





ADDRESS

OF THE

NEW-YORK YOUNG MEN'S

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

TO THEIR FELLOW-CITIZENS.

---

NEW-YORK :

W. T. COOLIDGE & CO., 55 WALL-STREET.

W. S. DORR, PRINTER.

1834.



## ADDRESS.

---

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

Fifty-eight years have elapsed since our fathers declared to the world the great fundamental doctrine of human freedom, that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Sincere in this declaration, they called God and the nations to witness their truth; no hypocrisy lurked in their hearts, and their actions set the seal to their professions. Scarcely had the war of independence been concluded, ere the citizens of the several states commenced a course of action calculated to abolish slavery, the only remaining feature of that oppression which a foreign yoke had imposed upon them. The immortal names of Franklin and Rush are enrolled among the first officers of the Abolition Society of Pennsylvania. In New-York, names as illustrious were to be found in the same cause,—Jay, King, and Hamilton, were men who not only engaged in the contest for liberty during the Revolution, but were active in every effort to effect the abolition of slavery after its conclusion, and the writings of the sage of Monticello contain abundant evidence of his strong aversion to slavery.\* In Mas-

\* The following extract from Jefferson's Notes on Virginia will show whether times have improved since that great man flourished. If Mr. Jefferson were now alive and

sachusetts, the name of Sedgwick is as distinguished for philanthropy towards the slave, as for genius, learning, and patriotism.

should venture such sentiments as these, is it probable that he would share a better fate than has befallen every man who has of late had the courage and conscience to plead the cause of the slave?

"It is difficult to determine on the standard by which the manners of a nation may be tried, whether catholic or particular. It is more difficult for a native to bring to that standard the manners of his own nation, familiarized to him by habit. There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people produced by the existence of slavery among us. *The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave he is learning to do what he sees others do.* If a parent could find no motive either in his philanthropy or his self-love, for restraining the intemperance of passion towards his slave, it should always be a sufficient one that his child is present. But generally it is not sufficient. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to his worst passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who permitting one half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the amor patriæ of the other. For if a slave can have a country in this world, it must be any other in preference to that in which he is born to live and labor for another; in which he must lock up the faculties of his nature, contribute as far as depends on his individual endeavors to the evanishment of the human race, or entail his own miserable condition on the endless generations proceeding from him. With the morals of the people their industry also is destroyed. For in a warm climate no man will labor for himself who can make another labor for him. This is so true, that of the proprietors of slaves a very small proportion indeed are ever seen to labor. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? *Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever: that considering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among possible events: that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest.* But it is impossible to be temperate and to pursue this subject through the various considerations of policy, of morals, of history natural and civil. We must be contented to hope they will force their way into every one's mind. I think a change already perceptible, since the origin of the present revolution. The spirit of the master is abating, that of the slave is rising from the dust, his condition mollifying, the way I hope preparing, under the auspices of heaven, for a total emancipation, and that this is disposed, in the order of events, to be with the consent of the masters, rather than by their extirpation."

Opposition active and virulent, unprincipled and persevering, it must be admitted, was excited then, as well as now, not only by the avaricious and interested, but by many who ought to have been guides in virtue.

But notwithstanding this opposition, the principles of liberty triumphed in the northern and middle states, and that they were advancing at the south until within the last twenty years is susceptible of demonstration.\* They have, it is true, since that period been arrested in their progress, but their foundation is in eternal truth and in the very nature of the human mind. What if a treacherous affectation of philanthropy have misled the public; discussion of the points at issue must result in the triumph of truth, justice, and humanity. Indeed whoever regards with attention the signs of the times, whether in relation to our own political position, the aspect of other nations, or the developments of pro-

\* " In 1790, the free colored people were 20,415 in all the States south of the Potomac and the Ohio.

In 1800, they had increased to 32,604, or at the rate of 60 per cent.

In 1810, they were 58,046, an increase of 78 per cent.

In 1820, they amounted to 77,040; which is an enlargement of only 32 per cent.

In 1830, the free colored people had increased to 112,708, which is an increase of 45 per cent.

So that by comparing the 26 years before the Colonization Society was instituted, with the 14 years subsequent to its establishment, it appears that there was an average disproportion in the emancipation of slaves of 74 per cent. per annum to 32; or in other words, that the number of slaves annually liberated before the Colonization Society was formed, was at the rate of 7 to 3 emancipated since the year 1816.

According to the previous enumerations and the advances of the free colored people before the Colonization Society was formed, the free colored people in 1820, should have numbered 112,464; and in 1830, they should have increased to 244,000: whereas in 1830, they only amounted to the number which they should in ordinary course have attained in 1820."

We merely adduce these statistics without comment; leaving it to the reader to decide what has been the practical effect of the Colonization scheme to which so many of the friends of human rights have heretofore looked with the sincere anticipation of good results.

phcey, now on the eve of a glorious fulfilment, must come to the conclusion that the time is at hand when "the merchants of the earth" who have "waxed rich" in the accursed traffic, shall no longer trade in "slaves and the souls of men."\*

The watchword of *liberty and right*, caught from America, was repeated with enthusiasm by the people of Europe :—The blood of our fellow-creatures, and the treasures of empire have been lavished for the last half-century, by the nations, to obtain the blessings we enjoy. To them America is the morning star of universal liberty. That the clouds of slavery should dim her lustre, that the sounds of violence and wo should ascend from these shores of the free, is cause of grief to the friends of freedom in all lands. They grieve at our dereliction of the principles of our ancestors. Despotism mocks at our boasted liberty, and brands with hypocrisy our professions of freedom and republicanism.

It is for us as Americans to wipe from the escutcheon of our country the only blot that stains it, to prove the sincerity of our principles, to establish not only our patriotism in giving liberty, the birth right of an American, to more than two millions of our own countrymen in bondage, but to prove our philanthropy and religion, by delivering the poor and needy, by loosing the bands of wickedness, by undoing the heavy burdens, by breaking every yoke, and by letting the oppressed go free. †

We contemplate a resort to no measures but those of argument and truth; and in the exercise of the

\* Rev. xviii. 13.

† Let every Christian read and ponder the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah, if he would learn the Divine will concerning oppression, and the Divine indignation against that kind of piety which is indifferent towards it.



*constitutional privileges* of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, we believe that the light of truth may be so diffused as to destroy slavery, a system which loves darkness because its deeds are evil.

In discussing this subject, we purpose to prove—

First, That slavery is a NATIONAL EVIL, and requires to some extent a NATIONAL REMEDY.

Second, To show the true character of slavery as it exists in the United States, and

Third, To propose and vindicate the remedy, viz: IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION, as enforced alike by expediency and duty.

First. Slavery is a NATIONAL EVIL, and requires to some extent a NATIONAL REMEDY.

If slavery were a mere local abuse of one of the states of this Union, affecting only its own interests, and capable of being controlled by its own authority, it might, at least with some show of propriety, be urged that the interference of the citizens of another state were gratuitous and improper. But slavery is not only degrading to our character abroad as a *nation*, it is the great cancer of this Union, corrupting the moral, social, and political sympathies of the country, gnawing at the very heart of its welfare, threatening in different forms *immediate* disunion and anarchy,\* and laying the foundation of an ultimate separation of interests, deep in the very nature of things.

Slavery is then a national concern in its nature and tendencies, but it is also sanctioned *directly* by Congress in the District of Columbia, and in the territories under the control of Congress. To remove slavery from these

\* Witness the Nullification of South Carolina, of which slavery, and not the Tariff, was confessedly the true cause.

portions of our country the national legislature is alone adequate, as they are entirely under the control of Congress in every respect. Every citizen of the United States is then equally interested and equally represented in a government which sustains and perpetuates this enormous violation of those natural rights, the very foundation of all law, the protection of which gives to governments the only just authority over their subjects. Any law which violates the great principles of natural justice is essentially null and void, can be enforced only by violence, and contains within itself the elements of its own dissolution.\* Our own happy government has been agitated to its foundations by disputes which, whatever may be their form, have their substance in slavery only. But passing over that succession of measures by which the slave-holding interests have uniformly thwarted and crippled the industry of the northern and middle states, we contemplate with grief the crisis which must arrive in a confederated government, continually agitated by deeply opposed interests of free and slave labor. Discontent, extravagance, and impoverishment, every where prevail in slave-countries. The nominal wealth of the master, in the persons of his slaves, is no permanent source of support to his family, but on the contrary increases his care in providing for them, while the purchase money of the slave absorbs capital which might be much more profitably invested. Nothing is more certain, both in theory and fact, than that slavery is a cause of national poverty. It con-

\* "We hold these truths to be self-evident:—that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights: that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."—[Declaration of Independence.]

verts the sinews of industry into the causes of want. The laborer, by this system is hardly worth his own support; while his voluntary toil would enrich both himself and his master. A deep seated hostility against the free is often engendered among slave-holders, which no concessions can assuage. It bursts forth, after every attempt to suppress it, with accumulated energy; the only effectual remedy for this evil being the establishment of a homogeneous interest, throughout this great nation, by the suppression of slavery. The emancipation of the slave, the elevation of oppressed humanity, and the increased productions of rewarded industry, are the proper and only remedies for the evils of this system.

2d. Again, the evil of slavery is national, because the internal or domestic slave-trade, now carried on to an incredible extent, depends absolutely upon the authority of the general government.\* The first article

\* The following opinions of the Rev. Robert J. Breckenridge, on the Constitutional power of Congress to abolish the slave-trade between the states, as well as slavery in the District of Columbia, are extracted from a communication in the N. Y. Evangelist of Oct. 18, 1834, under his own signature. We are pleased to find that the sentiments of this distinguished gentleman on this most important subject of national welfare, are exactly in unison with those expressed in the Declaration of the Anti-Slavery Convention held in Philadelphia in Dec. 1833. In proof of which we will extract a few sentences from that document, on the subject in question: "We *fully and unanimously* recognize the sovereignty of each state, to legislate exclusively on the subject of the slavery which is tolerated within its limits; we concede that Congress, under the present national compact, has no right to interfere with any of the slave states in relation to this momentous subject; but we maintain that Congress has a right, and is solemnly bound, to suppress the domestic slave-trade between the several states, and to abolish slavery in those portions of our territory which the Constitution has placed under its exclusive jurisdiction."

Mr. Breckenridge, in the communication alluded to, says:—

"I have continually held that this whole nation and world are bound to use all lawful means to put an end to slavery every where upon earth; and that to do this, we are all bound to use legal means where they exist, and moral means always.

That the Congress of the United States has power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, no reasonable man can doubt; that this power should be exercised without delay, every humane man ought to admit. But that Congress possesses the power to abolish the domestic slave trade under that clause of the Federal Constitution

(sect. 8,) of the Constitution declares that "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and *among the several states.*" The power to abolish both the foreign and domestic traffic in slaves is then derived from the same authority, and placed by this article on precisely the same footing. By virtue of this authority, Congress did abolish the foreign

which (section viii. of art. 1,) confers authority to regulate commerce among the several States, I have never asserted; nor do I now assert it, nor yet deny it. I firmly believe, however, that the ix. section of article 1, which is in these words, 'The migration or importation of such persons, as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808,' does expressly allow Congress to regulate, and if need be, prohibit, both importation from foreign countries, and emigration from state to state, of the persons intended in these words. Moreover, I consider that Congress has wisely and repeatedly in substance exercised these powers; and I am ready to vindicate and uphold, as far as one man may, the future exercise of the same beneficent authority; since I am fully convinced *nothing would more effectually tend to sap the foundation of slavery in several of the slave states.*

It is clear to my mind, that each state has exclusive power to say whether or not slavery may continue in its borders; yet it is equally clear that each state for itself, and Congress for them all, has power to prevent the emigration and importation of slaves—or of any other persons, not being citizens of the state whence they migrate.

So also, while no person, not a citizen in one state, has a right to set up any claim in another state, except under the *lex loci* of the latter; yet the third section of the iv. article expressly says, that 'The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.' *So that all laws that bear distinctively and harshly on the free people of color, are void as to those already citizens of any state; and may be made void as to all of them, by their all becoming entitled to citizenship, under the lex loci, in any state of this Union.*"

We quote the above remarks with great pleasure, and while we agree fully as to the result of this gentleman's argument, we must observe, that his reasoning from the prohibitory section (9, of article 1,) appears to us defective. The prohibition of Congress from exercising a certain power previous to 1808, in itself confers no power, even after that period, but implies as strongly as it is possible directly to express any idea, that without such temporary prohibition, Congress would immediately possess this power. Hence we infer that agreeably to the intention of the original framers of the Constitution, Congress does possess exclusive power to regulate trade among the several states, and that the trade in the souls of men cannot by any rule of interpretation be excepted. But this power to abrogate the domestic slave-trade is certainly derived from the article which gives to Congress the right of regulating commerce among the several states, and as certainly not from the article prohibiting this action of Congress previous to 1808. Although this prohibitory article implies that the Constitution somewhere endows Congress with this power, and may be regarded as alluding to viii. section of article 1, and regulating its time of going into operation.

traffic. Was this legislation in favor of humanity? or was it in favor of the domestic trade, the market of which would be overstocked by foreign importations? If the former was the object, why do not our representatives abolish the *domestic* iniquity immediately? Is it not an object sufficiently worthy of Congress? Shall a traffic, abhorred by all men, be permitted to tarnish the glory of our beloved country? Shall the bodies and souls of native Americans be subject to purchase and sale under authority of the general government?

If then it is manifest that Congress alone is competent to legislate on the subject of the domestic slave-trade, and the slavery of the District of Columbia and the territories, it is certain that no power could resist the will of the nation whenever that will shall be fully and constitutionally expressed.

Let it, however, be remembered that we desire no action of Congress in "regulating commerce among the several states" calculated in any wise to interfere with "the sovereignty of each state to legislate on the subject of the slavery which is tolerated *within* its own limits."\* Yet while we respect the sovereignty of the individual states, we deem it the duty of every American to vindicate the proper sovereignty of the national government.

It may be asked what good result would follow, if this measure could be carried into effect? would not slavery still exist and exhibit all its horrors? No—certainly. The prohibition of the domestic slave-trade would in all probability destroy slavery. Already the most northerly slave-states derive no other profit from the

\* Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention.

system, than that which results from supplying the southern markets. They would then very probably emancipate, and thus add their influence to the cause of righteousness and of liberty.

3d. Slavery interferes with and annuls the rights of citizens as guarantied by the Constitution. In the second section of the Constitution (article 4,) it is said "The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several states." But in the face of this express article, laws exist in almost every slave-state by which free colored citizens of the northern states may be, and actually are, taken up and imprisoned as runaways, and if not claimed, are sold for jail fees into perpetual slavery.— This horrid outrage is habitually practised in the United States prison in the District of Columbia and throughout the whole south.\* Where, we ask, is the majesty

\* "On the 1st of August, 1826, a notice appeared in the National Intelligencer at Washington, from the Marshal of the D. of C., that a negro named Gilbert Horton, and claiming to be free, had been committed to jail in Washington city as a *runaway*, and unless his *owner* proved property, and took him away by a certain time, the negro would be sold '*for his jail fees and other expenses, as the law directs.*' Horton was a native of Westchester Co. N. Y., and known there to be free. A public meeting of the inhabitants of the county was called, to take measures for his liberation. The meeting was held 30th August, 1826, and a series of resolutions were unanimously adopted; one of them calling on the Governor to demand the instant liberation of Horton as a *free citizen* of the State of New-York. Two of the resolutions were as follows :

"Resolved, That the law under which Horton has been imprisoned, and by which a free citizen without evidence of crime, and without trial by jury, may be condemned to servitude for life, is repugnant to our republican institutions, and revolting to justice and humanity; and that the representatives from this State in Congress are requested to use their endeavors to procure its repeal."

"Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to prepare and present to the citizens of this county for their signatures, a petition to Congress for the immediate abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia."

Governor De Witt Clinton, in compliance with the request of the meeting, wrote to the President of the United States, forwarding evidence of Horton's freedom, and requiring his immediate liberation "as a free man and a *citizen*." Horton was released before the receipt of the Governor's letter. The Westchester petition was signed by 800 and presented to the House of Representatives.

In December, 1826, Mr. Ward, representative in Congress from Westchester, intro-

of a state, whose feeblest citizen finds no protection from violence and outrage? Where the Christianity of a country, whose churches are dead to the cries of the poor and the needy?

What renders this more insulting to the northern states, is the fact, that while this article of the Constitution is trampled under foot, together with the sacred right of citizenship, our southern brethren pay particular respect to the claims of a *British pass*, which is sure to regain the liberty of any colored man thus arrested, "*to be sold for jail fees and other expenses, as the law directs.*" But our own citizens have not equal advantages with foreigners; fortified as their rights are by express enactment of the Constitution. If the rights of Americans cannot be preserved against such violations, the Constitution is already in ruins. It is too late to sound the notes of warning, it were better to

duced a resolution calling on the committee for the District of Columbia to inquire whether there was any law in the district authorizing the imprisonment of a free person of color, and his sale as an unclaimed slave for his *jail fees*. The resolution was adopted after much opposition by the southern members. The committee reported that there *was such a law, vindicated its general policy*, but recommended that when the arrested negro was unclaimed, he should not be sold, but that the *county* should pay the cost of imprisonment. The people of Georgetown presented a *remonstrance* against this proposition of the committee. The law remained unchanged, and *so remains*, it is believed, to this day.

On the 27th March, 1827, a petition was presented to Congress from 1000 citizens of the D. of C., praying for a revisal of the slave laws, and an act declaring that all children of slaves to be born in the District after the 4th of July, 1828, should be free at the age of 25, and that the importation of slaves into the District might be prohibited. From this petition, the following is an extract: viz.

"A colored man last summer, who stated that he was entitled to freedom, was taken up as a runaway slave and lodged within the jail of Washington city. He was advertised, but no one appearing to claim him, he *was according to law* put up at public auction *for payment of his jail fees, and sold as a slave for life!* He was purchased by a slave trader, who was not required to give security for his remaining in the District, and he was soon after shipped from Alexandria for one of the southern states. Thus was a human being sold into perpetual bondage, at the capital of the freest government on earth, without even a pretence of a trial, or the allegation of a crime." —[Extracted from Judge Jay's letter to Professor Wright, published in the American Anti-Slavery Reporter, for May, 1834.]

toll the knell of her dissolution. For what security is there that the rights of any other class of citizens may not be likewise invaded with impunity? While the slave-holder so contemptuously tramples on the Constitution in this respect, it is monstrous to witness his tenacity in enforcing the claims which the Constitution authorizes him to urge in the recovering of fugitives. Let our own prisons in this city, whose cells, 7 feet by 3½ and without ventilation, have been filled with these unfortunate beings through the past season of pestilence, bear witness! Sure we are that the judgment of the Almighty must overtake this nation if it do not repent of these outrages.

The provisions of the Constitution fully and fairly carried out, would cripple and destroy slavery, notwithstanding the repugnant clause relative to fugitives, and induce the states to banish every trace of it from their statute books and from the land. Let this subject be examined, and let the responsibility of every citizen be felt, the prayer of every Christian offered, and the effort of every lover of his country be put forth, to do what can be done, for liberty and for our beloved land.

On this subject, viz: the political question involved in slavery, we would recommend and entreat our fellow-citizens to petition Congress, for the abolition of slavery in the District and Territories, and the prohibition of all trade, in the bodies and souls of men, between the several states. Farther than this we wish no interference of Congress, but within these limits, the Constitution authorizes, and we desire, its action.

The moral effect of merely abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, placing as it would the national



frown upon this criminal system, would undoubtedly be such as to promote the progress of liberty throughout the Union, and prove an essential means of removing this stigma from the character—this curse on the prosperity—this upas on the morals of our nation.

Second. We proceed to take a view of the true character of slavery, as it exists in the United States.

Slavery is a system of compulsory, perpetual, hereditary, unrequited toil. It is a state of being into which humanity has been reduced by violence, outrage and robbery. A condition worse than that of the brutes. Nature designed them for the service of man! and no violence is done to them in subjecting them to that service. Brutes too are protected by law against cruelty, and are not rendered liable to its penalty, but the slave is an outlaw from the mercy, and a victim to all the terrors of legislation.

There are seventy-one crimes recognized by the slave-laws of the south, for which colored men suffer death, and for which a white man would be liable to no severer penalty than imprisonment in the penitentiary.\*

The testimony of a negro, whether bond or free, is not received as evidence, except to criminate one of his own color.†

Female virtue is not defended by the laws of the slave states, in this Christian land; while the pagan laws of Rome and Greece authorized a female slave to shed human blood in her own defence.‡

\* Vide Stroud's Sketch of the Laws relating to slavery in the several states of the United States of America, Page 107.

† Idem. Page 27.

‡ A slave cannot even contract matrimony—the association which takes place among slaves, and is called marriage, being properly designated by the word *contu-*

As if the outrage were not sufficient for men professing the principles of universal liberty, to deny to the poor and oppressed the inalienable right to their own souls and bodies, *Americans*, by the most cold blooded legislation, have put out the eyes of the mind, and quenched the light of everlasting life by denying to their own countrymen the knowledge of letters and the Gospel of God our Saviour.\*

These poor creatures are sold in the streets of our southern cities without regard to decency or humanity. Parents are separated; children torn ruthlessly from the very bosom of their mothers, and exposed to sale like cattle, under the auctioneer's hammer.†

Marriage is unsanctioned and unprotected by law, and all the domestic relations are summarily violated.‡ In this country of light and knowledge, in this land of religion and revivals, in this home of liberty, it is no disgrace to the Christian minister, to the dignified judge of our highest courts, to the eloquent senator or to the delicate female, thus to have dealt in the trade of human hearts; in the sighs and groans of God's poor. While "to cry aloud" in behalf of the oppressed, to repeat the Scripture commands "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him," is the sure way to provoke persecution and calumny.§ But blessed be

*bernium*—a relation which has no sanctity, and to which no civil rights are attached. "A slave has never maintained an action against the violator of his bed. A slave is not admonished for incontinence, or punished for fornication or adultery: never prosecuted for bigamy, or petty treason for killing a husband being a slave, any more than admitted to an appeal for murder."—Opinion of Daniel Dulany, Esq., Attorney General of Maryland—1 Maryland Reports, 561, 563.—[Stroud's Slave Laws, pages 61, 62.]

\* Vide Stroud's Sketch of the Slave Laws, Page 90.

† Vide Advertisements, in all the Southern prints.

‡ Vide Stroud's Sketch, Page 61.

§ It were easy to cite instances to prove every statement of this paragraph. A wish to avoid personality alone prevents references to facts published in southern

God! there are some who, like Moses, choose “rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.”—Heb. xii. 25.

Torture and the scourge, nakedness and hunger, are not uncommon sufferings of the slave. Slaves have been coursed with bloodhounds, and pursued by parties of men as wild beasts, in what is familiarly known as a negro hunt.\*

“If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain, If thou sayest behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul doth he not know it? and shall not he render to every man according to his works?”—Prov. xxiv. vs. 11 and 12.

What a commentary on the profession of religion is the apathy of our churches! We may mock each other, and deceive ourselves, but the Searcher of hearts will by no means clear the guilty.

Slaves are forced by the lash to work without wages, sometimes even by professed Christians, in spite of the divine malediction, “Wo unto him that useth his neighbor’s service without wages, that giveth him not for his work.”—Jer. xxii. 13.

The concubinage which is permitted or encouraged among the slaves, rolls back its pollution upon the master; and it is beyond dispute, and evidenced by the complexion of the slaves, that a large portion of them

prints, amply proving all that is here asserted; whilst other facts are fresh in the memory of the public to show that the freedom of speech and opinion, exercised on this “delicate subject,” has cost some of our best citizens both safety and reputation.

\* Vide Stroud’s Sketch, Pages 38 and 40.

are the children of their oppressors. What was ever heard of in the darkness of Africa, or in guilty Sodom, to transcend in enormity the crime of enlightened freemen trading in the bodies of their own children, and selling them into bondage more hopeless than Algerine slavery! for in the Barbary States, a slave is instantly set free, on embracing the faith of Mohammed; while in our Christian country, conversion sometimes renders the slave more valuable as an article of merchandize, and thus increases the difficulty of his manumission.

A show of argument is sometimes made of Scripture, in defence of slavery; but it needs only a moment's reflection to discover the fallacy of this reasoning; since all distinctions of nation are done away in Christ, who "hath broken down the middle wall of partition" (Ephs. ii. 14.) between the Jews and other nations. Christians should remember that "what God hath cleansed" they should not "call common." Our duties to the whole human family are those of love and kindness, as constituted by our own pardon and salvation in Jesus Christ. It were more pertinent to the subject of our duties to our fellow-men, to quote the words of the beloved Apostle—"If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?"—1 John iv. 20.

Let Christians remember the instructions of their master to the lawyer, that demanded of him, who is my neighbor? The Samaritan, who was of a nation despised by the Jews, and held in the same contempt that we indulge towards the negro, is in that inimitable parable held forth as "neighbor to him who fell among thieves." Hence the commandment "thou shalt love

thy neighbor as thyself," is totally irreconcilable with involuntary slavery, or any other form of oppression exercised even towards the meanest members of the human family. Our duty to the colored people of this land is urgent, and the retribution of Divine justice, if suspended in order to solicit our repentance, is yet imminent, and must overtake us, unless we speedily repent, and "do works meet for repentance."

Third. We propose and vindicate the remedy, viz: IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION, as enforced alike by expediency and duty.

Whatever exception may be made to the *term*, the *thing* itself must at some period be adopted, or slavery will be perpetual; for no plan of gradual emancipation has yet been proposed, or can be, which does not become immediate, whenever it is reduced to practice.

But if slavery be a sin—and the universal conscience of man thus brands it—by what code of morals, we ask, can a *gradual* abandonment of it be justified? That coerced labor and loss of freedom for crimes are authorized by the Divine law, we will not deny. Such an argument might be urged if we were pleading for criminals. But our enslaved countrymen are innocent individuals; they are unaccused of crime, and the only cause of their suffering, is the avarice of their oppressors.

We as freely admit that a man may sell himself, as was the case in the bond-service authorized by the Jewish law, for a term of service, but not as a slave, and that such voluntary bond-servants may of right become the inheritance of children, subject to original engagement, or, among the Jews, to the law of Jubilee; by which, on every fiftieth year, "liberty" was

proclaimed "throughout all the land, unto ALL THE INHABITANTS thereof."\*

We thus confess that *servitude* may begin by one's selling himself to another—"if only meant of contracts to serve or work for one another"—and that this is "very just, but when applied to strict slavery, in the laws of old Rome and modern Barbary,"† or the United

\* That the individuals to whom this law solely applied were the bond-servants bought of the strangers is evident, because there is an absolute prohibition in the Divine law against the Hebrews ever being permitted to take their brethren as bondsmen; Vide Levit. xxv. 39 and 40. By what right then can we take our brethren as perpetual slaves?

† "As to the several sorts of servants, I have formerly observed," says the learned Blackstone, "that pure and proper slavery does not, nay cannot, subsist in England: such, I mean, whereby an absolute and unlimited power is given to the master over the life and fortune of the slave. And indeed it is repugnant to reason, and the principles of natural law, that such a state of things should exist any where. The three origins of the right of slavery, assigned by Justinian, are all of them built upon false foundations. As first, slavery is held to rise "*jure gentium*," from a state of captivity in war; whence slaves are called *mancipia*, quasi, manu capti. The conqueror, say the civilians, had a right to the life of his captive, and having spared that, has a right to deal with him as he pleases. But it is an untrue position, when taken generally, that by the law of nature or nations, a man may kill his enemy: he has only a right to kill him in particular cases, in cases of absolute necessity for self-defence, and it is plain this absolute necessity did not subsist, since the victor did not actually kill him, but made him prisoner. War is itself justifiable only on the principles of self-preservation: and therefore it gives no other right over prisoners but merely to disable them from doing harm to us, by confining their persons: much less can it give a right to kill, torture, abuse, plunder, or even to enslave an enemy when the war is over.

Since therefore the right of *making* slaves by captivity depends on a supposed right of slaughter, that foundation failing, the consequence drawn from it must fail likewise. But secondly, it is said that slavery may begin "*jure civili*," where one sells himself to another. This, if only meant of contracts, to serve or work for another, is very just: but when applied to strict slavery, in the laws of old Rome and modern Barbary, is also impossible. Every sale implies a price, a *quid pro quo*, an equivalent given to the seller in lieu of what he transfers to the buyer: but what equivalent can be given for life, and liberty, both of which (in absolute slavery) are held to be in the master's disposal? His property also, the very price he seems to receive devolves *ipso facto* to his master, the instant he becomes his slave. In this case, therefore, the buyer gives nothing, and the seller receives nothing: of what validity can a sale be which destroys the very principles on which all sales are founded? Lastly, we are told that besides these two ways by which slaves "*fiunt*," or are acquired, they may also be hereditary "*servi nascuntur*;" the children of acquired slaves are *jure natura*, by a negative kind of birth-right, slaves also. But this being built on the two

States, there is nothing but injustice, a violation of all sound principles of government, and a practical insult to the authority of God, the common Father of us all. But our countrymen in chains have never sold themselves. The slavery of this land having originated in man stealing, is prolonged, by successive acts of violence and injustice. Every new-born child, appropriated by the avarice of its master, is in fact the victim of the same injustice by which the parent was at first torn from his home in Africa.

The true question before the American people, and especially American Christians, is, whether American slavery, whose origin and continuation are undeniably in violence and injustice, can be gradually repented of; or in other words, whether, according to the morals of Christianity, it is possible to postpone the duty of repentance. Could a greater absurdity be proposed, than to continue the crime and cruelty of slave-holding for any defined term, as an act of repentance? It is at best purposing repentance at a distant day. The insincerity of such a proceeding is too palpable to be argued. If we do not repent absolutely, we continue in the sin, and only compromise with conscience. The injunction of the Apostle is here exactly in point: "Let him that stole, *steal no more*, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth."—Eph. iv. 28. If then a gradual discontinuance of crime be incompatible with genuine repentance, how shall those who cry against this sin be justified in the sight of God,

former rights, must fall together with them. If neither captivity, nor the sale of one's self, can by the law of nature and reason, reduce the parent to slavery, much less can they reduce the offspring."—[Blackstone's Commentaries, Vol. 1st, Chapter 14, Pages 423-4.]

unless they preach the duty of an immediate, sincere, total and absolute abandonment of it?

The voluntary bond-service of the Jews was broken up every seventh or Sabbatical year, (which was the Jubilee of the Hebrew servants,) so that those engagements could never become perpetual, and degenerate into slavery and oppression. This was done immediately and invariably, and was never followed with consequences worse than the blessing of God, the repairing of the waste places, and the renewal of those voluntary engagements by which *servants* among them were held by *bond* to labor. The master had no proprietorship in their *bodies*, but possessed only a claim on their *services* until the expiration of the engagement or the return of the Jubilee. In case the servant was an Hebrew, and was even sold as a bondsman the master being a Hebrew could not extort service from him without wages. "If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to SERVE AS A BOND SERVANT. But as an HIRED SERVANT and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee."—Lev. xxv. 39 and 40. And again that the Jubilee of the Hebrew servant was at the end of every six years, or on the commencement of the Sabbatical year, is evident from the following passage. "If thou buy a Hebrew servant, SIX YEARS shall he serve, and in the seventh he shall GO OUT FREE FOR NOTHING." Hence it appears that the great Jubilee which was proclaimed\* "throughout all the land to every inhabitant thereof," was in fact the year of enfranchisement to other than Hebrew servants, for these were released

\* Levit. xxv. 10.



on the Sabbatical year, after six years servitude as hired servants, and not as bond-servants. We are now able to understand what is meant by the following passages, appealed to with such triumph by the defenders of slavery, to prove that Jehovah has authorized oppression.\* “Moreover of the children of the

\* To show with what effrontery the very fountains of the water of life have been poisoned, we transcribe from Calmet’s Dictionary, (article **SLAVERY**;) the following passages, in which he undertakes to prove that the Hebrews were authorized by Jehovah to enslave men in several different ways.

“A Hebrew,” says this author, “might *fall into slavery* several ways: (1.) If reduced to extreme poverty he might sell himself.—Lev. xxv. 39. (2.) A father might sell his children as slaves.—Exod. xxi. 7. (3.) Insolvent debtors might be delivered to their creditors as slaves.—2 Kings iv. 1. (4.) Thieves not able to make restitution for their thefts, or the value, were sold for the benefit of the sufferers.—Exod. xxii. 3. (5.) They might be taken prisoners in war. (6.) They might be stolen, and afterwards sold for slaves, as Joseph was by his brethren. (7.) A Hebrew slave redeemed from a Gentile by one of his brethren, might be sold to another Israelite.”

Now we dare assert, and will prove, that this writer has made a mere show of authority, and that in the whole seven ways “in which a Hebrew *might fall into slavery*,” he has not been able to produce a single reference which bears out his profane charge against God’s holy law.

This we will proceed to establish, by quoting the very passages to which he has referred, and proving that they authorize no slavery whatever.

(1.) “If reduced to extreme poverty he might sell himself.” The text here referred to, to prove that a *Hebrew* might sell himself into slavery, says nothing about slavery whatever; but on the contrary declares, “THOU SHALT NOT COMPEL HIM TO SERVE AS A BOND SERVANT, BUT AS A HIRED SERVANT, and as a sojourner,” and that for no period longer than six years; and further on, in the 42d verse, it is distinctly stated that “THEY (the Hebrews) SHALL NOT BE BONDMEN.” Hence the bondmen of the Hebrews were never of their brethren, and the first “*way in which a Hebrew might fall into slavery*,” as Calmet has it, has no existence in the authority of God, or the customs of the Hebrews.

(2.) “A father might sell his children as slaves.” What libel on the law of God greater than this could have been invented?

The text referred to is as follows: “And if a man sell his daughter to be a maid servant, SHE SHALL NOT GO OUT AS THE MEN-SERVANTS DO. If she please not HER MASTER WHO HATH BETROTHED HER TO HIMSELF, then shall he let her be redeemed; TO SELL HER UNTO A STRANGE NATION, HE SHALL HAVE NO POWER.” The whole text and context showing as clearly as possible that a father had no right to sell his daughter, EXCEPT AS A WIFE. Her rights are clearly protected, and she IS TO BE MARRIED BY THE PURCHASER OR HIS SON—otherwise (11th verse) “SHALL SHE GO OUT FREE WITHOUT MONEY.”

(3.) “Insolvent debtors might be delivered to their creditors as slaves.” The text is, “And the creditor is come to take unto him my two sons AS BONDMEN.” Here the sophistry consists in changing the word *bondmen* to *slaves*. The word *slave* cannot be found in the whole law, and we know what the law of bond service is, viz: that it shall terminate at the year of Jubilee. This is no slavery, but bond service.

strangers that do sojourn among you of *them* shall ye buy and of *their* families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and *they* shall be your possession: and ye shall take THEM for a possession, THEY shall be your bondmen forever, but over YOUR BRETHREN the children of Israel ye shall not rule one over another with rigor.\*—Lev. xxv. 45 and 46. Here we have an authority to keep slaves forever! according to the advocates of slavery; and certainly at first sight there seems to be a contradiction to the law of Jubilee, when liberty was proclaimed “throughout all the land TO ALL THE INHABITANTS thereof.” Like other seeming contradictions of the Bible, however, it needs only to

(4.) In the case of thieves the text is, “If he have nothing, than shall he be sold for his theft.” Here is nothing said of slavery, it is bond service merely, and even a thief, who thus righteously incurred the penalty of forfeited liberty, would enjoy the mercy of the Jubilee. If he were a Hebrew, he would go free at the lesser Jubilee, the Sabbatical or seventh year; but if a stranger, or foreigner at farthest, he would be released at the great Jubilee of bond servants, when *all* the inhabitants were released.

(5.) “They might be taken prisoners in war.” Here our author makes not even a show of authority; but we will help him to a text: Deut. vii. 2—“Thou shalt smite them and UTTERLY DESTROY THEM, THOU SHALT MAKE NO COVENANT WITH THEM, NOR show mercy unto them.” There is no statute of commutation for the seven guilty nations; none of them were ever reduced to slavery, nor did “pure and proper slavery” ever exist under the Hebrew polity.

(6.) “They might be stolen and afterwards sold into slavery, as Joseph was sold by his brethren.” This is the most extraordinary of all commentaries! They might be stolen! Indeed! But here again a text is wanted, and we have one at hand. Exod. xxi. 2—“And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, OR IF HE BE FOUND IN HIS HAND HE SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH.”

(7.) “A Hebrew slave redeemed from a Gentile, by one of his brethren, might be sold by him to another Israelite.” Here again no show of authority is adduced whatever. It will be sufficient, in order to prove the utter inaccuracy of this assertion, to quote from Lev. xxv., 39th and 40th verses, the prohibition of the Divine law against making any Hebrew a bond servant: “Thou shalt not compel him, [a Hebrew,] to serve as a bond servant, but as an hired servant.” Hence it is evident that the Hebrew could not be sold as a slave, or even as a bondman.

\* “Rigor” here used cannot mean oppression or cruelty, but is merely applied to the mode of obtaining labor from a bond servant; and is used in opposition to wages, the means of soliciting cheerful labor from an hired servant. Otherwise it would be contrary to the command of the most High, not to oppress the stranger.

be understood, and the contradiction vanishes. *They* and *them* in the 45th verse, referring to the children of strangers, are evidently in opposition to *your brethren*, in the next verse. The meaning of the passage is therefore evidently that the Jews should *forever* be privileged to hold as bond-servants persons purchased of strangers, but this privilege was forbidden them with respect to their brethren the Hebrews. The word *forever*, if rendered always, would have answered the proper meaning of the Hebrew. The emphasis of the passage is on *they*, and not on *forever*. *They* shall be your bondsmen forever, not the Hebrews your brethren. But let us take it in a literal sense. Then those men, both masters and servants, must live *forever* in those capacities to fulfil the meaning of the text. Other texts prove conclusively that the slave-holder's interpretation of the passage under consideration is in direct variance with its true meaning and with the whole spirit of the dealings of Jehovah towards our race. "For the Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward: He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and LOVETH THE STRANGER, in giving him food and raiment. LOVE YE, THEREFORE, THE STRANGER."—Deut. x. 17, 18, 19.

"ALSO THOU SHALT NOT OPPRESS A STRANGER, for ye know the heart of a stranger, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."—Exod. xxiii. 9.

"THOU SHALT NEITHER VEX A STRANGER NOR OPPRESS HIM, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."—Exod. xxii. 21.

But what oppression could be greater than to take them for slaves and their posterity after them forever,

to hold them as chattles, and to deprive them of every right? Jehovah is not the author of oppression.

The bondmen among the Hebrews who were bought of strangers, were sold for debt,\* for a limited period of time, at farthest not beyond the fiftieth year. Even if the sum for which they were sold was greater than the value of the services, yet in no case could the bondage be protracted beyond that period. But slavery in this country has its origin in man-stealing; and the same law to which the slave-holder so confidently appeals, makes no distinction between the original thief and the person in whose hands the stolen man may be found. "And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, shall surely be put to death."—Exod. xvi. 21.

This text alone proves that the bond service of the Hebrews, as sanctioned by the Divine law, was never involuntary and coerced—never originated in violence and robbery. Is it not enough to cause the blush of shame, that in the nineteenth century it should be necessary to prove to Christians, that their God is not the founder of slavery and justifier of man-stealing?

Oppression in every form was not only denounced and put under the curse of the Most High, but was entirely precluded by the following enactment: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which hath 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. 15, 16. So that in case of cruelty, unkindness or even dissatis-

\* Vide 2 Kings, iv. 1.—"The creditor is come to take my two sons to be bondmen."

faction, the servant might leave his master, and was protected from being delivered to him by an express law. Far be it from the God of the oppressed to have authorized a system of slavery and robbery; instead of this he has forbidden WITH A CURSE to take the labor of another without wages; and when he makes provision for sending away the servant on the year of Jubilee, (the Sabbatical Jubilee,) after ordering the master not to let him go empty, he uses this inimitable and eloquent language: "*It shall not seem hard unto thee, when thou sendest him away from thee; for he hath been worth a double hired servant unto thee in serving thee six years: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all that thou doest.*"—Deut. xv. 18.

Thus so far from the institution of slavery being traceable to the Divine law, we find, upon an attentive examination of the subject, that that law has no other tendency than to prevent, by wholesome provisions, the possibility of voluntary bond service ever degenerating into slavery, and to forbid even bond service itself among the Hebrews in the persons of their brethren.

A candid examination of the subject will satisfy any intelligent person that the bond service of the Hebrews, as authorized by the holy and merciful law of God, was a system of just and equal service, and although rigorous compared with hired service, was still assuaged by many important regulations, and has no affinity whatever with slavery, a system in which the master claims a proprietorship in the soul and the body, impiously wresting, (as it were,) from the Most High, his right; for God is manifestly the only proprietor of human beings.\*

\* Among the Romans, slaves were procured by being captured in war. The

Indeed many advocates of anti-slavery, themselves, seem to have fallen into the common error that Jehovah authorized the Hebrews to take captives from the seven accursed nations, and reduce them to bond servants. This was never authorized by the law of God. The Hebrews were directed "to MAKE NO COVENANT WITH THEM, nor show mercy to them—Deut. vii. 2.; and for the express reason, "For they will turn away thy son from following me," &c.—4th verse.

Even the Gibeonites who deceived Joshua, and were saved in consequence of his rash covenant with them, were not made slaves, or even bond servants, but were destined to be "Hewers of wood and drawers of water FOR THE CONGREGATION, AND FOR THE ALTAR OF THE LORD.—"Josh. ix. 27. The most merciful God would not even make these wicked men slaves or perpetual bond servants; they were servants of the lowest sort to the altar—never slaves. God authorized Joshua to take the lives, but not to commute to servitude the sentence of the vanquished heathen.

That gradual emancipation is but *emancipation in the abstract*, a postponed duty, a cruel injustice, is proved by the fact of its failure in this country, after being in vogue for half a century. It is confirmed also by the opinions of Wilberforce and Clarkson themselves, who rejected it after several years of trial, and confessed that their first efforts were ill-directed. It authorizes a continuance of evil, of suffering and sin.

Emancipation is always immediate *when it takes* etymology of the Latin words *mancipium*, (quasi manu capti,) slave, and *servus*, an abbreviation of *servatus*, (saved,) both prove this origin of slavery. But it was this very sin of oppression, among others, which induced the Divine vengeance on the Pagan nations. This heathen violence was never authorized by the Most High.

*place*; and there is no other meaning in the term *gradual* in this connexion than is better conveyed by the expression, *prospective* emancipation. There is a real illusion in the idea of gradualism. In the year 1827, ten thousand slaves were *immediately* set free in this state by virtue of an act passed in 1799. This is an instance of what is called gradual emancipation, but in fact it was *immediate* when it occurred, *prospective* before, but never gradual. It is a plan obnoxious, however, to many objections; among which not the least is the opportunity thus afforded to slave-holders within the period between its enactment and execution, to sell and transport their slaves to slave countries. In this view of the subject the boasted scheme of gradualism is no more than a hollow pretence of philanthropy, made by slave-dealers.

But a real and honest practice of gradual abolition amounts to this, and to this only, viz: to compel, by law, a future generation to manumit *their* slaves, while the present race is retained in bondage. It says—to emancipate the present number is impracticable, we will then oblige our children, in twenty years from this time, to set free twice the number. For it is a fact tested by all experience, that slaves double their number once in every twenty years, while the free negroes do not double theirs under forty years. Is not the advantage then decidedly on the side of immediate, and the disadvantage with postponed emancipation?

What real difficulty would have been encountered by New-York if she had manumitted her slaves in 1799, that was not experienced in 1827?

But while the benefit of this measure to the north was in course of preparation, the slaves at the south alone have become more than four times as many as

were in the whole country at the close of the Revolution. Thus, the most important practical result of the doctrine of gradual emancipation has been to multiply four or five times the number of slaves that were in the land at the time of its being first inculcated. They have more than doubled twice since the peace of 1783.

Many people regard the preponderance of the colored population at the south with dismay; and nothing can be more certain than that the ratio of increase of the *slave* population can only be equalled by the diminished rate of increase of the white people.\* All experience

\* It is shown by the census of the United States, that during the period of 40 years immediately preceding the year 1830, the slave population south of the Potomac and the Ohio had QUADRUPLED in number; and in the states north of those boundaries, in a majority of which the abolition principles of our revolutionary ancestors have triumphed, the colored population had NOT QUITE DOUBLED.

In Eastern Virginia (according to a communication in the Af. Rep. for April 1833, page 16,) it appears that from 1790 to 1830, the white population had DIMINISHED 131,915, and the colored had INCREASED 143,063. This almost incredible disparity of population occurred notwithstanding the vigorous prosecution of the domestic slave-trade, by which Virginia has been in the habit of exporting annually to the south, 6000 slaves. The same result followed the oppression of the Hebrews in Egypt, "and the land was filled with them."

From these facts, it is evident that THE CONDITION OF BONDAGE, IS THE REAL CAUSE OF AUGMENTING IN AN UNNATURAL AND FRIGHTFUL RATIO THE NUMBERS OF THE OPPRESSED.

Every moment of delay only sweeps us nearer to the awful precipice of destiny. The slaves double in less than 20 years, while the whites in many places by licentiousness and emigration actually diminish; thus it is evident that no infatuation is so mad, none so blind as that which urges the delay of measures already difficult, and which must soon become absolutely impracticable.

Whatever may be the considerations derived from these facts, one circumstance should be borne in mind by every lover of his country, viz: that the recent act of the British government in liberating the slaves of Jamaica, and the other British Islands, has rendered ABOLITION IN OUR COUNTRY IMPERATIVE AND UNAVOIDABLE. It is this fact, which adds certainty and gives impulse to the progress of universal liberty throughout the world. We are thus driven to the conclusion that slavery must terminate in one of these ways:—1. By the extermination of the blacks. 2. By the extirmination of the whites. Or 3. By voluntary emancipation.—[New-York City Anti-Slavery Society's Address, Oct. 1833.] (Third Edition.)



teaches that the colored portion must soon vastly outnumber the other, from the established facts of their growth; but in addition to this the emigration of white families from motives of prudence; and the licentiousness of others, together with the degraded state of the negroes, will continue to effect a greater disproportion of the races. The result, as horrible as it is inevitable, in the present state of hatred engendered by oppression, is only to be averted, by establishing a kind relation between the races. Unless mercy takes the place of cruelty, repentance of wrongs, and the law of kindness be substituted for the scourge, the thumb-screw, the torture and gibbet, nothing is more certain than that, in the common course of things, a most awful retribution will visit our southern country, overwhelming the master in utter ruin.

Will it be objected that emancipation is dangerous? that the slave, so inoffensive under injuries, is fierce and blood-thirsty when emancipated? Shall we be told that to give him liberty will endanger his master? His master already reposes on a volcano's crater. To him the night is a period of danger and dread. Profound peace a time of extreme exposure, to which the terrors of civil war are preferable. Govenor Hayne, of South Carolina, boldly advocates this doctrine, and explains in some measure the turbulence for which the party he leads is notorious. "*A state of military preparation,*" says his Excellency, "*must always be with us, a state of perfect domestic security. A period of profound peace and consequent apathy may expose us to the danger of domestic insurrection.* But when the FREEMEN of the country ARE IN ARRAY, WITH ARMS IN THEIR HANDS, there must be an end to all apprehension from this source."

It is difficult to conceive of a state of greater danger than that described by Governor Hayne.

The testimony of all history is against the safety of the slave-holding system, and as decidedly in favor of the safety of emancipation. Every state in this Union, which, under the colonial period of our history, tolerated slavery, was the scene of repeated insurrections, while no state in which slavery has been abolished has ever witnessed any insurrectionary tumult of the black population.\* On the contrary, the free colored people have suffered the rude and unmerciful assault of mobs throughout the country, within a few months, and have conducted themselves, notwithstanding, with commendable, and almost unexampled forbearance throughout the whole scene of outrage.

St. Domingo, in the year 1794, after five years of insurrections and massacres, received from the French Directory the enfranchisement of 500,000 slaves. At this time the white population were but 100,000. Here, though the negroes were to the whites in the proportion of five to one, accustomed to arms and the injured party, emancipated, not by their masters but by the French government, yet the effect was instant and permanent pacification. The Island advanced from one degree of improvement to another, and was very soon as productive, as well cultivated and profitable to the landholders themselves, as in any former period of its history. This state of things continued until the year 1802, when Le Clerc, with 30,000 men, sent by Napoleon, under the influence of advisers anxious to regain the ascendancy of lust and cruelty which they had

\* For a full and interesting account of the different servile insurrections in these states by Joshua Coffin, of Philadelphia, see Appendix to Phelps' Lectures on Slavery.

possessed before the period of liberty, began a course of murder and devastation unheard of in the history of blood. The cruelties which this man practised on the colored people of St. Domingo, were in the end visited on his followers; and the war of extermination which ensued, with the pestilence which assailed the oppressors, ended in their total destruction. Since that time, the people of Hayti have advanced in the arts of peace and of war, in prosperity and refinement. Many of her citizens are on a level, in point of cultivation and intelligence, with any people in the world: whatever prejudice or malice may object to the fact.

A million and a half of our fellow beings were emancipated in Colombia and Mexico, and not a drop of blood was shed; since that day no one has heard of any disturbances among the colored people of those countries.

The native gentleness of the negro character is therefore as conspicuous in sudden elevation of fortune, as in submitting to that most galling and cruel oppression which has disgraced Christendom for three hundred years—

“SINCE HOLY MEN GAVE SCRIPTURE FOR THE DEED,”

and led the march of pirate nations to the shores of Africa.

The testimony of Mungo Park, of the Landers, and of other travellers, agree in representing this injured and degraded race, as peculiarly inoffensive, gentle and patient in their own country, and this testimony is fully corroborated by our knowledge of their patient endurance of the complicated wrongs heaped upon them here.

We have no historical evidence that a drop of the white man's blood has ever flowed in consequence of liberating the slave, and "every day's report" from the hundreds of thousands recently emancipated in the British West Indies, confirms the safety of the measure : to question which is, in some sort, to libel human nature itself; for what motive could remain to incite hostility in the bosom of a man delivered from the horrors of perpetual slavery? The newly made freemen, according to some accounts, work better than they formerly did in slavery. And though lying newsmakers have represented them as turbulent, direct accounts, more recent and more respectable, prove exactly the reverse.

As a motive to immediate emancipation we would observe, that wherever slavery exists, and human beings are bought and sold, slaves are attracted by the market, and thence the stimulus of avarice is propagated even to Africa; a tide of human woe sets in, a tide "that knows no ebb," in spite of all those deceitful enactments of legislatures, which in words denounce, but in fact reward the traffic.

The foundation of the African slave-trade is undeniably in the market for slaves, and while the latter remains, the former will continue. It follows that that people who retain the one, whatever may be their professions, are the true authors of the other enormity.

Again, immediate emancipation is considered most feasible and safe by slave-holders themselves. In proof of this we have only to advert to the fact that Bermuda, and nine other British Islands, have immediately emancipated their slaves, rather than adopt the

system of seven years apprenticeship ; the alternative offered them by the parent country.

Where there is no motive to insurrection, but the strongest to gratitude ; where the power to do injury is not in the hands of the freedman, but all the means of restraint are possessed by their former masters ; where learning, legislation, arts, arms, and the habits and associations of government are exclusively the white man's ; what, we ask, is the source of danger so loudly deprecated by our opponents, in restoring to the slave his rights ? When the negro, accustomed to submission and labour, is no longer lashed, but rewarded for his toil, what is there to induce him to be less industrious than when the fruits of his labor were torn from him without compensation ? Accordingly all accounts agree that free labor is more profitable to the employer than that of the slave.

We will close by asking the intelligent reader, if there be any thing contrary to sound morals, to decency, to religion, to correct notions of government, to the doctrine of "unalienable rights,"\* to expediency, to the duty of citizens of the United States towards the slave-holders ; in a plan for the improvement of the colored people, which shall abrogate the system of compulsory, perpetual, hereditary, unrequited labor, and substitute in its place the just rewards which stimulate honorable toil all over the civilized world ? which shall raise the slave from the state of brutal degradation into which oppression has sunk him, to the protection, elevation and proper responsibility of a citizen ?

What danger will there be, in admitting the testi-

\* Declaration of Independence.

mony of a man, without regard to complexion? will he feel insulted or injured?

Will the protection of female virtue by the majesty of the law, stimulate to phrenzy the brain of the black man?

Will it endanger the happiness and peace of society to permit the liberty of conscience, of speech, and of the press, to native Americans, whatever be the hue of their complexion?

Will the preaching of the gospel of peace send discord into the heathen breast of ignorance?

Will it endanger the Republic, if we hold no more auctions for human cattle? if our white citizens should cease to sell their own flesh and blood into slavery?

Would the curse of God come on our land, if marriage, which is "honorable in all," should be sanctioned and protected among the colored race?

If the tender and dear relations of life should be protected by law from ruthless sundering?

If the trade in "slaves and the souls of men" should cease "among the several states" by the wise and just legislation of Congress, according to the express words of the Constitution, as well as the spirit of the gospel of peace and good will to men?

If torture and scourging, men-hunting and legalized murder should no more exist unpunished and even sanctioned?

If the land and its inhabitants should rid themselves, by repentance, of God's curse on them who "take their neighbor's service without wages; that give him not for his work."

If pollution and violence should no longer be tolerated; but men should begin to give evidence of loving

their neighbors as themselves, and of some sincerity in the profession of the AMERICAN PRINCIPLE, that "all men are created equal."

If all this should happen, and no danger follow to our homes, our country or our persons, then IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION IS SAFE; because these alterations in the present state of slavery, define its nature and constitute its essence.

There would be no general change in the state of society; the same laborers would remain on the same plantations, subject to the same masters; and any slight changes would occur as amongst servants in free countries, by mutual consent of master and servant.

To the young men of our country we look with intense interest. On them will soon fall the responsibility and the glory of this great work. If they imbibe the short-sighted and selfish principles of a dark age, not only will the progress of this great work be retarded, but the glory of America will set in the night of nations. Her epitaph will quickly be written:

SHE WAS FREE,—  
BUT DENYING TO HER OWN CITIZENS  
THE JUSTICE SHE CLAIMED OF OTHERS,  
THE GOD OF RETRIBUTION  
HAS  
OVERWHELMED HER  
WITH  
HIS VENGEANCE.

But "we hope better things, though we thus speak." We pray God to deliver our guilty land! May we learn to leave off oppression, to break the bonds of wickedness, and to let the oppressed go free; then will liberty,

peace, equality, and the blessing of the Divine favor,  
rest upon our country forever.

“ Spirit of Freedom, on !  
Oh, pause not in thy flight,  
’Till every clime is won,  
To worship in thy light.

On, ’till thy name is known,  
Throughout the peopled earth !  
On, ’till thou reign’st alone,  
Man’s heritage by birth !

On, ’till from every vale  
And where the mountains rise,  
The beacon light of ‘Liberty’  
Shall kindle to the skies.”



CONSTITUTION  
OF THE  
NEW-YORK YOUNG MEN'S  
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be styled the New-York Young Men's *Anti-Slavery Society*, and shall be auxiliary to the "American Anti-Slavery Society."

ART. II. Any young man may become a member of this society by subscribing to these articles, and shall be entitled to vote at its meetings; contribution to its funds being left to the option of each subscriber.

ART. III. The officers of this society shall consist of a President, two Vice Presidents, a Corresponding and Recording Secretary, a Treasurer, and twenty Managers, who together shall constitute a Board of Directors; to be elected annually by the Society, and shall have the power to form their own By-Laws, and to fill all vacancies in their body.

ART. IV. It shall be the duty of the President, (or in his absence, one of the Vice Presidents,) to preside at all meetings of the society, and of the Board of Directors.

ART. V. It shall be the duty of the Corresponding Secretary to conduct the correspondence, prepare the Annual Report, and perform such other services as may be required of him by the Board.

ART. VI. It shall be the duty of the Recording Secretary to keep the minutes of the society, to file all its papers, to give notice of its meetings, and to register the names of its members.

ART. VII. It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to receive and disburse the funds of the society by authority of the Board of Directors.

ART. VIII. The foregoing officers shall constitute the Executive Committee of the society, to whom shall be entrusted the disposition of the society's funds, and the general management of its affairs. Nine shall constitute a quorum.

ART. IX. The object of this society shall be to promote the entire abolition of slavery in the United States, by collecting and diffusing information concerning its true character; by endeavoring to convince our countrymen, by arguments addressed to their understanding and consciences, that slave-holding is a heinous crime in the sight of God, and that the duty, safety, and best interests of all concerned, require its immediate and unconditional abandonment.

ART. X. This society shall aim to elevate the character and condition of the people of color by encouraging their intellectual, moral and religious improvement, and by correcting the prejudice of public opinion; but never to countenance the oppressed in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force.

ART. XI. It shall be the especial duty of the Board of Directors to employ their best endeavours to obtain the signatures of as many young men of the city of New-York as may be disposed to join the association, and also to report this Society to the Secretary of the American Society.

ART. XII. This society shall meet as occasion may require, at the call of the Board of Directors, and annually, at such time and place as the Board shall appoint, when their report shall be read, the accounts of the Treasurer be presented, appropriate addresses delivered, and the officers chosen.

ART. XIII. This Constitution may be altered or amended by a vote of two-thirds of the members present at an annual meeting.

## LIST OF OFFICERS.

ABRAHAM L. COX, M. D., President,  
THERON T. POND, 1st Vice President,  
ROBERT F. WINSLOW, 2d Vice President,  
JAMES F. ROBINSON, Corresponding Secretary,  
EDWARD A. LAMBERT, Recording Secretary,  
JOHN WILEY, Treasurer.

## MANAGERS.

GEORGE P. FITCH,	ISRAEL W. CLARK,
JOHN JAY,	WM. STEELE, M. D.,
THOMAS W. B. DAWSON,	JAMES KENNEDY, M. D.,
HENRY F. BRAYTON,	JOHN BURDELL,
WILLIAM HOMMANN,	ALEXANDER PELOUBET,
WILLIAM S. ROSS,	WILLIAM R. SUTTON,
DANIEL CHASE,	JAMES H. PARKER,
EBENEZER H. BURGER,	JEREMIAH WILBUR,
RICHARD L. CLARK,	GEORGE A. DWIGHT.



