents—for their brothers, sisters and friends; and for this natural involuntary ebullition of feeling, their bodies had been cruelly lacerated with stripes, until nature sank exhausted, no more to revive. Their breasts were distended with the undrawn nutriment for the lack of which their babes perhaps were perishing; it was oozing in streams from their nipples, mingled with their own blood.

Soon the two special objects of my compassion were released from their sufferings by death; and just as the visiting captain had attempted some observations in excuse or palliation of their conduct, our attention was arrested by another object. One of the captives, a well made, good looking man, of about twenty-five years of age, had contrived, manacled as he was, to scale the bulkihead, from the top of which, being unable to use his hands, he fell into the females' apartment, where his head struck a ring-bolt with such force as to fracture his skull. It was the husband of the youngest of the two women who had just breathed their last. For a few moments he lay senseless from the effects of the blow; but soon came to himself sufficiently to understand what was said to him. In the next moment he recognized the dead body of his wife, which he frantically strove to clasp in his manacled arms; and, with a yell of despair, endeavored to awaken her with his carresses from the sleep of death, while the wound in his head was pouring forth a torrent of blood on the inanimate object of his piteous lamentations.

‘The captain of the brig now spoke, and ordered one of the officers to tear the poor fellow from the corpse

of his wife, and to stow him on the other side of the deck. He raised his mute imploring eye to me, in which I read a speedy termination of his miseries, and an ardent desire to expire on the bosom of his wife. The officer advanced to seize him, but this was too much for me to witness. I sprang before the dying man, drew my dirk, and ordered the officer to desist, on the peril of instant death.

‘The officer recoiled a few paces, while the others stood gazing at me and each other in mute amazement. I stood fixed in my purpose, however; and not one of the conscience-struck, guilt-appalled, cowardly wretches, could muster up sufficient courage to oppose my single arm. The dying captive’s struggle was short. In a few minutes more he breathed his last, on the cold inanimate lips of her he loved more than he feared death.’

It were easy to pursue this part of the subject, and detail some of the horrors of the ‘middle passage;’ and then, some of the heart-rending scenes that transpire as husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, are separated in the slave market; but I forbear. It is enough to know, that the horrid traffic still goes on; that the cruelties attending it are probably greater than at any former period; that its extent, too, is nearly as great as ever; that since its commencement, it has probably exported from Africa not less than *twenty millions* of her children; and, by the wars it has excited, been the occasion of death to at least as many more. And yet all this, as we have seen, is but the creature of the system of slaveholding. But for this, the traffic had never existed. But for this, it would not continue a day. Truly, then, it is the parent of this abomination; and *piracy* though it be, yet for it, as the originating and perpetuating cause, slaveholding and its abettors will be held responsible at the bar of God.

2. *Slaveholding originates and perpetuates the domestic slave trade, with all its attendant sins and woes.* The same course of argument applies here as in the other case. But for the system of slavery, there had been no slaves in the land to be bought or sold, and no masters to buy or sell them, and of course no traffic. The plain matter of fact is this; as the system extended itself South and West, it created a demand for slaves, and that demand originated and still perpetuates the traffic. Slavery in the Southern and Western slaveholding States creates the demand, and slavery in the Northern and Eastern furnishes the supply, and thus the traffic goes on.

And shall I give you a brief sketch of this traffic? Would you know how its victims are procured?

Some of them *are bought.* 'Dealing in slaves,' says Niles' Register, vol. xxxv. p. 4, 'has become a large business. Establishments are made at several places in Maryland and Virginia, at which they are sold like cattle. These places are strongly built, and well supplied with *thumbscrews, gags, cow-skins and other whips, oftentimes BLOODY.*' And the following 'NOTICE' from the Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, informs us how this business of buying and selling human beings is carried on.

'This is to inform my former acquaintances and the public generally, that I yet continue in the Slave Trade at Richmond, Virginia; and will at all times give a fair market price for *young negroes.* Persons in this State, Maryland or North Carolina, wishing to sell *lots* of negroes, are particularly requested to forward their wishes to me by mail; \* \* \* also persons living near Richmond, having *one or more* for sale. \* \* \* Persons wishing to purchase lots of negroes, are requested to give me a call, as I keep *constantly* on hand, at this place, a

\* The italicising is mine

great many for sale, and have at this time the use of one hundred likely young negroes, consisting of boys, young men, and girls: and I will sell at all times—in lots to suit purchasers. Persons from the Southern States wanting to buy a choice lot of slaves, will do well to call on me, as I shall be able to furnish them at any time. \* \* \* I have comfortable rooms, with a jail attached for the reception of negroes: and persons coming to this place to sell slaves can be accommodated; \* \* \* the company of gentlemen (!) dealing in slaves, will conveniently and attentively be received. My situation is very healthy and suitable for the business.

LEWIS A. COLLIER.'

'April 19, 1833.'

But this is not the worst of the case. Many of the victims of this guilty traffic are not even bought—they are KIDNAPPED. Even to this day, freemen, in this boasted land of freedom, are kidnapped, and then sold into hopeless bondage. Strange that the community will sleep over this matter! Could the facts in the case be brought out, I doubt not it would appear that there are in this land thousands of legally free people of color, who have been thus kidnapped, and are now toiling in hopeless servitude and transmitting that servitude to their otherwise free children. It is common to decoy the unsuspecting victims to some retired spot, or on board of a vessel and then seize and bind them. More than twenty free colored children were thus kidnapped in the single city of Philadelphia in 1825; and in 1827, two were stolen in open day. 'I know,' says Mrs. Child, 'the names of four colored citizens of Massachusetts, who went to Georgia on board a vessel, were seized under the laws of that State, and sold as slaves. They have sent the most earnest exhortations to their families and friends, to do something for their relief;

but the attendant expenses require more money than the friends of negroes are apt to have, and the poor fellows as yet remain unassisted.\* It were vain to attempt a minute account of the great variety of ways in which the business of kidnapping is carried on. Sometimes they are decoyed away as I have stated; again they are imprisoned as runaway slaves, and, being unable to prove their freedom by written documents or the testimony of white persons, are sold to pay the cost of imprisonment; again they are violently seized, sometimes individually and sometimes whole families together, their free papers wrested from them, and they hurried away under cover of night into hopeless servitude; and again, some 'monster in human shape,' pursues 'the occupation of courting and marrying mulatto women, and selling them as slaves.† Strange that a christian community can sleep over this matter!

But what next? The slaves, thus procured, are driven over land to the South and West, chained together in gangs of ten, twenty, sixty or an hundred even, or else stowed away in the hold of a slave-ship, and conveyed thither by water. In one instance, recently, sixty slaves were attached to one chain, and, in repeated instances, these slave-ships have carried away from one to two hundred, and even more, at a time.

But to say nothing of the cruelties of this middle passage, nor of the woes which await the slave in his new house of bondage, let me point you to some of those scenes, which are constantly transpiring, both in

\* Mrs. Child's 'Appeal in favor of that Class of Americans called Africans,' (p. 64)—a book, filled with pithy remarks and thrilling facts, and that ought to be read by every one.

† This has actually been done in the city of Philadelphia.

the Northern as well as Southern and Western slave States, as this business of buying and selling goes on.

'Who does not know,' says Mr. Paxton, 'that *hundreds of thousands of dollars* are employed in this trade—that vessels run constantly from the Middle to the South-western States, loaded with slaves—and that many men of *high standing* in society are interested in the traffic? Who does not know that in this trade, little or no regard is paid to the nearest and dearest relations in life—that the husband and wife, the parent and child, are separated without hesitation, when a *better bargain* can in that way be obtained?'

'Curiosity,' says a gentleman in Charleston to his friend in New-York, 'sometimes leads me to the *auktion sales* of the negroes. A few days since I attended one which exhibited the beauties of slavery in all their sickening deformity. The bodies of these wretched beings were placed upright on a table—their physical proportions examined—their defects and beauties noted. "A prime lot, here they go!" There I saw the father looking with sullen contempt on the crowd, and expressing an indignation in his countenance that he dare not speak; and the mother, pressing her infants closer to her bosom with an involuntary grasp, and exclaiming in wild and simple earnestness, while the tears chased down her cheeks in quick succession—"I can't leff my children! I won't leff my children"! But on the hammer went, reckless alike whether it united or sundered forever. On another stand I saw a man, apparently as white as myself, exposed for sale.

'At another time I saw the concluding scene of this infernal drama. It was on the wharf. A slave ship for New-Orleans was lying in the stream, and the poor negroes, *handcuffed and pinioned*, were hurried off in boats, eight at a time. Here I witnessed the last farewell—the heart-rending separation of every earthly tie—the mute and agonizing embrace of the husband

\* Paxton's Letters on Slavery, p. 134. Mr. Paxton is a native of Virginia, and was once a slaveholder.



and wife, and the convulsive grasp of the mother and child, who were alike torn asunder—for ever! It was a living death—they never see or hear of each other more. 'Tears flowed fast, and mine with the rest.'

Similar scenes are constantly enacted in the progress of this drama. Similar separations are constantly taking place, first at the outset, or if not then, when the wretched slaves arrive at their place of destination, and are there exposed for sale. Sooner or later the separation comes. Says Mr. Stuart, 'He (a slave) said—that he was leading a life of terrible suffering; that about two years had elapsed since he and his wife, with his two children, had been exposed in the public market at Charleston for sale; that he had been purchased by Mr. Street; that his wife and children had been purchased by a different person; and that, though he was living in the same town with them, he *never was allowed to see them*; he would be beaten within an ace of his life, if he ventured to go to the corner of the street.'

Such, then, is a brief sketch of the *American* slave-trade and some of its attendant sins and woes: and yet, as we have seen, it is the mere creature of slavery. The system of slavery originated and still perpetuates it. The slaveholder may censure the slave-trader as much as he will; but let him remember, that that trader is less guilty than he. For, say what he will, that trader is but his humble servant, obsequious to his will, buying slaves *of* him when he wishes to sell, and procuring them *for* him when he wishes to buy. True, the trader is not innocent; far from it. Still he is but the humble servant of the other. Whence originates the demand for slaves? With the slaveholders of the

\* Stuart's 'Three Years in North America.' vol. ii. p. 74.



women and ten children, in whom he thought he had obtained a great bargain; for he supposed they were his own property, as were his brood mares.' And this, doubtless, is the public sentiment of a vast majority of slaveholders. It is a sentiment that regards and speaks of, and, as facts show, treats the female slave as a 'brood mare.' It yields her no protection against the embraces of unhallowed lust. And what is true of the slave is true of the free female. Public sentiment affords her no security, but on the contrary marks her, if she have charms, as the defenceless victim of some licentious white.

Nor does law protect the colored females. Is she free? She may not, under severe penalties, resist any white man under any circumstances. Is she a slave? She is her master's property, and is subject to his control in the matter of sexual intercourse as much as in any other. What say the facts? 'In a single State, more than *three thousand* persons are sold as slaves annually by their mercenary *fathers*.' 'Many plantations are stocked by the master with slaves of his own ungodly begetting'!

'The planter,' says Mr. Stuart, 'and the doctor seemed to be on intimate terms, which rendered their conversation tolerably unreserved. The doctor asked the planter what could have induced him to stay at such and such a plantation during the unhealthy season. I shall never forget the *sang froid* with which the question was answered by his friend. He said he found that half a dozen of the girls could not longer be trusted without a husband, for one of them had been already seized by the blacksmith at his gate, and he thought it was not only for his interest, but that of the plantation generally, that he should be the *first* husband. This

answer, of course, gave rise to a great deal of merriment (!) among the friends; and the doctor, who gave us some accounts of his management of his own slaves of a similar kind, of course admitted the validity of the reason. In the course of the conversation which followed, it turned out that this planter was frequently waited upon *at table by his own children*, and had actually sent some of them to the *public market to be sold as slaves.*<sup>\*</sup>

But it is not to the unhallowed lust of the master only that the defenceless slave falls a victim. He, in many if not most instances, contents himself with being the 'first husband.' After him come his sons, the overseers, &c. &c. Could all the facts in the case be brought out, they would tell a tale that would make every ear, that heard it, tingle. I fear they would reveal a state of things not much unlike that which has existed and now exists in Jamaica, though perhaps less open and somewhat less extensive. And what is this state of things?

'At New Ground, the overseer, book-keepers, and head carpenter, all lived in the habitual practice of gross and unblushing profligacy.' 'One of the book-keepers voluntarily told me, that he had had *twelve* 'negro wives' within six months.' †

'Let us endeavor for a moment,' says the Christian Record of Jamaica, ‡ 'to raise the veil from before this

\* Three Years in North America, vol. ii. p. 127. This planter was a 'wealthy and well known planter' of South Carolina, and not by any means a young man.

† Three Months in Jamaica, in 1832, by Henry Whitely.

‡ The Christian Record is a monthly periodical, published in Jamaica. The first number was issued on the 30th of September, 1830. The facts here quoted, and others of a similar character, were published in one of the first three numbers of the work, the challenge given to any one to disprove them, and the offer made to admit into the pages of the work, any evidence that should prove them unfounded. They were never disproved. This I say on the authority of the Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter, (London) from which I quote.

disgusting picture. The simple facts are notorious to us who have lived here for some years, but few persons, if any, have had the boldness to notice them publicly, and our fellow-countrymen in England have no adequate idea of them. They hardly know that from the governor (we speak not of the present one) to the slave, an organized system of open and shameless concubinage has prevailed for generations past, and still prevails throughout the whole mass of society—exhibiting a congregated accumulation of the grossest moral putrescence. \* \* \* \* With the exception of those who are married, (and not always those) and a few rare instances, members of council, members of assembly, custodes of parishes, magistrates, common council men, vestry men, merchants, masters in chancery, doctors, judges, barristers, attorneys of estates, overseers, book-keepers, clerks, tradesmen, whites, browns, blacks—all, in short, have every man his *house-keeper*, (Jamaica parlance) established in open whoredom, living in his house or attached to it according to circumstances. \* \* \* But the weightiest proof, surrounded with the darkest shades, is still behind in the prevalence of the system among the great body of the slave population. The master himself, who is responsible to God for the souls of his people, either lives with some colored female, perhaps one of his own slaves, or he systematically seduces every attractive object among his people. It is for the most part considered by the people themselves an honor and a privilege, and is attended with substantial advantages to them and their friends. The attorneys and overseers, almost to a man, and the book-keepers, as far as their influence enables them, pursue the same system. If a married proprietor resides on his estate, he permits his overseer and white servants to do so without rebuke.

O! for some Christian Record to speak out, untrammelled by fear or fastidiousness, and give us the awful facts on this subject in our own slaveholding community! Verily, they would make us blush. Say not that there is nothing like this now existing in our land.

That it exists so openly or so extensively, I myself do not suppose, but the facts—*the facts*, what are they?

‘Marriage among them (the slaves) is commonly allowed; but where a young man has a fine family, the planter very often, with a view to the increase of his stock, FORCES him to have many wives: and in the same way married females are often obliged to receive more husbands than one, as the planter may order.’\* And I also have some facts in my possession, but I am not at liberty to mention names or specify particulars, so that persons and places can be identified. I may, however, ask a few questions. I ask those who know, then, whether it be not a fact that some masters do sometimes select one of the stoutest, and healthiest, and best formed of their slaves, and send him around among the females on their plantations ‘with a view to the increase of their stock’? Again, is there not somewhere in the South a female professor of religion, who keeps one of her handsomest slaves as a mistress for her son, because she can in no other way keep him from more gross and indiscriminate indulgence? And once more—is there not somewhere in the South, a minister of the gospel, the owner of a plantation, who once refused to protect a poor slave girl from the licentiousness of his own overseer, though the girl herself requested such protection, lest forsooth, he should enrage the overseer and cause him to quit his service, by speaking to him on the subject; and who, like the planters in Jamaica, though he ‘resides on his estate,’ yet ‘permits his overseer’ to persist in these criminal indulgences, ‘without rebuke’? †

\* Stuart, vol. ii. p. 120.

† Since writing the above I have been authorized to state it as a fact, that about two years ago, a minister in the State of Mississippi did thus refuse to protect one of his own female slaves.

But enough—enough of this ‘disgusting picture’—these awful, heart-sickening details. Gladly would I have omitted them, but the times demand plain matter-of-fact dealing and forbid fastidiousness. If slavery is ever to be remedied by the power of a correct public sentiment, it must be brought out from its hiding places, and exhibited to the public view, in all its naked deformity—‘root and branch—bud, blossom and fruit.’ And if the detail of its fruits is disgusting, it is the heart-sickening reality that makes it so. It must, therefore, be given, and be pondered, if we would ever get rid of the reality. There should be no shrinking in the case. We must see the thing as it is. Disgusting or not disgusting, we must look it in the face. Beyond all contradiction, licentiousness does exist at the South to an alarming extent. ‘That the vice prevails to a shameful extent is *proved* from the rapid increase of mulattoes. Oh, how many have fallen before this temptation: so many that it has almost ceased to be a shame to fall!’\* All other facts, then, out of the question, this simple one—‘*the rapid increase of mulattoes,*’ is demonstration. And yet who needs argument to show him that slavery is the fruitful source of this iniquity? Argument is out of place in so plain a case.

Here then are three abominations of which slavery may truly be said to be the parent. Two of them, the foreign and domestic slave-trade, owe their origin and continuance solely to the principles and practice of slaveholding, and of the other, that practice is, to say the least, the fruitful source.

I might go on to speak of other abominations of which slaveholding is the parent—such as the cruelties

\* Paxton's Letters, p. 129.

to which it subjects the slave—the ignorance of God and duty in which it keeps his soul—the dangers it occasions to the nation, &c., but I forbear. My design was to exhibit only some of its more gross and tangible features. That I have done. You have seen them. By its fruits then let the tree be judged—those fruits which it bears in the very circumstances which are urged as its justification. What are these fruits? One of them is a system of most horrid licentiousness; does this argue a good tree? Another is a most extensive domestic slave-trade—the execration of all good men; does this argue a good tree? Another is the foreign slave-trade continued, and all the world pronounce this *piracy*; does this argue a good tree? Plainly not. Slaveholding, then, is in all cases a sin. It is falsehood in theory; tyranny in practice; a violation of God's law, and a parent of abominations. In all the circumstances of its existence, the mark of guilt is upon it—deep, crimson, blood-stained guilt. That individual who practices it is a guilty individual. That nation which does so is a guilty nation. And sooner or later, if they repent not, the God, to whom vengeance belongeth and who claims it as his prerogative to repay, will repay. He will visit for this thing—yea his soul will be avenged on such a nation.



## LECTURE II.

### OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

JOB xiii: 6, 7.—Hear now my reasoning, and hearken to the pleadings of my lips.

Will you speak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for him?

EZEKIEL xviii: 2.—What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?"

On a former occasion I have shown the wickedness of slavery by direct argument. It is next in order to notice objections. As introductory to this, allow me to recapitulate a little.

Slaveholding, as I have before shown, is, in all cases, falsehood in theory; tyranny in practice; a violation of God's law; and the parent of abominations. It is all this, in those very circumstances, which are urged in extenuation of its guilt, and in justification of its present and continued existence. Plead, if you will, constitutional recognition, a self-legalized right of property, the kindness of the master, the degradation of the slave, the danger of manumission, &c. as the peculiar set of circumstances which justify present slaveholding, and yet, in these very circumstances, the thing itself—the principle, which is the head and front of its offending and constitutes its soul and essence, is *false-*

*hood in theory, denying self-evident truths;—is tyranny in practice, taking away and withholding inalienable rights;—is a violation of God's law, wresting man out from the rank of moral, and putting him down into that of mere inanimate or brute existence, thus making ungodly havoc with the order of things, established by the finger and guarded by the law of God;—and finally, is the parent of abominations, yielding evermore the same bitter fruits of cruelty and crime.*

Let me enlarge a little on this point. Whence comes this whole system of oppression? Yonder solitary man loves, and is for grasping after power. He persuades himself that he needs, and that in some cases, especially in so peculiar a case as his, it is lawful to hold man as property. His neighbors are similarly situated, have a similar love of power, reason in a similar manner, and come, as by common consent, to the same conclusion. *The leaven of oppression has thus begun to work.* It extends to the community. The community reason thus and conclude thus. It becomes a maxim, admitted in theory as a correct one, that in some cases, at each individual's own discretion, it is lawful to hold man as property. And this originates the demand for slaves. The market is opened, and demands a supply. In obedience to that demand, the proud ship is soon riding in majesty over the deep, in search of some poor, degraded and defenceless ones—an easy prey to the oppressor. Next, the flames of burning villages flash out upon night's darkness, and the yell of the oppressor and the shrieks of captured and murdered innocents break up its stilly silence and sweet repose, and the dry earth drinks in the streaming blood. Next, that proud ship, now the prison-house of

grievs and woes unutterable, is on her homeward way. In the economy of a wise but inscrutable Providence, judgment lingers and damnation slumbers, and so that ship rides on unscathed by the lightnings and the thunderbolts of indignant heaven. That open market is thus supplied. But that supply only whets her appetite, and makes her more voracious. Like the hell of Isaiah, 'she enlargeth herself and openeth her mouth without measure.' Like the hungry grave she cries, at every new supply—'Give, give, and saith not it is enough.' And now, in obedience to this continued and increasing demand, other ships are on their way to the homes of the defenceless; and the work of death goes on with accelerated step. At the same time, and by this means, a system of most cruel oppression is growing up to maturity at home. It is enlarging its dimensions, shooting out its hydra heads in new directions, and throwing around itself at every step, every possible entrenchment to secure its continued existence, and rearing up every possible obstacle to its annihilation. At length this entire system of iniquity and blood, in all its parts—market, traffic, slaveholding, all—has grown up to giant manhood, and is carrying on its work of violence and death with giant strides; whitening the wide ocean with its spreading canvass: drenching the dry earth with the blood, and strewing the coral beds of ocean and the soil of the oppressor with the bones of its countless victims. And yet forsooth just at this point—just as the monster has grown up to full maturity and is filling up the measure of his iniquity with frightful rapidity—just as the patience of indignant heaven is exhausted and its lingering judgments begin to hasten, and its slumbering damnation to

awake—just here, forsooth, the monster, we are told, becomes a very kind, gentle creature, and on account of his very peculiar circumstances begins to wash his hands of blood-guiltiness, and proclaim abroad his innocence, while, at the same time, he persists in the adoption and practice of the very *principle* to which alone he owes his first, his continued and his future existence—the principle that in *some* cases, the master himself being judge in the case, it is lawful to hold man as property.

Now, plainly, the man who attempts to prove, that slaveholding is no longer wicked, now that it has originated and is perpetuating these and other abominations, and is just about to fill up the measure of its iniquity, will be compelled to speak wickedly for God and talk deceitfully for him. He cannot otherwise maintain his point and justify present slaveholding. He must, of necessity, take up the old proverb, ‘The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge’—the evil is entailed—or some other proverb quite as false and wicked. We should therefore expect beforehand, that such would be the character of the arguments or objections urged in defence of slaveholding. Whether such is their character remains to be seen. To the objections, then. *What are they?*

**OBJECTION 1.** In the first place, says the objector, whatever may be true of slavery in the abstract, or in other cases, still, if you mean to bring the case home to slaveholding in the United States, it becomes a very different matter. Slavery here is altogether peculiar, at least so far as respects the difficulties and dangers in the way of its removal. There are circumstances in

the case which render it peculiar, and go to show that the American slaveholder is not so guilty a man—or American slaveholding so wicked a thing as many are apt to suppose.

In reply, it would be in point to ask the objector to name over specifically those circumstances, which, on account of their special peculiarity, are supposed to extenuate the guilt of the American slaveholder and to justify the continuance of American slaveholding. What are these circumstances—these peculiar difficulties, dangers, &c? I venture to affirm that whatever they are, they are not peculiar, but are, in all important respects, common to all systems of slaveholding. There seems to have been an utter mistake on this point in the minds of the community. Just as an individual sinner is wont to regard his own case as altogether peculiar, and to see peculiar difficulties in the way of *his* repentance, so the community seem to have regarded and looked upon the system of American slaveholding. It has seemed to them to be in itself unlike all other systems, and its abolition to be encompassed with difficulties unlike all others. But this idea is false. The substantial features of involuntary servitude, and the difficulties in the way of its abolition, are of necessity substantially the same in all cases. When was there ever a system of such servitude, in which the slave was not the master's property; in which the master could not plead legal recognition, right of property, poverty on his part, non-qualification for freedom on the part of the slave, entailment, danger, and Bible even, in justification of his continued slaveholding? Who does not know, that the defenders of English Colonial Slavery justify its continuance

by the plea of peculiar circumstances: and that these circumstances are substantially the same as those urged in justification of continued slaveholding here? Who has not heard the cries of legal recognition, right of property, entailment, frightful poverty, starvation, insurrection, blood, death, &c. &c. which have gone ever from the Colonies to the mother country, loud and tumultuous, as the voice of many waters? I affirm then, that the same plea of peculiar circumstances is necessarily common to every system of involuntary servitude, and if valid in respect to one, is equally so in respect to all. If it can wash out the guilt of continued slaveholding to day, it may do so to-morrow. If it can bleach out the stains of American slaveholding, it can do so in respect to all. And then, at every time and in every place continued slaveholding, thus justified, may stand forth in angel innocence, though its hands be reeking with a brother's blood. The truth is, there is nothing in the circumstances of American slaveholding, which renders it so unlike all other slaveholding and is an extenuation of its guilt. So far from it, the peculiarities of the case are all the other way, and go rather to heighten than extenuate its guilt. The American slaveholder sins against such light and under such circumstances as render him a more guilty man than most other slaveholders. As to *light*, he sins against the blazing light of his own national constitution—in utter contradiction to truths himself has admitted, and in utter violation of principles in defence of which he has fought and bled. And as to *other circumstances*, they are all circumstances of his own creation, or at least, his own preservation. If he did not originate he has perpetuated and does perpetuate them.

They are sparks of his own kindling. And what is more, if he would but get his *will* right on the subject, they are sparks which he is perfectly competent to put out. The peculiarities of the case are therefore altogether against the extenuation of his guilt, or the justification of his continued sin.

**OBJECTION 2.** But it is said, *that the Bible sanctions slaveholding in some cases, and that it cannot, therefore, be a sin in ALL cases, unless it be admitted that the Bible sanctions sin.*

The Bible sanction slaveholding!—pray, *what sin does it not sanction?* Where is the sin that does not contrive, especially when hard pressed, to cloak itself under the Bible? Where is the sinner that is not ready to quote Bible in apology for his sin, whatever it be? Who does not know that it is one of the commonest things—nay, if one be so disposed, that it is one of the easiest things imaginable, to make the Bible an apologist and minister of sin? The very devil can change himself into an angel of light and quote scripture most learnedly, *when it suits his purpose.* And men are too often apt imitators of him. *Cherished sin* is always fruitful and ingenious in argument. It never lacks apology; and what is more, is generally a great biblical scholar, and somewhat pious withal. The thought has sometimes occurred to me, how Satan must laugh in his sleeve, to see good men poring over the Bible, with most saintly devotion, in order to find some apology for their darling sin!

But the Bible sanctions slaveholding!—and what says that man who has two wives? Polygamy, you tell him, is wicked. ‘You are vastly mistaken, sir,’ he replies. ‘Wicked! Why, sir, didn’t the patriarch Jacob

have his two wives? And David, that man after God's own heart, didn't he have as many as two? And Solomon, that wisest of men, didn't he have as many as two? You had better read your Bible a little, sir, before you talk to me about its being wicked to have two wives.'

But the Bible sanctions slaveholding!—and what says that rum-drinking or rum-selling Christian? 'The use and traffic in ardent spirits, you tell him, are both wicked. 'Just the reverse,' he replies. 'Didn't Noah use something—I don't care whether you call it ardent spirits or not—which would intoxicate? and if he used it, didn't somebody make and sell it? Aye, and didn't Christ attend a wedding where they drank rather freely of wine? Why, sir, if I had time I could turn you to chapter and verse on this subject. It is only the immoderate use that the Bible condemns. Any other use it sanctions. You may rely upon it. And what satisfies me, is, that some of the "most approved divines" think so, or at least have thought so, and would have thought so to this day, if some hot-headed fanatics hadn't frightened them out of it. Ministers swim with the current sometimes, as well as other people.'

But the Bible sanctions slaveholding!—and what says the slave-trader? Why that he has Bible authority for slave-trading. Indeed it is a notorious fact, that those, who originally plead the Bible in justification of slaveholding, plead it with equal pertinacity in justification of slave-trading. The very traffic, that is now the execration of Christendom, is denounced and punished as piracy, has had ten thousand tongues to quote the Bible in its behalf. There is nothing that men, even good men, are so prone to do as to hide behind the Bi-



ble for the protection of some darling sin. Rather than give up their idol and suffer the inconveniences of so doing, they too often wrest the scriptures and make them the apologist of sin. And what is even worse, if conscience dare to whisper her rebukes, she is at once brow beaten and awed to silence by a '*thus saith the Lord*'! Verily if men, and christian men are ever the laughing stock of devils—if angels ever weep—if God himself ever frowns in utter wrath, it is when he sees Bible and conscience thus wrested from their true office, and, with great appearance of piety, carried over into the service of Satan, and made prime ministers of sin.

But the Bible sanctions slaveholding!—then why does not the God of the bible sanction it? It is to no purpose to say that he forbears in some cases to punish it. If this be sanctioning or even tolerating it, God sanctions and tolerates every species of sin. The truth is, delaying judgments, in this case as in others, are only the earnest of gathering indignation and swift destruction, if the space, they afford for repentance, be not improved. In thus forbearing to punish, God is merely enduring 'with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction.'

Wrath stays him, or else God would strike them dumb.

His wise forbearance has their end in view,

They fill their measure and receive their due—*Cooper.*

How then has it happened, not once or twice, or thrice, but repeatedly, that just at the moment, when a system of slavery had grown up to maturity, among a given people, then the measure of their iniquity has been filled up, and then the ear of Jehovah been opened to the cry of the oppressed, and he come forth in the terror of his judgments and swept

that people with the besom of destruction? Or rather, how does it happen that this is the uniform course of God's providence? How is it that God's Providence is thus at war with his word? Does not Jehovah know, that the moment mentioned is of all others, the moment when the pleas of legalized and long-possessed right of property, entailment, non-qualification for freedom, danger of emancipation, &c. have most of plausibility and force? What if the cry of the oppressed does come up and enter into his ears, why does he not listen to the cries of the poor, *unfortunate* oppressors, who have had the dreadful evil entailed on them? Why is not his heart touched with pity for them as well as for the poor slaves? Says a minister of the gospel, now living, and in *New England* too! 'Viewing slaveholding as a crime, it were difficult to decide which were the most guilty, the masters, who by birth-right, hold the peasantry in a servile state; or the slaves, who by the same tenure, hold the masters in a state of master-ship: a bondage more severe and more fearful than their own. (!) As a state of society, generated like all other existing evils, in the errors of former times, it is bad; [indeed!], a considerate master sees it to be so, without casting the blame upon the slave, (!!) who holds him in the unhappy condition of owner; as a considerate slave may be supposed to do, without casting blame upon the master, who holds him in the condition of servility.'

Now how does it happen that God is not a little more 'considerate'? Why does he not take this 'consider-

c. \* Telescope, &c. p. 172—by Samuel Nott, Jr., a very good little book with this exception. Mr N. is not alone in such sentiments.

nto' view of the subject; and, instead of 'casting blame upon the slave' for holding the master in his 'unhappy condition of owner,' or 'upon the master' for holding the slave in 'the (enviable?) condition of servility,' just regard it as a 'bad' state of things, 'generated like all other existing evils in the (innocent?) errors of former times'? One would naturally expect God to be at least as considerate as a 'considerate slave.' Why then does he not listen to the cry of the 'unhappy' owners, whose slaves hold them 'in a state of mastership; a bondage more severe and more fearful than their own'? Why not hear their pleas of extenuation, and so shut up the bowels of his compassion for the oppressed and turn away his wrath from the oppressor? Why put on vengeance at the very period when the 'unhappy condition of the owner' is most unhappy, and the pleas of extenuation wax loudest and strongest? Verily, if the Bible sanctions slaveholding, the God of the Bible does not.\* The dispensations of his providence do not contradict his word.

\* Almost all the excuses now made in justification or palliation of slavery could have been made by that generation of Egyptians that was punished for enslaving Israel.

They could have pleaded that they did not begin it; that Israel were in slavery when they were born, that they formed the laboring class, and could not be set free without changing the whole state of society; that, considered as property, the Israelites were of immense value. That there were such prejudices between them and the Egyptians that they could not mingle and become one people. They were an abomination to each other. That they were treated well, allowed to live with the countries, and to hold and accumulate property, that if correction was used, and overseers placed over them, it was because they would not work without it. That their rapid increase proved that they were well treated.

All these and similar excuses availed not. The practice of slavery was morally wrong. Their continuing it increased their

But, insists the objector, the Bible does sanction slaveholding: *What is the proof?*

Is it said that Abraham had slaves—that some of them were born in his house and some of them bought with his money, and that his example is decisive on the point?

True; Abraham had servants, and some of them were 'bought.' And so it follows, does it, that the slave-trade—the business of buying and selling slaves, is a very allowable business! Men may buy men, (for if 'bought' proves any thing it proves this, and then hold them as slaves at pleasure, and quote father Abraham for authority! The good patriarch was a slave-trader, and a slaveholder too! Slave-traders and slaveholders are Abraham's children—walking in the steps of their father! Verily Abraham's character needs to be looked after.

'But Abraham's servants were "bought."—Aye: and it was the fashion in those days to buy wives. Jacob, if I mistake not, bought his. What slaves they must have been! And Joseph, it seems, bought all the people of Egypt as servants for Pharaoh. All the people of that populous country were his 'bought' servants! What a plantation! What a gang of slaves that!

But, to be serious:—Abraham's servants were not American slaves. And the proof is plain.

1. Their servitude, admitting it to be the servitude of slaves, was a very different thing from American servi-

gitude and made sure that you should see. Paxton's Letters, pp. 101, 102

God came forth in vengeance. He heard our voice, and looked on our affliction and our labor and our oppression. And the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand, and with an out-stretched arm and with great terror and signs, and with wonders. Deut. 26: 8, 9

*tude.* One fact is decisive. Eleazer of Damascus, one of them, was steward or ruler of his house and prospective heir to his property. 'Behold,' says Abraham, 'to me thou hast given no need, and lo, one born in my house is mine heir.' Who ever heard of an American slave that was or that could be heir to his master's estate? But,

2. *It cannot be proved that the servitude of Abraham's servants was the servitude of slaves.* In order to do it, it must be shown, (1) That he held them as property—by the same tenure, under the same absolute control, and on the same footing with his flocks and herds. (2) That he held them in this condition without their consent; and (3), That in so doing he acted on his own responsibility and at his own discretion. And in order to show all this, and to clear up other difficulties in the case, it will be necessary to answer the following questions—and to do it by sober facts and not by dreamy conjectures. It should here be borne in mind that Abraham had quite a number of these servants. Rev. J. W. Nevin says, 'Some of the richer shepherds, like Abraham and Job, appear to have had thousands of them belonging to their households.' Now, then, for the questions.

1. Abraham's servants were bought—in what sense were they bought? Were their bodies and sinews as well as their service bought, or their service merely? In other words, were they slaves or hired servants? Let us have the true meaning, substantiated by facts and not conjecture.

2. *Of whom did Abraham buy them?* Did they sell themselves? If so their servitude was not involuntary. Did Abraham buy them of some other slaveholder?

Did he buy them of kidnappers? And if so, how is he to escape the charge of being an accessory to the sin of man-stealing. Let us have the facts in the case.\*

3. *Where did Abraham originally obtain his servants—in Canaan or Haran? They are spoken of (Gen. xii. 5) as souls, which he and Sarah had 'gotten in Haran.'*

4. *In what sense were they gotten? In the sense of purchased slaves, or Pagan converts, or (as the original is) 'made' to the true religion? If they were gotten in this sense—i. e. if they were Pagans who had been converted to the true religion by Abraham, and from religious, as well as other considerations followed him from Haran to Canaan, then it is easy to see in what sense they were bought. What then is fact? Were they not persons 'who kept the way of the Lord*

\* Rev. Samuel Crothers of Ohio in his 'Strictures on African Slavery,' recently published, says, in reply to the same inquiry, slaveholders 'tell us that Abraham bought them of man-stealers or slaveholders; and they insist on the privilege of being believed without proof. We must not, they think, explain the phrase, "servants bought with money," by a reference to other passages in scripture where it is explained, but by reference to the practice among them. In our slave regions, when they commenced house-keeping, so as to hold a respectable standing in church and state, they buy a few slaves, and then, in a few years, they have servants born in their houses, as Abraham had.'

\* If it was thus the man, who is eminently styled the friend of God, commenced business in the land of promise, he must have invested a vast amount of capital in bought slaves. We see him at one time, heading three hundred and eighteen active young men, born in his house. One author tells the children in the Sabbath school, he had several thousands of slaves. It makes us shudder to think of his imprudence in risking his own life, and that of his beautiful Sarah, among such hordes of slaves, in a strange country, surrounded by so many rude and warlike tribes. It distresses us to think of the trouble he must have had in keeping the wretches from running away, and in preventing them from stealing his cattle, and in securing the bars and bolts of his door at night.'—Strictures, p. 31.

to do justice and judgment? Were they not circumcised in token thereof? They are spoken of as his trained ones—('servants' is inserted by the translators), were they not trained in the sense of 'instructed ones'—i. e. as disciples instructed in the true religion? If then they were originally 'gotten in Haran' in this sense, where is the evidence that their servitude was the servitude of slaves?

Again 5. *How did Abraham treat his servants—in such a way as to show that they were slaves? Did he ever sell one of them? Did he ever flog one of them? When one of them was rather impudent to her mistress, did he not furnish her with 'bread and a bottle of water,' and then give her her freedom? Gave her her freedom to punish her! It would be well for the slave if such punishment were in vogue now-a-days.*

Again,—*examine Abraham's domestic arrangements. When three angels came to his tent, who ran to the tent-door to welcome them in? Abraham or some one of his numerous slaves? Who proposed to fetch water, that they might wash their feet and rest under the tree? Who said 'I will fetch a morsel of bread and comfort ye your hearts; after that you shall pass on'? Who 'hastened into the tent unto Sarah, and said, Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth'? Who did the kneading and the cooking—Sarah or her slaves? Who 'ran unto the herd and fetched a calf and gave it unto a young man to dress it'? Who 'took butter and milk and the calf which he had dressed and set it before the guests and stood by them under the tree while they did eat'? Who but Abraham and Sarah were the chief actors in this whole matter? Who beside*

them, were the waiters and the cooks on the occasion? Truly it must have been rather a novel sight to the angels to see the master and mistress of thousands of slaves acting the part of cooks and waiters! And then what rare sport it must have been to the slaves, to see in what fine style their master and mistress did up the business! The question returns then, does Abraham's treatment of his servants show that theirs was the servitude of slaves?

It is then a plain case (1), that Abraham's servants were not American slaves, and (2), that it cannot be proved that their servitude was, in any proper sense, the servitude of slaves. Throwing aside all conjecture and all reasoning from the mere spelling and sound of the word 'bought,' and where I ask, is the solitary fact, which proves either that he held them as property, or without their consent, or in the exercise of discretionary power in the case? I ask not what conjecture may do in the case, but where is the logic of facts which proves Abraham to have been either a slave trader or a slave holder? Away then with the plea that Abraham held slaves, and that therefore any man may hold them, when he deems it necessary. Away with this practice of heaping sins on a good man which are not his, just to hide your own behind them.

But says the objector, 'reason as you may, the Jews had slaves. This is sober fact, and you can't deny it; and what is more, God expressly allowed it—thus showing beyond dispute, that in some cases slavery is justifiable.'

In respect to this I would say 1. *Jewish servitude was not American servitude.* The two are utterly unlike. One fact is decisive. In the Constitution of the United



States it is thus written. 'No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on the claim of the party to whom such labor or service may be due.' In the Jewish law-book it is written thus, 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose: IN ONE OF THY GATES, where it LIKETH HIM BEST'; thou shalt not oppress him.' (Deut. xxiii. 16.)\* How unlike each other! Other facts to the same purpose might be adduced. These two are specially in point, (1), the servitude of a large proportion of Canaanites was merely the payment of tribute; (1 Kings, ix. 21.) and (2), cruel treatment entitled those whose servitude was personal to instant release, (Exod. xxi. 26, 27.)†

\* Canterbury people and all who cannot bear to have a colored man 'come between the wind and their nobility,' would do well to read this passage frequently.

† Mr. Paxton, (Letters pp. 82, 83,) thus sums up his view of Jewish servitude—'The case then stands thus—Israel had been reduced to slavery, and for many years held torribly in that condition, and compelled to serve without wages. God heard their groans, and delivered them. In giving his law to the same people soon afterwards, God reminded them again and again of their bondage, and charged them not to deal thus with others. For certain crimes, however, and in some cases for debt, persons might be sold and held to service, but none were to be made to serve more than six years.'

Severe or cruel usage gave liberty at any time. The stealing of a person or holding such in bondage, was punished with death. Those taken in war might be held in bondage; this, in the then usage of war, would prevent much bloodshed, and they were allowed to buy of the nations about them, but in both of these cases, they must *confine* themselves to those that would renounce idolatry, embrace the true religion, and receive circumcision—

But there are other points of dissimilarity, more important than these. In order to make the two cases parallel at all, so that the one shall justify the other, the following things must be shown:

1. That our government is a Theocracy, and that God therefore acts as our civil lawgiver and chief magistrate.

2. That we are his chosen people.

3. That the slaves are a people who have filled up the measure of their iniquity, and are sentenced by Jehovah to condign and summary punishment.

4. That that punishment is involuntary personal servitude.

5. That we are appointed by God as his executioners; and

6. That we have a special warrant, applicable to this special case.

Until these points are made out, it cannot be made out that there is any parallel whatever between Jewish and American servitude. For the evidence is full and decisive, in the case of the Jews, that their government was a Theocracy, God acting as their civil ruler; that they were his chosen people; that the Canaanites were an idolatrous and guilty people, who had filled up the measure of their iniquity, and were sentenced by Jehovah to summary punishment; that that punishment was, at the first, complete and utter destruction (Deut. vii.) but was afterwards, in respect to some of them, commuted to personal and tributary servitude, at

the token of the covenant; and when they did this, they were to be recognized as brethren, and the law gave them freedom in six years.' Every man, in view of this, can see at once that Jewish and American servitude are very different things.

the discretion, under some restrictions, of the Jews, (Josh. ix. 24, 27; 2 Chron. viii. 7, 8,) that the Jews therefore were appointed as God's executioners, and acted under the authority of a special warrant, applicable to the special case.

Now when all this can be made out in respect to American, or to any other servitude, then and not till then may it claim kindred with Jewish, and justify itself thereby.\*

\* One can hardly imagine a more incongruous or ungracious task, than for a man in a land of freedom, to set about ransacking for arguments in defence of slavery. Yet there is something more incongruous and ungracious still; to have recourse, for the protection of such a system, to the word of that God who is light and love. Yet this has been done. Slavery, we are reminded, was, under certain restrictions, permitted among the Jews. I admit the fact. But what of that? An exception in any case to a general law, requires to be sanctioned by the same authority that gave the law itself. In this instance it was so. The permission to make slaves was expressly limited to the Heathens round about them. Now, Sir, let us recollect, there were other permissions, nay commands, in reference to these Heathen nations. No one who reads his Bible can doubt, that these nations were driven out of their own lands by the judgment of God for their iniquity; that the time chosen for this was when 'their iniquity was full;' and that the Israelites were the commissioned executors of this righteous vengeance. Now, the permission to have bond-men of these nations formed a part of the same system of retribution. It was part of the infliction of judgment, in which the Jewish people were the agents. I ask them, then, if we are to take this divine permission to the Jews, as our precedent; how will they dispose of the other parts of that precedent? Will they maintain, on the same principle, the right of conquest—the universal and unqualified right of the stronger to invade and subjugate the weaker? Nay more, will they assent to its being enacted and registered among the *jura belli et pacis*,—and even among the express divine requirements in war,—that, in all cases in which offers of peace on the condition of tributary subjection are refused, cities should be sacked and laid in ashes, and 'man, woman, and suckling, ox and ass,' exterminated by the edge of the sword? The argument, by proving too much, becomes thus a *selfe de se*—destroying itself. The truth is, those defenders of slavery, (I blush to utter the designation) are guilty of a sad

And now is it said that this is yielding the position that slaveholding is in all cases wrong and admitting that in some cases it is not? If it be, then so be it. I have no wish to contend for more words. Slavery, or death is right when God authorizes its infliction as a punishment for crime. But is this giving up the position that slaveholding is, in all cases, wicked? Let us see.

You probably admit the position, that *murder is in all cases wicked*. Yonder lies a dead man. He did not die a natural death; nor did he kill himself, though there are marks of violence upon him. Some one else killed him. You exclaim at once, he *was murdered!* But hold;—don't you see that hangman? *He* killed the man, in obedience to a sentence passed by competent authority. His death was the authorized punishment of his crime. Was he murdered? Was killing him murder? Was the hangman a murderer? Not

blunder in reasoning. They make the exception the rule, and the rule the exception. Let them once show us the same theocratic authority, and we shall allow the case for which they plead, to be a second exception; but, till then, we must refuse them the privilege of sheltering themselves under the cover of Jewish precedent. Speech delivered at the Glasgow Anti-Slavery Meeting, by RALPH WARDLAW, D. D. pp. 4, 5. And Mr Wardlaw's opinion is worth something at least. What he terms an exception, however, is more properly an execution of law.

'By a decree of the Most High [a father was commanded to sacrifice his son —] Elijah was empowered to slay the false prophets, and the Israelites were enjoined to put to death some, and to enslave others of the idolatrous people whom they conquered in war, and therefore we have a moral and religious right to do any or all similar things, though we can show no corresponding warrant, sanction, or authority. Excellent Logic! Excellent Theology!' An Address to the Ladies of Glasgow, and its Vicinity, &c. by George Thompson, p. 11. 'Not less than 1000 females composing the elite of the beauty and fashion of Glasgow, were present.' The Meeting was held March 15, 1833. Ladies of America, 'Go and do likewise.'

at all. *Killing a man in such a case is not murder.* Again, the Jews waged wars of extermination with the Canaanites; they destroyed their cities, laid waste their land and put old and young alike to death. They killed their thousands; but were they murderers? By no means. They acted as the authorized executioners of a sentence passed by competent authority, and not on their own responsibility and at their own discretion. The death they inflicted was the authorized punishment of crime. *Killing men as punishment for their crime and in obedience to competent authority is not murder.* It is not acting on the principle of discretionary power in the case. It is not killing men with malice aforethought at one's own discretion or caprice. It is not therefore a fact in proof of the lawfulness of killing men, in some cases, with such forethought and at such discretion. In a word it is not murder, and does not disprove the position that murder is, in all cases, wicked.

So in the present case. Yonder guilty Canaanites, those 'hewers of wood and drawers of water,' are held in involuntary servitude as a punishment for their sins. The severer punishment of death, originally pronounced against them, is commuted to that of servitude, and that Jew, their master, is Jehovah's authorized executioner in the case. Is that master a slaveholder? Is holding them in bondage, in such a case, slaveholding? I say, No. The Canaanite, it is true, is held in bondage, and so in the other case he was killed. But holding him thus, in obedience to such authority, is no more slaveholding, in the true sense of the word, than was killing them, in obedience to that authority, murder.

But, not to dispute about mere words, this, let me say, brings us to the gist of the whole question: to the

inquiry, *whether God has ever, in any case, authorized the exercise of discretionary power in the matter of reducing men to, or holding them in involuntary servitude?* And here, fearless of contradiction, I aver that he never has, and challenge the proof. I wait to see the commission, executed in the court of heaven, and signed and sealed by heaven's King, authorizing any man or set of men to hold their fellows in involuntary servitude, *ad libitum*. Such a commission was never executed in that court or signed and sealed by that King. So far from it, the severest punishments are threatened those who shall presume to arrogate such power to themselves.

Away then with the plea that the Bible tolerates or sanctions slaveholding. The Bible tolerate it? The Bible sanction it? It is at utter war with it. Quibble as much as you will, respecting isolated facts and texts, still the spirit of the Bible, is no other than the spirit of the divine law. It is a spirit that wages war with all involuntary servitude. Wherever it comes, it comes to 'preach deliverance to the captives'—'to undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free.' Whenever it shall have breathed its sanctifying influence into all the family of man, then the day of millenium will have come, every yoke be broken, violence be heard no more in the land, and jubilee be proclaimed over the earth.\*

\* One of the most remarkable passages, which I recollect to have met with recently, is the following by Mr. Danforth, Agent of the Colonization Society. 'To the slaveholders, she (Christianity) did not say, *Robbers, give up your prey*, but *Masters forbear threatening*.' to the slaves, she did not say, *Slaves, burst your shackles*, but *Be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh,—with good will doing service*.' While she said this, her heavenly and disenthraling influence began to

**OBJECTION 3.** *But the slave, it is said, is not QUALIFIED for freedom.* Such, it is insisted, is his ignorance and degradation that he is incapable of taking care of himself, and therefore, that kindness to him, in other words, that the law of love, so far from requiring, absolutely forbids his present emancipation, and shows that continuing him in servitude in existing circumstances, is not sin.

Now in respect to this, it is in point to ask at the outset *what is meant by qualification?* What does the objector mean by the qualification of which he speaks, and without which he supposes the slaves to be unfit for freedom? Of course he does not mean that those powers and faculties which constitute one a man, are such a qualification. In other words, he does not admit the principle that man *as such* is qualified for freedom. If he does, let him produce his proof that the slave is not a man, or else give up his objection and bid the slave go free.

undermine the system, till at length, though not until the twelfth century, it was overthrown.'

Now what have we here? Why, that Christianity, or what is the same, the Bible is guilty of double meaning;—that it says one thing and does another;—that its precepts speak one language—a language which leaves the master's right to his slave not only untouched but most carefully secured to him, while its spirit speaks a language exactly the reverse,—one that undermines and upsets the whole matter. Pray, whence comes 'the heavenly and disenthraling influence' of Christianity? Whence, but from its *precepts*? In what is the influence of Christianity embodied, save in its truths? And by what are those truths expressed save by its precepts? And yet, forsooth, while that *influence* undermines and overthrows all slavery, those *precepts* are continually saying, O no! O no! Slavery is not to be disturbed. Slaves, 'Be obedient'! Truly, there never was a greater absurdity. Christianity does not thus say one thing and do another. Her spirit and her precepts are in perfect harmony. If the one forbids and undermines slavery, so does the other. *This double-dealing Christianity is the Christianity of Expediency.*

Does the objector mean, then, that in order to be qualified for freedom the slaves must have the learning and intelligence of physicians, or lawyers, or divines? This will not be pretended.

*Does he mean that ability to read and write is the requisite qualification?* But are there not some white men—possibly some who are the owners or overseers of slaves, who are destitute of such ability? Will he then be consistent and reduce them to bondage and put them under slaveholding tutors and governors, until such time as they have learned to read and write? But let that pass. Ability to read and write is the test of freedom! How well must they read and write? Will it answer to be able to spell out the words, or must they read fluently? And if fluently, how fluently? What is the standard of judgment, and who is to be judge in the case—the slave or his master?

But suppose all these difficulties settled, on what principle is emancipation to go forward? Are the slaves to be kept in bondage and not one set free, until such time as they have all, to a man, learned to read and write? Are they to be thus kept until a large majority of them have done so? How large a majority? And who shall be the judge in the case? Or shall this be the principle of emancipation—that each slave shall be set free the moment he has learned to read and write? But who is to look after his instruction? Shall the master take his own time for it and give the slave just as little time, and as few means and as scanty opportunities as he pleases? And if perchance the master should prove faithful in this respect and hasten the business of instruction, who is to pronounce the sentence, 'go free'? Will it be a pleasant thing to the



master—a thing that he will be eager to do—to let these emancipated readers and writers run loose among his slaves, arousing them, as their very presence must do, to a sense of their wrongs, and thus kindling the spirit of revenge, hitherto smothered, into most tremendous action? How then is the objector to get his slaves free after they are instructed? Will he state the ‘plan’? For I am a ‘practical’ man and I wish therefore for some ‘plan.’

But there is still another difficulty—there are in the slave States various laws by which the man, who teaches a slave or even a free person of color to read or write, is subjected to a penalty of thirty dollars, or thirty-nine lashes from the whip, or a ten days, or twelve months imprisonment, &c; and, in case the books used in instruction should be put into the hands of the slave, and, in the opinion of the slaveholder, should have ‘an evident tendency to excite slaves,’ &c., he is subjected to ‘imprisonment not less than one year, and standing in the pillory, and whipping, at the discretion of the court for the first offence; and death for the second.’\* Now the difficulty is to dispose of these laws while all this business of instruction is going on. So far as I can see, the objector may lose his head before he has taught a single slave to read or write.

But perhaps the objector does not mean that slaves must be able to read and write in order to be qualified

\* Mrs. Child's Appeal, p. 67. This law is still in force in North Carolina. The following fact is from a recent number of the Emancipator, published in New York. ‘A gentleman of our acquaintance, on whose veracity the public may rest with entire confidence, recently met with an intelligent man, direct, as he stated from Alabama. This individual states—among other things—‘that three young gentlemen from the North are now in prison in Alabama, FOR ATTEMPTING TO INSTRUCT THE COLORED PEOPLE IN WRITING SCHOOLS.’

for freedom—well then, what does he mean? All I wish is a fair understanding of the matter. Does he mean then, that by means of oral instruction, the slaves must be so enlightened and elevated, and at the same time made so virtuous as not to abuse their freedom when it is put into their keeping? If so, the same questions as before, or similar ones, return. Who is to be judge on the question of abuse? Who shall decide what is and what is not an abuse of freedom—the slave or the master? And further, must the slave be so enlightened, &c., as to be secure from all or only a partial abuse? If partial, how much abuse is a partial abuse—what is the criterion of judgment and who is to be judge? And whichever be meant, where is the authority for making this the condition of freedom? Does God's word pronounce it the necessary qualification? Does his providence do so? Nay, is there a community of men on the earth, some of whom, do not, in some respects abuse their freedom? The very masters—so careful to secure the slaves against the abuse of freedom—do they never abuse their freedom? One would think it a small abuse of freedom, to say the least, to wrest away and withhold from his fellow being, his dearest and most sacred rights.

But let this pass, and admit that a degree of mental and moral improvement such as will secure the slave from an abuse of his freedom is the proper qualification. Then I ask, first, what degree of improvement this is? On what scale is it to be measured and who is to measure it—the slave or his master? Must every slave have the same degree of improvement, or are there to be different degrees according to the different temperament, circumstances, &c., of different individuals?

And if so, who is to be judge, and what is to be the standard of judgment in this case? And these difficulties being gotten over, where is the *proof*, that *oral* instruction, given with the best of intentions and on the most efficient plan, can ever bring the slaves up to the requisite degree of improvement? Has it ever been done? Or if ~~the~~ thing can be done, where is the proof and the security that it ever will be done? Who is to look after the matter to see that it is done—the master? If so, shall he act discretionarily in the case—take his own time and way for doing it, and give the slave just as little time and as few opportunities and means of improvement as suits his convenience or his pleasure? And if, in spite of self interest and a thousand other interests, the master should prove faithful to his trust, and bring them up, as speedily as possible, to the requisite degree of improvement, then on what principle and in what way is emancipation to go forward? Are the slaves to be retained in bondage until the entire mass, or a very large majority of them, are thus qualified? How large a majority, and who is to be judge? Or are they to be set free, one by one, or family by family, as fast as they reach the specified degree of improvement? If so, who is to set them free, and what is to become of them? Are they to be turned adrift on society unemployed and uncared for, or are they to be employed as free laborers, and work for hire side by side with the man about whose ears the overseer cracks his whip? That indeed would be putting new wine into old bottles with a witness—nay, uncapping a volcano even. Do let the objector then give us some explanations. What does he mean by qualification? And how is he going to make this business of qualifying for

freedom result in freedom? As we are practical men, we would like to see the *plan*, and to know *how* it is going to work out the desired result. *Strange the community do not demand explanation on this point, as well as on that of immediate emancipation!* In the absence of such explanation, however, I must take the matter as it is, leaving each one to guess for himself in what the supposed requisite qualification consists, while I proceed to refute the objection that in his present condition the slave is not qualified for his freedom. I remark, then,

1. *This plea of non-qualification is not always sincere on the part of those who urge it.* It is to be feared that some knowingly play the hypocrite in this matter, and urge this plea as a mere blind to keep others quiet. The larger number, however, are probably themselves deceived. They imagine that they are sincere in the matter, when in reality they are not. Many a man, it is believed, talks loudly of the non-qualification of his slaves for freedom, and urges this as the main reason for not emancipating them, and deems himself sincere in so doing, when in reality the grand reason is an unwillingness to meet the inconveniences of such emancipation to himself. It would be monstrous cruelty, he says, to set them free in their present condition; but the moment some man proposes to take them out of his way, so that he shall be liable to no inconvenience from their manumission, save the single one of giving them up, then the plea of non-qualification is given to the winds and forgotten in a trice—thus betraying the fact of its insincerity. For plainly, if slaves are not qualified to be put under the control of equitable law, instead of individual caprice and brute force here, they are not qualified for it elsewhere. Much less are they

qualified to make and administer their own laws. This I regard as self-evident. The man therefore who pleads the non-qualification of his slaves for freedom as the reason for not manumitting them, and then manumits them so soon as the proposal comes to take them off out of his way, does but convict himself of insincerity, and show to all the world, that his own inconvenience is after all the real and main objection to an earlier manumission. But

2. *This objection, if sincere, is not true.* The slave is qualified for freedom, and if emancipated properly would be able to take care of himself. Facts demonstrate it. The condition of the free blacks, at the South even, is decisive on the point. I know we hear much of their degradation, ignorance, wretchedness, &c., as if their condition were vastly worse than that of the slave. And probably there is some truth as well as some exaggeration in what we hear—but what then? Why are they thus? Not because they are free; not because they are incapable of taking care of themselves; not because they are beyond the reach of motives to exertion; not because they are destitute of a capacity to rise in the scale of intellectual and moral existence; but because, though free, a cruel oppression still rests upon them—an oppression that grows out of the continued existence of slavery, that subjects them to a thousand inconveniences, and among other things, takes from them most of the motives to effort. To instance a single thing—the *monopoly of labor* is in other hands. They have not, and so long as slavery exists, they cannot have the chance of fair and honorable competition. The planter will not employ them, for he has slaves, and they would learn unwholesome

truths from too close a contact with the free. The same principle operates extensively in other departments of labor. So that the poor free black is shut out from all fair and honorable competition, except, perhaps, in respect to the mere *chores* of labor. These are his chief, if not only incitements to effort, and these, his chief, if not only means of subsistence. And even in respect to these, he must contend with a thousand obstacles, and compete it with the labor of slaves kept and leased by their masters for the performance of this very kind of labor. Now with these and a thousand other things against them, the wonder is, not that the colored freemen of the South are as degraded and wretched as they are, but that they are not more so. And the fact that they are not is proof positive, that in existing circumstances they are qualified for freedom, provided the master, instead of turning them adrift as outcasts on society, will employ them as free laborers, and thus put them under the control of law and motive instead of the lash.

The truth is, the mind of a slave, while a slave, is like a watch without its mainspring. You may take hold of its hands by direct physical force and move them around, but you cannot make them go alone. The self-moving power is gone. But make that slave a freeman, restore his long lost but inalienable rights, and by that *single act*, you have put the mainspring back again. Now *wind up* that watch, and it will go. Give *motive* to that mind, and its slumbering energies will awake. The spell of the enchanter is broken, and now apply the stimulus and the mind will work. It is not true then that the slave is disqualified for freedom. Mind is mind—man is man, whatever his complexion

or the circumstances of his existence. He has all the susceptibilities and faculties and powers of a man. True, if he 'be in chains, he droops and bows to the earth, because his spirits are broken; but let him twist the fetters off his legs, and he will stand erect.\* Put him under the treatment suited to his nature, as a man, and he will show himself a man, and, by the rapid development of his powers, will demonstrate to the world that the rights of a man are his, and that he, as man, is qualified to hold them. But

3. Qualified or not, this plea of non-qualification involves the principle that circumstances, which are themselves the result of sin, can change that sin persisted in to right. For whence, I ask, come that ignorance and degradation which so unfit the slave, as is supposed, for freedom? From his bondage. This it is that first originates, and then, by its continuance, perpetuates it. Nothing is more absurd, therefore, than to turn short around, and plead such ignorance as a justification of the continuance of the very sin to which alone it owes its first and present existence. It is making the fruits of sin its excuse. It is as if a man should steal another's property, and withhold it from him year after year until he were dead, and then withhold it also from his children, and so on for generations, and then plead in justification of his crime, that the children having always been accustomed to circumstances of poverty, were not qualified to take care of themselves if they had their father's property to help them do it—that it would only make them giddy, &c. &c., and be worse for them than to remain as they were! Shame on such apologies for sin. Whatever may be true in respect

\* Patrick Henry.

to other men, they are out of place and out of character in the christian's mouth.

'The Mohammedans,' says Mrs. Child, 'deem it right to subject the heathen tribes to perpetual bondage. The Moors and Arabs think Alla and the Prophet have given them an undoubted right to the poor Caffre, his wife, his children, and his goods. But mark how the slave-trade deepens even the fearful gloom of bigotry! These Mohammedans are by no means zealous to enlighten their Pagan neighbors—they do not wish them to come to a knowledge of what they consider the true religion—lest they should forfeit the only ground, on which they can even pretend to the right of driving them by thousands to the markets of Kano and Tripoli.

This is precisely like our own conduct. We say the negroes are so ignorant that they must be slaves; and we insist upon keeping them ignorant, lest we spoil them for slaves. The same spirit that dictates this logic to the Arab, teaches it to the European and the American:—Call it what you please—it is certainly neither of heaven nor of earth.'

This leads me to say 4. That the plea of non-qualification, in proof of the innocence of present slaveholding, is a most wicked plea. It is fraught with falsehood and mischief. And the proof is plain. *First*, it assumes the very principle in debate. It takes it for granted that in some cases man may hold his fellow as property at discretion. It thus sets up each individual's private opinion of his neighbor's qualifications as the test of that neighbor's freedom, and thereby erects an arbitrary and wicked standard of judgment in the case. It is *arbitrary, and therefore fruitful in mischief and wickedness*. It varies with the ever varying opinions of interested and various individuals. It is scarcely the same in any two cases. What one man would

\* Appeal, &c. p. 5.



consider the requisite qualification, another probably would not. Each man is thus the arbiter on the question of his neighbor's freedom, and that without any settled rule to guide his judgment in the case. It is solely a matter of discretion.

Now it needs no argument to show that such a principle of judgment is fruitful of mischief. It is in substance the originating and fundamental principle of slavery itself. But aside from this, it is a principle of judgment of which one man has as much right to avail himself as another. It is as valid in the case of the slave as in that of the master. He has the same right to set up his judgment of his master's qualifications as the test of his freedom, that the master has to set up his judgment as the test of his (the slave's) freedom. He may judge and act discretionarily in respect to his master, as well as the master in respect to him. And if he deem his master unfit for freedom, he may turn the tables, and reduce him to bondage in his stead. Why not? The truth is, the principle which allows one man thus to be judge over his fellow, and to decide on the question of his freedom according as *he* shall deem him fit or unfit for it, is the elementary principle and essence of all tyranny. It is the principle which alone puts control and government, both among individuals and communities, into the hands of irresponsible and arbitrary power, and thus makes might, right.

Nor does it stop with thus trampling on the rights and making havoc with the dearest interests of man. It trenches on the rights of Jehovah, and allows man to decide on a question which Jehovah has never put within his jurisdiction, but has himself expressly decided. God's decision is that man, as man, is qualified for free-

dom—that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are his inalienable rights. But the plea of non-qualification assumes that man, as man, is not thus qualified. It takes upon itself to exercise jurisdiction over God himself, and even to reverse his decisions. It dares to

‘Snatch from his hand the balance and the rod,  
Rejudge his justice—be the God of God.’

This plea then is a most wicked plea. Under a fair exterior, it hides the worst and most abominable of principles. However well meant it may in some cases be, still after all the *principles* involved in it are the principles of tyranny, and the plea itself is none other than tyranny transformed into an angel of light. And therefore, to every man who urges it, however sincere he may be in so doing, and however well disposed he may imagine himself to be towards the slave, I would say in the language of Milton, and say it because of the principles involved therein :

‘O execrable son! so to aspire  
Above his brethren, he himself assuming  
Authority usurped from God, not given :  
He gave us only over beast, flesh, fowl,  
Dominion absolute; that right we hold  
By his donation; but man over men  
He made not lord; such title to himself  
Reserving, human left from human tree.’

But admitting that the slaves are not qualified for freedom now, I remark 5, *That continuing to hold them in bondage is the very way to prevent their ever being qualified.* If not qualified now, continued servitude will never mend the matter. So far from it, it will only make it worse and worse. It will even frustrate well meant attempts to qualify them, and will render them comparatively fruitless. You cannot ‘gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles.’ No cul-

ture can make them bear such fruit. Their very nature will frustrate all your attempts. So in the present case. The slave is a slave, and while a slave, subjected to the noxious influences of slavery, you cannot bring any stimulus to operate on his mind to make it bear any other than the legitimate fruits of slavery—ignorance and degradation. You have no means by which you can so reach his mind as to inspire him with an effectual desire for attainments, which shall qualify him for a station to which, for the time being, he does not know that he has a right, and for which, though conscious of his right to it, he dare not hope. You cannot whip such a desire into him. And as to motive, while a slave, he knows no motive so imperious as the whip. Nor will it relieve the difficulty to tell him that by and by when he is qualified for it, if he will behave well, &c. &c. he shall be free. He knowst so well the worth of such promises. There are too many *when's* and *if's* about them to inspire him with hope. This process of qualification he knows to be a very gradual one. He has seen generation after generation go down to the grave before it was completed in respect to them, and the inference is irresistible on his mind, that most likely he will be in his grave before it is completed in respect to him. And more than this, he knows that every increase in knowledge, if not followed up by a corresponding increase of obsequiousness to his master's will, does but make him the object of a more eagle-eyed suspicion, and expose him to severer punishments for the least dereliction from duty. There is therefore no getting ahead in the business of qualification in this way. It is beginning at the wrong end. You cannot play this double game of treating the hu-

man mind as a mere animal, and yet as an intelligent, thinking being, with any hope of success. You must be consistent with yourself, and subject that mind at once to the treatment suited to its nature. You must start right in *theory*, viz. admit that the slave, degraded as he is, is yet a man, and as such, qualified for the immediate possession of his inalienable rights, subject indeed, like other men, to the control and restraints of equitable law, equitably administered. You must next start right in *practice*, viz. restore at once those inalienable but wrested rights. This done, you have put the mainspring back again. You have made that mind the creature of motive instead of physical force. Or rather, by that single act, you have ushered it into the world of motive, and now you can reach it with the stimuli of action, and do more to develop its powers and fit it for the proper exercise of its rights in one week, than you could before in a year—I had almost said, a life-time.

Should it be said here that facts contradict this reasoning—that the slave has a desire for knowledge, and is eager for instruction, I would say 1. If this be so, the master, as all experience shows, will see to it that this eagerness is kept under proper control and within proper limits; and 2, as a general thing this is not so; and 3, where it is so, a careful examination of facts, I think, would show, that it is not the result of any prospects of ultimate emancipation held out by the master, but is rather the result of that instinctive desire for knowledge, which belongs to man as an intelligent, thinking being, and which no circumstances, not even slavery with all its power to wither, can utterly destroy.

But, not to dwell on this, whence, I ask, come the ignorance and degradation which so unfit the slave,

as is supposed, for freedom? Where lies the cause of this effect? What is that principle of evil, of such mighty energy, of such wide-spread, deep, and far-reaching mischief? Not the color of the negro's skin. Not the shape of his head; for white men in bondage sink as low as he.

'If they (Europeans) had been any considerable time in slavery,' says M. Dupuis, British Consul at Mogadore, 'they appeared lost to reason and feeling; their spirits broken; and their faculties sunk in a species of stupor, which I am unable adequately to describe. They appeared degraded even *below the negro slave*. The succession of hardships, without any protecting law to which they can appeal for alleviation, or redress, seems to *destroy every spring of exertion or hope in their minds*. They appear indifferent to every thing around them; abject, servile, and brutish.'

Here then the secret is out. Slavery is that principle of evil. It is this that 'destroys every spring of exertion or hope,' sinks the white man 'even below the negro slave' and makes him also 'abject, servile, and brutish.' This is the cause of the ignorance and degradation, that unfit the slave, as is supposed, for freedom. And now is it to be believed that the cause of this ignorance and degradation will work its cure—the cause do away its own effect? Nay, is it to be believed that any attempts at remedying this mischief can be successful, so long as its cause is left to work on with its almost omnipotent energy? As well might you expect to stay a pestilence by efforts that leave its cause untouched. As well might you think to put out a volcano by dipping the lava from its crater, and leaving its subterranean fires to burn on unmolested. If you would destroy the effect, you must destroy the cause. If you would unshackle the mind, you must unshackle the

man. Otherwise your efforts at elevation and qualification will be comparatively fruitless.

Nor is this mere speculation. The testimony of facts bear me out in these remarks. The plea of non-qualification is by no means a new one. It was urged years ago. For aught I know, it is as old as slavery itself. It is still urged. 'The slaves,' it is said, 'are not qualified for freedom, and until such time as they are qualified, benevolence to them requires that they should continue in their present condition. When they are once qualified'!—and thus the objector talks on, just as if some extensive, systematic, and efficient plan of instruction were in actual operation, and we were only to sit still and wait for its results, in order to see the whole body of the slaves stand forth, at no distant period, emancipated and free. So far as I know, this objection is generally urged in such a way as to leave the impression on the mind that something efficient is doing in the way of instruction and qualification. It has been so urged for years, both in this country and in England. And now what is fact in the case? More than one generation has gone down to the grave since the plea was first urged. But let that pass. What is fact in respect to the existing generation? Are they a whit better qualified for freedom than were their fathers? Has the process of qualification advanced a single step in respect to them? And if it has, in here and there a case, will it ever be completed, even in respect to them, this side the grave? Where is the proof? Slavery and its abettors, I know, are full of promises. They talk largely of what they are going to do. But they have been feeding us and the poor slaves on nectarean promises quite long enough. It is

time to ask what they have done. If they have done nothing, let it be known. If they have done something—made some advances in the work of qualification, let that be known, and let them cease to reiterate, with louder and louder cry, the stale plea of non-qualification.

I repeat the question then, what is fact in the case? Are the present generation of slaves more enlightened and elevated, and therefore better qualified for freedom, than the generation before them? Nay, though the business of qualification has been professedly going on for years, is there up to this time any extensive, well defined and efficient system of measures in actual operation for the accomplishment of the object? Has so much been done towards it as even to mark out such a system? Something, I admit, has been done in the way of oral instruction in the sabbath school, &c. but this is limited in extent. The vast majority are without it. And where it is enjoyed, there is much reason to believe, that it is given, rather as a salvo to the master's conscience, and with the design of making the slaves more contented and submissive to their lot, than with a distinct view to their qualification for freedom. The fact then in respect to this country is, that though slaveholders have been talking of the business of qualification for years, they have done just nothing. They have not even devised a well-digested system of measures for the purpose: nor set it in operation. Whatever has been done, has for the most part been done individually, without concert, without system, and almost without aim. And the result is, that years of servitude have rolled away, and generations have gone to the grave, and the cry of their blood gone up to

heaven and been registered there, and the present generation is still as unqualified for freedom, and so far as qualification is concerned, as far removed from it as any that has preceded it.

Is it said that such is the state of public sentiment—such the general character of society, and such the laws, as to prevent the adoption of any such system of measures? This is doubtless true, and it is the very argument of all others to show that nothing effectual can be done in the way of instruction and qualification, so long as slavery exists.

I have been speaking of the difficulties in the way of instruction, which exist on the part of the slaves, even should their instruction be attempted. The objection now started leads us to look at the difficulties in the way of attempting it. If attempted, it must be done *by the master himself, or at least with his consent. Mark this.* What then, is the true state of the case? Public sentiment and the laws do stand in the way of any extensive and efficient system of instruction; and there is no possibility of getting them out of the way—there is no such thing as effecting any radical change in that sentiment, or any repeal of those laws, so long as you do not lay your finger directly upon the fundamental principle of slavery itself, out of which that sentiment and those laws have grown—I mean the principle that in some cases, at the discretion of the individual, it is lawful to hold man as property. This is the soul—the root of the whole difficulty—this, the life-giving principle of slavery—this, that single principle of evil, of such mighty energy, which has originated, and which alone perpetuates that sentiment and those laws. It is then but boys' play—nay worse, it is a mere whistling



against the wind, to attempt a change in the sentiment or the laws so long as you leave their cause untouched. And as to any extensive and well-digested and efficient system of instruction without such change, that plainly is out of the question.

And let me say, it is vastly easier, and safer too, as I shall show by and by, to effect this change, by assailing the fundamental principles of slavery itself and overturning the whole system, than to do it in any other way. It is labor lost to tug away at the removal of an effect, at the same time that you leave its cause untouched. You cannot do away the sentiment and the laws of which slavery is the chief, if not sole cause, at *the same time* that you keep the cause itself in existence. To attempt it is like attempting to serve two masters. It is like attempting to dry up the Niagara by dipping water out of the basin at the foot of the falls. Tolerate slavery, admit that, though wrong in principle, in existing circumstances it is right in practice, and therefore must have a present existence, and you can never make the slaveholder instruct his slaves or allow them to be instructed to any great extent. By such admission you have robbed the motives, by which you would urge him to it, of all their power. Ignorance and degradation are inseparable from slavery. The atmosphere they create is its breath of life, and the slaveholder knows it: and therefore, so long as you admit to him the present necessity of slavery, you do virtually admit the present necessity of continued ignorance. So at least he regards it. You cannot therefore make him repeal those laws in the statute book, or do any thing effectual in the matter of instruction, except as you lay the axe at the root of the tree,

and call in question the present necessity and moral right of slavery itself. You cannot stop a man's breathing at the same time that you keep him alive. He will breathe in spite of you. And so slavery will entrench itself in the ignorance of the slave, so long as itself is allowed to live. There is no doing away of the lesser sin while you justify the greater. This straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel, will never do. On the one hand, it will never so revolutionize the sentiments and laws of the masters as to bring them up to their duty in the matter of giving instruction; nor, on the other hand, will it ever so change the habits and feelings of the slaves as to remove the difficulties existing on their part, and bring them up to the point of eager and diligent and successful improvement. And I appeal to the testimony of facts and of eye-witnesses.

The first witness I bring forward is the Rev. Mr. Paxton, 'the man who has lived forty years—spent four or five of them as a teacher in a college—fifteen years in the ministry, eleven of them as pastor of congregations, and four as a missionary, all in the slaveholding States,'\* and once been a slaveholder himself. And what is his testimony?

'I notice as another evil of slavery, that it is hostile to that instruction of slaves, which, if not absolutely necessary, is exceedingly important to their salvation. *The policy of most slave-owners is to keep their slaves in ignorance.* This often extends to religious matters. Very little attention is paid to instructing them in religion. Neither is this peculiar to the irreligious part of the community. You must all admit that *many professors of religion pay almost no attention to this matter; and not one in five hundred pays as much attention as he*

feels bound to pay in the case of his own children. But few teach their slaves to read God's word, and how few are careful to have it read to them. How many heads of families, who would think themselves greatly neglectful of the salvation of their children, if they did not pray with and for them, and take them to the house of God, almost wholly neglect these matters as regards their slaves? They may, perhaps, occasionally tell some of their slaves that they ought to attend preaching; *but what facilities do they give them for attending?* Their slaves have labored all the week, and are, it may be, from four to ten miles from the place of preaching—must be at home that evening or early next morning—have, perhaps, no clothes fit to be seen in—may wish to see a wife, or husband, or child, who lives in an opposite direction—have no time for this but on the Sabbath. The slave is blamed for not attending preaching. He may deserve blame: but taking the whole case into view, the fault does not altogether lie on the slave. The master who holds him in slavery, who requires his constant labors, is often justly chargeable in the sight of God with the irreligion of his slaves; and that many a professor of religion will at last have a fearful reckoning on this matter, I have no more doubt than I have that we have a Master in Heaven, "who is no respecter of persons."

'It is often said, and not without reason, that there is a growing indisposition among slaves to worship with their masters, and attend on the preaching, of the whites.'

'That slaves should think their case hard, is as natural as that they should think at all: and that this should lead to hard thoughts of those who forcibly hold them in bondage, is equally natural.' 'Now with this general feeling of discontent at the whites is it at all wonderful that slaves should have little relish for joining them in religious worship?

'Suppose the master a professor of religion, and prays in his family. After laboring during the day, the slave comes home and throws himself down to rest.

He was called out, it may be, pretty early—has labored under the eye of a watchful master or overseer—has been found fault with as to his manner of doing his work, or his not doing it faster—has been scolded and threatened, and perhaps whipped—has made his meal, it may be, in the field, and on provisions much inferior to what he knows his master and family enjoy. His labors for the day are, however, closed. Presently he hears the horn blow or the bell ring for prayers. What now are the thoughts which would most likely pass through the mind of a slave of no decided religious feelings. Ah, the white folks are going to be religious now; master is going to pray. He takes his ease all day, and makes us poor negroes do his work. He is always finding fault, and scolding and whipping us. I don't think his prayers will do much good—I won't go to prayers.

'Their aversion to attend family prayers is so common as to be the subject of frequent remark. I think NINE TIMES OUT OF TEN, few attend even in PROFESSORS' houses, except the house-servants, and not unfrequently they slip out of the house when the family assembles for prayer. Similar feelings operate against their worshipping publicly among the whites. This is the greater evil, as few of them are prepared to instruct their fellows; and even their assemblies for that purpose, are discouraged as dangerous.\*

Thus far Mr. Paxton. This then, as some would have us believe, is the school of freedom—the place in which men are to be so fitted for its possession as not to abuse it when once put into their hands!

But let us hear a second witness, the Rev. Samuel Crothers of Ohio.

'It is amusing to hear the privilege of the slaves, as regards religious instruction, brought forward to balance the sin of holding them in bondage; especially in a country where rulers are making it penal to instruct

\* Letters, pp. 130, 131, 132.

them. The writer of these remarks, spent *nearly twenty years in a slave region*; and was more or less acquainted with, perhaps, some hundred slaveholding families.\* He avers, that in every family possessed of any considerable number of slaves, so far as his knowledge extended, either all, or some of the slaves, were unable to read the Bible; grossly ignorant of the christian religion; in the habit of absenting themselves from family worship, and the house of God; and living, uncontrolled by their masters, in the open profanation of the Sabbath. The apology from both ministers and people was—**IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR A MASTER TO TRAIN HIS SLAVES TO THE KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE OF RELIGION.** Nor is it believed that this was, in a single instance, a deliberate falsehood. It is the sober truth; and it is easily accounted for. An ignorant American never hates Mahometanism, till he has an Arab master. A stupid African never feels so strong an aversion to Christianity, as when he finds himself stripped of his dearest rights, and in chains, rivetted upon him by the hands of a christian. Slaves, throughout the world, are men; and they have common sense enough to know, that religion, to be worth any thing, must make its possessor an honest man. They, therefore, spurn the proposal with indignation, when a man, who is thriving by robbing his neighbors, offers to take them by the hand, and lead them to heaven. That minister in the south who, by marriage, has become the owner of hundreds of slaves, and has it blazoned among the churches as an evidence of his heavenly mindedness—that he takes no stipend, but expends his whole ministerial labors among his own slaves, is just telling the world that he has played the fool with his ministry. We have no doubt that, with his Bible and cow-skin, he can make his congregation understand what *he means* by one text—*servants be obedient to your masters.*\* Account

\* It has been said in his defence, that he employs an overseer, and attends to nothing himself, but preaching. That is, he preaches to his congregation personally, and cowskins them by proxy; and if an overseer does it, he will do it faithfully.

for it as you will, slaveholders tell the truth when they say, it is impossible for them to train their slaves to the knowledge and practice of religion.\*

But perhaps I shall be told, that the experiment of instructing the slaves preparatory to their freedom has never, as yet, been fairly tried in this country—that the public mind is just beginning to awake to the subject, and that I ought not therefore, to be too hasty in my conclusions, but should rather wait to see the result of the present movements in respect to the matter.

It is rather strange that nothing has ever been done—especially when the plea of non-qualification has been so often, and for such a length of time, urged as one grand reason for non-manumission. Slaveholders have told us, time out of mind, to wait, wait until their slaves were qualified for freedom, and yet it seems they have not, to this day, made a fair experiment at qualification! But a fair experiment has been made in the English colonies, if not here. Instead of waiting then for a whole generation to die, in order to see the result of present movements, suppose we condescend to learn a little from the experience of others.

If, in our slave States, there were various laws in force, requiring instead of forbidding the instruction of slaves; if the national and state governments, acting in concert, were to adopt various measures and make various appropriations of money, in order to carry those laws into effect; and if, in addition to all the rest, various benevolent societies should undertake the work of co-operation, &c. &c.—that, I suppose, would be considered a state of things, in which the experiment of preparing slaves for freedom by means of instruction

\* Crother's *Strictures*, p. 33.

could be fairly and fully tried. But this is the very state of things in which the experiment has been tried in the West Indies. What then is the result of experiment there? Let us hear the witnesses.

George Thompson, England.

'I am aware of the efforts made to persuade the public into a belief that the planters are anxious for the instruction of their slaves. The law of Jamaica contained in the slave code of February, 1831, is appealed to as a triumphant answer to all who express a doubt of the planters' sincerity. The clause is as follows: "And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all owners, proprietors, and possessors, or, in their absence, the managers or overseers of slaves, shall, as much as in them lies, *endeavor the instruction of their slaves in the principles of the Christian religion, whereby to facilitate their conversion, and shall do their utmost endeavors to fit them for baptism,* and, as soon as conveniently can be, cause to be baptized all such as they can make sensible of a duty to God and the Christian faith." I acknowledge that a glance at this enactment would be likely to inspire one uninitiated in the arts of Colonial trickery, with an idea, that the legislators of Jamaica, and the planters generally, are favorable, nay, solicitous, for the conversion of their slaves: and such an one might be ready to say, "Allow this law to take its course, let time be given, and the slaves will be instructed, and Christian liberty as well as civil, will soon dawn upon the island of Jamaica." But let it be known, that time *has* been afforded for making a full experiment of this law. It was not passed for the first time in 1831. It was inserted in the slave code of 1829: nor was that its first appearance. It stood prominently forth in the code of 1816: nor was that the period of its first promulgation. In 1778 did this law stand upon the statute-book of that island: nor was it then that, for the first time, it demonstrated the pious anxiety of the slaveholder:—it was in 1696, 137 years ago, that this law was enacted for the benefit of the slave. You

perceive that every individual exercising control over a slave is bound, by this law, to provide for the instruction of such slave in the principles of the Christian religion. Now, let us see how far the present practice corresponds with this ancient obligation. I hold in my hand a faithful account of the number of slaves upon 24 estates in the parish of St. Andrew, together with the degree and description of instruction imparted; from which I find, that out of 4,891 slaves, 140 only are taught to read, 1551 are orally instructed by book-keepers—a class of men as utterly unfit to take the religious oversight of slaves as can be found upon the face of the earth,—and 2,900 are allowed no instruction whatever; and it should be known, that 356 of them belong to an English nobleman, who, in his place in the House of Commons, has again and again declared, that a religious education is necessary to prepare the negro for the enjoyment of civil liberty. Away, then, with such hypocritical professions; it is time that such impositions were brought to an end. Here is a law imposing a solemn obligation on every slave manager to impart Christian knowledge to the slave, and yet it has recently been asserted by one of their representative agents in this country, that not one in a thousand of the negro population can, at this moment, comprehend the nature of an oath. We are therefore compelled either to regard the negro as a being incapable of receiving religious instruction; or his master as a wicked and hypocritical tyrant.\*

But perhaps Mr. Thompson is mistaken in his facts, as well as somewhat severe in his language. Will you please to state, Mr. Thompson, where you obtained your facts?

Mr. Thompson. *From the Christian Record of Jamaica, the editors of which, state what they themselves have seen and known. And if you wish for farther evidence on this point, from the same authority, you may*

\* Address to the Ladies of Glasgow and its Vicinity, p. 17, 18.



consult the *Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter*, (London) for the year 1831, pp. 122, 128, and 486, where, among other things, you will find the following quotations from the *Christian Record*.

‘But we may again be told, that in certain districts vast numbers of slaves bend their way, every Lord’s day, to their several places of worship. But it is well known, that even in those districts where the disposition for religious exercises among the slaves is most favorable, the numbers who do actually attend their several places of worship on Sundays bear but a very small proportion to those who ought to attend, and who, there is every reason to believe, *would attend, if they had the opportunity.* Consult, in proof of this, the memoranda of those clergymen and other ministers of the gospel, who have applied themselves, with diligence, to the instruction and conversion of the slave population. It will then be ascertained, that barely *one-fourth* even of the Christian professors and catechumens attend their several places of worship, each Sunday, on an average of the whole year: that is to say, each attends on the average, thirteen Sundays out of the fifty-two. We do not make this statement at random; it is supported by stubborn facts.

‘Such is the state of things which has existed for more than a century; and even since *the bishop and an augmented number of clergy were introduced into this island, in the year 1825, including an arch-deacon, and latterly three rural deans.*’

‘It may perhaps be objected here, that the colonists are not generally opposed to the religious instruction of the negroes; on the contrary, that a considerable number of them permit and encourage the system of *oral instruction*, which we have described. True: but we have reason to fear that the more intelligent of them do so, because they are well aware of *its inefficiency to bring about the proposed end.* They know that mere oral instruction of that kind produces but little effect upon its subject.’

And again, 'Since the Report of the Conversion Society was reviewed in our last number, our attention has been called to an article in the Christian Record of Jamaica, (for April 1831, No. 8,) which remarkably confirms all the observations we have ventured to make upon it, and even goes beyond us, in depreciating the good effected, among the slaves, by means of that Society. The Editor exhibits, among other things, a document which, if it be true, is decisive on the subject; and he boldly challenges an investigation of its correctness. It is a detailed and specific enumeration of the slaves in Jamaica, who, in 1829, were receiving a "lettered and effective education," (!) "in connection with the established church;" and it amounts on the whole, out of a population of 330,000, to 601. "of whom 391 are educated by the Church Missionary Society, and 210 by the Bishop and the rest of the establishment." That is to say, for an annual sum of about 9,600*l.* expended from the public purse on the ecclesiastical establishment of Jamaica, aided by the funds of the Societies for the Conversion of Slaves and for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 210 negro slave children are being taught letters, so as to be put in the way of being able to read their bibles!

This then is the result of experiment in the West Indies. There has been one other experiment tried there under circumstances more favorable still. I refer to the experiment on what is called the "Codrington Estates," situated in the island of Barbadoes. Col. Codrington, it seems, some 120 years since, gave these estates in trust for some literary institution, to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. A prominent motive for giving them up to the management of this religious society was to secure religious instruction to the slaves.

'But what has the Society been doing since 1710, when the bequest was made them?

It has been preparing to obey God, as soon as might be prudent or convenient, by first preparing the Negroes for liberty.

Here are my poor, said God, they have been oppressed—I put them into your hands. ‘Let them go, that they may serve me.’

We will, replied the Society, as soon as we have fitted them for it.

So, thirty years rolled away, a generation passed into eternity, and the next generation was still enslaved, and still not fitted.

‘Let my people go,’ said God, in 1740, ‘that they may serve me.’

‘They are not ready yet,’ replied the Society.

A third generation rose in 1770, and again God said—‘Let my people go, that they may serve me.’

‘We are getting them ready,’ replied the Society, ‘as fast as we can. Do pray give us two generations more, for to tell you the truth, we want them to serve ourselves a little longer, and to make money for us, that we may build a college, and educate the white youths.’

‘Another generation passed into eternity unredressed; and then another; and still the Society, instead of obeying, is only *preparing* to obey.’

‘But perhaps there is something in the Society for Propagating the Gospel, which makes it an exception to all general rules?’

Where is it?’

‘Can we find it in any peculiar or unnatural *difficulties* with which the Society has had to contend?’

Not at all. But on the contrary, it has been singularly and largely aided by the collections repeatedly sanctioned for it by the highest authorities, and it has received and acknowledged the most solemn and affectionate warnings.

And now, amidst all these facts, what is the spectacle which it is exhibiting?

Why, that after a set of the most honorable and accomplished men in the world, many of them dignitaries and ministers of a Christian Church, with every means which

*wealth, and learning, and power could give them, during a course of 120 years, in order to prepare their poor unoffending Negro fellow subjects for liberty, have professedly done all they could do for that purpose, the same need of preparation as formerly is still insisted upon, for continuing to keep them in bondage!* \*

Now in view of all this testimony, and these facts, I repeat the position with which I started—viz. that if the slaves are not qualified for freedom now, to retain them in bondage is the very way to prevent their ever being qualified, all well-meant attempts to the contrary notwithstanding; and I aver that the position is established beyond all dispute. Not that I would imply that no instruction has been given, and no negroes converted and saved. Something considerable of this sort has doubtless been done in the West Indies. But after all, the slaves are not qualified for freedom, i. e. in the judgment of their masters, nor are the masters ready to set them free. The plea of non-qualification is urged as strenuously as ever, and in point of fact, in respect to the great mass, is as valid as ever. And so, from the nature of the case, as I have shown, it must ever be. The master knows perfectly how far he can allow his slaves to be instructed, and yet retain them in bondage. So far he will allow them to be instructed, and no farther. This will ever be true of the great majority of masters, so long as you neglect to lay the axe at the root of the evil, and allow the lawfulness of slavery itself.

I have dwelt the longer on this point, because I deem it important, especially at the present time, that the friends of human rights in this land should husband

\* C. Stuart's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. London, Jan. 2, 1831.

*their strength.* We have no energies to waste in the chase of phantoms. We cannot afford to be diverted, from the main object, by eloquent speeches and touching appeals about plans of instruction, qualification, &c. The wrong of withholding inalienable rights—the iniquity of the *principle* involved therein, is more eloquent and touching than aught else. This too, be it remembered, is the only truly vulnerable spot in the whole system of slavery. It is at this then, that we must drive with steady, concentrated and well-directed energy. There are stratagems in this war as well as in others. Let us not be diverted by them, but let us drive with a steady aim and with all our might at the very root of the evil—the *fundamental principles of slavery.*

And farther, besides diverting attention from the main object, all attempts at instruction are a real evil in another respect. 'Though they can never secure the supposed necessary qualification for freedom, yet they may, to a limited extent, succeed in making the slave acquainted with some of those simpler and more important religious truths, which are essential to his salvation. And this, it is cheerfully admitted, is, on some accounts, an important point gained, while at the same time, on other accounts it is a *real evil.* And the reason is obvious. It serves to cover up the deformities of slavery itself, to polish off the roughness and ugliness of its features, and thus to make the impression on the public mind that slavery, after all, is not so bad a thing, but is, on the whole, quite tolerable. It is the white-washing of a sepulchre, making it appear fair and beautiful without, but at the same time leaving it full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness within. In a word, it serves only to dress up this worst of human

things in a fair exterior, and thus hide its fundamental principles from the public gaze.\* Now as I said, the friends of human rights have no strength to waste. The question in hand is not one of treatment, kind or cruel. It is solely a question of principle, and therefore what is wanted, is to keep the public eye intent upon *the principle*, **THE PRINCIPLE, THE PRINCIPLE.** In this way, and this only, the public conscience can be aroused, the dormant sympathies and energies of the public mind be quickened into action, the public sentiment be revolutionized, and its resistless power be so concentrated on a single point, as speedily to sweep away every vestige of slavery from our land, and make it, in truth, the land of the free and the home of the oppressed.

\* Speech of Ralph Wardlaw, D. D. pp. 11, 12, delivered at the Glasgow Anti-Slavery Meeting, Nov. 11th, 1840.

‘But let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, while we are talking about the evils that are attendant upon slavery—that slavery itself is an evil: a greater evil than them all. It is the parent of them, it is true; and as the parent of them it is evil. But it is in its own nature evil: and the evils that spring from it are only the indications of this. They are the deadly streams of a fountain of death. The thorns and poisons that are indigenous to this soil, are only proofs that the soil itself is under a curse. Let us never, Sir, allow ourselves, by any illusory representations of the kindly treatment and the many outward comforts of the slave, to be beguiled into the conception, to which they are intended to lead us, that slavery itself is but a name!—that the substance of comfort lies in what is actually enjoyed, and not in a mere designation. Never was there more wretched sophistry—never a more perilous conclusion.’ ‘We cannot be satisfied with alleviations and improvements. We are pleased with them, for the temporary good they do to the poor victims of slavery: yet in one sense, it has been truly remarked, they do harm, because they lessen the general horror of slavery itself. We cannot be satisfied with diminishing, or sweetening, or cutting off, some of the streams of bitterness—we must stop up the fountain. We cannot be satisfied with “skinning and filming the ulcerous sore,” with applying softening purgents or cooling lotions, while “rank corruption” continues to “mine within.” Cost us what it will, we must have a thorough healing.’

**OBJECTION 4.** *It is said that slavery 'is entailed upon the present generation of slaveholders,' and therefore that present slaveholding is not sin.*

It is in point to ask here, what entailment means. The plea is often urged, and with the confidence of a self-evident truth, but for myself I have never yet met with any thing like a definition of its meaning.\* *What then does the objector mean when he talks of entailment? Does he mean merely that parents of the former generation have willed their slaves as property to their sons of the present? If so, is the son obliged to receive them? Or if he receives them under his care, is he obliged to receive them as property? Or if he must thus receive them, is he obliged to retain them as such? The moment they come into his hands, are they not under his control, and has he not therefore the right to do what he will with them, and put them at once, if he chooses, on the footing and under the treatment of free, hired laborers?*

Is it said that such are uniformly the conditions of the will, and such the customs and laws of society, that the son has no alternative—no option or power of

\* The following quotations will justify this remark, and show also, that the slaveholder and his apologist resort to this as a silencing argument against the sin of present slaveholding.

'Even slavery must be viewed as a great national calamity; a public evil entailed upon us by untoward circumstances.'

'Slavery is an evil which is entailed upon the present generation of slaveholders, which they must suffer whether they will or not.'—*Am. Rep.* vol. v. pp. 89, 179.

'The present generation did not produce and are not therefore responsible for the existence of the present form of society in our southern communities.'

'They [abolitionists] confound the misfortunes of one generation with the crimes of another.'—*Am. Rep.* vol. vii. pp. 196, 202.

What a pity that Adam cannot be held responsible for all the sin that ever did or will exist on the earth! *He introduced it!*

choice in the case, but whether willing or not, and even in spite of his will, must both receive and retain them as slaves. All this must be said, or the plea of entailment is worthless. If the entailment be not of such a kind, i. e. if slavery be not entailed in such a sense as to involve a *physical* impossibility that it should be otherwise, then it is not entailed in such a sense as to furnish the least excuse or justification of its present continuance. This is plain common sense. To pretend otherwise is as absurd as to pretend that intemperance or any other sin, although not entailed in the sense of physical or natural necessity, is yet so entailed that, in existing circumstances, it is not sin. No plea of entailment is valid which does not involve a *physical inability*, in the strict sense of the phrase. What then is fact in the case? Is slavery thus entailed on the present generation?

If a freeman of the North were to go to the South, and there voluntarily (and it must be voluntarily if at all), conform to the customs of society, and purchase for himself a gang of slaves, or receive them from some friend as a gift, and then from this stock proceed to the business of raising slaves, could he plead entailment in justification of his conduct? Plainly not—even though his friend should take an oath, that he would turn those slaves adrift on society the next hour if he did not receive them. The man that *voluntarily* buys his slaves, or receives them as a gift from another, or from this stock raises them for himself, cannot plead entailment of any kind—much less a kind that renders him innocent in so doing. Nor is the case altered one whit, even if that other be his father. In order to make the plea of entailment valid, therefore, the



present slaveholder must show, among other things, 1, that he did not buy his slaves, 2, that he was not voluntary in receiving them from the hand of his father, and 3, that he did not raise them for himself. What then is fact in the case? Take away from the present generation of slaveholders all the slaves that they have bought for themselves—all that they have voluntarily received from others, and all that they have raised for themselves—i. e. kidnapped on their own plantations, and how many slaves would remain, in respect to whom it could be said, in any sense, that slavery is entailed? The number would be small.

But let us look at the subject in another point of view—*What is the thing that is entailed?* What is it, that is so handed down from father to son, as that the son, 'nill or will' must receive and retain it? Not the care merely of a hundred or more human beings: for there are various kinds of care. The owner of a large manufacturing establishment may have hundreds under his care, and when he dies may leave them to the care of his son, and do it in such circumstances, that if the son fail to exercise that care and provide for them by giving them employment, they will be turned adrift on the world, uncared for, and destitute of the means of support. But this is not slavery, or slavery entailed. What then, is it, that is entailed? The objector says slavery? But what is slavery? And here it should be remembered, that slavery has respect to two classes of men—the master and the slave. Our present inquiry respects the master. What then is slavery as it respects the master? What, but an assumed right of property in man, acting itself out in corresponding treatment of its victim? What, but the single princi-

ple, that in some cases, at one's own discretion, man may hold his fellow-man as property? This principle in theory, is slavery in theory; in practice, is slavery in practice. This one principle, adopted as a *theoretical and practical principle*, is slavery. All beside is slavery acted out. If then slavery be entailed at all, this is the thing that is entailed. For, take this away, and whatever else may be entailed on the son, slavery is not. The human beings that his father leaves to his care, cease to be slaves and he ceases to be a slaveholder, the moment that he, in theory and practice, gives up this one principle, and adopts its opposite. What if his father does leave a hundred or more human beings to his care? There is more than one kind of care. The mere transfer of these beings to his care is not itself a transfer of the father's *principles of action* in respect to them. The matter then comes just to this. Slavery in the father is this principle of property in man, adopted and acted on as a practical principle. If then it be entailed on the son, this practical principle of the father is the thing that is entailed. And the question therefore comes to this—can a father, in any case, transfer his principles of action to his son, without and in spite of that son's consent? Can he make his principles of action over to his son, so that the son cannot but receive them, and adopt and act on them *as his own*, whether he will or not? The supposition is *absurd*. The very nature of the case forbids the idea of his being *involuntary* in the matter. He cannot be a slaveholder, except as he adopts for himself and acts on the principle of property in man, and he cannot adopt and act on this as a practical principle, except by the exercise of volition or choice. If he

receives the slave as a slave, and retains and treats him as such, he does by that very act voluntarily consent to the principle of slavery that, in existing circumstances, it is good, and adopt it as his own voluntary principle of action. It is as much a matter of consent and choice with him, as it was with the first slaveholder that ever existed.

But more than this—how came the father by an equitable and just right of property in his slaves? Of whom did he obtain it? Not from God, for God never gave such a right. Not from *his* father, for how could *his* father give what neither he nor any one else ever possessed? How then has it come about that principles of action, which were wrong in the outset, have become right by being persisted in? How is it that sin has sinned itself into righteousness? What was the process of transformation? With what generation did it begin—the first, second, third, or fourth? What was the nature of the process—how did it proceed—and when was it completed?

‘Tell me not,’ says one, who ‘makes no distinction in point of absolute right, between the holding of slaves, (whether bought or inherited,) the purchase of slaves, selling of slaves, and the stealing of slaves, or in a word, downright kidnapping’—‘tell me not, that whatever may be the guilt of stealing a man, the son has a right to retain an inheritance of slaves. To the shame of our country, he has a legal right, I know; but in the sight of that God, who seeth not as man seeth, he has no right to retain what his father or relative had no right to buy, and what the seller had no right to obtain by his own or another’s *unrighteous* instrumentality. What is the right that can guarantee the possession or inheritance of stolen property? • • • • • Could a sovereign *justly* detain those in prison who had been *unjustly* confined by his predecessor?

But I am ready to say, that the slaveholder, *bating* particular aggravations of cruelty, is to all intents and purposes, a man stealer.\*

Is it insisted, then, that slavery is entailed? The plain answer is, it *cannot* be, in any such sense as cancels guilt. To suppose it, is to suppose 1, that a principle of action, wrong at the outset, can become right by transfer; and 2, that a principle of action, voluntarily adopted and acted on by the father, can be so handed over to the son, as to become his adopted and voluntary principle of action, and all without any consent of his—two absurdities as gross as were ever imagined.

Is it said, in reply, that the necessities of the case *compel* assent? The assertion is denied, and the proof of it is demanded. Whence originates such a necessity, and what constitutes it? Are the customs and opinions of society such a necessity? Why then do you call on the Pagan to renounce his idolatry? If the son, instead of receiving his father's slaves as slaves, and adopting his father's principles of action in

\* Recorder & Telegraph for July, 1825. Articles on Slavery by 'VIGORNERS.' No's 2 & 3. The Recorder does not print such sentiments now-a-days. Colonization, by the discussions it has provoked, and the progress of liberal principles, both together have so elevated the tone of public sentiment on the subject, that now it would be rank heresy, if not stark insanity, to promulge such doctrines. What! the slaveholder a 'man-stealer,' and on the authority of the Recorder too! What an 'incendiary' doctrine! What 'inflammatory' language! How it smacks of Garrison—that abominable Garrison! Why, good Gen. Washington, what is going to become of your character at this rate! This is turning the world upside down, and sitting in judgment on the great and good, with a witness! Alas! those were days of ignorance. Since that time, public sentiment has been on the advance. Colonization, &c. has moved it on with most gigantic strides, and the Recorder has now learned better than to say such horrible things. So peace to thy ashes, good General. The slaveholder is not a 'man-stealer' now

respect to them, were to receive them as men, and to put them at once on the footing and under the treatment of freemen, would he thereby strip himself of his property, and subject himself to most abject poverty and a thousand other serious inconveniences? What then? Is this, even if it were so, a necessity compelling and justifying what would otherwise be wicked? What then has become of that principle of the gospel, which requires a man to take the spoiling of his goods joyfully, and face danger in a thousand forms and death even, rather than swerve from fidelity to Christ? It has been well said, that *'the sacrifice of ill-gotten wealth is the sole necessity which can now exist.'*

Is it said that this cannot be, for that the laws, independent of all other things, constitute such a necessity and compel assent? Whom do the laws compel? Not the *community*. For that community make and perpetuate the laws, and it has only to speak the word, and they are at once repealed. The community, if it *choose*, can erase from the statute book at once every law that forbids emancipation, and, as the slaveholder would persuade himself, compels him to receive and retain human beings as slaves. Do the laws then compel the *individual*? Not in any such sense as cancels guilt. Do they forbid emancipation, except on condition of removal from the State? Then let him, the moment his father's slaves come into his possession, remove and take them with him, and put them at once on the footing of freemen, and exercise a guardian care over them in finding them suitable employment. One such removal would preach more to the consciences of slaveholders that remained, than fifty expeditions to Liberia. Or if he cannot do this, then let him give those

slaves a *real*, if not a legal emancipation on the spot. The moment that they come under his control, let him refuse to adopt his father's principles of action in respect to them—let him call them around him, inform them of his resolution, tell them that so far as *he* is concerned, he gives them their freedom; that he needs their labor and will employ them as hired laborers, and do all he can to instruct and elevate them if they will remain in his service; that such are the laws, that he cannot give them a legal freedom, and therefore if they leave his service, they will be taken up and sold as slaves to some one else, but still that they have their option whether to go or stay—I say let him do this, and he will thereby give those slaves a real, though not a legal emancipation. And if this provokes the jealousies and animosities of his neighbors, or brings him into collision with the laws, so be it. He must obey God rather than men. Less than this he cannot do, and be faithful to God. Trying, therefore, and self-denying as may be the duty, he is bound to meet it. Why, what if the legislature of a slaveholding State should enact laws forbidding the christian to pray, or read his bible, or keep the sabbath? Who would not feel it solemn duty to go to the stake, if need be, rather than obey such laws? What if such legislature, taking advantage of a perverted public sentiment tolerating it at the time, should enact a law requiring the stronger slaveholders to reduce the weaker to bondage, and then retain them and their posterity in bondage indefinitely on pain of confiscation and death? Who would not deem it duty to break such a law, and thus test its constitutionality at once? Or admitting its constitutionality, who would not deem it duty, if need were, to give his life a sacri-

fice, in order to show forth its obnoxiousness, and thus do what he could to correct the perverted sentiment out of which it originated? So at least did christian martyrs think and act in similar cases, in other days. Let not the slaveholder then plead that the laws compel his assent to the principles and practice of slavery. Whatever of compulsion there be, it is not of such a kind as cancels guilt. See that christian martyr. The fiat of a tyrant demands the renunciation of his religious principles. The instruments of torture have been tried in vain. Confiscation has not moved him. At length the faggots are piled together, the torch applied, and the flames beginning to rise around him. 'Will you renounce or will you not?' is the harsh inquiry of the iron-hearted executioner. And what is that martyr's answer?—that the laws compel assent? Never—with death, certain and speedy, staring him in the face—his decided answer is, 'I will never do it.' It is all idle in the slaveholder then to talk of necessity, and urge entailment as a canceling of his guilt. No such entailment is possible in the case. The only entailment that is possible, is the same as that which is common to all sin—an entailment that takes place through the voluntary consent of the individuals concerned, and is therefore of such a kind as makes the thing entailed their own, and they themselves personally responsible for it.

The whole matter may be thus illustrated. A. B. is the rightful sovereign of a large and extensive empire. C. D. is a rebel. Madly bent on the accomplishment of his own schemes of self-aggrandizement, he attempts, in ten thousand ways, to lead off his fellow subjects from allegiance to their lawful king, and attach them

to his interests. He succeeds. Province after province join the revolt and rally around him as their leader. The work of rebellion goes on, until, at length, the rightful sovereign is displaced, and the usurper seated upon the throne. The whole structure of society and all the relations thereof are thus changed. Things move on. The generation of men, that were the actors in this revolution, and the instruments of introducing this change in the structure and relations of society, is soon dead. In the mean time, the usurper has been consolidating the powers of his usurped dominion, and providing for its security and continuance by the enactment of various laws and the adoption of various measures, suited to that end. In this state of things, posterity comes upon the stage. They know, for their ears have heard it, and their eyes behold it, that the present king is an usurper, and that their allegiance belongs of right to another. What then is to be done? Shall they sit tamely down, and say usurpation is entailed on us; if we attempt to throw it off, it will be to change the whole structure of society, to subject ourselves to untold inconveniences, perhaps to overwhelm us in utter ruin, and therefore we are justified in upholding, or at least consenting to its present continuance? Never. That posterity are bound to take their stand at once on the side of loyalty to the rightful sovereign. Not a moment is to be lost. They must rally at once, and change, if need be, the whole structure of society and its relations back to their original condition. And if they will not do it, but instead thereof, sit tamely and silently down under the usurpation, their very silence gives consent to its existence, and makes it and its guilt their own. Acting as a com-



community that posterity is bound to throw off the usurpation at once. But what shall the *individual* do? Take his stand at once as an individual. Whatever the inconveniences to which he may subject himself, *he must take his stand*. The community itself will never take its stand as a community, until he and others lead the way by taking their stand as individuals. At the risk of consequences then, *he must take his stand as an individual*, else he ranks himself on the side of usurpation, consents to its existence, and becomes, WITH HIS EYES OPEN, a partaker of its guilt. The cases are exactly parallel.

Is it said that all this is fine-spun abstraction? Let us see then how plain practical common sense reasons.

‘A negro fellow, previous to the revolution, being suspected of having stolen goods in his possession, was taken before a certain justice of the peace in Philadelphia, and charged with the offence. The Negro acknowledged the fact, and made the following decisive defence: “Massa justice, me know me got dem things from Tom dere, and me tink Tom teal dem too; but what den Massa? dey be only a piccaninny knife and a piccaninny corkscrew; one cost sixpence, and tudder a shilling, an me pay Tom honestly for dem, Massa.” “A pretty story, truly,” said his worship: “you knew they were stolen, and yet allege for excuse, you paid honestly for them; I’ll teach you better law than that, sirrah: don’t you know, Pompey, the receiver is as bad as the thief? You must be severely whipt, you black rascal.” “Very well, Massa, if de black rascal be whipt, for buying tolen goods, me hope de white rascal be whipt too, for same ting, when you catch him, as well as Pompey.” “To be sure,” replied the justice.—“Well den,” says Pompey “here be Tom’s Massa, hold him fast, constable; he buy Tom, as I buy de piccaninny knife, and de piccaninny corkscrew. He know very well Tom be tolen from his old fadder and mud-

der, de knife and de corkscrew had neder.' Such was the justice, as well as the severity, of Pompey's address, that the Magistrate after a pause, dismissed him, and discharged the action.\*

Such is the reasoning of plain common sense. It is, that stolen property is stolen property, and that the partaker, though he be of the third or fourth generation, is still a partaker, and is as bad as the thief.

But let us advance a step farther--to matters of fact. In March of 1825, a writer in the Christian Spectator said, 'There can be no palliation for the conduct of those, who first brought the curse of slavery upon poor Africa, and poor America too. But the body of this generation are not liable to this charge. *Posterity are not answerable for the sins of their father, unless they approve their deeds.*' In the Recorder and Telegraph of Oct. 7, 1825, a 'Southern man' thus notices this passage—

'Would to God, Messrs. Editors, we could take the benefit of this saving clause. But I fear it will not prove such a safety-valve to us as the writer wishes. It unfortunately happens, that the present generation have "approved the deeds of their fathers." There was a time, previous to the penal arrest by Congress in 1808, of the importation of slaves into the United States, when Southern ports were closed by the edicts of Southern legislatures against this "first born of hell," this internal traffic. But that time did not endure. Cupidity got the better of conscience, and of regard to safety, and the legislature of South Carolina, (perhaps of other slaveholding states too,) threw the door wide open to the introduction of Africans, and hundreds and thousands were introduced by almost every eastern breeze, and were eagerly bought. *Legislatures of the present generation, therefore, have been*

\* Negro's Friend, No. 13. pp. 12, 13.

*guilty of this original sin.* And so far as the community were concerned in patronizing and appointing men of such a description to legislate for them, the community was guilty too. *And every one, who did not bear his decided testimony against it, and every minister of Jesus, who did not lift up his loud and warning voice, was a large sharer in the guilt.* Yes, the present generation are guilty, awfully guilty, and let us not "cover our sins, for we shall not prosper, but confess and forsake them, that we may have mercy." We certainly are under obligation to our Northern brethren for throwing *this* mantle of charity over our shoulders. But the mantle itself is transparent, and we still appear in the nakedness of our guilt.'

Such then is the testimony of a 'Southern man' in respect to the facts in the case. There can therefore be no mistake. The present generation have acted, and acted voluntarily, both as a community and as individuals, in respect to the present existence of slavery. It is absurd then—it is in face of facts to talk of its being entailed in any such sense as cancels guilt.

This leads me to say that, so far from being literally entailed, *slaveholding descends from father to son, not merely by voluntary consent, but under circumstances which heighten its guilt in every succeeding generation.* And the simple reason is, that whatever else may be true in the case, this also is true, that the son, in each succeeding generation, *sins against greater light and motive* than did the father, and therefore incurs greater guilt. Whatever mitigating circumstances may exist on the one hand, they are more than overbalanced by the single aggravating circumstance of greater light and motive on the other.

It is really painful, as well as surprising, to see how the prejudices, or fears, or interests of even good men

warp their judgment, and lead them to overlook the most obvious and self-evident principles. If, for example, Ananias and Sapphira are smitten to the earth for the sin of lying to the Holy Ghost, who needs to be informed that their case is designed as an example to deter others from the commission of that sin? If then, with their example staring me in the face, I venture recklessly on in their footsteps, what so self-evident as that my guilt is infinitely greater than theirs? And yet, this plea of entailment would only make it less. Even if I were their son, instead of a mere looker on, and were therefore so connected with them that their example should be a parent's example—one, therefore, that could not but make a more thrilling and impressive appeal to my heart than to any one's beside, yet this plea would only turn that example, with its thrilling appeal and its heart-rending admonition, into a mere apology for my sin.

Take another case. My father, falling in with the customs of society and following in the footsteps of his ancestors, lives and dies intemperate. His history, and that of his predecessors, is all before me. It is written on my memory so as never to be forgotten. Its every page is but the history of his darling sin—its ruinous, its damning tendencies, and effects. From earliest childhood I witnessed those tendencies, and felt those effects. I felt them in the nakedness, and hunger, and violence to which it subjected me. I saw and felt them in the poverty, ignorance, degradation, shame, and wretchedness of the family—in the sufferings, abuses, tears, agonies, and groans of my broken-hearted mother—in the cries, lamentations and sufferings of that little one, my sister,—and more than all, in the bloated

visage, ruined constitution, wasted health, loathsome diseases, seared conscience, hardened heart, raging appetites and ruthless passions of that monster, once a husband and a father. Nay, I stood by him in his dying hour. My mother, with an affection that no abuses could destroy, was bending over the wretched victim and ministering to his wants. At length he died. And in the delirium and trembling, and agonies, and groans, and shrieks of that hour, and in the thrill of anguish that rent my mother's heart as the guilty spirit sunk to hell, I more than ever saw and felt the ruinous and damning tendencies and effects of my father's sin. And yet that father's was not a solitary case. He did but follow in the footsteps of those before him and around him. Turn which way I will, therefore, and on every hand I meet with similar examples fraught with similar instruction. They gather thick around me. Past and present are both alike full of them. And yet with all these examples staring me in the face, and flashing the conviction full upon me that there is death in the cup, I go reckless on, and quaff that cup to my own undoing. Now what so self-evident as the fact that my guilt is infinitely greater than that of my predecessors in crime? And yet this plea of entailment does but turn all these examples, with their appalling admonitions, into mere apologies for my sin! It allows me to put the suicidal cup to my lips, and yet proclaim my innocence, though the tears of a broken-hearted mother, and the miseries of a ruined family, are yet before my eyes, and the death-shrieks of a self-murdered father are yet ringing in my ears! The case is perfectly in point. Away then with the idea that slaveholding is so entailed as to cancel guilt. The very reverse is the fact.

Be it so, that there are mitigating circumstances—that the son, if he take his stand and refuse to adopt the principles and the practices of his father, must do so at the risk of great sacrifices and inconveniences—what then? This is more than counterbalanced by the strong light shed upon the subject from the past. There is no sin, and from the nature of the case, there can be none, the abandonment of which does not require self-denial, greater or less, according to the circumstances of the case or the nature of the sin. Who can tell the inconveniences and the struggles to which that son must needs subject himself, who takes his stand against the example and influence of his intemperate father and his companions in crime? Who can estimate aright the tide of influence he must stem—the host of difficulties with which he must contend? In every case of sin,

• • • • • *facilis descensus Averno.*

• • • • •  
*Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad auras,*  
*Hoc opus, hic labor est.\** • • • • •

The only difference is, that the more abominable the sin, the more easy is the descent, and the more difficult the work of retracing one's steps. To talk of the difficulties therefore in the way of reformation, as if these constituted a necessity for continued sin, and thus entailed it on posterity, is to talk utter nonsense. These very difficulties are the legitimate fruits of the sin, and accumulating and multiplying as they do with every step of progress in the sin, they are only so many lights revealing its hideousness. They are but so many voices from heaven, bidding its guilty perpetrators abandon it at once, and begin to bring forth fruits meet for repentance.

\* The descent to hell is easy, but to retrace one's steps, that is the difficulty.

The truth is, no sin, and least of all that of slaveholding, can be practised from generation to generation without bringing forth results that shall throw the clear light of unclouded day upon it, and stripping it of all disguise, set it forth in all its ugliness and deformity. To talk then of mitigating circumstances in the case as a set-off against this light and the motive embodied in it—why, it is as if a man should stand at the mouth of the bottomless abyss, and with the smoke of its torment rolling up before him, should yet persist in his sin, and then gravely talk of the mitigating circumstances in the case! No; the single circumstance of increased light and motive swallows up every other, and brings a darker guilt and a deeper damnation on him that disregards and sins against it. How strange that great, and good men too, should ever overlook these self-evident principles! Yet so it is.

But this is not the worst of the matter—in overlooking these, they overlook one of the most obvious, and at the same time, fearful principles of God's providential administration—that of *visiting on one generation the sins of preceding generations*. The fact that God does this is not to be doubted. He even announces it, as a prominent characteristic of his administration, that he is 'a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him.' Hence it was, when 'the wickedness of man had become great in the earth,' that God broke up the fountains of the great deep, and opened the windows of heaven, and swept the earth with a flood. Hence it was, when the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah had become 'great,' and their sin 'very grievous,' that then the Lord rained upon them 'brimstone

and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and overthrew those cities, and all the plain and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground,' so that 'the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace.' The generation then existing had filled up the measure of their fathers' iniquity, and upon them, therefore, it was, that God poured out those judgments without mercy that had been slumbering indeed, but yet gathering for ages.

So it was with the devoted Canaanites. When Abram first visited their land, their iniquity was '*not yet full,*' and God therefore did not give him possession. But when it was full—when a generation arose, by whose abominations the measure of their fathers' iniquity was filled up, then came the '*day of visitation.*' And so also was it with the Jews. Age after age, God waited on them. He sent them '*prophets and wise men and scribes,*' to turn them from their wickedness, and some they killed, and some they crucified, and some they scourged in their synagogues, and some they persecuted from city to city. At length a generation arose that built the tombs of the prophets, and garnished the sepulchres of the righteous, and said, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets; and yet, with this plea on their lips, imbrued their hands in the blood of the Son of God. Not this man but Barabbas was the decision of the nation. That was their crowning sin. That was the filling up of the measure of their iniquity. That brought upon them all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom they slew between the temple and the altar. Then came the '*day of vengeance.*' Their



judgment lingered not. Their damnation slumbered not. 'Wrath came upon them to the uttermost.'

And thus doubtless it will be to the end of time. True, 'the acceptable year of the Lord' will move on, side by side, with 'the day of vengeance of our God;' and in this way, God will redeem and save, from among the children of men, a 'great multitude which no man can number.' At the same time, this same principle of administration will continue to regulate the movements of his providence down to the last guilty generation of men. That will be a generation whose sins will be committed against the light of the example and experience of countless generations before them. Their guilt will therefore far exceed that of their predecessors, and God, true to the principles of his administration, will then come to judgment on a larger scale and in more awful terrors than ever before. That will be 'the great day of his wrath.' It 'will come as a thief in the night.' In its progress 'the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burnt up.' It will not only be 'the day of wrath,' but also the day of the 'revelation of the righteous judgment of God.' It will show out to the universe, so as it was never shown before, the great, the appalling fact, that each generation of sinners, whatever its particular sin, sins against greater light, incurs deeper guilt, and therefore must lie down under a heavier damnation than its predecessor; and that it is in this way and on this account, that God visits on one generation the sins of another.

And yet plain and obvious as is this principle of the divine administration—written in sunbeams as it is, on

the pages of God's word, and on every opening leaf of his providence.—this plea of entailment entirely overlooks it. It puts out the light that shines on the present from the past, and, loving darkness rather than light, attempts to hide sin behind circumstances of its own creation. It even puts in a plea of innocence, and talks of peace and safety, at the very moment when the measure of iniquity is filling up, and destruction without remedy is standing at the door.

Suppose we come to the case in hand—our own system of slavery. Slavery, it is admitted, is a great evil—a curse even; and the people of the South feel it, it is said, more sensibly than we at the North can do. It is '*an evil which presses them more sorely than can enter into our most benevolent conception.*'\* They even groan under it; but then, it is entailed on them, and how are they to be blamed for it?

How are they to be blamed! Why what are the facts in the case? Are there various mitigating circumstances? And what else, what aggravating circumstances are there? First, there is the light of the Bible, shining with increased and increasing brightness upon the subject. Next, there is the light of the Constitution, meeting the slaveholder at every step, and flashing on his mind the conviction of inconsistency and guilt. Next, there is the light of public sentiment at home, and more especially abroad; and last, not least, there is *the light of past and of gathering judgments.*

Slavery is a curse, and the people of the South, though not perhaps aware of the real cause of their distress, do groan under it. And these groans are

\* Mr. Danforth. Boston Recorder, June 12, 1833.

waxing louder and louder. Jehovah's slumbering damnations are awaking, and his lingering judgments make haste.

'God comes! God, in his car of vengeance, comes!'

Else what mean those sterile lands, and bankrupt estates, and that blasted prosperity? What mean that reckless scepticism, and rank impiety, and abominable licentiousness, and sensual gratification, and beastly indulgence, so rife among them? What mean those fearful forebodings, those nightly patrols, those pistols under the pillow, those dreams of insurrection and carnage and blood, and those fears, that agonize the soul when the slumbers of midnight are broken up by the cry of fire? And, to say nothing of judgments direct from Jehovah's hand, what mean those actual insurrections, and that unwonted movement of the moral and political elements of society, as if its deep foundations were soon to be uprooted, and all its elements to be thrown into chaotic agitation? These are not unmeaning signs. He that runneth may read and understand. Our brethren of the South are conscious of their meaning, and though they may not formally acknowledge it, still in their every movement they do virtually say, a volcano is underneath us, and the hour is hastening on when it will pour desolation over the land.

Talk you then of entailment? Run your eye back upon the past, and in the results of involuntary servitude in other lands and other ages—nay, in its results in our own land and our own age, read the fact that this plea is not valid with God.\* Or, if not content with this, look out upon God's gathering judgments, and read it there.

\* See Appendix A.

Q

Talk you then of entailment? It will not avert the thunderbolts of heaven. Entailed or not entailed, God's providence will hasten on to judgment. Unless speedy repentance take place, the time is not distant, when, in the language of a Virginian, 'the same breeze that fans our harvest—that plays among the leaves of the cane and the corn, will rustle banners of war. By the side of implements of agriculture, employed in works of peace, will appear the gleam of arms.' There is no avoiding it. Of American slaveholders it may be said with emphasis—'Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.' You have sinned against such light, and in the face of such warnings, that your guilt far transcends that of your predecessors in crime. You have done it, and you persist in doing it with your eyes open. You cannot therefore escape the righteous judgments of God. They will overtake you. No plea of entailment will turn them back. They will hasten on. Clouds of vengeance, dark and dreadful, will veil the sky. Lurid fires will dart athwart their dark and gathering folds, and muttering thunders will utter their voices. Then talk of entailment if you will; but will those thunders listen? Will those fires put out their blaze? Will those clouds scatter? Will God turn back from judgment? I tell you nay. Those clouds will put on new terrors, and let fall fiercer thunderbolts; and yet for all this, God's anger will not be turned away, but his hand be stretched out still.'

The plea of entailment, then, is empty as the wind. But what if it were not? Admit that slavery is entailed on the present generation, *are they therefore justified in entailing it on the next?* If it were so wicked in their fathers to entail it on them, how can they be in-

nocent, if they do the same to their children? Their fathers, in many cases, doubtless, thought it a precious inheritance and therefore left it to them. They know, and if what they say be true, feel that it is the heaviest of curses. It *'presses upon them more sorely than can enter into our most benevolent conceptions.'* And yet, for aught that they have done or are doing, they are going, with their eyes open, to leave this curse as a legacy to their children! How then can they be innocent? What if it does cost them some effort—subject them to some inconveniences, and demand some moral courage and self-denial, to take a stand and throw off the curse, and save their children from its inheritance? It will demand the same, and even more of those children; and now, groaning as they do under the evil themselves, have they not affection enough for their children to make the effort, and subject themselves to the inconveniences requisite in order to throw it off? Are they *'destitute of natural affection?'* Plainly, whatever other guilt they may throw back on their ancestors, they cannot throw back this. In this respect, they stand condemned on their own confession. For every charge of guilt they throw back on their fathers, for entailing the evil on them, and they are quite liberal in such charges, is a charge of guilt upon themselves if they consent to entail it on their posterity. There is no escape from this. Away then with this plea forever; at least until some decisive measures are adopted, by which slavery shall cease with the present generation. Until this is done, I insist upon it, that the man or the community that urges this plea, does but *'speak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for him.'*

Why, what if the present process should go on, and slavery should be handed down from generation to

generation, until the clear light of millennial day should shine upon it and reveal its ugliness? Would not the plea of entailment, if valid at all, grow more and more valid with each succeeding generation? Does not the objector suppose that it is more valid with the present than with any preceding generation? Why then shall it not continue to become more and more so, with every subsequent one? But does any man, does the objector even, imagine that a slaveholder can stand up amid the blazing light of the millennium, and wash his hands in innocency by this plea of entailment? Why not? Why not throw guilt back upon the past, and repentance on the future, and bring in the verdict of not guilty for the present, then, as well as now? What has the light of millennial day to do with the matter? Why not throw that out of the account, and talk of mitigating circumstances, and call slavery an 'evil,' a 'misfortune,' a 'calamity,' an 'unfortunate state of society,' &c. &c. then, as well as now? How is it that the old adage, 'the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge,' is valid only or chiefly with the present generation, while past and coming generations are doomed to bear their own iniquity? There must be some mistake in the philosophy.

So far from apologizing, therefore, for the sin of present slaveholding, I would adopt the language of another,\* and say, 'let the slaveholder know, what the thunders of avenging Heaven will one day teach him, that he is more deeply guilty than his predecessors in crime. He breathes their spirit, and adopts their habits, and exhibits their character, amidst clearer light than they abused. Their history furnishes him with

\* Prof. Green's Sermons, pp. 28, 29.

weighty lessons of instruction, which he ventures to disregard; urges, as in peals of thunder, impressive warnings on him, which he madly neglects. While he refuses to let go the sufferers, whom he holds in bondage, he is "treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath." As he would escape the storm, which for ages has been gathering in the heavens, let him withdraw his hand from his brother's throat. And let those, who soothe the fears and hush the conscience of this wicked man, by prophesying in his ears their dreams about *entailed iniquity*, cease to deceive, and mislead, and destroy. Why will they palliate his crimes? Better try to save him from the judgments which certainly await him. Better hold up before his face his guilt and danger, and try to stop him in his mad career.'

## LECTURE III.

### THE REMEDY OF SLAVERY.

ACTS xvii: 18, 19, 20.—‘Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him; and some said, What will this babbler say?’

And they took him and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, May we know, what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?

For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean.’

One of the strange things which the babbler Paul brought to the ears of these *Philosophers*, was, that God had ‘made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth.’ The text, therefore, seems very pertinent to my present purpose. When told, that slaveholding is evermore wicked, that the slave, though black, is yet a man, and as such, entitled to possess the inalienable rights of man, and that sacred duty demands the immediate restoration of these rights, not a few, and some of them philosophers too, regard such sentiments as strange and monstrous things, and are ready to ask the man that utters them, what will the babbler say—what is this new doctrine whereof thou speakest?

It will be my object, in the present lecture, to answer this inquiry, in reference to the subject before us. I



have already spoken of the sin of slavery. I come now to the question of remedy. On this point, I hope to be able to tell you, what the new doctrine we speak of is, and what the strange things we utter mean, even if I do not succeed in convincing you of their correctness.

And here, let me say, that the time has evidently come, when this subject is to undergo a new and thorough investigation, among all classes of the community. Men are springing up, in every section of the land—men too, who are not to be cashiered as ‘babblers,’ or in the parlance of modern philosophers, as ‘visionary enthusiasts,’ ‘reckless incendiaries,’ &c.—men, whose sentiments are not to be set aside, or sneered out of existence, as being the result of fanaticism and overheated zeal—who tell us, that their former views upon the subject have been wrong, radically wrong, and that some new and more efficient means of remedy must speedily be adopted. They have re-investigated the subject. They have done it with fervent prayer for guidance from on high; and they have come to results at variance, or at least in advance of their former views. They now regard the matter of slaveholding as a sin, not merely in the abstraction of theory, but in actual and present practice. They are beginning to preach, and print, and talk of it as a sin; and laugh at them as it may, the whole community feels the effect thereof. Attention is awakened, discussion is elicited,—the right kind of discussion too, and not that of apology merely—the press and the pulpit are speaking, and the time has gone by, when the subject of slavery and its remedy can avoid the light, or escape the scrutiny of strict and general examination. The community will not and cannot be lulled to sleep much longer with cries

of 'hush,' hush,' 'careful,' 'careful.' Nor will it much longer be imposed on by cries of 'fanatic,' 'incendiary,' 'firebrand,' &c. on the one hand, or be frightened on the other by cries of 'danger,' 'insurrection,' 'blood.' On the contrary, it will claim the right of seeing for itself, on the subject; and if it be true, indeed, that slavery has grown up to such frightful maturity, as that remedy is out of the question, and we therefore are a ruined people, the community will insist on knowing it; or if there be yet a remedy, the community will insist on knowing what it is, and on its speedy application. The subject cannot escape a thorough and rigid investigation. It must and will be thoroughly sifted. The investigation is begun. It is going on, and cry 'hush' as much as you will, there is no stopping it.

And farther, the investigation has begun just where it ought; and just where we should expect it to begin. To my mind, it amounts almost to an axiom, that *the people of the North are better qualified to judge of the true nature, and hit upon the true and best remedy of slavery, than are the people of the South.* To be sure they have no power, and I trust, no desire to force any remedy on the South, without its own consent. Still they are most favorably situated to give an impartial judgment in the case, and therefore best qualified to hit upon and recommend the true and only remedy; and then they have the power and the right, nay, it is their solemn duty to urge that remedy on the voluntary acceptance of the South in every possible and lawful way. Who would think of setting the rum-selling and rum-drinking part of the community, to the work of devising and recommending the best remedy for intemperance? Who would set a community of slave-traders—

even if they were as honest as John Newton in the matter—to the work of devising and recommending the best and most efficient remedy for slave-trading? Or who would imagine, for a moment, that warped and blinded, as they must of necessity be, by interest, they would or could be the fittest and best judges on the question of remedy, though the remedy itself were devised and recommended by others? Why, then, suppose that slaveholders are the only, or the best qualified persons to hit upon, and recommend the proper remedy for slaveholding; or the best qualified to judge on the question of remedy, when proposed by others? Plainly they are not. Like us, they are men—men of like passions with us, and therefore, however honest they may be in other respects, when you come to the matter of slavery, their judgment will inevitably be warped by fear and interest, and long-established habits of thinking and feeling, just as are the judgments of other men in similar circumstances. The true remedy, therefore, if it is ever hit upon, must, as a matter of course, originate with those that are not personally interested or implicated in the sin, and be recommended by them to slaveholders, and pressed on their acceptance, by every possible consideration of duty and of interest.

But to the question of remedy, what is it? I remark,

1. *That whatever it be, it is to be determined on general principles, and not on the supposition of excepted cases.* How much reasoning there is of this kind, on this subject, you need not be told. One can hardly whisper the doctrine of immediate emancipation, but he is met at once by the supposition of some extreme

case, in which it is always *taken for granted*, that such emancipation would be certain ruin both to master and slave; and then, starting with this extreme case—the creature of interest, or a panic-struck imagination, by which all sorts of frightful things are conjured up—starting with this, as a fair representation of the slave-holding community generally, and a correct basis of reasoning, it is gravely inferred that such emancipation cannot be duty! Was ever reasoning more absurd?

You look out upon society, and see intemperance making its fearful havoc of the souls and bodies of men. On reflection, you are satisfied that the whole of it grows out of the habitual use of spirit, and that no remedy can be effectual which does not lay the axe at this root of the tree. You therefore take the ground that such use is wicked, and that the only true doctrine of reformation is the doctrine of immediate and entire abstinence. O no! says your neighbor, that will never do. There is friend A——; he has used spirit so long, and his habits are so confirmed, that he would not live a week without it. He would most certainly die. And then all his property is vested in the rum-trade, and if you should once carry your principle out, and stop all the people from drinking, he and his family would be town paupers at once. It would take the bread out of their very mouth. O sir! it will never do—that doctrine will never do—rely upon it. Very well, you reply, if what you say be true, as you *assume* it to be, then friend A——'s is an excepted case. There is no help for him; he must die, and his family be beggared; but he is not a fair representative of the whole community, nor even of all dram-drinkers; and I am deciding

on a remedy on general principles, and not on excepted cases. And besides, you have not yet *proved* that what you predict would be true even in the case of A. You have taken it for granted. It is all conjecture with you—the conjecture of ignorance, or interest, or fear. You *think* so, and that is all. You give us no *proof*.

So in the present case—the remedy for slavery is to be decided on general principles. Nothing is more weak and childish than to reason in respect to it, from some frightful supposition of an interested or frightened imagination. It is not the supposition of such extreme cases, that is to furnish the proper rule of judgment in the matter, even if all the frightful things which are imagined were to be realized as the actual result, and much less when they are only anticipated and conjectured evils.

And farther, it ought to be understood, that in applying the remedy, whatever it be, most men would have sense enough not to apply it to the worst cases first. And so, in this case in applying the doctrine of immediate emancipation, we do not intend to apply it to the worst cases first. We purpose to go first to that slaveholder whose mind is most open to conviction, and in whose case there are fewest obstacles to emancipation—fewest difficulties and fewest dangers, and ply his conscience with the doctrine, and when we have succeeded with him, we purpose to go to another, and ply his conscience, and add to all our other motives the example of his neighbor, and so on. And if in the end, we find some extreme cases that do not admit the possibility of remedy, without the direful results anticipated, all we can do is to meet them, and let the individual die in his sin, rather than abandon general principles

and thus sacrifice public to private good. Our business is with the public, and if, therefore, the scheme of remedy that is best for the public as a whole operates hardly here and there on the individual, it is indeed to be regretted, but nevertheless we must abide by general principles. It is better that one member perish than that the whole body be cast into hell. \*

\* 'In respect to the reformation of those over whom the habit of intemperance has obtained an ascendancy, there is but one alternative—they must resolve upon *immediate and entire abstinence*:

'Some have recommended, and many have attempted, a *gradual discontinuance*. But no man's prudence and fortitude are equal to the task of reformation in this way.' \* \* \* \*

'Retrenchments and substitutes then are idle, and if in any case they succeed, it is not in one of a thousand. It is the tampering of an infant with a giant, the effort of a kitten to escape from the paw of a lion.

'*There is no remedy for intemperance but the cessation of it.*'

'But what shall be done for those to whom it might be fatal to stop short? Many are reputed to be in this condition, probably, who are not—and those who are may, while under the care of a physician, be dealt with, as he may think best for the time, provided they obey strictly as patients his prescriptions. But if, when they are committed to their own care again, they cannot live without ardent spirits—*then they must die*, and have only the alternative to die as reformed penitents, or as incorrigibly intemperate—to die in a manner which shall secure pardon and admission to heaven, or in a manner which shall exclude them forever from that holy world.'

'The remedy, whatever it may be, must be *universal, operating permanently, at all times, and in all places*. Short of this, every thing which can be done, will be but the application of temporary expedients.

'There is somewhere a mighty energy of evil at work in the production of intemperance, and until we can discover and destroy *this vital power* of mischief, we shall labor in vain.

'Intemperance in our land is not accidental; it is rolling in upon us by the *violation of some great laws of human nature*. In our views, and in our practice as a nation, there is something fundamentally wrong; and the remedy, like the evil, must be found in the **CORRECT APPLICATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES**. It must be a universal and national remedy.

I remark again 2. *That the remedy, whatever it be, must respect the rights and interests of the injured, in preference to those of the injurers.* This is demanded on every principle of justice and humanity. If the case in respect to slavery is a desperate one, so that there is no alternative but that the rights and interests of one or the other must be sacrificed, then I hesitate not to affirm that those of the master must yield to those of the slave. If there be no remedy in the case, save one that shall compromit, in whole or in part, the interests and rights of one or the other, then it is a clear case that, that party should suffer which is in the wrong. The remedy, whatever it be, must aim primarily and mainly at the reparation of the injuries inflicted on the injured. Every other consideration and object must bend and be subordinate to this.

Nor will it answer for the slaveholder to say in reply, that the state of society in which he finds himself is not

‘What then is this universal, natural, and national remedy for intemperance?’

‘IT IS THE BANISHMENT OF ARDENT SPIRITS FROM THE LIST OF LAWFUL ARTICLES OF COMMERCE, BY A CORRECT AND EFFICIENT PUBLIC SENTIMENT; SUCH AS HAS TURNED SLAVERY OUT OF HALF OUR LAND, AND WILL YET EXPEL IT FROM THE WORLD.’—*Beecher on Intemperance*, pp. 41, 42, 43, 63, 64.

The same principles are applicable in the case of slavery. Slavery has come in upon us ‘*by the violation of some great laws of human nature.*’ ‘*There is somewhere a mighty energy of evil at work.*’ It is the *principle of property in man.* And until we ‘*destroy this vital power of mischief, we shall labor in vain.*’ The remedy, whatever it be, must be ‘*universal, operating permanently, at all times and in all places.*’—it must put its finger upon the ‘*vital power of mischief,*’ and therefore, ‘*like the evil, must be found in the correct application of general principles,*’ and not in the *supposition of extreme cases, that do not admit of any remedy but death.*

one of his own choosing ; that the evil of slaveholding is entailed on him, and is his misfortune and not his crime. If it be so, he is bound to bear it as his ; and it is only adding insult to injury to attempt to throw it off from himself upon his poor slave. The slave's own cup is full enough of bitterness. He has as much misfortune of his own as he can well bear. The master has no right to add his to it. If it be his calamity, he must meet it as his, and not screen himself, and redeem his misfortunes at the expense of his already too much injured slave ; and especially must this be so, when instead of calamity merely, slavery is the master's crime.

This is said on the supposition that the rights and interests of one or the other *must* be sacrificed. It is believed, however, that there is no necessity for this ; that if the master will but do his duty voluntarily to his slaves, it will be for the best good both of him and them. Emancipation will be for the interest of both. I make the above remarks, therefore, not because I suppose that the real rights and interests of either must be sacrificed, but for the purpose of guiding you to a remedy of the proper *moral character*, as well as adequate to meet the exigencies of the case. It will not do to remedy oppression by oppression. Such remedy is no remedy. It is only adding insult to injury. And yet such, to all intents and purposes, is every scheme of remedy which goes on the principle of consulting the assumed rights and imagined interests of the master, in preference to the real rights and interests of the slave. If it be eagle-eyed and trumpet-tongued in behalf of the master—talking loudly of his ‘chartered’ ‘sacred’ rights, &c., while at the same time it is well



nigh blind and dumb in respect to the sacred, the 'inalienable rights' of the slave, it has the marks of oppression about it. It exalts assumed rights above real—usurpation above justice. Whatever its professions, therefore, and however well-meant on the part of many of its abettors, it is still a scheme which takes sides with the oppressor against the oppressed, and sets up his imaginary claims as paramount to those which God and nature give. It puts its foot along with the oppressor's, on the neck of the oppressed, and cannot therefore be either an equitable or efficient scheme of remedy. Under the government of a righteous God, oppression can never be remedied by oppression.

But the main question returns—what is the remedy for slavery? And the plain answer is, *complete and universal emancipation*. The question, however, commonly has a more limited signification. All are agreed, that the only remedy for slavery is its abolition. The question of remedy, therefore, has reference to the *means* of remedy, rather than to the thing itself. So that the practical and more important form of the question is this—*how, by what means, is complete and universal emancipation to be effected?* I answer,

1st. *Not by any schemes of amelioration*. All such schemes are futile, and worse than futile, so far as emancipation is concerned. They do not even aim at it. Their object is amelioration simply, and not remedy. They go on the assumption that slaveholding is a necessary evil, and that the best, and all indeed, that can be done in the case, is to modify and meliorate and soften some of its harsher features. They admit and act in respect to it, on the old maxim that 'what cannot be cured must be endured'; and they aim, therefore,

not at its cure, but simply at making its endurance as tolerable as may be. Remedy then is out of question on any such scheme. Indeed, as I have before said, such schemes, if successful at all, are on the whole an obstacle in the way of the only real remedy, emancipation. They cover up the hideousness of slavery. They hide its dark features, and thus put the moral sense of the community asleep, and leave the slave, comparatively unpitied, to drink still oppression's bitter cup.

Again 2. *Slavery cannot be remedied by any schemes of gradual emancipation.* And, for the better understanding of the matter, it is in point here, to ask the advocate of gradual emancipation, what he means by it; and, since we are practical men, when and how he is going to make his schemes work out the desired result? What, then, does he mean? Here is an individual slave. It is proposed to try the experiment of gradual emancipation on him. He is a pretty fair subject too, for he is a stupid fellow. In point of intellect and will, he is doltishness itself. One is almost in doubt whether he be a man or a brute. Well, the problem is to emancipate him. Will you say to him, Mr. Gradualist, you are free to day?

Mr. Gradualist. Not at all. That would be your absurd and incendiary doctrine of immediate emancipation.

True, and stupid and doltish as is the supposed slave, you probably think that he yet has sense and spirit enough to wreak vengeance on his master, the moment he sets him free?

Mr. Gradualist. To be sure I do.

Well, then, the problem of gradual emancipation.

Please to work it out, for I have some curiosity to know what it means.

Mr. Gradualist. Why, instruct him.

Ay, a simple thing truly, and then so easy and expeditious too! But never mind; we'll try. And to be the more sure of success, we will *begin immediately*. The teacher is all ready. The master has given his consent, and the time is allotted to the slave for his instruction. Now if he does not have his freedom, he may thank himself for it. Well, here he comes; but—but, what a stupid dunce! And then he says he is fresh from the field and is tired, or it is Sunday, and that is the only time he has to go and see his wife on the next plantation. Do you think such a stupid, lazy, love-sick fellow as this is going to learn any thing?

Mr. Gradualist. To be sure. Why, sir, you have no idea how fast the slaves learn.

And so stupid too! Those 'human-brutes,' so unfit for freedom! Well, we will go on. The slave is instructed to-day, but he is a slave yet. He is instructed to-morrow, and yet he is a slave. The next day he is instructed, and then the next; the next month, and then the next; the next year, and then the next—next—next, and yet (for though an old man, he is not, we will suppose, dead) he is but a slave—instructed to be sure, but *yet a slave*. He is not emancipated. You must make haste, or his schooling will not do him any good; for he will be dead soon, or his master will be dead, and he be sold to another master who will not send him to school. There are a thousand slips between the cup and the lip. Ten to one he is not emancipated after all.

Mr. Gradualist. Not emancipated! But he is in-

structed, and what more could you ask? All you have to do now is just to set him free.

Indeed! A very easy matter, truly! And you intend to become an immediate emancipationist,—you intend to stop crying gradual and cry immediate, by and by; and this is what you mean by gradual emancipation! So soon as the slave gets instructed, and every thing else is in readiness, then you intend to abandon your gradualism, and take the ground of immediatism! We take that ground now, because we think things are as much in readiness as they ever will be, and you intend to take it by and by. A time is coming when you mean to be an immediate emancipationist!

Will you tell us, when? Is it one, ten, fifty, a hundred, or two hundred years hence? Is it before or after you are dead?—before or after the present generation of slaves are dead?—before or after slavery has

\* The following anecdote will throw some light on the subject.

An American slave-owner lately said to a sensible English lady in Boston, that it was much to be regretted that a lady here (Mrs. Child) had published a book about slavery, because she was so very ignorant of the subject; that slavery had been inherited by the people of the South from their ancestors, and although it was 'a great evil,' it could not be removed under a long time without the utmost mischief to slaves as well as masters. Therefore it was better to let it alone, especially by persons who had not been in the midst of it, and knew nothing about it.

'You admit,' said the lady, 'that slavery is an evil?'

'Certainly, a very great evil, and we all lament the necessity of its continuance as much as the people of England, or of the North.'

'Very well,' rejoined the lady, 'then between us, it is only a question as to the proper time of removing an acknowledged evil. I think that now is the time. I should like to know what time you think will be proper.'

'The gentleman paused a few moments; but being urged by his fair antagonist to fix some period, he at length said hesitatingly, 'I think about two hundred years.'

severed the Union, and brought down upon us the judgments of an insulted and sin-avenging God? 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.' Do then tell us when you intend to take the ground of immediate emancipation? \* And besides, admitting that you have gotten over all other difficulties in the way of instruction, &c. how will you contrive to keep these instructed ones quiet? When most stupid and brutish, they have, as you say, so much of sense, that they feel

\* Others would *temporise*, propose modifications of the system, and do what they can to perpetuate it. 'Wait a little time,' say they; never mind how mercy bleeds, or justice flows, how the negro suffers, or the Englishman petitions,—do it gradually, yes, do it gradually. I wonder what they mean by gradually? When will gradual emancipation arrive? I remember an anecdote told of Charles James Fox, who, when in power, was very deeply in debt; he had a secretary, named Hare; and 'like master like man,' both were up to the ears in embarrassment. Mr. Fox looking one morning out at the window saw coming up the street an old money-lending Jew to whom both were indebted. 'Well, Solomon,' said he, 'what are you after this morning? Are you Fox-hunting or Hare-hunting?' 'Why, for the matter of that,' said the Jew, 'I am both Fox-hunting and Hare-hunting; I want both, I want my money.' 'You must wait, Solomon,' said Mr. Fox. 'I cannot wait,' said the Jew; 'I want my money;—have I not a right to my money?' 'Certainly, Solomon; you have a right to your money, Solomon—a most undoubted right, Solomon; but it is inconvenient to me to let you have it now; you can call again, Solomon; come on such a day.' The Jew went accordingly, and again the answer was,—'Wait, Solomon; both Mr. Hare and myself are so deeply involved in business that we have not time to attend to the settlement of your account; call again, Solomon.' Solomon went again, and still the answer was, 'Wait, Solomon.' 'I cannot wait,' said Solomon at last. 'I will not wait a day longer than your next appointment.' 'Well, then,' said Mr. Fox, 'suppose we say, Solomon—the day of judgment, Solomon.' 'Oh!' said the Jew, 'that will be far too busy and important a day for the settlement of your account.' 'Well, then,' said Mr. Fox, still determined to be facetious,—'suppose, Solomon, we say the day after!' This is exactly the line of argument pursued by our friends on the opposite side—'Wait till the day of judgment,—wait till the day after,—but don't do it now?' 'Why not do it now?'—Thompson's Lectures, p. 76.

their wrongs most keenly, and so much of spirit, that they pant for the opportunity to avenge them. How then will you keep them quiet, as the work of instruction goes on? Will they feel their wrongs less keenly as their minds become more enlightened, and they are thus enabled to understand and appreciate them, in all their length and breadth, and height and depth? What is fact? Do the most enlightened slaves feel their wrongs less keenly, or breathe less of the spirit of revenge than others? How then are you going to keep them quiet?

But suppose you succeed in this, and the time does at last come for you to take the ground of immediate emancipation, how are you going to work out the desired result? How are you going to make your gradualism of theory and practice slide off into immediatism? Will you take your stand alone? Ten to one they will call you a 'fanatic' or an 'incendiary' if you do. Will you wait, then, until you can go with the multitude? Many men have many minds, and though you may think that every thing is ripe for immediate action, others may take the liberty to differ from you, just as you now take the liberty to differ from us; and how then are you going to make the multitude think with you, and take the same stand with you? or rather, lead the way for you? And, these difficulties removed, how will you contrive to get the master's consent? How will you show him that the condition of his instructed, well-fed and well-clothed slaves, is not infinitely better than it would be, if they were free; and that he is not therefore bound, on the principles of benevolence, to retain them in that happy servitude? \*

\* The editor of the Mercantile Journal, (Boston) not long since, presented his readers with certain statistics respecting the condi-

And, difficulties of this character being overcome, how are you going to manage these instructed slaves when you set them free? Will instruction make them all christians, and cause them to return good for evil? Or will it, in the vast majority of cases, only kindle the spirit of revenge to deeper indignation, and arm it to greater mischief? And if, as you say, so keen is the sense of injury, and so rife the spirit of revenge among them now, when most senseless and stupid, that the announcement of freedom would be but the watch-word of insurrection and blood, what are you to do when they have become instructed? Will not the sense of injury then be keener, and the spirit of revenge fiercer? As you make proclamation of freedom, will not these oppressed, but instructed ones, who have seen their wrongs more clearly, and felt them more keenly than while in ignorance, turn upon their masters, and, with

tion of the free blacks in this country, from which he says, 'the inference ..... is irresistible, that *the slaves are more comfortably situated than the free blacks.*' And the inference, he probably would have his readers make from this, is, that kindness to the slaves forbids their present emancipation—in other words, makes it duty for the master to retain them in their present happy condition. Be it so. And then, what is the consequence? What is to become of their gradual and ultimate emancipation? If they are so 'comfortably situated' now, how much more so will they be when they are well-instructed, as well as well-fed, well-clothed, &c. &c., and their condition is so wonderfully ameliorated as we are taught to expect it will soon be? Surely they will be far more 'comfortably situated' then. If then, the editor tells the master now, that his slaves are so much 'more comfortably situated' than the free blacks, that it is not duty to emancipate them, how will he get the master's consent to their emancipation when more comfortably situated still? How can he consistently even ask for such consent? Or if he does ask it, what arguments can he urge to induce it? The slaveholder will meet him at every point with the plea, they are more 'comfortably situated' than if they were free, and thus put him to silence on his own admission.

vengeance in their eye, demand why they did not give them their freedom before? In a word, how will you avoid the evils of immediate and universal emancipation at that time? While you have been getting rid of some difficulties, will not others have risen up? How will you guard against, and how dispose of them? \*

But without waiting for an answer to these inquiries, I will proceed with my remarks. It should be recollected here, that different schemes of emancipation take their names from the different *doctrines* on which they are based, rather than from their actual operation. Thus the scheme of Immediate Emancipation is built upon the doctrine, that *immediate emancipation is the duty of the master and the right of the slave*, and takes its name accordingly. All schemes of Gradual Emancipation are built upon the doctrine, that *gradual emancipation is the duty of the master and the right of the slave*, and take their name accordingly. Now the actual operation of the doctrine of immediate emancipation may be gradual on the community, taken as a community—just as is the doctrine of immediate repentance. Indeed, the doctrine of immediate emancipation is nothing more or less than that of immediate re-

\* It will be seen that in the above remarks, I am reasoning with the gradualist on his own grounds—admitting that the slave, in his present condition, is as stupid, and yet at the same time, as spirited and ferocious in his revenge; as dull, and yet as teachable and apt to learn, as the gradualist himself pretends. This to be sure is making the slave a contradiction to himself, and yet it is the only way in which the gradualist can make good his plea. If the slave be neither stupid or dull or revengeful now, but spirited, teachable, and friendly, it does not appear that he is not now qualified for freedom, and that now is not the time to take the ground of immediate emancipation.

In connection with the above questions, see also p. 25. (middle.) 'And if, in spite of self-interest,' &c.



repentance, applied to this particular sin; and therefore in this case, as in others, its actual operation on the community as such, may be gradual. It may in point of fact become the power of God to the actual repentance of one here and another there, and not of the whole community at once. And if any are disposed to rate out at this, that after all it is nothing but a scheme of gradual emancipation, then I have only to say *first*, if this be so, that there is no such thing as immediate repentance in respect to any sin, and the doctrine that teaches it is false; and *second*, that if this scheme be gradual, then schemes that are built on the doctrine of gradual emancipation, are not schemes of emancipation at all, but rather schemes of perpetual and everlasting servitude; and *third*, that there are none so blind as those who will not see.

The distinction I have made is a most obvious one. The veriest child can see and understand it. On the one scheme, I come to the conscience of the community as a community, and of the individual as an individual, with the pressure of immediate duty—duty now—duty on the spot; and if, in point of fact, it be only here and there one at a time who yields to that pressure and repents—what then? Am I to be cashiered as a gradualist, and my scheme of repentance as mere gradualism? Not by men of sense and candor.

My remark then is this, that slavery can never be remedied by any schemes of gradual emancipation—i. e. by any schemes which are built, and which act on the principle that gradual emancipation is the duty of the master and the right of the slave. And the plain reason is, the principle of reform, with which they start and on which they proceed, is a wrong principle. It

does not teach the 'vital power' of the mischief. This is clear; for in the first place, the doctrine on which these schemes are built is a *false doctrine*. It expressly asserts that present emancipation is not duty, and therefore virtually asserts that present slaveholding is duty, and is not therefore sin. It asserts this to-day. 'The morrow comes, and it asserts the same to-morrow. The next day comes, and it still asserts the same. Weeks, months, years roll on, and still the doctrine is evermore the same—present emancipation is not duty, and present slaveholding is not sin. Duty and guilt are always crowded into the morrow, and thus to all intents and purposes crowded out of existence. And now I affirm that the doctrine which does this is a false doctrine. It admits, perhaps, that there is guilt somewhere, but it always screens the culprit. It cannot therefore be true.

And farther, it is a *wicked doctrine*, and all schemes built upon it are therefore wicked. It is so, because it respects the assumed rights and imagined interests of the master, in preference to the real rights and interests of the slave. If either party is to be favored in the work of remedy in preference to the other, most obviously it should be the injured. But the doctrine of gradual emancipation, and all schemes built upon it, go on the assumption that the rights and interests of the injurer are to be consulted first. They take the ground, therefore, that the rights and interests of the slave are of secondary importance, and that the rights and interests of the master, though usurped and imaginary, are to be the *primary standard of decision*, in respect to the time when and the mode in which the wrested and trampled rights of the slave are to be re-

stored. Nor I maintain that such doctrine and such schemes are wicked. They do not lift a finger in the way of breaking the rod of the oppressor. On the contrary, they take sides with him against the oppressed. They justify him in the present retention of his usurped authority and power. They even give his continued oppression the sanction of their authority. They license his present retention of the wages of iniquity, and authorize its continuance, until such time as he, himself being judge, can give them up without inconvenience; and thereby, they frame an excuse behind which, if disposed, he may entrench himself forever.

This leads me therefore to say, that the doctrine in question is an *inefficient doctrine*. How can it be otherwise? False and wicked, what efficacy can it have in the work of remedying falsehood and wickedness? It throws the charge of guilt back upon the past, or on upon the future, and brings in a plea of innocence for the present. How then can it awaken conviction of guilt—the indispensable prerequisite to all genuine repentance and real reformation? It pushes emancipation, too, into the distant future, and talks of it as duty at some time and in some way; but it always talks of doing duty to-morrow, and doing it gradually even then. But what child does not know, that to-morrow never comes—that the duty of the morrow is never the duty of to-day?

But this is not the worst; this doctrine gives up the whole ground of debate between freedom and slavery, and virtually takes the side of slavery. For it admits the principle, that in some cases it is lawful to hold man as property, leaving it to the slaveholder to decide whether his be such a case or not; or rather, deciding

for him, that it is. It yields therefore the whole ground in debate. It admits the very principle out of which all slaveholding has grown; by which it is perpetuated; on which the slaveholder, in his present practice, acts: under which he ever finds an apology for his sin, and for which, therefore, as the fundamental principle and only safeguard of continued slaveholding he warmly contends. What power on the conscience, what influence on the life, then, can such a doctrine have? Can you change a man's opinions and practice on a subject, so long as you yield him the main and fundamental principle in debate? Can you make the slaveholder quit his slaveholding, so long as you admit to him, that in some cases, himself being judge, it is right for him to practice it? As soon might you think to stop the slave-traffic, and yet admit to the slave-trader that in some cases, himself being judge in the case, it is perfectly right to carry it on. He would be very sure not to find a case in which it would be wrong for him to do it, whatever might be true of others. You never would find him condemning himself as a pirate. He would understand the law of self-preservation, if not the law of interest, too well for that. Such doctrine would never reach the case. It would be the extreme of impotency.

But we need not confine ourselves to mere speculation on this point. There are facts at hand—facts, which show conclusively that this doctrine of gradual emancipation, and that all schemes of emancipation built upon it, are utterly inefficient. I need not go into detail; but let me ask, what have the philanthropists and christians of England been doing on this subject? They have been alive to it for years. At first, they

began with their schemes of amelioration, and what did they effect? Just nothing. Next, they resorted to schemes of gradual emancipation; and what did they then effect? Just nothing. No longer ago than the 14th of May last, Mr. Stanley said in the House of Commons, that he was then 'addressing Parliament in 1833; and up to that hour, neither the voice of friendly expostulation, nor of authority, had produced the least alteration in the contumacious conduct of the Colonial Legislatures—not a single step had been taken by any of them with a view to the extinction of slavery.' And this, doubtless, was on the whole a fair representation of the case. Just so long as English philanthropists went on the principle of amelioration, or of gradual and ultimate emancipation, they accomplished nothing. The doctrine on which they acted, and therefore their plans of action, were utterly inefficient. They proved it out by fair and actual experiment, and they went on proving it out, until at length, actual experiment forced them to change their doctrine, and with it their schemes of emancipation. Gradual emancipation went out of date. Immediate emancipation became the order of the day, and then the work was done.

Now I maintain that all schemes built on the doctrine of gradual emancipation, will of necessity prove abortive. And, aside from all '*a priori*' reasoning on the subject, I quote the experience of England as absolute demonstration. Slavery, in its essential features, is the same the world over, and must be remedied, if remedied at all, in substantially the same way. Why, then, I ask, with the experience of England staring us in the face, and most evidently set up as an example for our admonition and instruction—why waste our

time and energies in going over the same fruitless experiments of amelioration and gradual emancipation? Why not learn wisdom from her example, and adopt at once her present doctrine and her present plan of action,—that of Immediate Emancipation! For one, I mean to do so; and therefore I say,

3. *That the only true and effectual scheme of remedy, is that of Immediate Emancipation.* This scheme, as I have said, is so named, because it is built and acts on the doctrine, that immediate emancipation is the duty of the master, and the right of the slave. And I maintain, it is the only true and efficient means of remedy. It is so,

(1). *Because it starts right in theory.* Its doctrine is the *true doctrine*. It takes the ground that slaveholding is, in all cases, wicked; and this, as I have shown, is the true ground. The scheme thus entrenches itself in the omnipotence of truth, and cannot but be an efficient one.

And besides, whether true or not, the doctrine *at the outset, calls in question the starting point and fundamental principle of all slavery.* That principle, as I have shown, is the principle, admitted in theory and acted on in practice, that in some cases, at discretion, it is lawful to hold man as property. From this admitted in theory, as *starting point* has originated, first the demand and market for slaves, then the traffic, and then the system of slavery. Slaveholding, traffic, market, all are but parts of the same system of iniquity and blood. They all originated from, and are all perpetuated by the one principle, admitted in theory, and acted on in practice, that in some cases at discretion, it is lawful to hold man as property. This one principle, then,

is the originating and the sustaining principle of all slavery. This once denied and abandoned as a principle of action, and all slaveholding would be at an end. Now the doctrine of immediate emancipation, and therefore the scheme built up in it, begins its operations here. It calls this principle in question at the outset, and pronounces it false and wicked. It thus lays the axe at the root of the tree. It admits not as valid, either the fundamental principle of slavery, or the objections urged in apology for it. It denies the whole, and pronounces the whole matter of slaveholding wicked, both in theory and practice. Slaveholding and all its connected sins began by *starting wrong in theory*—on a wrong and wicked principle of action; and its iniquities are perpetuated by continued action on that principle. And now the doctrine of immediate emancipation proposes that the remedy shall begin at the same spot—viz. *by starting right in theory*—i. e. with the denial and abandonment of that wrong principle of action, out of which all slaveholding has grown. Of course, true or not, if this doctrine prevails, slavery is demolished. Its efficacy on slavery must of necessity be radical and mighty.

And more, this scheme of immediate emancipation starts right in theory in another respect—viz. it assails slavery in its true character, as a moral, rather than a physical evil. All moral evils, it is true, have more or less of physical evil connected with them, and growing, as a necessary consequence, out of them. Intemperance, for example, carries most frightful physical evils in its train, and these taken by themselves may be spoken of as such; and intemperance, when you speak only with reference to these, may very properly be

called it an evil, &c. But it were wide of the truth to call it an evil merely, when you speak of it in reference to its *moral character*. When you talk of character, it were treachery to truth, to call it aught less than sin. Its true and real character is that of a moral evil—a sin. The same is true of slavery. There are, it is true, many physical evils connected with and growing out of it, and these may be spoken of, separately, as physical evils. But to speak of slavery, taken as a whole, as an *evil*, meaning by it a more physical evil, or at best, nothing more than a physical moral evil; to speak of it as a calamity, an unfortunate system, &c. &c., is to talk utter nonsense. It is to misrepresent its character. Slavery, in its true and real character in the sight of God, is a moral evil—a sin—a crime, and not a mere undefined evil, or calamity, or misfortune. And every man who is in any way implicated in the matter, is implicated in a sin, and not merely in a misfortune or calamity. If, therefore, this sin is ever remedied, it must be assailed and remedied in this, its *true character*. To assail it in any other is certain defeat.

The time was, when the community were in the habit of regarding and speaking of intemperance as a great evil, a dreadful evil, a sore calamity, &c.; and so long as they thus regarded and spoke of it, the evil grew upon them. Their efforts to check its progress were idle as the wind. It grew and grew, and rolled on continually a deeper and wider tide of desolation, until it verily seemed as if it were about to sweep the whole community into the drunkard's grave. Just, then, some wild fanatic took it into his head, that intemperance was a sin, and then, that it all grew out of the temperate use of spirit, then, that this temperate use



was ricked, then, that the whole matter was to be assailed as a sin, from first to last; and what was worse than all the rest, just so soon as he had made the people think it was a sin, he ran away with the strange idea, (what pitiabie absurdity!) that the way to remedy it, was to stop drinking.\* He was a crazy-headed fellow to be sur, and wital rash and imprudent, and mad with the spirit of party—a mere party man. But see—the moment he began to preach, and print, and disseminate his strange doctrines, they made no small stir among the people, especially among the intemperate, and some of the better sort who loved a little of the good creature now and then. Of course, they were not a little excited, and made not a little uproar about this impertinent intermeddling of his. Some were exceeding mad against him, and occasioned him some little inconvenience. They assailed his character—impeached his motives, and where they could, made him trouble in regard to his means of subsistence, &c, &c.† Nothing disheartened, however, he held up his his head, and kept about his preaching and printing. Soon the tables were turned. Public attention was aroused. Public sentiment was changed. Intemperance was regarded and spoken of as sin, from first to last. Thousands and thousands went crazy with the idea of ‘immediate and entire abstinence,’ and that tide of desolation, which was rolling over the land, was turned back. Just so soon as the community regarded it as a sin, and spoke of it as a sin, intemperance received its death blow.

\* ‘There is no remedy for intemperance but the cessation of it.’—BEECHER.

† Appendix C.

Nor is this mere conjecture. It is a fact, known and read of all men, that the grand secret of success in the Temperance Reformation, is, that it has assailed Intemperance in its true character—as a sin. What is the testimony of the leaders in this cause? At the meeting of the Temperance Convention in Philadelphia, in May last, it was proposed to pass a resolution, declaring that the use and traffic in ardent spirits, for purposes of drink, were *morally wrong*. And what said Dr. Edwards in relation to it?

‘Dr. E. said that the phrase “morally wrong,” the committee supposes to mean, “contrary to right.” They do not decide on the guilt of those persons who remain in the use or traffic. The guilt or innocence of individuals, he supposed, would depend on the light they have. The resolution only declares what, in our view, is the character of the traffic, as compared with the moral law. He should be pardoned for taking time to say, that this principle had been the starting point of this whole movement. From the beginning of the Temperance reformation, the aim and the effort have been, to convince all men that this is wrong. And in order to convince men that a thing is wrong, he knew of no better way than *to say so*. And then, if our arguments are good, we may expect to prevail. But we cannot expect to succeed in convincing others, unless we are willing to tell them what we want to prove.’

And as the discussion, occasioned by the resolution in question, went on, what said Dr. Hewit?

‘Dr. Hewit hoped \* \* \* \* \* the \* \* \* resolution would be adopted.’ \* \* \* \* \* ‘Unquestionably, Mr. President, damage will ensue from the adoption of this resolution—great damage. Multitudes, not only at the South and West, but in all parts of the country, will be irritated, and roused to active opposition, who might otherwise have remained quiet. And the shoulders of those, who bear the weight of care and responsibility

in the Temperance cause, will be burdened with a heavier burden in consequence. But, sir, *it must be borne*. And such burdens, though grievous, are honorable to those on whom they are laid.

The American Temperance Society has had to bear this burden from the beginning. The array against this Society has been mighty. And it has grown to its present height, not because it consulted the maxims of human expediency, but because it DEFIED THEM, AND TRAMPLED THEM UNDER FOOT. We appealed from them to the consciences of men. Sir, the safety of making this appeal, and of resting our cause upon it, needs not now to be demonstrated. It has been tried, by the experiment of years. And what is the result? Behold the witnesses in every seat of this house, and on that stage. Every thing is in favor of a bold and uncompromising appeal to the consciences of men, irrespective of their passions, their appetites, their interests, or their sins.

'Sir, NO PROGRESS WAS MADE IN THIS REFORM, TILL THE GROUND WAS TAKEN THAT THE USE AND TRAFFIC IS MORALLY WRONG. And if this convention refuse to sustain that principle, all we have done must be done over again.'

And Dr. Edwards and Dr. Hewit were right. No progress was made in this reform, until the evil to be remedied was thus assailed in its true character--as a wrong and wicked thing.\*

The same is true in respect to slavery. We may talk of it as a calamity, an unfortunate state of society, a great evil, &c. until dooms-day, if we will, and have our talking for our pains. Nay, we may weep tears of blood over the matter, and so long as we regard and speak of it in this light merely, have our crying for our pains. Satan can never be dislodged from this strong

\* For extracts from the speeches of other gentlemen on this point, see Appendix D.

hold in this way. It is as a moral evil—a sin then, that this matter is to be assailed, and remedied, if remedied at all. To talk about it, and operate on it as a mere physical evil, or if moral, as moral only to generations past, is utter folly. You can never reach the difficulty in this way. It is a moral evil, and must therefore be so regarded and acted on, if you would act to the purpose. Removal, colonization--what is it but a mere physical operation? What, but a mere carting off of slavery? You might as soon think to remedy intemperance by carting off the rum-drinkers. In the first place, you never could cart them all away. As fast as you carried one off, another would spring up in his place. In the next place, you would find it difficult to take care of them after you had carted them off. And in the next place, even if you got over the other difficulties and succeeded in getting them all away, you would find that this physical operation had, after all, left the *spirit* of intemperance untouched; and hardly an hour would pass, before it would lay its hands on other victims, and furnish you with new subjects for transportation. No—no—you can never operate on mind, to move it to action, by the law of physics, or by those moral influences, which may be imagined to cluster around, and be incidental to physical processes and operations. To think of remedying slavery thus, is absurd. Do your utmost, and the spirit of slavery, its fundamental principles, yet live. If you would act to purpose, you must assail it in its true character—as a moral evil, for the existence of which, moral agents are responsible and guilty.

Now it is in this character, especially, that the scheme of immediate emancipation assails it. The fundamen-

tal doctrine of this scheme is, that slaveholding is wicked. As certain, then, as it is, that truth is power, so certain is it that this doctrine, laying the axe as it does at the root of the tree, will sooner or later become mighty, through God, to the pulling down of this strong hold.

There is every reason, then, for supposing that the scheme in question is the only efficient one. *It starts right in theory.* Its doctrine is just what it needs to be, in order to make it efficient. It is the true doctrine. It calls the fundamental principle of slavery in question at the outset, and pronounces it wrong and wicked; and finally, it assails the matter in its true character—as a sin, and not as a calamity or evil merely. No theory could be better fitted to secure its end, and therefore, the scheme that is built upon it, cannot but be of mighty efficacy.

But (2.) This scheme is the only true and effectual one, because *it starts right in practice.* Right theory generally leads to right practice. It is so in this case. Other schemes of emancipation content themselves with lopping off the branches, in the hope that in this way the tree will ultimately die. And perhaps it would, but for the fact, that the branches grow faster than they are, or can be cut off. This scheme, however, aims its blows at the root. It first corrects the wrong and wicked *theory*, out of which all slaveholding in practice has grown, and by which it is perpetuated. It then proceeds to apply its principles to the right spot—viz. *that practice itself.* Now this is beginning in the application of its principles just where it should begin. It assails the practice first and directly; and does it on the principle, that all indirect

attacks are fruitless. What! abolish slavery indirectly, by a mere incidental influence, or rather by no influence, save just letting it alone to its own 'calm and dispassionate reflections'!! Leviathan is not so tamed. There never was a grander mistake than has been made on this subject. Philanthropists in England and America once thought that if they could succeed in putting a stop to the Foreign slave trade, slavery would ultimately die, of its own accord. And so they wasted their energies in the tedious, though at length successful efforts for its abolition. The civilized world, with one consent, pronounced the traffic a crime, and forbade it under the severest penalties. And what was the result? Did slavery die? Was the monster starved, for want of new supplies? Nay, were his supplies diminished a whit? The truth is, they went to work the wrong way. They began at the wrong place. It has been so proved by the actual experiment. The whole matter thus far is a comparative failure.\*

The temperance reformation has taught us some principles that ought never to be forgotten, and that apply in all their force to this subject. Whence the rapidity and success with which that reformation has moved on? Under God, it is entirely owing to the single fact, 1. that it hit upon the true principle of reformation; and 2. that, starting with that as the basis

\* This was written before the late act of Parliament on the subject. And to show that my remark is not unauthorised I would say, that it has been recently stated, on good authority I believe, that Mr Clarkson and Mr Wilberforce have both expressed the conviction, that their efforts for many years have been, in a great measure, misdirected, and therefore comparatively inefficacious to the great result desired—the abolition of slavery.

of action, it put its finger on the very root of the evil—the *use*. It started right in practice. Think you that the tide of intemperance, which was rolling over our land, had ever been checked or turned back, as it has been, if, instead of beginning with the use and taking the ground that that use was wicked, this reformation had laid its hand *first* upon the traffic? Most certainly not. In the remedy of all such prevailing sins, you must begin where the sins themselves begin. You must dry up the fountain, or you can never dry up the stream. You must shut up the market, or you can never cut off supply. Abolish slavery, by abolishing the traffic in slaves! Shut up the market by cutting off supplies! Yes, truly, if it *could* be done. But it cannot. Cover the ocean with your fleets, and the shores of Africa with your colonies, if you will, but you cannot stop that traffic. So long as the market exists, and cries ‘give,’ ‘give,’ it will be supplied. The traffic will go on. You cannot prevent it.

Nor is this mere assertion or conjecture. So far from it, facts bear me out in the assertion, that colonies on the coast of Africa, instead of hindering the slave-trade, do, and from the nature of the case, must furnish *facilities for carrying it on*. I know the community generally, are accustomed to think otherwise: and perhaps if you could plant christian—*truly christian* colonies around the whole coast of Africa, North, East and West, it might be otherwise. But this can never be done, and until it is done, to plant one colony here and another there, is only, at best, to drive the trade from one place to another, while at the same time the colonies furnish a convenient place to which the slave-traders can resort, and purchase those arti-

cles of merchandize, which they exchange with the natives for slaves. The operation of the thing is simply this. A colony is planted, say at Liberia. It is a colony of freemen, and each one therefore is at liberty to pursue such a business for a livelihood as he chooses. One Mr. Hilary Teague is a colonist, and he chooses mercantile pursuits. He has such an assortment of goods on hand, as he finds it for his interest to keep, and he sells them of course to any man who wishes to buy, and offers to pay for them. To-day a certain individual, a stranger to Mr. Teague if you please to have it so, calls upon him, and wishes to buy a thousand dollars worth of his various articles, and proposes to pay the cash for them. Mr. Teague sells them cheerfully, and to-morrow, *the stranger is on his way to the Gallinas, or some place where he exchanges them for slaves.* Mr. Teague, in the mean time, finds it necessary to replenish his assortment, and is on his way to Sierra Leone, or some other place, for the purpose. He makes his purchases, and in order to make his payment, produces the bag of specie he received from the stranger, when, lo! it is marked '*Manzanaris,*' the name of a notorious SLAVE-SHIP, thus showing to the astonished Mr. Teague that he has been selling his goods to a slave-trader.

Nor is this fiction. It is sober fact, attested to, under oath; and it shows how easily, without any evil intentions on the part of the colonists, slave-traders may avail themselves of colonies near at hand, for the purpose of purchasing such articles as they need to give in exchange for slaves.

But more than this, colonists are men as well as others, and therefore as in other communities, there





will of necessity be some, perhaps many bad men among them—men who will be governed by interest rather than principle; and having the right to buy what they please and sell to whom they please, where is your security, where can it be, that they will not wittingly, as well as unwittingly, sell to the slave-trader—especially when he offers them ready money and is willing to pay them a higher price than others? What if Mr. Teague knows that his strange customer is a slave-trader, and that his trinkets, and powder, and guns, and tobacco, and rum, &c., do therefore go at once into the slave-traffic, if he be a man that is swayed by interest rather than principle, what power can prevent his selling as afore-said—nay, if so disposed, what shall prevent him from acting as *agent* for slave-traders? If, in spite of every thing, deacons will sell rum in America, what shall hinder Hilary Teague from selling it in Liberia? And if they can and will sell it here to whom they choose, what shall or can hinder him from selling it there to whomsoever he chooses? And if the slave-trader offers cash for it, and a higher price than others, what power can put a veto on their bargain? There is no law to touch that slave-trader, except as he is caught in the very act: and if there were, he would have sense enough, and so would Hilary Teague, to keep his character and the character of his business to himself. How, then, can you prevent the colonies from being thus instrumental in affording *facilities* for carrying on this abominable traffic? They have done it in time past, and done it to no small extent, and unless there should cease to be selfish and wicked men in them, why should they not do it in time to come? So long as the market for

slaves is open, and there is, consequently, a demand for those articles of merchandise which are given in exchange for slaves, they will do it. There is no preventing it. Multiply your colonies to any conceivable extent, and the same principles of interest and selfishness which now afford one kind of facilities, will continue to afford the same, or if circumstances require, others still more direct and dreadful—even to the business of smuggling and kidnapping itself.\* There is no such thing as cutting off supplies so long as the demand exists. You may as soon think to change the laws of gravitation, and make rivers run up hill. Demand will have its supply. If it cannot get it in any other way, like the obstructed river, it will rise and swell and overflow its banks; or if the banks be too high, will sweep away opposing obstacles by its mighty and resistless pressure. Supply it will have, at all events. If you would cut off the supply, therefore, you have no alternative but to shut up the market, and thus cut off the demand.

Now the scheme of immediate emancipation does this. It begins with the market. It takes the ground that all slaveholding is wicked, and demands therefore that it cease. It plies the conscience with the doctrine of immediate duty, and rests not until the master has yielded his assent. In this way it abolishes the practice of holding slaves, and of course shuts up the market, annihilates the traffic, and puts an end to the whole system of slavery, and its connected iniquities and woes. I say, then, that the scheme of immediate emancipation is the only true and efficient

\* See Appendix. E.

scheme of remedy for slavery. It is the only scheme that starts right in theory, and in practice too. Let it once become the prevalent scheme, let its doctrine once become the prevalent doctrine in our land, and slaveholding, and with it, the slave-traffic is abolished forever. The rod of the oppressor is broken. The cry of violence ceases. The oppressed go free.\* The shouts of jubilee are heard. The judgments of heaven are turned back, and God, in mercy, smiles on us again.

Nor need we confine ourselves to a priori reasoning on this point. We have the testimony of facts. I know we are told, somewhat tauntingly withal, that the scheme of immediate emancipation talks largely, but accomplishes nothing—that it is all talk and no action. ‘Just look,’ it is said, ‘into the first annual report of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society; see how it spreads itself; what large things it proposes to do, and that immediately, and then see how it tapers down to nothing— “The Society has effected the emancipation of a young slave boy in this city,” (Boston)!!! ’\*’

It were easy to turn the tables upon the Society whose agents are so ready to sneer in this way, and ask whether there be not some little tapering down in respect to that? Why, what does it propose to do? Let its agents speak for it.

\*The objects of the friends of colonization are—

I. To rescue the free colored people from the qualifications, the degradation, and the proscription which they are exposed in the United States.

II. To place them in a country where they .

\* The argument of an agent of the Colonization Society

enjoy the benefits of free government, with all the blessings which it brings in its train.

III. To avert the dangers of a dreadful collision at a future day of the two classes, which must inevitably be objects of mutual jealousy to each other.

IV. To spread civilization, sound morals, and true religion throughout the vast continent of Africa, at present sunk in the lowest and most hideous state of barbarism.

V. And though last, not least, to afford slave owners who are conscientiously scrupulous about holding human beings in bondage, an asylum to which they may send their manumitted slaves.\*

These, then, are the grand, the 'noble objects in view.' And now what has been done towards effecting them? One thing is certain, a great deal has been said. But what has been done? These are great and glorious objects, and this is, professedly, a 'doing' concern. What then has it done? Why 'in November, 1819, three years after its formation, the society appointed TWO AGENTS (!) \* \* \* \* \* to proceed to the coast of Africa, via. England, to make the necessary explorations and inquiries as to a suitable location for a settlement.' † Nay worse, 'five years of preliminary operations were requisite for surveying the coast, propitiating the natives, and selecting the most eligible site.' ‡ Thus much for the preliminaries.

And what has been the progress of things since? This is the seventeenth year of the Society's operation. Great men and noble have talked, and legislatures have voted. The treasury has been flooded with great names, and glowing speeches, and pompous

\* M. Carey's Letters on the Colonization Society and its probable results. pp. 5. 6.

† Carey's Letters, p. 8.

‡ Cresson.

votes ; but after all, what has been done ? Why 'with such noble objects in view, \* \* \* \* \* although the society has been in existence for sixteen years, the whole of the contributions, public and private, (except the support by the government of the United States, of negroes captured from slave-traders) received up to the present day, by the society for carrying them into effect, has been but about \$165,000, little more than a cent a head for the entire population of the most prosperous nation in the world !' \* And then, in seventeen years, it has actually sent off some eleven or twelve hundred emancipated slaves.

Truly the grand and 'noble objects in view' are hastening on to a speedy accomplishment ! But enough of this. I have no desire to push remarks of this kind. There is no argument in them on either side, and I fear but little love. I have indulged in them not for arguments' sake, except so far as to show that people who live in glass houses should be careful not to throw stones. The truth is, every great and good and efficient scheme of benevolent action, must of necessity have a beginning, and that beginning must, of necessity, be comparatively small. It was so with missionary operations. It was so with the Temperance Reform. It will be so in every benevolent movement : and it is no proof of its folly or its inefficacy that it is so. †

Is it still insisted, then, that the scheme of immediate emancipation talks largely, but accomplishes nothing ? It is far otherwise, and facts prove it. True, its results the *first* year are small, compared with what it proposes ultimately to accomplish : but what then ? Has it done nothing ? It has electrified the nation already. It has

\* Carey's Letters, p. 6.

† See Appendix F.

made an impression on the public mind that has been felt from Maine to Georgia. In a single year, it has provoked more discussion, awakened more interest, done more to arouse the public conscience, touch the public sympathy, and give tone to the public sentiment, than has been done by all other causes for years. It has shaken the whole system of slavery. Give it five years for its 'preliminary operations,' and it will produce results, such as the most sanguine have hardly dared to expect. It is but recently that the Anti-Slavery Societies of England ventured to go on the principle of immediate emancipation. Individuals indeed took this ground before, but the societies as such—the anti-slavery party as such—did not do it until *some three years since*. Then they did take it, and in earnest too. And the emancipation of every slave in the West India Colonies testifies to the world the power of this principle, and the efficacy of this scheme of reformation. And once let the matter be pushed here, as it has been there—let the pulpit and the press speak out with all their power, and the years will not be many before jubilee will be proclaimed throughout our land, and the world be permitted, in millions of slaves emancipated, to see a living witness to the power and efficacy of the scheme of IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION.

But you will say, perhaps, 'all this sounds very well; but after all, it is a most absurd and Quixotic scheme—the wildness of fanaticism' itself. What! turn two millions of slaves out upon the community at once?

By no means. Nothing is farther from our designs and wishes. We would not turn them adrift on society, if we could. So far from it, we are opposed to such a measure. We insist, even, that the master has

no right thus to set them afloat on society, unlooked after and uncared for. He may not add insult to injury in this way, any more than by retaining them in bondage, or giving them their freedom on condition of expatriation.

'Well, then, what would you do? What does your immediate emancipation mean?'

It means simply and only an immediate emancipation from slavery, not from all its consequences. It is simply, that the slaves be at once delivered from the control of arbitrary and irresponsible power, and, like other men, put under the control of equitable laws, equitably administered. Slavery, as I have shown, is the principle that man, in some cases, at his own discretion, may hold his fellow man as property. This, adopted as a *practical principle*, is slavery. Rejected as a *practical principle*, is slavery rejected. Immediate Emancipation, then, means that slaveholders, as individuals, and as a community, should at once give up this as a principle of action, and so doing, give up all that treatment which is based upon it, and thus put their slaves on the footing of men, and under the control of motive and law. It is, for example, that England should at once yield the *principle* of taxing us at pleasure, without our consent; and in this *one act*, yield of course, all the treatment growing out of, and based upon that principle.

Or more specifically, immediate emancipation means,

1. That the slaveholder, so far as he is concerned, should cease at once to hold or employ human beings as property.

2. That he should put them at once, in his regard and treatment of them, on the footing of men, possessing the **'inalienable rights of man.**

3. That instead of turning them adrift on society, uncared for, he should offer to employ them as free hired laborers, giving them, however, liberty of choice whether to remain in his service or not.

4. That from this *startling point*—*this emancipation from slavery itself*, he should at once begin to make amends for the past, by entering heartily on the work of qualifying them for, and elevating them to all the privileges and blessings of freedom, and religion;—thus doing what he can to emancipate them from their ignorance, degradation, &c.—in other words, from the consequences of slavery, as well as from the thing itself.

Thus much in respect to the individual. In respect to the community as such, the scheme means,

1. That, in its collective capacity, it should yield the principle of property in man, and thus cease to recognize any human being as the property of another.

2. That, by wise and equitable enactments, suited to the various circumstances of the various classes of its members, it should recognize them, all alike, as men— as subjects of equal law, under its, and only its control, to be deprived of ‘life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,’ on no account but that of crime, and then, by due and equitable process of law.

And farther, in respect to those slaves, who might be disposed to leave their master’s service, and become idle vagrants in society, the scheme means,

1. That they should come under the control of vagrant laws—just as white vagrants do.

2. That, if they commit crimes, they should be tried and condemned, like other vagrants, by due process of law.\*

\* ‘It seems to be forgotten that emancipation from tyranny is not an emancipation from law; the negro, after he is made free,



And finally, in respect to non-slaveholders, the scheme means,

1. That they, acting as individuals, should *yield the principle of slavery*, and so doing, yield all that supineness and inaction on the subject, which grows out of its virtual, if not professed admission.

2. That they should adopt its opposite as *their principle of action*, and so doing, *begin at once*, in every lawful and practicable way, to enlighten the public mind, to change the tone of public sentiment, to organize and concentrate its energies, and, in this and other ways, do what they can to convince slaveholders of their duty, and persuade them to do it. In a word, in respect to all the parties concerned, the scheme means, *a yielding up of the principle of slavery as a practical principle—a basis of action, and the adoption of its opposite*. This one act is emancipation from slavery. All that follows is the carrying out of the new principle of action, and is to emancipation just what sanctification is to conversion; or just what a subsequent sober life, the recovery of health, reputation, property, &c., are to the adoption, as a basis of action, of the principle of entire abstinence from ardent spirit.

‘And all this you mean to do immediately? A splendid scheme truly! Why, sir, your theory carried out,

is restrained from the commission of crimes by the same laws which restrain other citizens— if he steals, he will be imprisoned: if he commits murder, he will be hung.

‘It will, perhaps, be said that the free people of color in the slave portions of this country are peculiarly ignorant, idle, and vicious? It may be so; for our laws and our influence are peculiarly calculated to make them bad members of society. But we trust the civil power to keep in order the great mass of ignorant and vicious foreigners continually pouring into the country; and if the laws are strong enough for this, may they not be trusted to restrain the free blacks?’—Mrs. Child’s Appeal, p. 29.

would change the whole structure of society. It would turn every thing upside down.'

Indeed? And you are a minister of the gospel are you, and preach the doctrine of immediate repentance?

'To be sure, I do; but what then?'

Why, this—please to take your stand in yonder pulpit, and preach me a sermon from this text, '*God now commandeth all men, every where to repent,*' and allow me to question you a little.

'I see no particular object to be gained by this; but still if you insist upon it, I have no objection.'

Well, sir, I do. So please to announce your text, and proceed.

• "*God now commandeth all men, every where, to repent.*" This—

Hold—*God now commandeth all men, every where—* and you believe this, do you?

'Why, yes—'

And you preach it, do you?

'Certainly.'

And you expect—do you—that *all men, every where* are going to repent?—that all your congregation are going to repent, right here, on the spot?

'Why—no—not that exactly.'

You don't? It seems to me you are very silly then, to believe and preach up what you don't expect to see done.

'Ah, but you don't make the distinction.'

No—no—none of your distinctions and metaphysics, 'Mr. Philosopher.' I am a practical man. I like to see things straight. I wish for no quibbling.

'Very well. There is no quibbling in the matter. It is all straight enough, if you will just take the trouble to look at it.'

It is—eh? Well then, all I have to say is, that your doctrine of immediate repentance, ‘*as I understand it,*’ is the most absurd doctrine that was ever broached. What! you would have *all men, every where,* repent—no matter who or what they are, or how they are situated—rum-drinkers, rum-sellers, harlots, and sinners of every class and character, even to the slave-trader and slaveholder, &c. &c.—you would have them all repent at once! Why, sir, if your doctrine should once be carried out, it would turn the world upside down. Just suppose it should be carried out here, in Boston. Why, the whole city would be set in an uproar. The distilleries and dram-shops, and lottery offices, and brothels, and theatres, would all be shut up, their occupants thrown out of business, and they and their families become city paupers. They would be whelmed in utter poverty and ruin, and thousands of others, respectable men too, would be whelmed in ruin with them. City officers, however respectable and useful, would be thrown out of office, just because they winked at some little sin, and worthy christians be thrust out of the church, just because they would sell a little rum. Indeed, there is no calculating the result. Your doctrine once carried out would make a complete overturn in every thing. The whole structure of society would be broken up. It would be thrown into perfect chaos. But, sir, there is one consolation: your doctrine is as harmless as it is absurd. It is all talk. Boston people need not be afraid of it.

‘But what has all this to do with immediate emancipation?’

Do?—It has this to do with it, to show how foolishly men can reason about it, if they are so disposed.

‘ Well, then, admitting that your scheme is not so absurd, pray how are you going to carry it into effect? You have told *what* you mean, and “you talk learnedly, \* \* \* \* \* but there is a *practical* difficulty about your proposal. You propose a result, but say nothing about the process. The question with a working-man, who desires to do something \* \* \* \* \* is, How?” ’

Well, Mr. ‘ Working-man,’ if you will be so candid as to be a thinking-man also, I will tell you ‘ how.’ To proceed then. The evil to be remedied is a moral evil, and we propose therefore to remedy it as such. In the first place, then, we disclaim all physical force, and all unconstitutional legal interposition.

2. We disclaim all trickery, either in doctrines or measures. We have no idea of playing the hypocrite. We would not, if we could, frame a set of doctrines, or adopt a system of measures, which should say one thing here and another there, or which should profess one thing, viz. to let slavery alone, and yet at the same time aim to overthrow it. We are for being frank, open, plain-hearted. We mean to think out, and speak out our opinions and designs. If we really think the present slaveholder guilty, we mean to tell him so frankly, and not lull him to sleep, and lead him to perdition by the soothing lullaby of entailment, present innocence and future repentance. And if our *real* design is the overthrow of slavery, we mean to avow it, and, from what we know of our Southern friends, we believe they will like us the better for our frankness. We have no idea of catching the slaveholder asleep on this subject, and, by honied words and smooth speeches, tricking him out of his slaves, before he knows it. He will not let them slip through his fingers

so easily. This is a case that demands plain dealing. Nothing else will answer. And, therefore, we intend frankly to avow our design; and then, in order to accomplish it, we mean,

3. To preach the truth, the whole truth, on the subject. The grand obstacle in the way is, the *will* of the slaveholder. This being changed, there would of necessity be a change in all those laws and other obstacles which have grown out of it; and this will, if changed at all, is to be changed by 'light and love' on this subject, as well as on others. So, by God's blessing, we intend to change it; and therefore, instead of concealing our light, and showing out our love in honied words and smooth speeches, we intend to go on the principle that 'faithful are the wounds of a friend,' and believing that 'open rebuke is better than secret love,' speak out clearly and distinctly, and let in on the slaveholder's conscience the concentrated light and authority of the pulpit and the press. In this way we hope to reach him, and at the same time organize, and concentrate a public sentiment on the subject, that shall strike off every chain, break every yoke, and sweep away, in its onward and resistless progress, every vestige of slavery. Such things have been done in other cases, and we trust they can be done in this.

And now do you say, that this is not telling how?—that here is no plan? It is the how, and the plan of Jesus Christ, in respect to all sin—slavery not excepted. It is the plan on which he has been acting, and is now acting, in conjunction with his people, for the conversion of the world. It is simply the application of his plan for the abolition of every sin to the abolition of a particular one. How does Christ propose to change

the will of the world and convert it from all sin to himself? Not by magic—not by miracle; but by the humble, yet mighty instrumentality of his people and his ministers, living out, speaking out, printing out, and preaching out the *truth*—the one great truth, to which all others are subservient, that ‘God now commandeth all men, every where, to repent.’ This, is the grand weapon in the warfare, and, through God, it is mighty to the pulling down of strong holds, and will yet bring the world into captivity to Christ. We propose to try it in the present case, and we doubt not its efficacy will be such as to show that its temper is etherial.

And now, do you say still that this is all talk—that it does not go into the detail of the plan at all? Let us come then to the detail? We propose,

1. A national Society, whose special business it shall be to superintend this great movement, to collect facts, print tracts and send them abroad upon the winds, to enlist the press and the pulpit, to employ agents and send them abroad to confer with influential individuals, address popular assemblies, assemblies of clergymen, form auxiliaries, &c. &c.; in a word, to throw out an influence, steady, strong and increasing on the subject, until every section of the land shall be pervaded with it, and the *people* with one consent, shall rise and say to the oppressed, ‘Go free.’

And in carrying this operation into effect, we propose—

2. To begin where the influence of slavery is least felt, and there are, therefore, fewest obstacles to success. Of course, we shall begin with Northern ministers and Northern men, and among these, with those who are not committed on the side of slavery, but

whose minds are most open to conviction. And by the time we get these right, we shall expect to find that other minds have become open to conviction, and long before the work is thoroughly done up at the North, if we mistake not, the leaven will have begun to work at the South. Minds there will be open to conviction. We shall then go there, and first address ourselves to the ministers of the gospel, then to other good men, then to the community generally, and among others, to those broken-hearted mothers and deserted wives, who are doomed to weep day and night over sons and husbands that have fallen victims to the shameless licentiousness, which slavery every where begets. In this way we expect to proceed, and what is more, *succeed*. And now Mr. 'Working-man,' if you will consent to shake hands with Mr. 'Philosopher,' by adopting his principle of action—viz. immediate emancipation, there is work enough to do, and all we ask, is that you should act up to your professions and go about it.'

'No, no—it is all talk, after all. Your scheme looks well enough on paper, but you can't make it work in practice. You can't do the thing. I have been to the South, and I know something about it. You may depend upon it, Leviathan is not so tamed. All this talking, here at the North, only exasperates the South, and makes the matter worse and worse.'

And so you have gotten over your itch for working! You are one of those working, practical men, whose working chiefly consists in letting the thing alone! But to be serious. 'Can't be done'! It can be done—by plain dealing and persevering effort, it can be done. So read I my bible. 'Make the matter worse'! No such thing. The gospel is the power of God. Through

him, it is evermore mighty to the pulling down of strong holds. There is no system of iniquity, however strengthened and fortified by entrenchments, that it cannot, and properly applied, will not demolish. It does not, and God, its author, does not allow us to despair of any thing. What if its plain and uncompromising principles, when applied to slavery, do exasperate? The same is true of its application to any sin. And it is no proof that the gospel is powerless, or that the matter is growing worse, that it is so. So far from it, that very exasperation may be the earnest of success. It may betoken a conscience, that, instead of being utterly seared, is open to the access of truth. Plain dealing cannot make the matter worse. The people of the South are themselves frank and open, and they respect such frankness in others; and, though they may at first set themselves in hostile array, and storm and threaten; yet, after all, go to them in the honest simplicity of truth; tell them plainly they are wrong, and guilty in the sight of God; show them that duty and interest both bid them say to the enslaved, 'be free;' point them to the retributions of that God who is no respecter of persons; bid them look about and see on every side of them the evidences of his gathering judgments—warn them—do it kindly, yet plainly, and faithfully, and believe me, they will hear. They will (the better sort at least) respect you for your frankness; and, if for no other reason, yet for this, will give you their ear, and having won this, the gospel is adequate to reach the conscience and the heart. No, no—if the gospel is ever rendered powerless, in respect to this subject, it will be made so, not by the strength or magnitude of the sin, but by the time-serving policy of



a hollow-hearted expediency that dares not disturb its guilty repose, lest, perchance, it should rouse a lion from his lair.

The thing proposed, then, can be done. To say that it cannot, is to deny the efficacy of the gospel. It is to distrust the readiness and power of God to give it effect. It is to be treacherous to ourselves, treacherous to our country, treacherous to the cry of the oppressed, treacherous to God. Away, then, with the plea, that nothing can be done—that the consummation, so devoutly to be wished, cannot be realized.

In the language of one \* older and greater and better than myself, I would say :—

‘Reformations as much resisted by popular feeling, and impeded by ignorance, interest and depraved obstinacy, have been accomplished, through the medium of a rectified public opinion—and no nation ever possessed the opportunities and the means that we possess, of correctly forming the public opinion—nor was a nation ever called upon to attempt it by motives of such imperious necessity. Our all is at stake—we shall perish if we do not effect it. There is nothing that ought to be done, which a free people cannot do.’

‘No great melioration of the human condition was ever achieved without the concurrent effort of numbers, and no extended, well-directed application of moral influence, was ever made in vain. Let the temperate part of the nation awake, and reform, and concentrate their influence in a course of systematic action, and success is not merely probable, but absolutely certain.

• • • • • With just as much certainty can the public sentiment be forced and put in motion, as the waves can be moved by the breath of heaven—or the massy rock balanced on the precipice, can be pushed from its centre of reaction :—

\* Beecher on Intemperance, pp. 15, 35, 37.

and when the public sentiment once begins to move, its march will be as resistless as the same rock thundering down the precipice. Let no man, then, look upon our condition as hopeless, or feel, or think, or say, that nothing can be done. The language of Heaven to our happy nation is, 'be it unto thee even as thou wilt,' and there is no despondency more fatal, or more wicked, than that which refuses to hope, and to act, from the apprehension that nothing can be done.

## LECTURE IV.

### OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

**MATTHEW 26: 52.**—Then said Jesus unto him, put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

In my last lecture, I attempted to answer the inquiry, ‘What is the remedy of slavery?’ I stated, and endeavored to prove, that slavery could not be remedied by any schemes of amelioration, or gradual emancipation; but only by the scheme of immediate emancipation. To this scheme, however, there are a multitude of objections. By many, it is regarded as the very climax of absurdity, extravagance, and even recklessness—as based upon abstract theories, correct enough, perhaps, as theories, but in their results wild, visionary, and disastrous in the extreme. It is next in order, therefore, to notice some of these objections; and this I propose to do in the present lecture.

The prominent objections that are urged, are these which tell us of the *danger* of such emancipation—its danger to the slave, to the master, to the nation. It is to these, therefore, that I shall, for the most part, confine my remarks. And in respect to them all, I would say, at the outset, that the text furnishes us with a gen-

*eral principle*, which shows, that however specious they may appear, they are yet entirely unfounded. These pleas of danger—whether the danger respect the individual or the community—are mistaken pleas. They are founded upon the principles of a false philosophy and a false religion. The principle of the text is this—*that violence will beget violence, oppression beget oppression, and kindness beget kindness, in return.* It is, as if the Saviour had said, if you wish for violence and blood, then take the sword, and you shall perish with the sword; but if you wish for peace and quietness and safety, then put up again thy sword in his place, and treat your fellow-men on the principles of peace, rather than of the sword; for ‘with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again’—*kindness for kindness, violence for violence, blood for blood—‘good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and RUNNING OVER.’* And this, be it remembered, is the only true philosophy or true religion. It has the sanction of God’s co-equal Son. It bears upon it the impress of the Deity. And, degraded and wicked as human nature is, it is yet the only principle of peace and safety. Kindness will beget kindness, and violence, violence in return. It is the truth of God. It is a law of our nature. And it applies, in all its force, to communities and individuals alike—to the one as truly as the other. Are we told then of the danger of ceasing oppression and letting the oppressed go free?—it is altogether a mistake. Every such plea is based on the principles of a false philosophy and a false religion. The danger is all on the other side. If we wish for peace and quietness, either as individuals or a nation, we must put up again our sword into his place. If we will not, but will rath-

er take the sword, then shall we perish with the sword. Oppression will provoke resistance, violence will beget violence, blood will cry out for blood, and we shall have our fill. Dangers, dark and dreadful, will overtake us, both as individuals and a nation, and there will be no escape.

But let us examine these pleas of danger more particularly.

**OBJECTION 1.** *The scheme of immediate emancipation, it is said, is fraught with danger to the nation.*

How so? In what respects? Suppose the scheme carried through, and every slave to be this day a free man, and to be employed as a free laborer by his master—what harm would be done to the nation? Would the nation be the poorer for it? Would it become bankrupt, because forsooth two millions of free laborers occupied the place of two millions of slaves? Has free labor ever made the free States bankrupt? Or would the nation be more *guilty* in the sight of God? Would the breaking of every yoke be the filling up of its measure of iniquity? Or would the nation be more obnoxious the judgments of heaven? Would God be angry? Would he clothe himself in utter wrath, and gather up his judgments, and pour them on us without mercy, because we had, for once, learned righteousness and done it? Whence then the danger?

From this injudicious agitation of the subject of slavery and emancipation, by the people of the North, is the reply. It is said, that we cannot constitutionally meddle with the subject—that in the Constitution we have entered into a solemn compact not to meddle with it; and therefore, that if we push our mad schemes of immediate emancipation, we do it in violation of the

most sacred engagements—that we virtually trample the Constitution under our feet—and do but act over, at the North, the nullification schemes of the South, and shall, therefore, inevitably sunder the Union and overwhelm the nation in ruin.

Now I am no lawyer, and do not speak as a lawyer, but if plain common sense is qualified to speak on this subject, I would say,

1st. *That the people of the North have not entered into a solemn compact, never to meddle with the subject of slavery.* There is more than one way of meddling with this subject. To interfere with it in the way of physical force, is of course unconstitutional, and out of the question. For one State to interfere with it by attempting to legislate for another in respect to it, is also unconstitutional and out of the question. And for Congress, under the present form of the Constitution, to interfere with the subject by attempting to legislate for the States respecting it, is equally unconstitutional and impossible. And no man, at least no Abolitionist, I am sure, ever dreamed of interfering with the subject in either of these ways. But what then? Does all this shut us out from the right to interfere with it through the medium of an enlightened public opinion: and when that opinion demands it, through the medium of legislation also? What if individuals and States, as such, cannot legislate on the subject? Congress can, at least so far as the District of Columbia and the Territories are concerned, and when the public sentiment demands it, Congress will. Or if, under the present form of the constitution, Congress cannot touch the matter, I know of no obligation or statute, moral or political, which forbids the amendment of that con-

stitution, so soon as, by a change of public sentiment, the united voice of the people shall demand it. The people made the constitution. They adopted it. They sustain it. It is but the expression of their will; and they are, therefore, competent to make any changes or amendments in it, they choose. If, then, it needs amendment, touching the matter of slavery, it is theirs, of right, to amend it, if they will. And if the people, as a people, will to amend it, who shall veto the people's will? Who wrest from them the right and power to amend it in this particular, as well as in others?

But there is no need of such amendment. Congress, under the present form of the constitution, can have all the action on the subject which is needed, just so soon as the public sentiment of the people, shall constrain it to act. Many have supposed that the constitution expressly sanctions the existence of slavery. But it is not so. Slavery, considered as involving the right of property in man, is no where recognized in the constitution. The word slave is not there. It does not speak of slaves, as slaves—as chattels or property, but as 'persons'—as persons not 'white,' not 'free,' 'held to service or labor.' It speaks of them, therefore, just as it does of other men, and recognizes no relation between them and their masters, which differs at all, from the relation of master and apprentice, or hired servant. It puts the runaway slave on the same footing with the runaway apprentice. He is simply and only, a 'person held to service or labor,' and the constitution simply provides, that, in case he escape into another state, the laws of that state shall not nullify the laws of the other, but that the 'person' thus escaping, shall be delivered up, on claim of the party,

to whom such service or labor may be due. In doing this, however, the constitution does not enter at all into the nature of that claim. It does not ask whether he be held to service by the claim of property, or by the simple claim of hired service. It does not ask whether he be held as a slave, or an apprentice, or a hired servant, but, leaving the particular nature of the claim unquestioned and unrecognized, it simply provides that one State shall not exercise jurisdiction over another to nullify, by its laws, claims, which are valid under the laws of the other. The constitution, therefore, is not committed to the existence of slavery, so far at least, as the Territories and the District of Columbia are concerned. In respect to the abolition of slavery in these, Congress can therefore act freely and at once, if it will. The constitution interposes no barrier whatever to such action. And this action, be it remembered, is all the action that is needed in the case. The abolition of slavery in the Territories, and in that District, would be its virtual abolition throughout the land. The state of public sentiment that should demand and sustain its abolition there, would be one, that would demand and sustain its abolition in a majority of the slave States. The voice of the people that moved Congress to act on the subject, would also be heard in those States, and move them to act. And besides, the example of Congress acting for its abolition, would be an example that would be seen and felt. It would shake the whole system. It would be the nation uttering its testimony against it, and that testimony would pour such a flood of light and influence on the States, as could not be resisted. And more than all, abolition in the Territories, would be cutting off the branches of slavery, and



thus preventing its extension, on the one hand; and its abolition in the District, would be plucking out its heart, on the other; and thus robbing the system of its very life-blood. For nothing is more true, than that slavery, tolerated, as it is, in that District by Congress, is the very heart and soul of the whole system. That District is the great slave market of the nation. It is the great thorough-fare of slavery in the States. Let abolition, then, once go forward there, by authority of Congress, and the whole system of slavery will feel the blow; and it will be a death-blow. If, then, the tone of public sentiment, both at the North and the South, should be so changed, that the nation, as such, should demand the immediate abolition of slavery in that District—who could object to it, as unconstitutional or unchristian? And so in particular States, if the will of the people should become so changed in any State, as that a majority should be for abolition, what minority, or what sister State would be competent to veto the enactment of laws suited to that end?

Now it is in this way, and this only, that the scheme of Immediate Emancipation and its advocates propose to touch and legislate on the subject of slavery. And who can complain of this as unconstitutional? Does not the constitution accord to every man liberty of thought and speech, on one subject as truly as on another? And if, in the lawful exercise of this, we can originate a public sentiment, which, as the voice of the people, shall demand an amendment of the constitution, who shall indict us as guilty of trampling on 'sacred, chartered rights,' because, forsooth, that amendment respects one particular subject rather than another? Or if, without amendment, Congress can now act on the

subject, at least within its own jurisdiction, who shall bring the charge of treason against us, because we presume, in the lawful exercise of lawful rights, to get up a public sentiment which shall compel it to act?

And so of individual States—whenever the public sentiment in any slaveholding State shall demand immediate and entire abolition, who shall deny that State the right and the power of repealing its present laws, and enacting such others, as may be necessary to effect the object? And if we, in the non-slaveholding States, by the lawful exercise of our liberty of thought and speech, can succeed in getting up such a sentiment, both among ourselves and them, who shall stigmatize us as ‘disorganizers,’ ‘reckless incendiaries,’ and the like—sacrilegiously trampling on the sacred constitution? May we think, and then speak out, and print out, and act out our thoughts in respect to other prevailing sins? May we thus correct, and change the public sentiment, in respect to them? And, when that sentiment is sufficiently changed to demand it, call in legislative aid to effect our object, and yet not trample on the constitution, or trifle with ‘sacred, chartered rights’? May we abolish the slave-traffic thus? May we vindicate the claims of the poor Indian thus, and if possible, destroy the oppression that would crush him? How then does it happen that we must be thoughtless, and speechless, and motionless, in respect to slavery? Plainly, we need not be; and no sober man, in his senses, ever *really* supposed it. The constitution does not bind us to any such course. We may, constitutionally, think and speak and act on this subject, and continue to do it, until public sentiment throughout the land is radically changed; and, until it demand, with

one united voice, the entire and immediate extinction of slavery; and *then* we may, constitutionally, call in legislation to our aid. Congress can legislate on the subject wherever its jurisdiction extends, and each State can legislate for itself.

But what if it be constitutional to interfere with slavery in this way: slavery, it is said, is altogether a Southern matter, it is no concern of ours, why then should we, of the North, wish to meddle with it? Why not leave the South to manage its own concerns in its own way?

No concern of ours! No more is Paganism a concern of ours. Why not keep our printing presses, and tracts, and bibles, and missionaries at home then? Why send them abroad to break up the existing order of things, to overturn and overturn and overturn, until the whole structure of society is changed, and Paganism lies prostrate before Christianity? Is all this to be brought about, thank you, without excitement, and commotion, and convulsions even? Far from it. Why not quit our disorganizing schemes at once then, and let Paganism alone? Why meddle with that which is none of our business? Don't you think Pagans are capable of managing their own matters? Let them alone then, and let them manage their own concerns in their own way.

No concern of ours! No more is the tariff a concern of the South? Does the tariff levy taxes on the South? So does slavery levy tenfold heavier taxes on the North, and every northern man pays his proportion of them. Why then does the South make such a bluster about the tariff? It is no concern of theirs. Why can they not let us alone, and let us manage our own

concerns in our own way? We certainly do not need their interference in the management of our manufactories.

No concern of ours! It is a concern of ours, and every Northern man, whether aware of it or not, is deeply implicated in the matter. Who but the people, of which every non-slaveholder is one, are answerable for the existence of slavery in the Territories and the District of Columbia? In that District and those Territories, there are not less than *twenty-six thousand* human beings, made in the image of God, who are held in cruel bondage. And who and what is it, that holds them thus? The plain answer is, the people and the people's will. Every non-slaveholder in the land, is one of the people, and his will is a part of the people's will. If, therefore, he stands aloof from slavery, as a matter in which he has no concern, and neglects to lift up his voice and lend his influence for its abolition, at least so far as the District and the Territories are concerned, he does thereby consent to its existence, and involve himself personally, in the guilt of holding twenty-six thousand fellow-beings in the 'abhorrent chains of slavery'! He is a partaker in the sin, and as such, will be held answerable at the bar of God. Nor can he wash his hands of blood-guiltiness in this matter, without assailing the whole system of slavery. He cannot urge on its abolition in the District and the Territories without vitally affecting its existence in the States. Whether he will or not, then, he must make it a concern of his, either by consenting thereto and becoming partaker of its guilt, or by setting himself against it in every lawful and practicable way.

No concern of ours! Suppose a slave, escaped from his cruel bondage, takes refuge in our dwelling, and

his master claims him at our hand, what are we compelled to do? Why, with the word of God before us, saying 'thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that has escaped from his master unto thee,' and contrary to the convictions of our own conscience, we are compelled to deliver up that slave, and thus assist in reducing an immortal being to hopeless servitude. And yet, it is no concern of ours!

Nay more, there are more than two and a half millions of human beings—of immortal minds, almost in the darkness of Paganism itself, and rushing on, in all that darkness, to the realities of eternity, and we are christians, and are sending the light of the gospel over all the earth, and yet we may not touch a system of oppression, which is shutting out this light of life from these millions at our very door, because forsooth it is no concern of ours! Here they lie, groping in their darkness, groaning under their oppression, weltering in their blood; like the man among the thieves, 'stripped,' 'wounded,' 'half dead,' and we, forsooth, instead of interfering for their relief, must 'pass by on the other side,' because it is no concern of ours! 'Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, *how dwelleth the love of God in him?*' Slavery, then, is a concern of ours. It is my concern. It is your concern. It is every man's concern. And God will hold every man responsible, for the course of conduct he pursues in relation to it.

Thus much for the propriety and right and duty of our meddling with the subject. It is still insisted, however, whether right and proper or not, that, by agitating the subject at the North, and pushing the 'mad' scheme

of Immediate Emancipation, we shall assuredly sever the Union, destroy the Constitution, pave the way for civil war, and all other terrible things—in a word, whirl the nation in utter ruin.

Now in respect to this, I have only to say, *first*, that it is a mere bugbear alarm; and *second*, if not, that the nation may as well perish in this way, as by the continuance of its oppressions.

But we shall sever the Union! Pray, how? Do tell us how? Let us have the 'process,' for we are 'practical men.' Shall we sever it, so long as we push our 'mad' scheme of emancipation, by no other means than that of discussion and argument? Will the slaveholding States play the fool, and just because we, in the exercise of our constitutional rights, are discussing the matter of slavery, set themselves in battle array, unfurl the banner of Nullification, and declare their secession from the Union, unless we at once shut our mouths and stop our presses? Will they declare it to the world, that the non-slaveholding States are discussing the matter of slavery, that they have endeavored by persuasion, and argument, and entreaty, and threatening, to induce them to stop, but in vain, and that now, 'having exhausted argument, they are resolved to stand by their arms'? Will they ever base a declaration of secession on the fact of our discussion? Such a thing would but make them the laughing stock of the world. It would be the climax of folly; and it is little short of the climax of absurdity to suppose it.

How then are we going to sever the Union? Shall we do it by petitioning Congress to abolish slavery in the Territories and the District of Columbia? But the right to petition is a constitutional right—so acknowl-

edged. Will the slave States, then, instead of availing themselves of this right, and sending in counter petitions, just levy their armies, and set matters in battle array, and put forth a declaration of secession, because forsooth, we are exercising an acknowledged constitutional right? The supposition is preposterous.

It seems to be forgotten, that if the slave States ever secede from the Union, such secession must, of necessity, be based on some act of government, which, in their estimation at least, shall be unconstitutional. They cannot base their secession on the acts of individual States, except as such acts may be sanctioned by the general government, and thus made its own. It must be on *governmental action*, considered by them, at least, as unconstitutional, and on that only, that they can ever think of basing a secession. It is utter folly, to suppose they would ground it on any thing else. It were a sorry picture they would exhibit, to come forth before the world and say, you A. A. P. and various other 'fanatics' and 'firebrands,' are presuming to discuss the matter of slavery, and to petition Congress for its abolition in the District and the Territories. THEREFORE we shall secede from the Union, and 'stand by our arms'! No—the slave States have more sense than to think of such a thing as this. If they declare for a secession, they will not do it on the basis of individual action, or the action of individual States, as such, but on some action of the government. But what action of the government is it for individuals to discuss the subject, or even petition Congress in relation to it? None at all. And even if it were, slaveholders themselves cannot deny that it is constitutional action.

How then are we going to sever the Union? Will the discussion of the subject produce such an exasper-

ated state of feeling on the part of the slave States, that they will be ready to seize upon the most trifling pretext, and make it a ground of secession? As to this, the state of feeling is such already, and as long as slavery exists will continue to be such, that the least action on the part of government, which can possibly be construed into unconstitutional action, will be so construed, and will at once unfurl the banner of Nullification. It has done so, and, discussion or no discussion, it will do so again.

Or, as discussion goes on, will the slave States be so exasperated as to secede without any pretext, except, perhaps, that they do not like our company, and choose, therefore, to be by themselves? What then? Let them go. If they can live without the Union, surely we can. If they do not need our company, no more do we need theirs. As Mrs. Child said in another case, their threats of separation are 'very much like the town's poor, threatening to separate from the town.' They have been nothing but a tax and a burthen, and a constant source of difficulty ever since we have been in company; and now if they wish to separate, let them go. It would only save us from 'footing the bill' for them, any longer. It would only save us from being taxed for the support of slavery. It would only release us from the necessity of restoring runaway slaves; from the curse of a slave representation; the expense of a few more embargoes and wars; the clamor, and wrath, and excitement, and *dangers* of a few more Missouri and tariff questions; and from various other such like things. If they choose it, then, let them go, and revel in their luxury and licentiousness and oppression, and thus hasten on their day of bankruptcy and ruin. All



this will not stop discussion. Nor will it build a Chinese wall along Mason and Dixon's line, to keep the influence of it out of the slave States. Discussion, quickened and invigorated by the very act of secession, would go on, and, spite of every thing, would be felt in those States, as well as others. Moral influence can never be hemmed in by Chinese walls, much less by a mere parchment '*cordon sanitaire*.'

But admit the worst—that the agitation of this subject now, will so exasperate the South as to sever the Union—what then? We must agitate it sooner or later, and if the people of the South are so waspish, as to insist, that we shall not agitate it now, when will they cease to be waspish? When will they cease to storm and threaten? Never, so long as slavery exists. If to touch the subject now, is to touch the Union, it will be so next year, and so on indefinitely. It will never be safe to agitate it.

The truth is, so long as government refrains from unconstitutional action on the subject, the slave States *cannot* secede from the Union. And the plain reason is, that nothing short of such action can ever bring them to take a *united stand*. On any other ground than this, they will always be divided among themselves on the question of secession. Let that question be started to-day, and though some of the more reckless spirits among them might be ripe for immediate action upon it, yet would it be so with the more serious and stable? Would the community be ready for *united action* on it? Much less will they be ready for it at any future period. For as discussion goes on, and the leaven of abolition works among non-slaveholders, it will inevitably cross the line, and work among slaveholders. It will raise

up one here, and another there, who will plead the cause of the oppressed fearlessly. It will thus originate a small, but increasing party of abolitionists, in the midst of slaveholders themselves; and these, together with a still larger party of moderatists, and the presence of the slaves, will always hold the more violent in check, and secure a division of counsel on the question of secession—a division so great, as to render the idea of secession out of the question.

This is true even now, in respect to Maryland, Virginia and Kentucky. In those States there is now a division of sentiment on the subject. The large majority are indeed decided advocates of slavery. Still there is a party, which thinks and feels differently, and as public sentiment advances, that party will increase. It is so great now, that, should it be attempted, it would be impossible to secure any thing like unity of counsel on the question of secession. This is demonstrated by the Virginia debate of 1832. In that debate some of the members from Western Virginia discussed the subject on the broad principles of justice, not on those merely of expediency or convenience, and though they were met with angry recrimination and with threats of separation, still the fact was thus evinced, that Virginia itself is divided in counsel in respect to the matter of slavery. The same is true of Maryland and Kentucky; and, as public sentiment goes on, the same will be true of the other States.

I repeat it, then, so long as government refrains from unconstitutional action on the subject, so long, storm and threaten as they may, the slave States *cannot secede from the Union*. The cry of danger—danger to

the Union, is all a bugbear then. There is nothing in it. It is the child of interest and fear, and not of sober reason.

Or be this as it may, still I would say, 2d. *That the Union may as well perish in the struggle for right, as in the continuance of its oppressions.* For, to my mind, nothing is more certain than that the Union will perish, and at no distant period, unless it be saved by the timely abolition of slavery. There is but one path of safety. It is the path of duty; and if we will not walk in it, our destiny, and the destiny of the Union is sealed. If this Union is ever severed it will be severed by slavery perpetuated. In one form or another, slavery is now, and so long as it exists, will continue to be the great and almost only cause of collision between the South and the North, and, as I have elsewhere said, will originate collisions without end. This is our stone of stumbling and rock of offence. This is the great, the fruitful source of danger. Every day it continues it waxes worse and worse, and becomes more and more fruitful of danger. It is constantly weakening the bonds of our Union, and, let alone, will soon sever them. The process of separation has been virtually going on for years. A few more collisions, such as we have already felt, will complete it, and such collisions so long as slavery exists, cannot be avoided. They will come; and with them, sooner or later, will come the severing of the Union. No other alternative is before us, if we persist in our oppressions. If then we must have disunion, let us have it in the struggle for right, rather than in the struggle for wrong. If we persist in the latter, we shall have it, at all events. We can but have it, by endeavoring the former. Let us

then risk the experiment. It is better to die a penitent, than to be smitten down as an incorrigible and hardened offender.\*

**OBJECTION 2.** It is objected farther, that the scheme of immediate emancipation is *fringed with danger to the master.* The proclamation of freedom to the slaves, it is said, would be but the signal for a 'servile war'—'the opening of a red sea of blood'—'the dropping of a spark into a magazine of powder, whose explosion would bury master and slave in one common ruin,' &c.†

Now, in reply to all this, I remark, 1. *That it is naked assumption—mere conjecture.* There is no proof whatever of its truth. None is attempted even. It is merely the *a priori* opinion of ignorance, or interest, or fear, or all together, or of something worse. In nine cases out of ten, the men that utter this plea have never investigated the subject. Their impressions are mere first impressions, not the result of sober and honest investigation.

But 2. *This plea of danger involves those who urge it, in the most flagrant self-contradiction.* It goes on the supposition, that the slave has been so cruelly treated, that he would turn about, and wreak his vengeance on

\* 'The conflicting interests of free and slave-labor, furnish the only ground for fear in relation to the permanency of the Union. The line of separation between them is day by day growing broader and deeper; geographically and politically united, we are already, in a moral point of view, a divided people. But a few months ago we were on the very verge of civil war, a war of brothers—a war between the North and the South,—between the slaveholder and the free-laborer. The danger has been delayed for a time;—this bolt has fallen without mortal injury to the Union—but the cloud from whence it came still hangs above us, reddening with the elements of destruction.'—Whittier's *Justice and Expediency*, pp. 20, 21.

† These, as near as I can recollect, are the identical expressions of a Southern clergyman! O shame!

his master, the moment he should be free; and yet the men, that urge this plea, are commonly the men who tell us, that the master is exceeding kind, that he treats the slave with the utmost kindness, that the slave is therefore wonderfully attached to him, is his best friend, loves him almost as he would a father, is ready to do any thing for him; indeed, would be almost willing, in some cases, to die for him. But still, only give him his freedom, and all this friendship is changed into the bitterest hate in an instant, and that docile, friendly slave stands before you a very demon, thirsting for revenge and blood! Marvellous consistency truly!

Again, we are told of the anxieties and fears of the whites—of their nightly patrols—how they tremble at the shaking of a leaf—how the cry of fire fills them with consternation and dismay—what plots for insurrection are continually surrounding them: and the picture is often drawn with such a masterly hand, that the flames of burning dwellings, the yell of the murderer, the cry of the murdered, and the clash of arms, stand before you as so many living realities, and you can hardly persuade yourself that they are not. And yet, almost in the same breath, these same men tell us how comfortable, and happy, and contented the slaves are—that they are far more comfortable and contented than are the free blacks—that give them their freedom and they would not take it—that they would on no account whatever, leave their dear masters, that are so kind to them, and that they love so much! \* Glorious consis-

\* This gentleman (originally from the south) denied that the lot of the negroes was hard. He said they loved their masters, and their masters loved them: and in any cases of trouble or illness, a man's slaves were his best friends. I mentioned some undoubted instances of cruelty to slaves; he acknowledged that

tency! Plotting to destroy their best friends! Plotting to throw off that bondage they are so happy and contented in! Plotting to break the yoke that is lighter and easier than no yoke, and that they would not break if they could! Truly, if ever plea involved those that urged it in flagrant self-contradiction, this does it. And, take which alternative they may, on one hand or the other, there is the grossest falsehood. If the slaves are as comfortable and contented as is pretended, then the plea of danger is unfounded and false. Or if there be danger, then the pretence of comfort and contentedness is false. Both cannot be true.

But 3. Admit that there is some, even great danger in immediate emancipation, there is *equal and even greater danger, in any other scheme.* The point, fairly in dispute, is not whether immediate emancipation be free from *all* danger, but whether it be attended with *least*? This may be a case, in which, take what course we may, we must encounter danger, and if so, the simple and only question is, which will be attended with the least of it?

‘There have been insurrections, and there is danger of others, still more dreadful.’ Very true; but whence

such instances might very rarely happen, but said that in general the masters were much more to be pitied than the negroes. A lady, who had been in South Carolina when an insurrection was apprehended, related several anecdotes concerning the alarm that prevailed there at the time: and added, “I often wish that none of my friends lived in a slave State.” “Why should you be anxious?” rejoined the Southern gentleman; “You know that they have built a strong citadel in the heart of the city, to which all the inhabitants can repair, in case of insurrection.” “So,” said I, “they have built a *citadel* to protect them from their happy, contented servants—a citadel against their *best friends!*” I could not but be amused at the contradictions that occurred during this conversation.—Mrs. Child’s Appeal, pp. 147, 148.

comes this danger? Whence originates this spirit of insurrection? From the withholding of freedom—from slavery. For what are plots of insurrection laid? The slave surely has some object in view, in laying them. What is it? What can it be, but to throw off oppression and obtain his wrested rights? Let oppression cease, give the slave his freedom, and rely upon it, he will have obtained his object—that object for which he is ready to hazard life and every thing, and he will cease to plot and rise in insurrection. The slave plots *for something*. Give that something to him peaceably, and he will not plot for it. He will have the object of his heart's desire, and all motive for plotting will be taken away. The danger of insurrection, with all its horrors, lies therefore in the continuance of slavery, not in its extinction. So true is this, that slaveholders have but one alternative, either to emancipate their slaves voluntarily, and thus escape the dangers they dread, or to have the slaves emancipate themselves by force. Peaceable emancipation, or *violent* with all its horrors, will inevitably take place. There is no avoiding it. Sooner or later it will come. In the midst of their oppressions, and in spite of them, the colored population of the South is rapidly increasing. Like the Israelites in Egypt, the more they are afflicted, the more they multiply and grow; and half a century will not pass, before they will have become a great and mighty people. The occupation of the Indian lands and various other causes will keep the ratio of increase as great, at least, as it is now. So that fifty years hence, the present two and a half millions of slaves will have become eight or ten. But when we see, in our land, some eight or even six millions of slaves, we

shall see a mass of physical strength, that will not always sleep, and that will laugh to scorn the petty arm that would control and bind it. This increase will operate, in various ways, to wrest the sceptre from the master's hand, and carry the balance of power over into the hands of the slave.

And besides, elements are at work, that will inevitably breathe into that slumbering mass, the breath of life. Knowledge is abroad in the nation, and spite of laws and spite of every thing, will shed some rays of light upon the darkness that envelopes the slave. The spirit of freedom too is abroad, and to a greater or less extent, it will breathe itself into the entire mass of slaves. It has done so already. It will continue to do so. Ignorant as are the slaves in other respects, they do know now very extensively, and however they may increase, they will continue to know yet more extensively, that freedom is their birthright, as truly as it is their master's. The rejoicings and festivities of our national birth-day, and a thousand other things will teach it them. They will know it—they will feel it, yet more extensively and deeply than they do now. And what, especially, will hasten this result, is the process, now extensively going on, of carrying slaves from the Northern to the Southern and Western slaveholding States. These, living as they have in the vicinity of the free States, know more of freedom, breathe more of its spirit, than do other slaves. They understand perfectly, at least the more intelligent of them, that their bondage is, from first to last, a matter of oppression—of cruel, wicked, unholy oppression, and that they, therefore, have the same right to rise and trample on the master, that the master has to trample on them.



And with all this knowledge, and with the spirit it inevitably begets, they go to the South, to carry it there—to communicate the one, and breathe the other into the minds of their companions in bondage. In this way, increase as it may, the whole mass will be leavened; and the spirit of insurrection—the creature of oppression, to be tamed and subdued only by ceasing oppression—that spirit will not then be dead, nor will the fears it awakens be quieted. On the contrary, it will be instinct with life. It will awake to most fearful action. When the present two millions of slaves, shall have become six or eight, it will breathe the breath of life into the whole of that slumbering mass of physical strength, and that mass will rise, and throw off its oppressions, and say to its oppressors, as did the Patriots of our Revolution, *‘for a people to be free, it is sufficient to will it.’* There is then no other alternative. Peaceable or violent emancipation, slaveholders must have. If they will not have the former, they must have the latter. And when that comes, it will be violent indeed. It will be the outbreking of the accumulated, though smothered vengeance of millions—a vengeance lashed to fury by years of oppression and outrage; and that indeed, will be *‘uncapping a volcano,’* and pouring desolation over the land.\* Danger, therefore, lies in the continuance, not in the extinction of slavery.

\* *‘Mind is the same every-where, no matter what may be the complexion of the frame which it animates: there is a love of liberty which the scourge cannot eradicate—a hatred of oppression which centuries of degradation cannot extinguish. The slave will become conscious sooner or later of his brute strength—his physical superiority, and will exert it. His torch will be at the threshold and his knife at the throat of the planter. Horrible and indiscriminate will be his vengeance. Where then will be the pride—the beauty and the chivalry of the south? The smoke of her torment will rise up like a thick cloud visible over the whole earth.’*  
—Whittier’s *Justice and Expediency*, pp. 12, 13.

Which then, to return to the question before us, is the path of greatest safety? Admit, that the spirit of insurrection is rife among the whole slave population, that notwithstanding their comfortable and happy condition, they are yet thirsting for the blood of their masters, and what then? Is this spirit less rife among them, than it was fifty years ago? Not a whit. And if slavery continues, and things go on as they have, will it be less rife fifty years hence? So far from it, it will but have ripened to maturity. That spirit is the creature of oppression. It is nurtured by oppression. It is perpetuated by oppression; and while oppression lives, it will live, and sooner or later, if oppression cease not, wreak vengeance on its head. It certainly, then, is not the path of safety to persist in our oppression. Safety lies altogether in the other direction.

Shall we then desist gradually or at once? Which of these is the safer course? To say nothing of the impossibility of it, it is enough that we have been desisting gradually for years, and after all have not advanced a step. Our movement has been retrograde rather. The spirit of insurrection is as rife as ever, if not more so; and when we talk of emancipation, the cry of danger, danger, death, death, waxes as loud or louder than ever. And beside, while we are gradualizing, we are every moment exposed to the outbreaking of this spirit. Our gradualizing can never subdue and destroy it, until it has resulted in the extinction of that oppression, which gives it birth, and keeps it in existence. The course of greatest safety then—indeed the only course of real safety, is to kill that spirit at once, not to tamper with it and attempt to kill it by piecemeal, but, by ceasing at once the oppression of which

it is the offspring, to destroy it at a blow. 'They that take the sword shall perish with the sword.' If you wish for peace, 'put thy sword again into his place.' Do it at once.

Whether the scheme of immediate emancipation then, be *entirely* free from danger or not, this, at least is true, it is most free from it. Pursue what other scheme you will, and it is fraught with dangers more certain and dreadful than any that cluster around this. If you regard the matter then simply as a choice of evils, this is the lesser, and should have the preference.

But 4. *This plea of danger is entirely unfounded. Immediate Emancipation is perfectly safe; and the idea that it is not, is founded on the principles of a false philosophy and a false religion.*

There is one simple principle, that settles the whole matter forever. It is, that *kindness will evermore disarm revenge*. There is no principle that is more obvious than this, none that is matter of more familiar experience, and yet in the investigation of this subject, none that is oftener overlooked. Exceptions to it there may be, as to all other general principles. Nevertheless the principle is a true one. It is *the grand principle of the gospel*—that of winning and subduing by love. 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.' 'Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.' 'Yielding pacifieth great offences.'

It is a *law of our nature*. Every man's consciousness bears witness to its existence and its power. When do you begin to hate a man? When he begins to injure you. What provokes your continued hatred?

**Continued injuries.** When is your hatred subdued? When injuries cease and reparation is made. When do you begin to love? When kindness takes the place of injury. Such is the testimony of every man's consciousness. Kindness and love will beget kindness and love in return. Every man knows it—feels it.

And farther, the testimony of consciousness, is confirmed by that of *experience and observation*. Let facts speak. When our fathers came to this land, they took the sword, and when collisions arose between them and the natives, they used the sword, and the result was that they perished with the sword. Violence received violence, and vengeance, vengeance in return. Wars were waged and blood flowed, and the red man seemed a demon in his revenge. And yet there was a power that could disarm even him. Penn came—not with spear, or sword, or battle-axe, but with the calumet of peace. The 'law of kindness' was on his lips, and with no protection but this, he and his companions threw themselves into the midst of the savage red men. They treated them kindly—as men and brethren. The demon was disarmed. Kindness beget kindness, and Penn and his companions found a brother even in the savage, and received from him, not a demon's vengeance, but a brother's kindness and a brother's love.

Again, Saul the king, thirsting for the blood of David and madly bent on his destruction, pursues him to Engedi. He enters into a cave, and David is there, secreted in its sides. His life was thus in David's hand, and, had he been so disposed, could have been easily taken. But no, David chooses rather to cut off the skirt of his garment merely, just to show him that he had been in his power. Saul, unconscious of the

danger to which he had been exposed, quits the cave, and David follows, and cries after him, saying, among other things, 'My father, see, yea see the skirt of thy robe in my hand: for in that I cut off the skirt of thy robe, and killed thee not, know thou and see, that there is neither evil nor transgression in mine hand. \* \* \* \* The Lord judge between me and thee, and the Lord avenge me of thee; but *mine hand shall not be upon thee.*' And Saul said, 'Is this thy voice, my son David? *And Saul lifted up his voice and wept.*' His hard heart was melted. 'And he said to David, thou art more righteous than I, for thou hast rewarded me good, whereas I have rewarded thee evil;' and ashamed of himself he gave up the pursuit of his victim and 'went home.' Kindness disarmed him.

The illustration might be pursued to any length, but it is needless to pursue it farther. Now I maintain that this principle applies in all its force to the present case. Suppose the master to be a kind one, and his slaves therefore attached to him. He calls them around him, tells them he considers it wrong to hold them as slaves, that he proposes therefore to employ them as free hired laborers, provided they choose to remain with him; and if they do not, that they are at liberty to go where they please. Now there is not one slave in a hundred, but would consider this an additional act of kindness on the part of his master; and, loving him as he did for his former kindness, it is not in the nature of things, to suppose that he would cease to love him now.

Or suppose the master cruel. He ceases his cruelty, bids his slaves go free, and offers if they prefer it, to employ them as free laborers. They certainly would

regard this as an act of kindness, and one of two things would be the result, either they would quietly leave his service, or, surprised by this unexpected kindness, would be disarmed of their revenge, and willingly remain. Such, as a general thing, would be the inevitable results of this act of kindness, in each case. In the one, it would but bind the slave to his master in still stronger ties of attachment, and in the other, it would at least disarm revenge, by taking away its cause. So far as the *individual* is concerned, then, immediate emancipation is perfectly safe; and as to the *community*, the same general principle operates to render it safe to that.

Thus much from the nature of the case. *What now is the testimony of facts? Does it confirm this reasoning?* Most unequivocally, is the answer. There are a multitude of facts on record, which both illustrate the principle to which I have adverted, and show, beyond all dispute, the perfect safety of immediate emancipation. Indeed the challenge has been repeatedly made, for any one to show, that a single drop of white blood has ever been shed in consequence of emancipation; and the challenge has never been met. It cannot be met. The facts are all the other way—on the side of safety. Let me quote a few of them.

‘Some years ago, a Friend residing near the borders of Virginia, heard that a negro of the most hardened character, was thrown into prison as a last resource; “not all the promises or all the terrors of his master,” said they, “can make any thing of him; he seems to laugh at flogging, and at chains, and death; he is always thieving, always lying, and always idle.” The Friend, with two or three others, went to see him; the negro seemed to have made up his mind for defiance, and sat gloomily and contemptuously before them.

They sought to get at his heart, but long he heeded them not; at length, when they were about to give him up in despair, a fibre was suddenly smitten: "massa," said he, "you know no'ting 'bout dat: you get me free, den you see, what kind man, I." They easily purchased him, for he was a nuisance rather than of any value to his master; and he immediately proved himself, and continued to prove himself, one of the most dutiful and industrious men, that the Friend ever knew.\*

Again:—

\* One of the most interesting instances of immediate emancipation, which has occurred in our country, was related by Capt. Burrill, of Trumbull, Connecticut, who some years since went to Virginia, or North Carolina, for corn. He received his cargo from two planters, one of whom was kind towards his slaves, as the Captain supposed them to be, and they were cheerful, well dressed, and ready to do anything which would be desirable to the master, and enhance his interest. His plantation was in a fine condition, and every thing wore the appearance of thrift and happiness. The slaves on the other plantation, were poorly dressed, appeared forlorn and miserable. They seemed to care for nothing, but went like brutes at the command, or whip, of the master. The plantation was in its appearance far behind the other, and there was no motive presented by the master but fear. It was in the month of April, that Capt. Burrill took in his corn, and instead of using a boat, the master made the slaves carry the corn sacks on their backs to the vessel, wading in the water to their loins. The Captain remonstrated with the master. He said it was good enough for the rascals; that they would cut his throat any time, if they could, and that he would have them know, that he had the control over them. The Captain inquired of the former planter how it was, that there was such an immense difference between the situation of his slaves and plantation

\* Stuart's West India Question, pp. 27, 28.

and those of the latter. He remarked that his neighbor was a cruel master, drove his slaves, and took poor care of them. They hated him, and would no doubt cut his throat, if they could without discovery. Some years ago, he said, I was convinced that it was a sin in the sight of God, to hold my fellow creatures as slaves, and one morning I called them all together, and confessed to them my conviction. I offered to employ them as laborers, and pay them wages, and to do them all the good in my power. I gave them all their freedom, remarking that if any were disposed to leave me, they were at liberty to do so, but that if they intended ever to return, they must come back within sixty days. They rejoiced to be free, and embraced my offer with gladness, at the same time declaring their intention not to leave me. Only one left, and at the end of thirty days, he came back, begging to be received, and was accordingly. Now, said he, these people love me and would do any thing for my pleasure. I act the part of a guardian, they make me their banker, and even request me to purchase their provisions; and in conclusion he remarked, that in ten years from the time that they were manumitted, he should be a richer man than if he had kept his people as property.\*

These facts are sufficient to settle the question of safety, and interest too, so far as the individual is concerned. Let me quote some facts on a larger scale, to show that immediate emancipation is equally safe for the community.

‘In consequence of the Revolution in Columbia, all the slaves who joined the Columbian armies, amounting to a considerable number, were declared free. General Bolivar enfranchised his own slaves to the amount of between seven and eight hundred, and many proprietors followed his example. At that time Columbia was overrun by hostile armies, and the masters were often obliged to abandon their property. The black

\* Stated by Mr. Jocelyn, of New-Haven.



population (including Indians) amounted to nine hundred thousand persons. Of these, a large number was suddenly emancipated, and what has been the effect? Where the opportunities of insurrection have been so frequent, and so tempting, what has been the effect? M. Ravenga declares that the effect has been *a degree of docility on the part of the blacks, and a degree of security on the part of the whites, unknown in any preceding period of the history of Columbia.*'

'In Guadaloupe, the conduct of the freed negroes was equally satisfactory. The perfect subordination which was established and the industry which prevailed there, are proved by the official Reports of the Governor of Guadaloupe, to the French government. In 1793, liberty was proclaimed universally to the slaves in that island, and during their ten years of freedom, their governors bore testimony to their regular industry and uninterrupted *submission to the laws.*'

I will quote one instance more, that of St. Domingo. And such were the circumstances of the case, as to make it absolutely decisive on the question of safety to the community as well as the individual. A civil war had been raging in the Island for some time. The government, though aided by troops from France, was unable to quell it. To extinguish this, and at the same time resist an invasion of the English, the government of the Island, in the latter part of 1793, proclaimed liberty to all the slaves. 'After this public act of emancipation,' says Colonel Malenfant, a slave proprietor, residing on the Island at the time, 'the negroes remained quiet both in the south and in the west, and they continued to work upon all the plantations. There were estates which had neither owners nor managers resident upon them, yet upon these estates, though abandoned, the negroes continued their labors where there were any, even inferior agents, to guide them; and on

those estates where no white men were left to direct them, they betook themselves to the planting of provisions ; but upon all the plantations where the whites resided, the blacks continued to labor as quietly as before.'

'If you will take care,' he says, 'not to talk to them of the restoration of slavery, but to talk to them of freedom, you may with this word chain them down to their labor. How did Toussaint succeed?—How did I succeed before his time in the plain of the Culde-Sac on the plantation Gouraud, during more than eight months after liberty had been granted to the slaves? Let those who knew me at that time, let the blacks themselves, be asked : they will all reply that not a single negro upon that plantation, consisting of more than four hundred and fifty laborers, refused to work : and yet this plantation was thought to be under the worst discipline and the slaves the most idle of any in the plain. I inspired the same activity into three other plantations of which I had the management.'

In the latter part of 1796, three years after the act of emancipation, 'the colony,' he says, 'was flourishing under Toussaint, the whites lived happily and in peace upon their estates, and the negroes continued to work for them.'

And this state of things continued, 'the Colony marched as by enchantment towards its ancient splendor,' until Buonaparte made the mad attempt to *restore slavery*. Then, indeed, the spirit of resistance was roused. Blood flowed, the French were driven from the Island, and the property of the planters was taken from them.

These facts are but a few from a vast multitude—all speaking the same language, and declaring, with a

uniformity that is truly wonderful, the complete and entire safety of immediate emancipation.\*

\*The following passage from Thompson's Lectures, p. 55, is so much to the purpose, that I cannot forbear quoting it. 'Now what did Sir Stamford Raffles do when he assumed the command of the island of Java? With one dash of his pen he abolished slavery forever. (*Cheers.*) Well, what was the result? Did the emancipated slaves refuse to work? No. Was there a decrease in the revenue? No; an increase. Was there more crime? No; during the whole of his government I believe there were but four persons tried and convicted for an offence against the laws of society. What was the consequence when he relinquished the government, and the Island was handed over to the Dutch? Slavery, according to the Dutch form, was again introduced; within a short time no fewer than 500 slaves were executed for rebellion. (*Hear, hear.*) What did Bolivar do in Mexico? Did he think there was any danger in emancipation? No; like Sir Stamford Raffles, with one dash of his pen he blotted out slavery forever, and every slave rose at once into the condition of a freeman. (*Cheers.*) But Mr. Borthwick says we ought not to think of emancipating at once 800,000 slaves, many of them in a state of ignorance, many of them under the influence of dark and untamed passions. Mr. Borthwick knows that there are not 800,000 slaves in any one place, and, therefore, he ought not to contemplate any danger but that which may result from a particular number in a particular place, whether it be the Cape of Good Hope, Antigua, Martinique, or Jamaica. Now taking the slaves of Jamaica at 30,000, we must deduct half for women, and, surely, Mr. Borthwick will not say that women will become rebels! Surely he who admires the ladies so much will not say that it is amongst them that the planters have to look for the Jassiers and Pierres who are to destroy them! (*Laughter.*) Deducting the ladies, therefore, Mr. Borthwick, we deduct half the danger. Then we must deduct the children, boys under 12 years of age; they, surely, will not join the rebels; therefore we must send them to their manmas whilst Mr. Borthwick and I discuss the remainder. (*Laughter.*) Mr. Borthwick tells us, that on every estate, two-thirds of the slaves are either children, sick, old, or infirm; where is the danger, then, Mr. Borthwick? Will freedom make the child a man; will it make the old man young; the leper clean; the cripple vigorous and athletic? No; the palsied man will still be palsied;—the leprous still a leper;—the cripple still a cripple; there can be no danger from them, and, therefore, we will send them to keep company with the women and children, whilst Mr. Borthwick and I talk about the rest. Again: have not the Wesleyans, and Moravians, and the Missionaries of the Church of England, to say nothing of the Baptists, so cherished by the

But there is still another consideration to be taken into the account, in respect to this plea of danger. It is this, *that it seems almost instinctive in the negro to return even cruelty with kindness.* Witness the following fact. It is from Godwin's Lectures on Colonial Slavery.

'A few years ago it was enacted, that it should not be legal to transport once established slaves from one island to another; and a gentleman owner, finding it advisable to do so before the act came in force, the removal of a great part of his *live stock* was the consequence. He had a female slave, a Methodist, and highly valuable to him (not the less so for being the mother of eight or nine children,) whose husband, also of our connexion, was the property of another resident on the island, where I happened to be at the time. Their masters not agreeing on a sale, separation ensued, and I went to the beach to be an eye witness of their behavior in the greatest pang of all. One by one, the man kissed his children, with the firmness of a hero, and blessing them, gave as his last words—(oh! will it be believed, and have no influence upon our veneration for the negro?) 'Farewell! *Be honest, and obedient to your master!*' At length he had to take leave of his wife: there he stood (I have him in my mind's eye at this moment,) five or six yards from

planters as Mr Borthwick tells us they are; have they not taught thousands of slaves the religion of peace and righteousness? And would the slaves thus instructed uplift an *arm* to pluck a *single hair* from the head of a planter? Deduct these from the mass,—but send them not to the women and children,—keep them as a body guard for their dear friends the planters. (*Laughter and cheers.*) Then, again, there are the happy and contented slaves,—the slaves who desire not freedom, who 'want no more,' they are so happy and comfortable,—these, too, may surely be deducted from the mass,—and then what becomes of the danger? Deducting the women, the children, the old men, the sick and infirm, the Christian slaves, and the attached slaves, a sorry remnant will be left behind. (*Cheers*) Away, then, with the talk of danger: it is contrary to nature, it is contrary to history, philosophy, and experience, to suppose that any danger will ensue.

the mother of his children, unable to move, speak, or do anything but gaze, and still to gaze, on the object of his long affection, soon to cross the blue waves forever from his aching sight. The fire of his eyes alone gave indication of the passion within, until after some minutes standing thus, he fell senseless on the sand, as if suddenly struck down by the hand of the Almighty. Nature could do no more; the blood gushed from his nostrils and mouth, as if rushing from the terrors of the conflict within; and amid the confusion occasioned by the circumstance, the vessel bore off his family forever from the island!

And these are the men—men that can say to their children ‘Be honest, and obedient to your master,’ at the moment that the grasp of a tyrant is hurrying them and their mother, the wife, away from their sight forever—men that can do this, when the strength of their affection for the loved ones is such, that nature itself cannot sustain the agony of separation—these are the men, who are going to wreak vengeance on their masters the moment they are free! Never. The negro’s heart, spite of all the maddening influence of oppression, is too kind, too full of tenderness and love. The white man might do it, but not he. He has too big a heart. The cry of danger then is a delusion. There is no ground for it. The negro’s characteristic trait, facts, reason, scripture, all go to contradict it, and to show the entire safety of immediate emancipation. Let oppression cease and danger will cease. Let the slaveholder put up his sword, and he will cease to be in danger of perishing with the sword.

There are various other objections to the scheme of immediate emancipation, but as they are less important, or at least, are less prominent just now, than are the preceding, I shall notice them briefly.

**OBJECTION 3.** If safe to the master's life, immediate emancipation, it is said, would *not be safe to his interest*—his slaves constitute so large a part of his property, that their emancipation would but make him bankrupt, and reduce himself and family to beggary.

The first answer is, *The slaves are not his property.* He may call them his. The laws may call them his, but they are not his. His claim to them, from first to last, is usurpation and robbery. They were stolen property at the first, if property they may be called, and as such, they have been handed down from father to son. They are, therefore, stolen property now. They are not the master's any more than if they were so much money, the fruits of robbery, that had been handed down to him, and that he, with his eyes open, had voluntarily received and retained, under the false plea that it was his. The slaves then are not his property; and therefore to talk of anticipated beggary, as a reason for not giving them up, is as great an absurdity, and as great an outrage on all principles of justice, as it would be—nay even greater than it would be to refuse to give up stolen money, because forsooth, knowing it to be stolen, he had received it from his father, consenting to live on the fruits of robbery, rather than restore the money to its owner, and seek for himself an honest livelihood.

‘But the master regards the slaves as his, and, whether his or not, to emancipate them would be beggary.’ Not at all; and the proof is easy. For, in forming a judgment in the case, we are to be guided, 1. *By general principles and not by particular cases.*

2. *By facts and not by frightful, panic-stricken anticipations.*

Suppose then we take the first rule of judgment, and decide on general principles—what is the decision? As a general principle, is it not a fact, the world over, that free labor is cheaper than slave, and at the same time more productive? Does not the employer thus secure the double gain, of *more* work at *less* expense? Nay, does he not secure the *triple* gain of *more* work, at *less* expense, and *better* done? The experience of the world demonstrates it.

Again, as a general principle, is it not a fact, that slavery evermore impoverishes a country, while freedom is attended with the opposite results? Let us look at a fact or too. Millions of acres of land, in the slaveholding States, have been made irreclaimably barren by slavery. The most prosperous counties in Maryland and Virginia are those which have the fewest slaves. The value of the houses and lands in Pennsylvania, increased, in fifteen years,—from 1799 to 1814—*ninety millions* of dollars, *more* than those of Virginia, though Virginia is the largest. The valuation of the houses and lands in New-York and Pennsylvania, under the United States assessments, the principle of valuation being the same in each case, was *more than six hundred millions of dollars, while that of the houses, and lands, and more than a MILLION OF SLAVES RESIDE of Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, WITH A MUCH LARGER AREA OF LAND, AND MORE THAN TWICE THE NUMBER OF INHABITANTS, was less than five hundred and twenty millions—NEARLY ONE SIXTH LESS.* Only think of it. Two States outvaluing seven, by nearly one sixth of their whole value; and that too, when the seven had more than a million of slaves to be

valued with their houses and lands, and a much larger area of land, and more than twice as many inhabitants, as had the two.\*

These are not solitary facts. The experience of the world might be quoted to prove, that such are the invariable effects of slavery. Its whole tendency, even in its days of prosperity, is to impoverish. The facts just quoted, be it remembered, show what slavery has done for the slave States, not in some unpropitious and adverse state of things, but in its day of greatest prosperity, when it has had almost an entire monopoly of the market, when its products have been in highest demand, and when its facilities for their cultivation have been greatest. To impoverish, then, as a general principle, is the invariable tendency and result of slavery. This is its tendency and result on the large scale—on the community; and for the same reasons, this, as a general principle, must be its tendency and result on the small scale—on the individual. † Guided

\* The above facts are given on the authority of Niles' Register.

† In the course of the debate on Slavery in the Virginia Legislature, in 1832, Mr Faulkner, himself a Virginian, said, 'Sir, I am gratified to perceive that no gentleman has yet risen in this Hall the avowed *advocate* of slavery. The day has gone by when such a voice could be listened to with patience or even forbearance. I even regret, sir, that we should find one amongst us who enters the lists as its *apologist*, except on the ground of uncontrollable necessity. If there be one who concurs with the gentleman from Brunswick (Mr Gibson) in the harmless character of this institution, let me request him to compare the condition of the slaveholding portion of this Commonwealth—barren, desolate, and seared as it were by the avenging hand of Heaven, with the descriptions which we have of this same country from those who first broke its virgin soil. To what is this change ascribable? Alone to the withering and blasting effects of slavery. If this does not satisfy him, let me request him to extend his travels to the Northern States of this Union,—and beg him to contrast the happiness and contentment which prevails throughout



by general principles, then, the conclusion is irresistible, that immediate emancipation would not be beggary to the master. It might—indeed it doubtless would produce temporary inconvenience and perhaps sacrifice. It would, for the moment, shock the whole structure of society. Here and there an individual might be reduced to poverty, and the community generally might experience some little temporary inconvenience. It would, however, be but temporary, and on the large scale, as a general principle, and in the ‘long run,’ it would be most salutary and propitious. It would be but the shock, felt by the intemperate man when he first abandons his cups—for the moment, perhaps, severe and trying, nevertheless the precursor of returning health, and peace, and prosperity, and salvation. So far from being itself the cause of beggary, therefore, it would be but the removal of the cause, and sensibly as it might, for the moment, be felt, nevertheless it would be its removal. It would be the annihilation of the curse, not its infliction. The hour, in which such

the country—the busy and cheerful sound of industry—the rapid and swelling growth of their population—their means and institutions of education—their skill and proficiency in the useful arts—their enterprise, and public spirit—the monuments of their commercial and manufacturing industry; and, above all, their devoted attachment to the government from which they derive their protection, with the division, discontent, indolence and poverty of the Southern country. To what, sir, is all this ascribable? To that vice in the organization of society, by which one half of its inhabitants are arrayed in interest and feeling against the other half—to that unfortunate state of society in which freemen regard labor as disgraceful—and slaves shrink from it as a burden tyrannically imposed upon them—to that condition of things, in which half a million of your population can feel no sympathy with the society in the prosperity of which they are forbidden to participate, and no attachment to a government at whose hands they receive nothing but injustice.—Mrs Child, pp. 31, 32. This is the testimony of an eye witness.

emancipation should be proclaimed throughout our slaveholding States, would be but the hour of their salvation. Their sterile lands would put on new fertility, assume new value, and under the sturdy stroke of the free, and voluntary, but interested laborer, yield a new and unwonted increase. Like St. Domingo, under the new order of things, they would march, as by enchantment, towards their ancient splendor. Cultivation would prosper. Plenty, from a full horn, would pour into their lap, her richest, choicest blessings; and wealth, which does but impoverish its possessors, making them in many cases bankrupt while in the possession of their thousands, that wealth would thus be exchanged for such as would be wealth indeed. And along with such a change in the agricultural interests, would come the introduction of the various arts and manufactures which exist in the free States and are among their greatest sources of prosperity, but which do not, and cannot exist, to any great extent, among a slaveholding community. Indeed, in ways innumerable, would immediate emancipation, notwithstanding present inconvenience, be but the precursor of better days to the slaveholding States—days of returning peace and prosperity and salvation.

But let us take our second rule of judgment, and decide *in view of facts and not of panic-stricken anticipations—and what is the decision?*

What are the facts? It is needless for me to quote them. Those already quoted on pp. 56, &c. are but a fair specimen of the whole. They show, not only that it is safe to the master's life, but to his interest also, to cease his oppression. Hear the testimony—*in ten years from the time that they were manumitted, he should*

be a richer man than if he had kept his people as property,' and that, too, without any inconvenience or loss whatever at the time of their emancipation. 'They rejoiced to be free, and embraced my offer with gladness, at the same time, declaring their intention not to leave me.'

And what was true of the individual in this case, was true in the case of St. Domingo, of the community. 'The Colony marched, as by enchantment, towards its ancient splendor.'\* 'The proprietors were in peaceable possession of their estates; cultivation was making rapid progress; the blacks were industrious and beyond example happy.† Facts of a similar character might be quoted to almost any extent. And where facts of an opposite character have existed, they may be accounted for from some fault in the manner or condition of emancipation. The slaves have been turned adrift on society, uncared for by the master, in the midst of a community that would not employ them because they were free, and without even the offer of employment on the master's part. Wherever emancipation has gone forward on the principles of equity and benevolence, there I believe, the result has been one and uniform—prosperity to the master and prosperity to the slave.

But here, it is said, lies the difficulty—the planter has no property save his plantation and his slaves; the plantation is worth nothing to him, except it be cultivated, and it cannot be cultivated without the slaves, how then is he to escape poverty if he give them up?

Thus—To 'give them up,' does not suppose, that they are to be turned adrift on society, so that the

\* Gen. Lacroix.

† Clarkson.

master cannot avail himself of their services. On the contrary, it supposes that he, if they are willing, will employ them at once as free laborers. And if the matter operates as in the case mentioned, p. 217, he will be in no danger of wanting for laborers. They will need employment for a support, and he will need laborers for the cultivation of his plantation, and mutual interest, therefore, will compel the one to employ the other to work. The planter will get his laborers just as the farmer does his—by offering wages for them. And the same interest that makes the white work for the farmer, will make the black work for the planter.\* The idea that emancipation will deprive the planter of his laborers is preposterous in the extreme. What is it that crowds our manufactories—nay, reaches across the Atlantic and covers our canals and railroads with free, voluntary and industrious laborers? The

\* A beautiful illustration of these remarks is furnished by the following facts :

‘ In the South African Commercial Advertiser of 9th of February, 1831, we are happy to find recorded one more of the numerous proofs which experience affords of the safety and expediency of immediate abolition.

*Three thousand prize negroes have received their freedom; four hundred in one day; but not the least difficulty or disorder occurred;—servants found masters—masters hired servants; all gained homes, and at night scarcely an idler was to be seen. In the last month, one hundred and fifty were liberated under precisely similar circumstances, and with the same result. These facts are within our own observation; and to state that sudden and abrupt emancipation would create disorder and distress to those you mean to serve, is not reason; but the plea of all men who are adverse to emancipation.’*

Again, ‘ a Vermont gentleman who had been a slaveholder in Mississippi, and afterwards resident at Metamoras, in Mexico, speaks with enthusiasm of the beneficial effects of these regulations, and thinks the example highly important to the United States. He declares that the value of the plantations was soon increased by the introduction of free labor. “ No one was made poor by it. It gave property to the servant, and increased the riches of the master.” ’—Mrs. Child’s Appeal, pp. 96, 97.

law of mutual necessity and mutual interest. Nothing less—nothing more. And the same law would exist and operate, in case of emancipation, to cover plantations with free, yet willing and industrious laborers. The planter, therefore, will have no difficulty in cultivating his plantation. Let him offer suitable wages, and he will not want for laborers.

But where shall he get the wages? He has no property save the plantation and the slaves, how then is he going to get the means of *paying them for their labor*? Just as he gets the means of paying them now. The expense of feeding and clothing them, together with the expense of supporting the young, the old, the women, the children, the maimed, the lame, the halt, the blind, &c., is really so much paid for their labor now; and the master can obtain the means of paying them in the way of direct wages as well as in this.

But will it not cost him more?

Far less. Make the calculation. Here is a plantation with, say 300 slaves upon it. Suppose the average value of them to be \$100 each. Here, then, is an expense of \$30,000, at the outset, that might all be saved on the free-labor plan.

Of these 300 slaves, one third are healthy, efficient and profitable laborers, another third are less so, and do just work enough to pay for their support, and the other third are the young, the maimed, the halt, the weak, the sick, the old, &c., whose support is a dead loss to the planter. What, then, are the facts in the case? These—the planter is obliged to sink a large capital at the outset—then has to lose the interest on that capital and to support a large number of unprofitable laborers, and then, out of those that are profitable, he

gets a mere forced, and, compared with free, unprofitable labor; while on the other hand, on the plan of free labor, he would not sink the supposed capital, nor have the unproductive laborers to support, and yet would secure, from the productive ones, the full amount of labor of which they were capable.

But if the planter gives up the supposed slaves, he will at least lose the \$30,000—

Not at all. That is lost already. So long as he retains the slaves, it is so much capital sunk. It is not available at all. He reaps and can reap no present advantage from it, other than what he receives in the labor of the slaves. If therefore he can, on the free labor system, obtain that labor, or more labor at a less expense and better done, he surely is the gainer and not the loser.

But suppose he wishes to sell, then surely he is the loser—

Not in the long run, or to the full extent of the value of his slaves, if at all. Their value, in case of emancipation, would revert, in part, or altogether to the lands. It would do so in part at once, and gradually it would, in most cases, do so entirely. And the proof is, the greater comparative value of lands in the free and slave States. In the fact quoted, p. 225, it is shown that the houses, lands and slaves together, in the seven slave States, were of less value than the houses and land merely, in two free States, although the former had more land and a greater population than the latter. This simple fact shows, that let slavery once be abolished in any considerable extent of territory, the increased and constantly increasing value of the lands would, in part, or in whole, equal the amount sunk in the manumission of the slaves.

But be this as it may, so long as it is evident that the planter, by employing his slaves as free laborers, can cultivate his plantation to better advantage and at a less expense, that is enough. It shows that the plea of beggary is utterly unfounded; and indeed that the path of true and greatest prosperity is to bid the oppressed go free.

**OBJECTION 4.** *Immediate Emancipation, it is said, would be the ruin of the slaves.* In respect to this I would say,

1. The objection goes upon the supposition that the slaves are to be turned adrift upon society, without employment, and, therefore, without the means of subsistence. But this cannot be done. The mutual necessities and interest of planter and slave will, as we have seen, absolutely forbid it.

2. It goes on the supposition that the circumstances of their condition would not only be like, but worse than those of the free blacks now. Whereas the whole state of things, in respect to the opportunities of honorable and profitable employment and the means of subsistence, would be changed. The monopoly of labor would cease, and the chance of free and honorable competition be open to all.

3. The objection is destitute of proof. In most cases it is mere conjecture. Where are the facts?

4. It involves absurdity. It supposes that bringing the relations of society into harmony with the principles of God's government is fraught with ruin, and therefore that the safer, better way is to infringe those principles; or, in other words, that righting the relations of society is ruinous, and that, on that account, it is safer and better not to right them—than which, nothing is more absurd.

And 5. The objection is blind to facts. It contradicts universal experience. In addition to the facts already quoted, see the following extract of a letter from Trinidad :

‘A field negro brings four hundred dollars, but most of the work is done by free blacks and people from the main at a much cheaper rate ; and as these are generally employed by foreigners, this accounts for their succeeding better than our own countrymen, who are principally from the old islands, and are accustomed to any other management than that of slaves ; however, they are coming into it fast. In Trinidad, there are upwards of fifteen thousand free people of color ; *there is not a single pauper amongst them* ; they live independently and comfortably, and nearly half of the property of the island is said to be in their hands. It is admitted that they are highly respectable in character, and are rapidly advancing in knowledge and refinement. Mr. Mitchell, a sugar planter who had resided twenty-seven years in Trinidad, and who is the superintendent of the liberated negroes there, says he knows of no instance of a manumitted slave not maintaining himself.’

The following is from the report of the Commons’ Committee on Slavery. It is the testimony of Hon. Charles Fleming, the Admiral of the West India Station, who has resided in Jamaica, and has frequently visited Cuba, Hayti, and the Caraccas :

‘Speaking of the black republic of Hayti, Admiral Fleming says—

‘Are you aware that there is a prohibition against all corporeal punishment in that country?—Yes, I know there is.’

‘Did they appear to you to be living comfortably?—Yes ; the most happy, the richest, the best fed, and the most comfortable negroes that I saw in the West Indies were in Hayti, even better than in the Caraccas.’



‘Were they decidedly better than the slaves in Jamaica?’—‘No comparison.’

‘Do you happen to know whether the population of Hayti has increased within the last twenty years?—Of my own knowledge I cannot know that; neither are there any correct returns; but I have every reason to believe that, since the last time the French retired from the island, in 1800, the population has trebled.’

‘What were their victuals, compared with the food of the slaves in Jamaica—were they superior or much the same?—They were fed on meat principally; cattle are very cheap in Hayti.’

‘Is meat much cheaper in Hayti than in Jamaica?—Yes, much cheaper; it is 2*d* a pound, whilst the contract price in Jamaica is 12*d*; in both places these are the highest prices.’

There need be no anxiety, then, in respect to the slave. Strike off the chains, break the yoke, bid him go free, and the health and vigor and enterprise and prosperity of the freeman are his.\*

**OBJECTION 5.** If the scheme of immediate emancipation is carried out, we must have emancipation here, on the soil, and of course, we shall have two races in the country, and amalgamation, &c. &c., will be the consequence; and who is there, that would like to have his child marry a ‘nigger?’

How often does one hear this absurd objection! Sometimes he hears it gravely urged by those, who on other subjects, are regarded as men of intelligence and sense. For myself, however, when I hear it, I hardly know whether most to pity the ignorance, or frown with indignation at the prejudice it betrays. If ever I feel disposed to ‘answer a fool according to his folly,’ it is at such a time. However, I generally contrive to be seri-

\* See Appendix B.

ous, and show the panic-stricken objector that, after all, there is no lion there. And the reasons I offer to show it, are briefly these :

1. There are two races in the country now.

2. They are amalgamating as fast as possible now ; infinitely faster than they would if slavery were abolished. And the simple reason is this—give that slave girl her freedom, and instead of courting the unhallowed embrace of her master or his sons as an honor, she would have a character of her own, and would stand upon it, and reject that embrace. Besides this, there are the authority and violence of various kinds, to which she is now exposed, from ungodly and licentious masters and overseers, but from which she would then be exempt.\*

3. So long as the present prejudice exists there is no danger. Do you think, Mr. Objector, that with your present feeling there is any danger of your amalgamating? No more is there in the case of others, who feel as you do. Only keep your prejudice alive, and instil it into your children, and rely upon it, neither you nor they will ever marry a negro.

And 4. If, by and by, this prejudice should melt away, and the generation then on the stage should have no objection to amalgamation, why should you be concerned? You probably will never live to see it. Amalgamation will never take place extensively in your day ; and if it does in your children's, it can do so only as it is a matter of choice with them, and if they choose it, why should you forbid them?

\* An intelligent and pious colored man, who was once a slave, recently assured me that he had known slaves compelled to yield to the unhallowed embrace of the master or overseer by threats of the lash, or other violence.

‘Perhaps, a hundred years hence, some negro Rothschild may come from Hayti, with his seventy millions of pounds, and persuade some white woman to sacrifice herself to him—Stranger things than this do happen every year. But before that century has passed away, I apprehend there will be a sufficient number of well-informed and elegant colored women in the world, to meet the demands of colored patricians. Let the sons and daughters of Africa both be educated, and then they will be fit for each other. They will not be forced to make war upon their white neighbors for wives; nor will they, if they have intelligent women of their own, see anything so very desirable in the project. Shall we keep this class of people in everlasting degradation, for fear one of their descendants *may* marry our great-great-great-great-grand-child?’ \*

Away then with this hue and cry about amalgamation. It is entirely groundless—the offspring of a most cruel and wicked prejudice. It merits only pity or contempt. What, shall the professed disciple of Christ say to his brother man and brother disciple, toiling in cruel bondage, ‘toil on, toil on, die under your oppression,’ because forsooth he is afraid some of his descendants, or somebody else will marry a colored wife or husband! Shame—shame on such religion—religion did I call it? There it is, in the sanctuary—what says it? ‘Stand thou there, or sit’ yonder brother, for thou art black.’ There it is, at the communion table—what says it? ‘Stand by thyself, come not near to me,’ my brother, ‘for I am’—*whiter* ‘than thou.’ There it is, in heaven, amid that throng of redeemed ones, ‘out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation’—and what says it there? ‘Stand back, my black brother, to be sure your robe is as white and your crown as

\* Mrs. Child’s Appeal, pp. 140.

bright as mine, nevertheless you are black, and I am no friend to amalgamation, so stand back, stand back!' Religion did I call it? No—no. All heaven would cry out upon it, as upon a demon from the pit. It is not religion. It savors not of heaven but of hell. Christian—professing christian, there is a *God* who is no respecter of persons. Look well to thine heart then. Thy God is a consuming fire. It is a fearful thing to fall into his hands. 'Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall.' 'He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death. Whosoever hateth his brother, is a murderer.' And 'if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.'

## APPENDIX.

(A.)

MR. PHELPS, — *Dear Sir :*

Having had the pleasure of hearing your interesting and valuable Lectures on slavery, I take the liberty of sending you a few facts, collected from various sources, which I noted down in consequence of the following remark, which peculiarly arrested my attention. 'If the *Bible* sanctions slavery, why does not the *God* of the *Bible* sanction it?' In other words, if slavery is agreeable to the revealed will of *God*, why are not the dispensations of his providence in accordance with that will? Could it be fairly proved that slavery is in accordance with the will of *God*, it must necessarily follow that obedience to his will is not only highly advantageous but perfectly safe; for surely no Christian can for a moment believe that the providence of *God* ever militates with the precepts of his word. As, however, the consequences of slavery have been, in all cases, when not averted by timely repentance, disastrous in the extreme, it is therefore undeniably evident that slavery is in direct opposition to the revealed will of *God*, and consequently that those who so violently oppose the abolition of slavery, for fear of supposed dangerous consequences, may truly be said 'to know not what they do.' The truth on this subject is so plain, and the facts so abundant, that he who runs may read, and know, to a certainty, the entire safety of immediate

emancipation, that danger arises solely from liberty withheld, and, not from liberty granted. - The general opinion seems to be, that the moment you 'proclaim liberty to the captive' and make the slave a freeman, be the conditions and restrictions what they may, that moment you make him a vagabond, a thief and a murderer, whom nothing will satisfy but the blood of those, who had been so 'fanatical and insane' as to treat him like a human being. Whence this opinion is derived no one can tell; for it is in direct opposition to reason, common sense, the nature of the human mind, and is entirely unsustained by facts. Indeed, so far as the evidence of facts is concerned, the advocates of immediate abolition have a complete monopoly. All experience proves two things, viz. the entire safety of immediate emancipation, and that all danger has arisen from its indefinite postponement; for this is really the true definition of the phrase 'gradual emancipation.'

We all know the results of slavery in Greece and Rome. Troy perished by her slaves in a single night, and as like causes always produce like effects, our obligations to our slaveholding brethren imperiously demand that we should urge upon them, in the most earnest manner, the duty of immediately abolishing slavery as their only hope of safety—the only means, by which they can escape the just judgments of God. In our exemption from slavery at the North, we have no cause of boasting, but rather of deep humiliation. We are all involved in the guilt, and must share in the punishment, unless timely and thorough repentance avert the impending blow. To do this effectually, information must be spread, the spirit of inquiry aroused, the temple of God be purified, and 'the book of the law be found and read in the ears of all the people,' that thus the gross mistakes and misapprehensions, which exist on the subject of slavery and its abolition, may be corrected.

Of these mistakes, none is more prevalent or more dangerous than the one just mentioned, that insurrection, rapine and bloodshed, are the necessary result of

immediate emancipation, and that the only way to avert the evils and the curse of slavery, is to continue in the sin for the present, promise future repentance, and in the mean time, whilst we are preparing to get ready to begin to repent, do every thing that in us lies to extinguish every good feeling, and cultivate and bring into action every bad feeling of the human heart. That such is the belief and consequent practice to an alarming extent throughout our country, and that such a course is as impolitic as it is wicked, and as dangerous as it is unjust, facts abundantly show.

How the consequences of abolishing slavery would be dreadful and terrible, neither history nor experience informs us. Let us, however, see what they tell us of the consequences of holding men in bondage. In every instance, which has fallen under my notice, insurrections have *always* been projected and carried on by slaves, for the purpose of obtaining their liberty, and never by the *free blacks*. In the speech of Gov. Gibbes to the Legislature of South Carolina, delivered May 15, 1711, is the following :

‘And, Gentlemen, I desire you will consider the great quantities of negroes that are daily brought into the government, and the small number of whites that comes amongst us ; ..... how insolent and mischievous the negroes are become, and to consider the negro act already made, doth not reach up to some of the crimes they have lately been guilty of, therefore it might be convenient, by some additional clause of said Negro Act, to appoint either by gibbets or some such like way, that after executed, they may remain more exemplary than any punishment that hitherto hath been inflicted on them.’

Whether the Legislature of South Carolina prepared the ‘more exemplary’ remedy recommended by the Governor, and thus aggravated the disease it was intended to cure, or not, I have no means of ascertaining ; but in June of the same year, the Governor thus writes :

‘We further recommend unto you the repairs of the fortifications about Charleston, and the amending of the

Negro Act, who are of late grown to that height of impudence, that there is scarce a day passes without some robbery or insolence, committed by them in one part or other of this province.'

Early 'in the year 1712,' says the Rev. D. Humphreys, 'a considerable number of negroes of the Carriantee and Pupa nations, residing in New York, formed a plot to destroy all the English, in order to obtain their liberty, and kept their conspiracy so secret that there was no suspicion of it, till it came to the very execution, which was in April. The plot was this. On a Sabbath evening about sunset, the negroes set fire to a house in the city, which greatly alarmed the people, who ran from all parts to it. The conspirators planted themselves in the several streets and lanes leading to the fire, and shot or stabbed the people as they were running to it. Some of the wounded escaped and informed the Government, and presently, by the signal of firing a great gun from the fort, the inhabitants were called under arms and prevented from running to the fire. A body of men was soon raised, which soon scattered the negroes; they had killed about eight persons, and wounded twelve more. In their flight some of them shot themselves; others, their wives, and then themselves; some absconded a few days, and then killed themselves for fear of being taken. Many, however, were apprehended and eighteen suffered death.'

From the Weekly Journal, April 8, 1734, I make the following extract:

'Every reasonable man ought to remember their first villanous attempt at New York, and how many good innocent people were murdered by them, and had it not been for the Garrison there, that City would have been reduced to ashes, and the greatest part of the inhabitants murdered.'\*

On the 6th of May, 1720, the negroes in South Carolina, murdered Mr. Benjamin Cottle, a white woman

\* May the assertion be again verified, and the soldiers of another GARRISON, armed with weapons of ethereal temper, and the panoply of truth and justice, save not only New York, but the whole country from impending ruin.



and a negro boy. Forces were immediately raised and sent after them, 23 of whom were taken, 6 convicted, 3 executed, and 3 escaped.

In October, 1722, about 200 negroes near the mouth of Rastahanock river, Va., got together in a body armed, with an intent to fall on the people in church, but were discovered and fled, and only 5 were taken.

From the New England Courant of November, 1724, I take the following extracts:

'It is well known what loss the town of Boston sustained by fire not long since, when almost every night for a considerable time together, some building or other, and sometimes several in the same night were either burnt to the ground, or some attempts made to do it. It is likewise known that these villanies were carried on by Negro servants, {slaves}—the like whereof we never felt before from unruly servants, nor ever heard of the like happening to any place, attended with the same circumstances.'

So great at that time were the alarm and danger, that in addition to the common watch, a military was not only kept up, but at the breaking out of every fire a part of the militia were ordered out under arms to keep the slaves in order!! Now to a thinking man the inquiry would naturally arise, what caused the peculiar 'villany' of the blacks in 1724! Let him examine the Boston records of April, 1723, he will find a most 'villanous' 'Negro Act' in fifteen sections, the last of which is as follows:

'That no Indian, negro, or mulatto, upon the breaking out of fire and the continuance thereof during the night season, shall depart from his or her master's house, nor be found in the streets at or near the place where the fire is, upon pain of being forthwith seized and sent to the common gaol, and afterwards whipt three days following, before dismissed.' &c.

Now will any reflecting mind doubt that the crimes of 1724 were principally caused by their very prohibition? The first settlers of this country prohibited certain unmentionable crimes by severe laws, which, how-

over, were in a few years repealed. And what was the consequence? When the *laws* were repealed, the *crime* ceased. 'Nitimur in vetitum' is a true saying, and I have no doubt that had the blacks been made free and treated with humanity instead of being subjected to the cruel rigor of the law of 1723, the disasters of 1724 would never have occurred. To me nothing is more plain than that the increasing severity of the laws of the Southern States will accelerate the very catastrophe they are designed to prevent. 'Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat.'

In 1728, an insurrection took place in Savannah, Ga. among the slaves, who were fired on twice before they fled. They had formed a plot to destroy all the whites, and nothing prevented them but a disagreement about the mode. The population was at that time 3000 whites, and 2700 blacks.

In January, 1729, the slaves in Antigua formed a conspiracy to destroy the English, which was discovered two or three days before the intended assault. Of the chief conspirators, three were *burnt alive!!* '*It was admirable,*' says the account, '*to see how long they stood before they died, the great wood not readily burning, and their cry was, water! water!!*'

In July, 1730, an insurrection of blacks occurred in Williamsburgh, Va., occasioned by a report, on Col. Spotswood's arrival, that he had direction from his Majesty, to free all baptized persons. The negroes improved this to a great height. Five counties were in arms pursuing them, with orders to *kill* them if they did not submit.

In August, 1730, the slaves in South Carolina conspired to destroy all the whites. This was the first open rebellion in that State, where the negroes were actually armed and embodied, and took place on the Sabbath.

In the same month, a negro man plundered and burnt a house in Malden, Mass., and gave this reason for his conduct, that his master had sold him to a man in Salem *whom he did not like!*

In 1731, Capt. George Scott, of Rhode Island, was returning from Guinea with a cargo of slaves, who rose upon the ship, and murdered three of the crew, all of whom soon after died, except the captain and boy.

In 1732, Capt. John Major of Portsmouth, N. H. was murdered with all his crew, and the schooner and cargo seized by the slaves.

In December, 1734, Jamaica was under martial law, and 2000 soldiers ordered out after 'the rebellious negroes.'

In the same year an insurrection took place in Burlington, Pa. among the blacks, whom the account styles '*intestine and inhuman enemies* who in some places are *too much indulged!*' Their design was, as soon as the season was advanced so that they could lie in the woods, on a certain night, agreed on by some hundreds of them, and kept secret a long time, that every negro and negress should rise at midnight, kill every master and his sons, sparing the women, kill all the draught horses, set all their houses and barns on fire, and secure their saddle horses for flight towards the Indians in the French interest.

In 1735, the slaves of the ship Dolphin of London, on the coast of Africa, rose upon the crew, but being overpowered, they got into the powder room, and to be revenged, blew up themselves with the whole crew.

In 1739, there were three formidable insurrections of the slaves in South Carolina, one in St. Paul's Parish, one in St. John's, and one in Charleston. In one of these, which occurred in September, they killed in one night, 25 whites, burned 6 houses, and sacrificed every thing in their way. They were pursued, attacked, and 14 killed on the spot. In two days, 20 more were killed, and 40 were taken, some of whom were shot, some hanged, and some *gibbeted alive!*

This 'more exemplary' punishment, as Gov. Gibbes called it, failed of its intended effect, for the next year there was another insurrection. There were then above 40,000 slaves, and about twenty persons were murdered before it was quelled.

In 1741, there was a formidable insurrection among the slaves in New York. At that time the population consisted of 12,000 whites, and 2000 blacks. Of the conspirators, 13 were *burnt alive!* 18 hung, and 80 transported.\*

In 1747, the slaves on board of a Rhode Island ship, commanded by Capt. Bears, rose, when off Cape Coast Castle, and murdered the Captain and all the crew, except the two mates, who swam ashore.

In June, 1754, C. Croft, Esq. of Charleston, S. C. had his buildings burnt by his female negroes, two of whom were *burnt alive!*

In September, 1755, Mark and Phillis were executed at Cambridge, Mass., for poisoning their master, Mr. John Codman of Charlestown. Mark was hanged, and Phillis *burnt alive!!* Their object was to obtain their liberty, as their master had by his will *made them free at his death.* They accordingly poisoned him that the will might take effect, and they be emancipated.

In August, 1759, another insurrection was contemplated in Charleston, S. C.

In 1761, October 20, there was a rebellion among the blacks in Kingston, Jamaica.

In 1761, December 3, the blacks in Bermuda rebelled, and threatened to destroy all the whites. All were engaged in the plot, which was accidentally discovered. One was burnt alive! 1 hanged, and 11 condemned.

\* As; in the language of Gov. Mechlin, these last were probably among 'the lowest and most abandoned of their class,' they would doubtless have made good emigrants for Liberia, had such a colony been at that time established, but in lieu of that, or a similar asylum, they were distributed with commendable impartiality to the different West India Islands. To show how and what they used to transport in those days, I give the following from the Boston Gazette of Aug. 17, 1761:

'To be sold a *parcel* of likely young negroes, imported from Africa, cheap for cash. Inquire of Jno. Avery. Also, if any persons have any negro men, strong and hearty, though not of the best moral character, which are proper subjects of TRANSPORTATION, they may have an exchange for small negroes'!!

In the same year, Capt. Nichols of Boston lost 40 of his slaves by an insurrection, but saved his vessel.

In 1763, the Dutch settlement at Barbettias was surprised and cut off by the negroes.

In 1764, the blacks in Jamaica projected a rebellion, and intended to destroy all the whites in the island.

In 1767, there was a rebellion among the slaves in Grenada.

The scenes of St. Domingo come next. 'To an almost unprecedented extent, the past history and present condition of St. Domingo, have been misrepresented by the opponents of negro emancipation, who have propagated reports on this subject, as opposite to truth as light is to darkness.' Let us examine the facts in the case. 'When the French Revolution took place, the free people of color in St. Domingo petitioned the National Convention that they might enjoy the same political privileges with the whites. In March, 1790, a decree on that subject was adopted, but worded so ambiguously, that the whites and the people of color, each interpreted it in their own favor. This caused great animosities between them, disturbances ensued and blood was shed.

'On the 15th of May, 1791, another decree, in more explicit terms, declared that the people of color, in all the French Islands, were entitled to all the privileges of citizenship. This decree, on arriving at the Cape, produced an indignation almost amounting to phrensy among the whites. The two parties were armed against each other, camps were formed, and massacres and conflagrations followed. The report of these occurrences led the Assembly to rescind the decree they had passed in favor of the free people of color.

'The news of this repeal enraged the people of color as much as the former decree had done the whites, and hostilities were renewed. On this, the National Convention resolved to re-adopt their former decree of May, 1791, and they appointed Commissioners to repair to St. Domingo, with a large body of troops, in order to enforce the decree, and to keep the peace.

During the interval, which had elapsed from 1790 to the time of their arrival in 1793, the island had presented a dreadful scene of carnage, caused by a civil war, not only between the whites and the people of color, but between the different parties of whites. And it was at this time, namely, in 1791 and 1792, *before the emancipation of the slaves had been contemplated*, that the great massacres and conflagrations, which make so frightful a picture in the history of this island, occurred; and all of which were caused, *not by giving liberty to the slaves*, but by quarrels between the white and colored planters, and between the royalists and revolutionists, who, to wreak their vengeance on each other, called in the aid of their slaves.

'In the year 1793, the same divisions and conflicts continued, notwithstanding the arrival of the Commissioners, and on the 20th of June, a dreadful commotion took place at Cape Francois, the seamen and the white inhabitants being ranged against the people of color, who were afterwards joined by the insurgent blacks. *The battle lasted two days, the arsenal was taken and plundered; some thousands were killed in the streets, and more than half the town was burnt.* The Commissioners, who were spectators of this horrible scene, tried in vain to prevent it. *As the only way to restore order*, they issued a proclamation, promising freedom to all the slaves who should range themselves under the banner of the Republic. This was the *first* proclamation by any public authority for emancipating any part of the slaves in St. Domingo. Satisfied that nothing short of the complete emancipation of the slaves would or could stop the effusion of blood, one of the commissioners [Palverel] issued a proclamation to that effect, in September, 1793. In this measure all the planters in the South and West, save one, concurred, and in February, 1794, the French Convention abolished slavery throughout the whole of the French Colonies, thus completing and consolidating the emancipation of the whole slave population of St. Domingo.'

This had the desired effect. Peace was restored;

the reign of liberty and order commenced, and the effect of this sudden and entire emancipation of 500,000 slaves, who were at once freed from the absolute authority of their masters, was most happy. 'The Colony,' says Lacroix, 'marched as by enchantment, towards its ancient splendor; cultivation prospered; every day produced perceptible proofs of its progress. The blacks were peaceable, the colony flourished, and no evil consequences followed Emancipation from 1794, till the peace of Amiens in 1802, when Bonaparte fitted out a powerful armament to reduce the negroes of St. Domingo to their former state of slavery.

The consequences of this mad project are well known. The armament sailed, and the happy and flourishing island became a scene of outrage, cruelty and blood, thus furnishing another proof that slavery is the only real cause of danger, insurrection and bloodshed.

In 1800 an insurrection took place in Richmond and neighborhood. The extent of the conspiracy and mischief I have never been able to ascertain. It is memorable only as having been the occasion of bringing into existence the Colonization Society. See African Repository, June, 1832.

In June, 1816, an insurrection was projected in Camden, S. C. but information of it was given by a *favorite and confidential* slave of Col. Chesnut.

In July, 1822, thirty-five slaves were executed, and thirty-seven were transported, on pain of death, for an alleged conspiracy against their masters. Perrault, a slave, was the chief witness against them before a court, consisting of a justice of the peace, and freeholders, *without a jury.*

'In 1826, the inhabitants of Newbern, Tarborough, and Hillsborough, N. C. were excited with the anticipation of insurrectional movements among their slaves. The inhabitants of Newbern, being advised of the assemblage of 60 armed slaves in a swamp, in their vicinity, the military were called out, and surrounding the *swamp, killed the whole party*'!!

In August, 1831, an insurrection took place among the slaves in Southampton Co., Va., headed by Nat Turner, a slave. Before they were quelled, they had murdered 64 persons, men, women and children.

In 1832 there was a general insurrection of the slaves in Jamaica. One hundred and fifty plantations were burnt, between two and three thousand slaves killed, and a large number of whites; and the whole loss occasioned by the rebellion and attempts to suppress it, valued at five millions of dollars.

Now what is the inference from this long list of insurrections, and hundreds of others, which might readily be collected? Why (1), that all danger from slavery arises from its continuance, and not from its abolition; and (2), that 'if the Bible sanctions slavery, the God of the Bible does not.' The language of God's providence is one and uniform. It is too explicit to be misunderstood. It assures us, and it writes the assurance in lines of blood, that 'the way of the transgressor is hard,' and that 'though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished.'

'All history, ancient and modern, is full of warning on this point.' Shall we slight these warnings, shut our eyes against the light, and rush madly upon our own destruction? Let us remember that 'slavery is an *unnatural* state,' and that nature, when her eternal principles are violated, is struggling to restore them to their first estate, and that the natural feelings of every slave accord with the sentiment of the poet:

'If I'm design'd yon lordling's slave,  
By Nature's law design'd,  
Why was an independent wish,  
E'er planted in my mind?'

Ay, why, unless the Creator designed, that man should be free? Away then with the wretched cant, or wicked sophistry of those, who are continually singing the lullaby of 'to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow.' 'To-morrow' never comes, and our neglecting to do what is right, is equivalent to a determination



to continue in the commission of sin. To all those, who thus postpone repentance to 'a more convenient season,' it may truly be said,

'Fatal mistake! their time runs on,  
Their dread account proceeds,  
And their *not doing* is set down,  
Among their darkest deeds.'

If the above facts are deemed worth an insertion in the Appendix to your lectures, they are at your service.

Yours with much respect,

JOSHUA COFFIN.

Boston, Nov. 23, 1833.

Mr. C. will please accept my sincere thanks for the above collection of facts. The reader will see in it, a practical illustration of the truth, *that violence will beget violence in return*, and that the only path of real safety is to cease from violence and oppression at once. This is a law of God's kingdom. He has written it out in his providence as well as his word.

(B.)

It will be seen, that in my lectures, I have avoided discussing the subject of slavery as 'a question of *treatment*, one way or the other, kind or cruel,' and have discussed it rather as 'a question of *principle*.'\* On this account, I have said little of the cruelties of slavery, or of its pretended 'tender mercies.' I have therefore taken no notice of the objection, that the slaves are happy, contented, more comfortably situated than the free blacks, &c. &c.

As this objection, however, is a very popular one, and withal so often, and so confidently urged, it seems proper to say something in reply to it in the appendix. This I propose to do, in the language of Mr. Thomp-

\* See page 28.

son, the celebrated anti-slavery lecturer in England. Although spoken in reply to a Mr. Borthwick, agent for the West India party, and therefore an *advocate for slavery*, it applies with all its force to certain men in this country, who, while they oppose immediate emancipation, and do it by urging the same objections that Mr. Borthwick did, yet profess to be, not, like him, the advocates, but the enemies of slavery.

'Mr. Borthwick said something very beautiful about the happiness and contentedness of the negro, which would be very elegant, if it were true; but the misfortune is, that most of the things he says are not true, in fact. That he believes them to be true, I must not question. He says the negroes do not care for freedom,—that they set no value upon it,—that if you go round amongst them, and put the question to them, they will say 'No, Massa; me very happy, me want no more, me get all me care for:' that, in fine, they would not have their freedom, if they could get it. Would they not? Then why are the newspapers filled with advertisements of runaway negroes? Why are the prisons filled with runaway negroes? Why are the mountains peopled with runaway negroes? Why is the bush filled with runaway negroes? Why is a standing army kept to force slavery down the throats of the negroes, if they are in love with it? (Loud applause.) Does the mother hold a rod over the child's head to force it to eat apple tart? (Laughter.) Did Adam and Eve run out of Paradise? If the negroes like slavery, then withdraw the troops, and save us the trouble and expense, the loss of life and money needlessly incurred, if the negroes are contented with their condition. (Loud applause.) But they like slavery, and do not wish for liberty; and Mr. Borthwick exclaims they shall not have liberty now, because they do not know its value: but shall man be kept in slavery, because he does not know the value of liberty? See the pitiful dilemma into which Mr. Borthwick has brought himself; the negroes do not like what all men sigh for,—what they would bleed and die to defend,—

what they would give house and lands, friends and reputation to obtain; and here is the dilemma,—if it be so, then, planters, proprietors, upholders of slavery, he defends and maintains a vile and brutalizing system, which has extinguished in man the most noble and generous quality that distinguishes him from the brutes. (Loud cheers.) What! because men do not like liberty,—if it be true that they do not like it, are we not to try to make them like it? Mr. Borthwick tells us that the negroes are very happy and contented,—that they want no more; and then he tells us of a man, a most miserable man,—if there ever were so very a wretch,—that bought fifty acres of land, and then said he did not want his own liberty. I should like to see the man who was thus in love with ‘going round and round his tub.’ Not like liberty for himself!—why, then, did he want it for his wife and children? Mr. Borthwick tells us that he might call them ‘my own.’ (Loud cheers.) Mr. Borthwick tells us that, when asked this question, the man replied, ‘I want to call them mine;’ and I beg Mr. Borthwick to remember that word *mine*. Not like liberty! Suppose I go with Mr. Borthwick to a lunatic asylum; (I do not mean any thing invidious—I do not think that either Mr. Borthwick or myself are fit to be permanent residents of a lunatic asylum;) but suppose that we go as accidental visitors, just as he came to see me at Manchester. (A laugh.) Suppose we go into a ward, and see a man weaving a crown of straw, putting it upon his head, and then walking up and down the ward, with his miserable rags trailing behind him, wielding his sceptre over an imaginary world.—Utopian princes bowing at his footstool. I say to Mr. Borthwick, ‘Is not that man happy? He never implores for liberty; he fancies himself clothed in regal splendor, with crouching slaves around him;—is he not happy?’ Mr. Borthwick would shake his head, be silent and turn grave. Then we might see another man chalking ludicrous figures on the wall, or stringing together senseless rhymes, and humming them the livelong day; and I might say, ‘Is

not this man happy? He is always smiling; he is fully satisfied with himself; he never sends a wish beyond his prison walls;—is he not happy?’ Mr. Borthwick would still be silent. Then I might show him a beautiful female singing love ditties all day long,—an eternal smile playing on her countenance; and I might say, ‘Look upon this being, and say, is she not happy? Are not all these happy?’ And then Mr. Borthwick, with a sigh, would answer, ‘No, they are not happy; see what a wreck of mind; see reason dethroned; see all the bright faculties of the soul gone astray! Oh! save them from this place,

‘Where laughter is not mirth, nor thought the mind,  
Nor words a language,—nor e’en men mankind!’

Let us strive to bring them back to society and to rational being; let them, if it must be, taste its sorrows and its bitterness; but let them know what are its joys, its hopes, its anticipations; let them live to mingle with mankind, and fit themselves for immortality.’ And I reply, ‘Yes, let us try to save them; let all human means be used to save them from this place; and when you have dropped the tear of sympathy over degraded reason here, go to the West Indies, preach that doctrine to the slaves, and see whether in their present prostration there is any reason why they should not have awakened in their minds a love of liberty, if it be not already there,—why they should not be released from that hateful system by which they are now enthralled, and brought to the enjoyment of perfect freedom.’ (Cheers.)

But I am prepared to show that the slaves *do* value freedom and long to possess it, notwithstanding Mr. Borthwick’s declaration to the contrary. I hold in my hand two documents,—the first is a proclamation from Governor Ross, published in the *Antigua Register* of March 29, 1831:

‘*ANTIGUA.*

‘By his Excellency Sir Patrick Ross, Knight, Commander of the most distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Major-General in the Army, Governor, and Com-

mander-in-Chief in and over his Majesty's Island of Antigua, Montserrat, and Barbuda, Chancellor, Vice-Admiral, and Ordinary of the same, &c. &c. &c.

‘Patrick (L. S.) Ross.

‘WHEREAS by my proclamation bearing date the twenty-first day of this present month, I did, by and with the advice of His Majesty's Privy Council, offer a Reward of One Hundred Pounds to the Person or Persons (except the actual offender) who should give such information as would lead to the conviction of the offender or offenders who set fire to several cane pieces in this Island, and also a free pardon to an accomplice or accomplices on conviction by their means of the actual perpetrator of such diabolical acts. Now, therefore, I do further, in compliance with the joint Address of both Houses of the Legislature, offer

**FREEDOM TO ANY SLAVE**

who by his or her exertions and evidence may bring to justice any of the incendiaries who have been destroying the canes in various parts of the Island.

‘Given under my hand and seal at Government-house, this Twenty-second day of March, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty-one, and in the First Year of His Majesty's Reign.

‘*God save the King.*

‘By His Excellency's command,

‘CHARLES TAYLOR, Private Secretary.

‘Duly published this Twenty-third day of March, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty-one.

‘MARTIN NANTON, Deputy Provost Marshal.’

—*Weekly Register, Antigua, Tuesday, March 29, 1831.*

Now, Mr. Borthwick, when Governor Ross means to offer the highest reward which it is in his power to confer,—what is it that he does offer? A few more yams, a little more rum, or a little more clothing? No; but he offers the slave the highest boon which the island can grant,—he offers him *freedom*. (Loud cheers.) Another proclamation to the same effect was issued in Jamaica during the late insurrection.

Freedom, Mr. Borthwick, is the highest boon that governors and generals can bestow; and to-day I have been informed, by a gentleman now on this platform, that whilst he was on the island of Nevis, a few years back, the inhabitants were alarmed by a tremendous storm, and found that a vessel had been wrecked, the crew of which were in danger of perishing. The plan-

ters stood on the beach, beholding the desolation on the waters, but they could not induce any person to launch a boat and go to the assistance of the persons in the wreck. At last the planters offered freedom to any slaves who would put off to the assistance of the shipwrecked mariners, and immediately these men, who are said to care nothing for liberty, rushed into the boat, and risked their own existence to save those who were in danger of perishing. (Cheers.) In the year 1794 there was what was termed the Maroon war in Jamaica: and who were the Maroons? Runaway negroes! And where had they run from? From the 'four parlors and a saloon.' What did they run from? From the light work, the beautiful clothing, and abundance of food; from the kind care and culture of the planters. And where did they run to from all this comfort and happiness? To the bleak and desolate mountains, to the fastnesses of Jamaica. Ay, to the desolate mountain, from the four parlors and a saloon. And what did they do there? Why, whilst the negro of Jamaica was enjoying his four parlors and a saloon, drinking his wine, and revelling in all the luxuries of slavery, like another Sardanapalus, the negroes in the mountains were getting strong, increasing and multiplying, and at last down they came upon the whites, and threatened to exterminate them. The whites met together, to consider how they might best resist the aggressions of the Maroons: the standing troops were called out, and found to be insufficient, and with the militia added to them they were still thought insufficient, and the arming of the negroes was talked of: but somebody said, 'How do you know, when you have armed the negroes, that they will fight for you? How do you know that they will not make common cause with the Maroons? You must find some motive sufficiently strong to induce them to fight.' And what was that motive? Was it food, house, a provision ground—No; they promised the slaves *liberty!* (Loud cheers.) And with liberty in their hearts, liberty their watchword, and liberty their expected reward, they went to

the battle plain, they fought and bled, and even many of them died, whilst the living returned victorious, not to pull down chapels, not to injure innocent men, but to clasp to their bosoms their wives and their children, to stretch out their *free* hands to Heaven and say, 'Now, indeed, we are men and brethren.' (Hear that, Mr. Borthwick.) I beg my friends will not make any remarks; let them leave that to me, for I am exceedingly jealous of my privileges. (Much laughter.)

And now Mr. Borthwick comes to Hayti; he thinks he has a fine specimen of the dangers of emancipation at Hayti; and he measures the happiness of the inhabitants of that island by the amount of their exports. But this is false philosophy, Mr. Borthwick. Suppose the people of Ireland were to ship less of their produce, less corn, fewer cattle, and fewer potatoes to foreign countries than they now do, and eat it all themselves, would any person assign this as a reason why they should be worse off than they were when they did export a larger quantity. (Cheers.) Mr. Borthwick ought not to measure the comfort and happiness of a people by the amount of their exports. Would he argue because the stage-proprietor did not carry so many passengers, and therefore did not run his horses so frequently, that the *horses* were worse off than they were before? (Loud cheers.) Would he argue that the ox was in a worse condition because he trod out less corn than he did before? How does it happen that the Haytians have not cultivated so much sugar as they did formerly? Why did they cultivate so much formerly? Because of the whip, to please their masters, not to please themselves. (Loud cheers.) What is the fact now? A gentleman who is now here is willing to come forward, to state it firmly, fearlessly and openly. (Cheers.) After a twelve years' residence in Hayti, where he kept a regular account of exports and imports, and investigated the manners, motives and desires of the inhabitants, he is ready to testify that the commerce of Hayti is prosperous, and that the peasant Hayti are as happy and comfortable as any

portion of the human family. (Loud cries of 'Name, name.') Mr. SHIEL. (Loud and reiterated cheering.)

Mr. SHIEL then stood upon the table, and said—Ladies and Gentlemen, called upon as I have been by the gentleman who has already addressed you for upwards of three hours, I do not come forward to make any long oration, I merely come forward to say that the facts stated by that gentleman, with regard to Hayti, are perfectly correct, and that I have witnessed them. I know that the people of Hayti are free, independent, comfortable, and happy. (Cheers.) There is also another point which I wish to notice, a point which has never yet been laid before the British public;—I allude to the revolution which occurred in Hayti in 1822, when the Spanish part of the colony threw off the yoke of slavery. That revolution was effected by the people, without a single act of violence even of the most trifling character. (Cheers.) The masters, it is to be observed, were Spaniards—a people who never maltreated their slaves. (Hear, hear.) The slaves declared themselves free, shook off the Spanish yoke, and joined the republican part of Hayti, without a single act of violence or the slightest destruction of property. (Loud cheers.)—Thompson's Lec. pp. 49, 50, 51, 52.

(O.)

'The argument of temperance from the beginning has been on moral grounds. Allusion has been made to the apostle of temperance. Sir, I knew the apostle of temperance from my boyhood. And I know the difficulties he had to contend with.' \* \* \* \* 'And yet this herald of reform did not shrink from denouncing the traffic as a moral evil. If he had trimmed to the popular breeze, this convention would never have met. But he went forward in the face of opposition. His first sermon hurled him from his pulpit.' ['This is a mistake. Mr. Hewit's first sermon produced a considerable excitement, but was very far from unsettling



him.'] 'But he was not daunted by this. He gathered strength from opposition, and went throughout this land, every where denouncing the traffic in ardent spirits as the criminal cause of all the evils of intemperance. Nay, sir, he crossed the ocean with his message, and proclaimed it in that luxurious metropolis, till England's titled nobility bowed to the force of truth, and rejoiced in doing honor to him who told it.

'Now, sir, if he had come to us with smooth and honied words, persuading us with gentle solicitations, and urging upon us the arguments of expediency, does any one suppose he would have converted a whole community to his views? Sir, by such measures, the temperance cause would never have begun to move. And now has it come to this, that we are ashamed to declare our principles? REFORMERS ARE NOT FIT FOR THEIR OFFICE IF THEY BOW TO EXPEDIENCY. The men of the revolution—the Patrick Henrys, the Washingtons, the Hampdens, the Sidneys, have left no such examples to men who are anxious to benefit their fellows. He was pained to think that the convention should be ashamed or afraid to declare its opinions. The eyes of the world were upon them.

'The gentleman talks of American morality. Shall we shut our eyes to what American morality has done towards counteracting the greatest moral evil the world ever saw? And how has it done this? Why, bringing moral principle to bear upon it, by declaring it morally wrong, and treating it as such, and putting it down as such.'—Speech of Mr. Wood, of Albany, at Temperance Convention in Philadelphia.

I quote this to show, that those who encounter opposition and suffer inconvenience, on account of their efforts in the Anti-Slavery cause, are not alone. They are but following in the footsteps of all reformers. It would be well for them, and their opposers too, occasionally to read Heb. xi, particularly verses 32—39. The one would be cheered and comforted thereby. The other might perhaps be led to pause, and ask themselves, whether, in their opposition, they were not 'FIGHTING AGAINST GOD.'

## (D.)

Mr. WILKINSON said—‘Sir, if we cannot say that it is morally wrong, we had better say nothing about it. We had better go home, and let the Temperance cause go down, and let the discretion of mankind take care of the matter, on the principle of prudent use. For however we may talk and resolve on other points, we may rely on it the Temperance reformation is at an end, if its friends are prepared to concede that the use and traffic is not morally wrong.’ \* \* \* \* ‘I hope nothing will be done by this convention to hinder the cause of Temperance, as I am sure it will, if we fail to declare our sentiments on this vital point. Sir, sound heads and pure hearts, such as I see around me, will not ask, whether it will be popular and help me to office, or give me the friendship of those who drink and vend ardent spirits, but do their duty, and leave results with God.’

Mr. GERRIT SMITH said—‘These gentlemen complain of their want of success in promoting temperance, and of the low condition of the temperance cause in Pennsylvania. Sir, I never heard that temperance had any success any where, unless the appeals in its favor were made directly to the consciences of rum-dealers. Strike out these, and it is in vain that you seek for other means to propel the triumphant car of temperance. Hitch to that car health, economy, expediency, the public good, what you please; if you leave out the appeal to men’s consciences, you have, as we say at the North, but a *weal team*.’

Mr. GOODELL said—‘Why, Sir, it has always been the doctrine of temperance folks that it is wrong. The apostle of temperance never thrilled the multitudes that came to hear him, by telling about expediency, prudence, and all that. But he proclaimed in tones of thunder which made the roof ring again, that it is wrong to drink or sell. Heaven grant that nothing of a cold, calculating prudence may have shorn Sampson of his strength, and induced him to compromise this vital question.’

'We are told, over and over again, and by the same persons who oppose this resolution, that the temperance reform is all to be gained by moral influence, but now they are not willing to have the convention say it is morally wrong. Sir, I should like to know what kind of moral influence we can employ, if the subject has no moral character.'

---

(E.)

'The following 'Extracts from Parliamentary Papers,' will show the fact, and to what an extent, the colonies at Sierra Leone and Liberia have already furnished facilities for carrying on the slave-trade.

'Copy of a charge delivered by Mr. Chief-Justice Jeffcott, to the Grand Jury of Sierra Leone, on the subject of the slave-trade.'

'Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 6th April, 1832.

'Extracts from a speech of Chief-Justice Jeffcott's, at Sierra Leone.' 'I have heard, and from the source from which my information is derived, I am bound to believe what I should otherwise have deemed incredible—that persons are to be found in this colony, who, if not directly engaged in, aid and abet the abominable traffic in slaves. That such persons are to be found, I repeat it, in this colony—a colony *founded for its suppression*, towards whose establishment, and in whose support, so much wealth has been expended, and so many valuable lives sacrificed: and further, that men holding respectable stations,—men having all the outward appearance and show of respectability, are not ashamed—I should rather say, are not *afraid*—to lend themselves to this nefarious, this abominable trade!

'I say, Gentlemen of the Grand Jury, that it has come to the ears of the Government of this colony, that such aid and assistance have been afforded in the *fitting out of ships well known to be destined for such*

unlawful traffic; and that vessels *have been fitted out* from time to time by persons such as I have described, residents of this colony, for the Gallinas and elsewhere, with the objects and purposes of which it is *impossible they could have been unacquainted.*

‘Is it to be tolerated, I say, Gentlemen of the Grand Jury, that this colony, established for the express purpose of suppressing this vile traffic, should be made a *mart for carrying it on?* Is it to be borne that this harbor, miscalled—if all I have heard and am led to believe be true—the harbor of *Freetown*, should shelter within its bosom, while the British flag waves over its ramparts, vessels, purchased after their condemnation by the Mixed Commission Courts, to make a *second* and a *third* experiment in the Slave-trade? to be perhaps again captured by our cruizers, and *again* bought up by the skulking foreigners who prowl about this place, as the one best calculated for their iniquitous purpose?’

‘I have, since my arrival here, taken some pains to ascertain the number of liberated Africans imported into this colony within a given period, as compared with the number now located in the different villages; and although the census of the latter is not quite complete, I have every reason to believe, that whereas there have been imported into the colony of Sierra Leone within the last ten years, upwards of 22,000 Africans, who have obtained their liberation, and have been located here at the expense of the British Government—an expense, which upon the most moderate calculation, amounts to 300*l.* per man, or nearly seven millions sterling, in the course of ten years—there are not now to be found in the whole colony above 17,000 or 18,000 men! What then is the conclusion to which I come, and to which every honest, unprejudiced, and right-thinking man must come, upon the subject? Why, appalling as the fact may be, and incredible as it must appear to many, that the Slave-trade is *either directly carried on, although of course not openly and ostensibly, or that it is aided and abetted in this colony.*’

After this it appears that 'a commission of persons was appointed to inquire into the truth of the charges contained in the Chief-Justice's speech.' The following are extracts from their report.

'The Report of the Committee of Inquiry constituted in and by the Despatch of the Right Hon. Sir George Murray, late his Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for War and the Colonies: dated 26th October, 1830;—

'Humbly sheweth, (among other things)

'That \* \* \* \* \* they have called before them such persons of all classes, as they were of opinion could afford them most correct information; and from the evidence adduced, the Committee cannot but conclude that the nefarious system of kidnapping has prevailed in this colony, to a much greater extent than was even alluded to in the Charge of the Chief-Justice to the Grand Jury in 1830, as will fully appear in the evidence adduced.

'The Committee have further to submit, that while the actual system of kidnapping has principally prevailed among the Mandingo tribes and liberated Africans themselves (who seem, in many instances, to have but little gratitude for the favors conferred upon them by the British Government), they cannot refrain from remarking, that great facility has at the same time been afforded to the increase of the Slave-trade by the *British merchants of the colony*, who have purchased vessels condemned in the Mixed Commission Court, as *agents for foreigners*; which vessels have afterwards been brought into the colony and again condemned, for a repeated infraction of the Slave-trade Abolition Act.

'With reference to this subject, the Committee have to express their regret that some very recent instances have occurred, in which persons of apparent respectability have been charged with aiding and abetting the Slave-trade, as will appear from the evidence annexed.'

(Signed)

'ALEX. FINDLAY, *Lieu. Governor,*

'J. W. JEFFCOTT, *Chief Justice,*

'J. BOYLE, *Colonial Surgeon,*

'HENRY RISHTON, *Col. Secretary.*

The following is some of the evidence alluded to. Thirty-two persons were examined. The whole evidence is of the same tenor with that which follows.

From the evidence of Mr. Benjamin Campbell.—  
 ‘He is aware that the system of kiduapping’ [liberated Africans, who have been taken from slave-ships and sent into the colony] ‘has prevailed in this Colony for the last five years, and latterly to a very great extent. \* \* \* \* On his late visit to the Rio Pongas, he made many inquiries to ascertain to what extent this kidnaping system prevailed, and the result has led him to believe that if he stated the *annual export* from that river, during the last three years to have been two hundred and fifty liberated Africans, the average would not be exaggerated.’

‘Deponent is of opinion that a great number of liberated Africans are sent to the Gallinas for the purpose of being sold; and supposes the average to be about the same as he has already stated for the Rio Pongas. Deponent does not know of this of his own knowledge but from report; and he is further led to believe it, from his *knowledge* of the sums of money being brought up from the Gallinas to Sierra Leone, as *returns for the exports*. Deponent knows that the slave vessels are in the habit of bringing specie for the purpose of procuring goods; deponent knows one instance. *Mr. Hilary Teague, who resides at the American settlement at Liberia, at Cape Mesurado, near the Gallinas, and who trades between that place and Sierra Leone, when purchasing some goods from a Mr. Lake, a merchant in the colony, produced a bag containing about one thousand dollars, on which was marked the name of the Spanish schooner ‘Manzanares.’ This vessel took in her cargo at the Gallinas, and was subsequently (in the month of May, 1830) condemned in the Court of Mixed Commissions:’ i. e. condemned as a slave ship.*

From the evidence of Mr. John Dean Lake. ‘Deponent had a mercantile transaction with a Mr. Hilary Teague, an American subject residing at Liberia. This Mr. Teague is in the *habit* of purchasing goods in this

colony, which he takes down to Liberia for sale, where a great many of the articles he purchases are in demand. Mr. Teague, in paying Mr. Lake for some goods, took the money from a bag containing about 1,000 dollars. The word 'Manzanares' was marked on this bag. This circumstance struck him from the singularity of the word. Deponent has every reason to believe this bag came out of this vessel, she having been brought into this harbor subsequently and condemned in the Court of Mixed Commissions, where it was proved that she had taken in her cargo at the Gallinas.'

From the evidence of Alexander Rae, Esq. 'Deponent is a partner with Mr. Hornell. The vessel, the 'Ellen Montgomery,' was insured for a voyage down the coast to Fernando Po, with liberty to touch at every trading place. Mr. Hornell called at Liberia, and landed goods to the amount of 400l. No one is allowed to sell at Liberia, unless they employ an agent from among those living on shore. Mr. Hilary Teague was employed as such agent. Mr. Hornell took Teague on board, and went from Liberia to Cape Mount and the GALLINAS. From thence he returned to Sierra Leone for more goods, deponent expecting a large assortment out from England. Mr. Teague made the whole of the sales. Mr. Hornell is now gone on the same voyage with the same description of goods, namely, to Fernando Po, with liberty to touch at every trading place. Deponent is not acquainted with the trade at the Gallinas, but, from report, he understands the slave-trade is carried on there.'

From the evidence of Mr. John Mac Cormack. 'That during the administration of Sir Neil Campbell, he received information that some liberated African boys and some native boys had been kidnapped by some Mandingoes from the Sand Beach, near the Merchants' Powder Magazine, and carried to the Mandingo country. Deponent sent over messengers to the Mandingo chiefs, and recovered two of the boys; afterwards, through the assistance of Dalla Mahommadoo, deponent

recovered five others. The eldest boy was about fourteen years of age, the youngest about seven. One of them stated, that when at the Fish Market in Freetown, a person asked him to carry home a bunch of fish to a house in Gibraltar Town. The boy consented, and when he arrived at the house, he went into the kitchen; he was seized, and carried to a canoe. The Mandingoes who carried him, *put something over his mouth, which contracted his lips, and prevented his making any noise.* The boy could not recognize the house; he told deponent that he had seen two others who had been carried away at the same time with him; one of them was deponent's own servant. This boy was a Timmanee, not a liberated African. During the time deponent lived at Tombo (an island in the river Sierra Leone, upon which deponent has a timber factory), he had frequent opportunities of recovering boys who had been kidnapped. Deponent was the better enabled to do this from his knowledge of the native languages. In some cases boys knowing this deponent to be in the native towns, have escaped to him, and claimed his protection.

From the evidence of Mr. Duncan Noble. 'He is of opinion, that the slave-trade is aided by the facility given to slave-dealers in purchasing vessels condemned in the Court of Mixed Commission. The usual way of disposing of these vessels is *by public auction; and it would seem of little consequence whether the purchasers are slave-dealers or no, provided they give the highest price.*'

From the evidence of William Smith, Esq. Commissioner of Arbitration. 'That the "Hoop," a Dutch vessel, was condemned in the Mixed Commission Court in the year 1826. She was purchased by Commodore Bullen, and called the "Hope." She was employed as a tender to the Maidstone, in preventing the illicit traffic in slaves, under the command of Licut. William Tucker, and captured the "Prince de Guinea." Commodore Bullen subsequently sold her to a person at Princes Island (a Portuguese colony.) She was then (in 1827) sent by this person to Bahia, and obtained Brazilian papers, under the name of the "Esperanza."



In 1828 she came to the coast for a cargo of slaves, and was captured, with her cargo, by his Majesty's ship "Sybille," the *Esperanza* being then under the command of Jose Alvar de Cruz Rios. She was condemned in June or July of the same year, put up to public auction, and purchased by one William Henry Savage. She quitted this port on the 12th July, and was reported by the master of the *Santa Ephigimia*, on oath before the king's advocate, to have sailed from Ajudah on the 6th October following, with a cargo of 300 slaves, under the command of the said Jose Alvar de Cruz Rios. This vessel has since been employed (as appears by the Parliamentary papers) in the slave-trade, and returned to Bahia under the command of the said Jose Alvar de Cruz Rios, having arrived at Bahia on the 5th May, 1829, since which time deponent has lost all trace of her.

'The *Prince de Guinea* was taken by Commodore Bullen's tender, the before-mentioned vessel, the "Hoop," in 1826, and purchased by him as a tender; was kept by him as such until the year 1827, when she was offered for sale in this colony; but Commodore Bullen not being able to procure a sufficient price for her, she was taken to the Cape de Verd Islands, and sold to one Martinez, a noted slave-dealer, as appears by the affidavit of the master of the "Tonhuiha" (published in the Parliamentary papers of 1827.) She was despatched, as alleged by Martinez, to the Brazils with salt, under the name of the "Volante." She obtained Brazilian papers in the Brazils: called the "Vingador," returned to the coast, and was captured off Wydah, with a cargo of slaves, by Commodore Collier. She was then bought at public auction by John Mardon Brockinton, and called the "Perseverance," afterwards condemned in the Court of Vice-Admiralty in this colony for breach of revenue laws, &c.'

Mr. Smith goes on to mention the names of quite a number of other vessels, which were captured, sold at auction and bought up for the slave-trade, in the same way. Among the rest, 'the "Donna Barbara," pur-

chased by an *American* named Pollard, agent of Jose Alvar de Cruz Rios,' the slave captain mentioned above.

From the evidence of William Cole, Commissioner of Appraisement and Sale to the Mixed Com. Court.

'Until lately, it was not customary for foreigners to purchase vessels themselves at the auction's; they were generally purchased for them by merchants of the colony, on commission.

'Deponent believes the system of kidnapping has prevailed in the colony for the last six or seven years.

\*\*\*\*\* The Government, in deponent's opinion, have done every thing in their power to put a stop to this trade; but it is carried on so SYSTEMATICALLY AS TO DEFY ANY POLICE. The liberated Africans are, the thieves; the Mandingoes the receivers.

From the evidence Mr. William Benjamin Pratt, who 'has been in the service of the Colonial Government, principally in the Liberated African Department, for the last ten years.' On one occasion he went to a place called 'Moribiah' to rescue a 'liberated African girl and boy.' Deponent ascertained that the girl was in the possession of a man named Anthony. \*\*\*\*\*

When the girl had been given up, Antony came to deponent in the evening and asked him for some rum, and said to him, "Now we are friends I may as well tell you the truth: I bought that girl from Suree Gaboo," [a Sierra Leone man.] Said he gave sixty-six bars for her, produced his book, and pointed out the articles with which he had purchased her. Deponent copied it; it is as follows, viz.

	Bars.
1 Gun	10
4 fathoms Blue Bast	4
3 — White ditto	3
4 — Check	4
5 — Shalloon	5
7 — Print	7
Madras Handkerchiefs	3
3 fathoms Salin Stripe	3
Tobacco, Powder, Rum, & Knife	27
	<hr/>
Total . . .	66'

And this, it seems is what becomes of the knives, and tobacco, and rum, and powder, and guns, which are shipped to the colonies along with emigrants! This is the commerce, by means of which the colonists amass their wealth! Is it indeed so? If not, what is done with these articles of merchandize? This certainly is a matter which needs to be investigated.

---

(F.)

It will be seen from the whole tenor of my remarks in the lectures, that I have no confidence in the scheme of Colonization. It is proper, to prevent misunderstanding, to make the following brief remarks.

1. I cheerfully admit that the scheme has the confidence of many good men—especially at the North, who, I have no doubt, espouse it from the best of motives.

2. The mere colonizing of colored or white persons, with their own, unconstrained consent, is in itself, a harmless and innocent affair.

3. To plant truly *christian* colonies; on the coast of Africa, or any where else in this way, is a very laudable enterprise, and I, for one, should be willing to patronize it.

These then are not the reasons of my dissent from the present Colonization scheme. I do dissent however,

1. Because it departs from its design, as expressed in the constitution of the Society, and proposes itself as the remedy for slavery, thus claiming for itself the monopoly of the public confidence and co-operation.

2. Because, thus departing, it promises what it can never perform—viz. remedy slavery. In proposing to remedy slavery by *transportation*, or by the moral influence of such a physical operation, it proposes a physical impossibility. Make what arithmetical calculations you please, and yet, it is everlasting truth, the project is Utopian. You might as soon think to remove all the 'ring-straked, speckled and grised' cattle from

the land, by the mere process of colonizing, with their own consent, those only, of these classes, that run at large and have no master. Emigration does not depopulate. Every emigrant, but makes room for another, to occupy his place. For aught I know, there are as many Irishmen in Ireland now, as when she first began to pour her thousands of emigrants into America. You can never put a stop to increase—never extirpate a race by mere voluntary emigration. So far from it, emigration does but quicken increase, and cause the race, that is thus spreading itself, to strike its roots deeper and deeper in its native soil. And the same or similar causes, which prevent an English population from rushing in and crowding out the Irish, as emigration goes on from Ireland, will operate to prevent a white population from rushing in to take the place of the colored, as emigration may go forward from the Southern States. The white population may and doubtless will drive the colored into the more Southern States and concentrate it there; but when thus concentrated, as is now extensively the fact, then the more brisk voluntary emigration, the more brisk the increase. This will hold as true of them, as of Ireland or New-England. Pray, how has it happened that emigration has not extirpated the Yankees; or at least caused the Irish, or the Dutch or some other population to come in and supplant them? It is nonsense then—it is contrary to all the laws of increase to suppose that a race of men are to be extirpated by mere voluntary emigration; and as to any other, the present scheme of colonizing, professedly at least, disavows it.

3. Because it does not promise even, to remedy slavery short of one or two hundred years; and for one, I hope to see the millenium come before that time.

4. Because it stands in the way of other and more efficient schemes of remedy. This it does by taking the ground of gradual emancipation, and claiming, at the same time, to be the *only* practicable scheme. Suppose a national temperance society organized on the principle of moderate use, claiming to itself that this is the only feasible or correct principle of reform, secur-

ing to itself the sanction of the great and the good throughout the land, the votes of legislatures, ecclesiastical bodies, &c. &c., thus thrusting itself upon the attention, and monopolizing to itself the confidence of the public mind, as being *the great national measure* for the remedy of intemperance—who so blind as not to see, that it must, of necessity, stand in the way of all other measures?—that so long as the public mind rests in this as the great, the national, the only practicable measure, it is lulled to sleep, and cannot be aroused to any other? The analogy is perfect.

5. Because it puts public sentiment back instead of advancing it. This it does in the way just specified. It makes up the public mind to the position, that this is the only practicable method of reaching the difficulty, and though the process be slow and its accomplishment distant, it yet causes it to believe and rest in the belief, that nothing more rapid is practicable. In this way it puts the public mind to rest, lulls its conscience to sleep, and whether intentionally or not, does in point of fact lower the tone of feeling and put back public sentiment on the subject.

Nor is this mere 'a priori' inference. I have documents on hand which demonstrate, that the tone of public sentiment on the subject of slavery was higher, thirty and forty and even ten years ago, than it was a year since—before the anti-slavery discussions came up. They used to speak of slavery as a sin. Take the following facts as proof.

As long ago as 1790, there were quite a number of Abolition Societies organized in different parts of the United States. They were called Societies for the 'Abolition of Slavery, &c. &c.' They seem to have aimed at the abolition of slavery as their main and ultimate object, and this in three distinct ways, (1), and mainly, by aiming at the abolition of the slave-trade; (2), by attempting the release of persons who were kidnapped, or otherwise illegally held in bondage; and (3) by endeavoring the elevation of the colored people, by schools, &c. &c. Accordingly, in 1790, they pre-

sented various petitions to Congress praying for the abolition of the slave-trade. In them however, they incidentally give us their views of slavery itself. Take the following extracts as illustrations.

‘To the Honorable the Senate, &c.

‘The Petition, &c.,

• ‘Humbly sheweth,

‘That, from a sober conviction of the unrighteousness of slavery, your petitioners have long beheld, with grief, a considerable number of our fellow men doomed to perpetual bondage, in a country which boasts of her freedom.’

‘Your petitioners are fully of opinion, that calm reflection will at last convince the world, that the whole system of African slavery is unjust in its nature—impolitic in its principles—and, in its consequences, ruinous to the industry and enterprise of the citizens of these States.

‘From a conviction of these truths, your petitioners were led, by motives, we conceive, of general philanthropy, to associate ourselves for the protection and assistance of this unfortunate part of our fellow-men; and, though this society has been lately established, it has now become generally extensive through this state, and, we fully believe, embraces, on this subject, the sentiments of a large majority of its citizens.’

[Signed] ‘In the name, and by order, of the Connecticut Society for the promotion of freedom, &c.

EZRA STILES, *President*  
of said Society.

SIMEON BALDWIN, *Secretary.*

*New-Haven, Jan. 7, 1791.*

The Memorial of the *Pennsylvania Society*, has the following.

‘We wish not to trespass upon your time, by referring to the different declarations made by Congress on the unalienable right of all men to equal liberty; neither would we attempt, in this place, to point out the inconsistency of extending freedom to a part only of the human race.’

Again:—

‘The Memorial of the subscribers, formed into a Society for the Abolition of Slavery, &c. in BALTIMORE:

‘Respectfully sheweth,

‘That the objects of their association are founded in reason and humanity. That, in addition to an avowed enmity to slavery in every form, your memorialists, in their exertions, contemplate a melioration of the condition of that unhappy part of the human race who are doomed to fill the degraded rank of slaves in our country, and a protection of the unhappy sons of Africa, who are entitled to liberty, but unjustly deprived of it.’

‘It is no less painful to know, than to communicate to your honorable body, that a traffic so degrading to the rights of man, and so repugnant to reason and religion, as that in human flesh, is carried on by the free citizens of these free governments, for the supply of foreigners—thus exhibiting to the world the curious and horrid spectacle, of liberty supporting slavery—and the successful asserter of his own rights, the unprovoked and cruel invader of the rights of others.’

And farther;—

‘The Memorial of the *Virginia Society*, for promoting the Abolition of Slavery, &c.

‘Respectfully sheweth,

‘That your Memorialists, fully believing that “righteousness exalteth a nation,” and that slavery is not only an odious degradation, but an *outrageous violation of one of the most essential rights of human nature, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the gospel*, which breathes “peace on earth, good will to men;” they lament that a practice, so inconsistent with true policy and the unalienable rights of men, should subsist in so enlightened an age, and among a people professing, that all mankind are, by nature, equally entitled to freedom.’

Take another illustration of the sentiment prevalent on the subject at that time. On the 15th of September of the same year, the younger Edwards, then pas-

tor of a church in New-Haven, and afterwards President of Union College, preached a sermon before the above mentioned Connecticut Society, in which he holds the following language.\*

‘The arguments which have been urged against the slave-trade, are with little variation applicable to the holding of slaves. He who holds a slave, continues to deprive him of that liberty, which was taken from him on the coast of Africa. And if it were wrong to deprive him of it in the first instance, why not in the second? If this be true, no man has a better right to retain his negro in slavery, than he had to take him from his native African shores. And every man who cannot show, that his negro hath by his voluntary conduct forfeited his liberty, is obligated *immediately to manumit him.*’

‘I presume it will not be denied, that to commit theft or robbery every day of a man’s life, is as great a sin as to commit fornication in one instance. But to steal a man or to rob him of his liberty is a greater sin, than to steal his property, or to take it by violence. And to hold a man in a state of slavery, who has a right to his liberty, is to be every day guilty of robbing him of his liberty, or of *man-stealing*. The consequence is inevitable, that other things being the same, to hold a negro slave, unless he has forfeited his liberty, is a *greater sin in the sight of God, than concubinage or fornication.*’

‘To convince yourselves, that your information being the same, to hold a negro slave is a greater sin than fornication, theft or robbery, you need only bring the matter home to yourselves. I am willing to appeal to your own consciences, whether you would not judge it to be a greater sin for a man to hold you or your child during life in such slavery, as that of the negroes, than for him to indulge in one instance of licentious conduct, or in one instance to steal or rob. Let conscience speak, and I will submit to its decision.’ \* \* \* \*

‘Thirty years ago, scarcely a man in this country thought either the slave trade or the slavery of negroes

\* It is to be presumed, that the sentiments of Mr. Edwards were, in the main, the sentiments of the whole Society. He was a leader among the abolitionists of that day.



to be wrong. But now how many and able advocates in private life, in our legislatures, in Congress, have appeared and have openly and irrefragably pleaded the rights of humanity in this as well as other instances? Nay, the great body of the people from New-Hampshire to Virginia inclusively, have obtained such light, that in all those States, the further importation of slaves is prohibited by law. In Massachusetts and New-Hampshire, slavery is totally abolished.' \* \* \* \*

'This light is still increasing, and in time will effect a total revolution. *And if we judge of the future by the past, within fifty years from this time, it will be as shameful for a man to hold a negro slave, as to be guilty of common robbery or theft.*'

Yet more ; in 1793, there was a New-Jersey Society for promoting the abolition of slavery. Among other officers it had an acting committee of five members, in Middlesex, Essex, Monmouth, Morris, Sussex, Hunterdon, Burlington, Gloucester, Salem and Cumberland Counties. The whole State seems to have been put under an efficient organization. The following is an extract from the preamble to its Constitution :

'It is our boast, that we live under a government founded on principles of justice and reason, wherein *life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness* are recognized as the universal rights of men ; and whilst we are anxious to preserve these rights to ourselves, and transmit them inviolate, to our posterity, we *abhor that inconsistent, illiberal, and interested policy, which withholds those rights from an unfortunate and degraded class of our fellow-creatures.*'

And in addition to all the rest, I have in my hands the 'Minutes of the Proceedings of the *Fourth* Convention of Delegates from the Abolition Societies, established in different parts of the United States, assembled at Philadelphia, on the *third* day of May, 1797, and continued' in session 'until the *ninth* day of the same month, inclusive,'—a session of six days. Delegates were present from 'New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Baltimore, Richmond, and Alexandria ;

and societies in various other places are reported as sending no delegates.

Now in view of the above facts and extracts, illustrative of the tone of feeling then prevalent, I ask whether it be not indisputably evident, that, up to the recent discussions, public sentiment, on the subject of slavery, has been going back? Where were the men two years ago, when Colonization held the monopoly of the public confidence, that took the high ground of President Edwards in respect to the wickedness of slaveholding? Where is the Colonizationist that does it now? Who does not know, that the operation of this scheme on his mind has been to modify and lower down his abhorrence of slavery, so much at least as to fill him with misgivings at the thought of taking the high ground of Edwards, that the master ought 'immediately to manumit' his slave, and that not to do it, but to hold him in involuntary servitude is 'man-stealing,' and 'a greater sin in the sight of God than concubinage or fornication'?

Is it said that Colonization is not answerable for this going back of public sentiment—that the above-mentioned abolition societies were dead, and public sentiment gone back, before Colonization came into existence?

True; but Colonization is answerable for *keeping* it back. It had gone back, but just as it began to rise again—just as the public feeling, that had slumbered for a little season, began to gather and pent up as it was, to demand some vent, then Colonization came in, proposed to strike off the chains of the captive, and gave the desired vent, but unhappily in such a direction and on the admission of such principles, as, in effect, to leave slavery untouched, and yet put the public mind to rest again, and, to all practical purposes, keep it in the same torpid state from which it was just awaking.

The facts in the case were these. The enemies of slavery, both in this country and in England, made strenuous and almost simultaneous efforts for the abolition of the slave-trade. This they did under the erroneous impression that, if they could abolish the trade,

slavery would die of itself. They succeeded in the effort. The slave-trade was abolished by law and measures taken to carry the laws into effect. Of consequence the friends of abolition, both here and in England, rested for a time in this, expecting that before long, it would issue in the destruction of slavery. It was during this period, and owing principally to this cause, that the above-mentioned societies became virtually dead, and that the tone of public feeling was lowered. The friends of the cause felt, for the time, that the victory was won, and their minds accordingly were put to sleep on the subject. This was true in England as well as here. It was not long, however, before they found out their mistake, and learned after all their efforts, that slavery still survived, and that the slave trade was carried on as briskly as ever, and with even greater cruelty. They saw, therefore, that nothing effectual could be done until slavery itself was abolished. At this, therefore, they must next direct their efforts. But how reach the matter—how accomplish the object? And with this, public feeling and sentiment began to rise again. In England, the friends of the cause began with amelioration and failed—then tried gradual emancipation and failed, and were thus forced to the dilemma of consenting to the perpetual existence of slavery, or of going, with all their might, for its immediate and entire abolition. They resolved on the latter, they took their stand, the public mind was aroused so as it had never been before, and in six years, the work was done—the fetters were stricken from every slave in the colonies.

In this country the course of events was different. The friends of the cause saw that nothing could be done, except as slavery itself was assailed and demolished, but how should they touch that? There was the sacred constitution, each State much legislate for itself, and a thousand other difficulties, so that there seemed to be no practicable way of reaching the subject at all. The public mind therefore remained at rest on the subject longer than in England. Still it could not be entirely at rest. As England went on with

her schemes of amelioration and gradual emancipation, from this and other causes, the feeling began to rise that something must be done here. The feeling rose higher and higher, and gathered strength and struggled for vent. Just at that point the Colonization scheme stepped in, let off the pressure of feeling which then existed, and which, but for that, had probably taken the same direction it did in England, and issued in the same glorious results—it let that feeling off, and, from that time to the present, has continued to operate as a kind of *waste-gate* to public feeling; or rather, I should say, as the *safety-valve of slavery*, letting off continually, in one way and another, those feelings of abhorrence and indignation, which, but for it, had by this time, engrossed the public mind, aroused its slumbering energies to resistless action, and thus swept away every vestige of slavery from the land. It has turned off the public eye from the hideousness of slavery by its honied apologies; and whatever of public feeling may or would have arisen from time to time, on the subject, it has either quelled, at the outset, by its cries of a ‘necessary evil,’ an ‘unfortunate state of society,’ &c., or let off in the direction of Liberia, instead of allowing it to rise, and swell and concentrate its energies on the system of slavery. It has thus in point of fact, operated continually as a mere safety-valve to slavery—not that it has been so regarded by most of its advocates, but simply that such has been its actual operation. In more senses than one, it has operated as a ‘drain’ to carry off what had otherwise, by this time, shaken the system to its foundation. I deem it clear, then, that the scheme operates mightily to put back and keep back public sentiment on the subject, and feel bound, therefore, to abandon it.

6. Because, in present circumstances, its movements do but sanction and encourage the most highhanded oppression. This it does by the admission of the *principle* that emancipation may be conditioned on expatriation. All its operations go on the admission of this principle. It comes, therefore, with all the authority of the bar,

the legislature, the ecclesiastical assembly, the pulpit, and the press, and begets and sanctions in the public mind the idea, that emancipation on condition of removal is right—is all even, that justice demands. It thus sanctions a false principle, and, what is more, a principle, which, in the present aspect of things, seems to be fraught with oppressions and cruelties, well nigh as grievous as those of slavery itself. Witness the legislative acts of Maryland on the subject. Its sum of one hundred thousand dollars for the colonization of people of color, is appropriated on such conditions as make it little better than a bribe to oppression. It is a price put into the hand of the oppressor, by which to force his unoffending and trodden-down brother to the execrable alternative of wearing the yoke of servitude, or quitting his country. For say what you may about 'their own consent,' facts warrant the assertion that in many cases, there is no consent, save such an one as that by which the Indians have been driven to the west of the Mississippi—a mere choice of evils. And this, be it remembered, is but the legitimate result—nay, is but the acting out of that one principle, admitted and sanctioned by all the operations of the colonizing scheme—that emancipation on condition of removal is right—is all even, that in our peculiar circumstances, justice demands. The scheme thus, whether wittingly or not, does in fact become the parent of the most high-handed oppression.

7. Because it throws innumerable obstacles in the way of the improvement of the free people of color, in this country. This it does, by begetting and sanctioning the idea in the public mind, that the colored man cannot be elevated here, but, if at all, must be elevated in Africa or elsewhere. This idea, sanctioned as it is by the simple operation of the scheme, is as wicked and disastrous as the one just specified. It is part and parcel of the same. It is fatal to effective effort in behalf of the colored man on the part of the white, and equally fatal to all ambition and effort on the part of the colored man in his own behalf. It is

an idea that sunders all the sinews of action at once and forever.\*

\* Since writing the above, I have met with the following excellent remarks by Gerrit Smith, Esq. upon the 'process' pursued with great success, in Peterboro', N. Y., 'for reforming the drunkard.'

'Benevolence is the soul of the enterprise. \* \* \* \* Those of my neighbors, who have undertaken, in reliance on God, the work of reforming drunkards, do not feel and act towards those wretched beings as they once did. \* \* \* \* Formerly they despised the drunkard. Now they pity him. Now they feel, that no class of men are entitled to draw so largely on their compassions as drunkards; and especially do they feel this, when they consider how much they have themselves done to make drunkards. \* \* \* \* Formerly they repulsed the drunkard from their doors; neglected his sufferings; and wherever they met him, manifested their contempt and abhorrence of him. Now they are kind to him; furnish him with employment; are tender of his feelings, and attentive to his wants. The drunkard's self-despair arises, in a great measure, from the conviction, that he is an outcast from the public respect and sympathy. Of this we have been aware in our efforts to reform him; and we have sought to show him, that, as to ourselves at least, this conviction shall be groundless. We have taken great pains to persuade him, that we are his friends, and that every improvement in his habits, however slight, would proportionably and promptly elevate him in our esteem. We have also cheerfully consented to practice every self-denial, by which we could gain his confidence. \* \* \* \* The drunkard is affected by this self-denial for his sake, and he straightway opens his heart to those who practice it.' And in this way, the work of reformation, hopeless as it was once regarded, is accomplished. Mr. Smith gives an account of *thirty-eight* drunkards, that have thus been reclaimed in his immediate neighborhood. This shows what benevolence can do. Aided from on high, it can work most marvellous and unexpected changes. Aye, it can make the wolf dwell with the lamb, and the leopard lie down with the kid. Suppose then, by a similar 'process,' benevolence should attempt the elevation of the colored people in our land. Let those who undertake the work, cease to feel and act toward these wretched beings as they now do. Instead of despising the colored man, let them pity him, and feel that no class of men are entitled to draw so largely on their compassions, especially, when they consider how much they have themselves done to make them degraded. And farther, instead of repulsing the colored man from their doors, neglecting his sufferings, and wherever they meet him, manifesting their contempt and abhorrence of him, let them be kind to him,

I omit an extended notice of the objection so often and so justly urged, that the whole tendency and operation of this scheme is to deepen and perpetuate, and at the same time, sanction, and excuse, and even sanctify that ungodly prejudice, which is already so rife in the community, and so pregnant with mischief to its unoffending victims. No man can over-estimate the weight of this objection. But I must not enlarge upon it. I must pass from the tendencies of the scheme in this country to its tendencies in Africa. I object to Colonization then,

8. Because, it promises for Africa, what it never has and never can perform—viz. the introduction of civilization and christianity among the natives. This is missionary work, and if ever done, must be done by missionaries set apart expressly to it, and not by men or ministers, such as Teague and Waring and several others that might be named, who will lay aside their sacerdotal robes the moment they reach their field of labor, and turn merchants, and get a living by selling rum, spear-pointed knives, powder and guns. These are not the men, nor these the means of civilizing and christianizing any people.

And besides, such is the nature of man, such the nature of the case, that colonies, of the very best ma-

furnish him with employment, be tender of his feelings, and attentive to his wants. The colored man's *'self-despair arises, in a great measure, from the conviction that he is an outcast from the public respect and sympathy.'* Of this, let those that endeavor his elevation be aware, and therefore, in their efforts, seek to show him, that, as to themselves at least, this conviction shall henceforth be groundless. Let them take great pains to persuade him, that they are his friends, and that every improvement in his habits, however slight, instead of subjecting him to new insults, will proportionably and promptly elevate him in their esteem. And finally, let them cheerfully consent to practice every self-denial by which they can gain his confidence, and, rely upon it, he will be affected thereby, and will straightway open his heart to those who practice it, and what then, think you, will have become of the now prevalent idea, that the colored man cannot be elevated in this country? It will have perished from the mind, or be remembered with wonder and abhorrence.

terials, never will or can be made the means of civilizing and christianizing the natives of a country. The very nature of the enterprise is such, and *all history proves it*, that the colonists and natives will have separate interests—so separate as to prevent their mutual amalgamation. The line of distinction will always be kept up, and so long as it is, there is an end to all civilization and christianity. This was the fact with these American colonies. This is the fact in Liberia now. We have it on the authority of the Rev. J. B. Pinney, the Presbyterian missionary, and now acting Governor of the Colony. And what does he say—that the distinction in question does not exist? Hear him—‘*Nothing has been done for the natives, hitherto, by the colonists, except to educate a few who were in their families in the capacity of servants. The natives are, as to wealth and intellectual cultivation, related to the colonists as the negro in America is to the white man—and this fact, added to their mode of dress, which consists of nothing usually, but a handkerchief around the loins, leads to the same distinction as exists in America between colors. A colonist of any dye (and many there are of a darker hue than the Vey, or Dey, or Croo, or Bassoo) would, if at all respectable, think himself degraded by marrying a native.*’ Here then you have the distinction in all its strength—and more, you have its results. ‘*Nothing has been done for the natives, except,*’ &c. ! The truth is, the whole tendency of colonies is, not to incorporate the natives with themselves, but to exist as separate communities, having separate interests, and so doing, to drive the natives back, and back, and back to ultimate extermination. Nor can this tendency be ever effectually counteracted. However circumstances may vary in different cases, yet the general principles of the operation, and therefore its general tendencies, are and must evermore be the same. Colonization is a good measure to people an uninhabited country; or, when a people, like the Canaanites of old, have filled up the measure of their iniquity, and God wishes to inflict summary punishment on them,



then it is a good measure to extirminate and cut them off. It answers such purposes well, but is useless, and worse than useless, as to all purposes of reform and salvation.

9. Because it aims at securing two incompatible objects—viz. the end, or gratification of prejudice and of benevolence.

Prejudice says, send the people of color to Africa, and get them out of my way. They can't be elevated here, neither do I want they should be. *Send them off.*

Benevolence says, 'convert Africa to Christ.' Benevolence aims at one object—the conversion of Africa to Christ. Prejudice aims at another—the removal of the people of color. *Can both objects be secured at the same time and by the same means? Can benevolence secure her end at the same time and by the same means, by which prejudice secures hers? Can Christ and Belial enter into copartnership and each have his own way and secure his own ends?*

If Africa is to be christianized, it must be done by appropriate means. What madness to think of doing it by inappropriate means! Who would send the ignorant and degraded—the dregs of society—to do it? If done at all, then, it must be done, (1) by means of colored and other missionaries and teachers, *qualified for the work here in America, and going forth to it in the spirit of Christ; and (2), if the colony at Liberia is to aid in this work, it must be increased slowly, and by the addition of such persons and such only, as are disposed and qualified to aid it.* In a word, it must be strictly and truly the *maid* of benevolence and not the great *lazar-house* of prejudice, into which it is to empty its victims by thousands. In this way Benevolence might secure her object.

If Prejudice is to have her way and secure her object, then the colored people, unfit (as the Colonization Society declares) to remain, and incapable of being elevated here—these, the dregs of society, are to be and must be disgorged by thousands on the shores of Africa!! Yes—prejudice must disgorge herself of

more than **SIXTY THOUSAND\*** of her victims every year, for many years to come; or she can never secure her object and get her hated victims out of the way. But let her put into her colony at Liberia only *one thousand* a year and the colony is ruined and the ends of benevolence defeated. Set down 1000 new emigrants a year into that thriving seaport New Bedford—could New Bedford live? The town would be a state pauper in five years. **THE COLONY IS GROWING TOO FAST** now. Make it then the open receptacle of Prejudice's countless victims, and it ceases to be the handmaid of benevolence, and becomes the lazar-house of prejudice,—the curse of curses to oppressed and bleeding Africa.

For these and other similar reasons, I have been constrained to withdraw my confidence and co-operation from this scheme. It is a scheme, in which I was once deeply interested. I have spoken, and preached, and written, and taken contributions in its behalf. I did not then understand the real nature and tendency of the scheme. I meant well in espousing it, but I now see my error and my sin; and though it was a sin of ignorance, still I desire to repent of it, and to send out this little book, to speak for the oppressed and vindicate their cause, that I may thereby do something, to make reparation for the injury done by former neglect and error.

\* This is the present annual increase.



**FINIS.**