

E 449

H14

1851

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 818 2

**Permalife•**  
**pH 8.5**

249  
H14

A

COMPARISON  
OF  
AMERICAN AND BRITISH  
**SLAVERY.**

---

BY WM. HAGADORN, JR.

---

New-York:  
PRINTED BY E. B. THOMAS, 13 SPRUCE ST.  
1851.



A

COMPARISON

OF

AMERICAN AND BRITISH

SLAVERY.

---

BY WM. HAGADORN, JR.

---

~~~~~

New-York:

PRINTED BY E. B. THOMAS, 13 SPRUCE ST.

1851.

45250  
104

A CONTRAST  
OF  
BRITISH AND AMERICAN  
**SLAVERY.**

---

MANY British subjects, upon reading the title of this Pamphlet, would, we know, hold up their hands in holy horror at the idea of such a thing as Slavery in Britain\*—in Britain, where they have so often and so loudly sung—

"Britons never will be Slaves!"

Was it *not all Britain*, as well as England, of which the poet spoke, when he said "Slaves cannot breathe in England!" Ah, so it was; and the poet might have added to the sentiment, so as to make it more complete and more true. He might have said: "As Slavery is defined "involuntary servitude," and as the great body of British laborers do indirectly, but yet "involuntarily" *serve* their masters, the privileged classes, with their hard labor—bring allowed less of their labor's product for their own use than American Slaves are allowed—therefore the great body of British laborers are, in fact Slaves." Then the poet might have exclaimed—

"*Do you say thyself as thou wilt, still, Slavery, thou'rt a bitter draught!*"

And *after this*, the poet might have added, "'Slaves cannot breathe in England!"—*without having to pay their masters roundly for the glorious privilege!*"

We have been told by Mr. Carlyle and other Englishmen, that English freedom was the foundation of whatever is free or admirable

---

\* We use the term "Britain" for convenience: meaning the whole "United Kingdom."

in American Institutions, and that thus to British Liberty we are indebted for whatever of freedom we enjoy. There is some truth in this—a little, perhaps, even in the sense in which it was intended to be understood, but much more in another sense. It was not the American sort of freedom, but the *British* sort which drove our fathers from their native shores, to seek, over the then most perilous ocean, and in the more perilous wilderness, for freedom of *another* sort—freedom of self-government—“freedom to worship God!” It was the British sort of *freedom* which drove our fathers to the desperate and bloody chances of the Revolution, and it is “the same sort” which has peopled our shores, and is still peopling them, with those prosperous beneficiaries of “British *freedom*” who love it *as our fathers did*: and who show their love of it in the same way—braving all perils, and sundering all ties to get rid of it!

This “*British freedom*” is called here “Oppression!” Oppression peopled our country—oppression forced her into independence, and oppression is still peopling her with the most daring and liberty-loving of the earth. And for all this is our country mainly indebted to “British freedom,” or rather to *those ideas* of freedom which are so peculiarly British!

We have no national antipathies: and are very far from having any toward Englishmen. On the contrary, we have many English friends whom we most warmly esteem. We do, indeed, think that uneducated Englishmen of the middle class are sometimes presuming, and sometimes a little snobbish when they mean only to be dignified; we do think them a little obsequious to those whom they own as superiors, and a little arrogant to those whom they wish to look down on as inferiors; but even Englishmen of this class have peculiar *virtues* as well as peculiar weaknesses. And as for the other classes: the English working people—those who do *not* try to be aristocratic—are naturally as fine a set of people as there are in the world; while the well-educated classes are perhaps more truly educated and refined than any other people. We *like* the English people, but we do not like British *Slavery*. It seems to us that we hear the question—If it is *slavery* we object to, why do we not first oppose *American* slavery? We reply—1st. Because a necessity continues the system here, which



necessity does not exist in Britain. 2d. Because American Slavery is not quite *so bad* as British.

“Slaves cannot breathe in England!”

but they *can* breathe here; ay, and “eat, drink, and be merry,” too; and we know some parts of the British empire where it is hard work often to be merry, for the want of that same eating and drinking.— 3d. We do not oppose American Slavery because, as one of the sovereign people of this country, we are pledged by a holy compact to support the institutions of the sister States of our Union, as *their* citizens are pledged in turn to support *our* State institutions. We (the American people) are pledged to support each other thus, as the one only means of *securing* our own liberties; and much as it might gratify European monarchists to see that pledge broken, and those liberties thus lost, yet we *will* keep that pledge *even unto death!* As we speak, so do four millions of brave men most earnestly and deeply *feel!* And this is both a moral and physical force not to be preached down by a few thousand Abolitionists, nor scared down by as many secessionists, nor *put* down by any other “ists;” nor even scolded down by the Mrs. Grundy of the English press.

Well, we have stated some reasons for not opposing the institutions of our sister States, but we know of no such reasons for not opposing British Slavery. We know of no compact by which we are bound to support *British* institutions, nor do the English people, apparently, feel bound to support *ours*. Indeed, just the contrary seems to be the case. We shall go on, therefore, with our remarks, and enquire, in the first place, who *are* the British Slaves, and then whether British Slavery really *is* Slavery, according to the universally received definitions of the term. In order to get at a proper reply to the question, “Who are the British Slaves?” it is well, in the first place, to inquire who are the British *freemen*, of whom the world hears so much? We remember seeing an article in Blackwood’s Magazine, some time since, which, speaking of public opinion, said, (we quote *the words* :)

“There is no such thing as public opinion in America, for public opinion is the work of reason, operating on the intelligent *portions* of the people.”

Now, those who are not of this “portion” are, in Britain, three fourths of the people—we mean of the human flesh; for, according to

Blackwood, their opinions are not part of the opinions of the "public," and consequently we are left to infer that the "lower classes" are not "people." The same article states that this Republic is not a free country; for, says Blackwood,—

"In no country on earth will difference from the opinions of the *populace* get a man excluded from public office."

In other words, "the populace" of the United States employ just whom it chooses as public servants, (dreadful despotism!) and therefore this is not a free country! Blackwood means, doubtless, that it is not free exclusively for the "intelligent *portion*," as Britain is. It is not free for the "people," for it is so dreadfully free for the "*populace*!" Now, it is this "populace" whom we speak of as being slaves in Britain—this "populace," whose freedom is so inimical to the freedom of the "portion." It is only those human beings in Britain who are not considered "people," whom we term slaves. We do not mean the British people; oh no, only "the populace." Were we to concede that "the populace" is no part of the British *people*, and that this *people* comprises only the "portions" above named, it would then result undeniably that the British "people" are the freest on the earth—the most free, and almost the most powerful. Did they not *conquer* America, out of hatred to the despotism of the "populace."—Did they not *quite* put down Napoleon, because he was raised by a "populace," and therefore a foe to the British *people*? Did they not "mediate" in India, till they had conquered the vast empire of Tanjore and the Moguls, merely to secure monopolies to the mercantile "portion?" The British people did not precisely do all these things themselves, but they employed their "populace" to do it. The populace were thus kept out of mischief at home, too, being employed in fighting or in shouting for British "glory." The expense was some eight hundred million pounds. The British *people* loaned the money, but they compelled "the populace" to pay *them* the yearly interest!—What a *free* "people," and what a convenient "populace!" What other "people" ever took such *freedom* with *their* "populace." But this people have taken, and of course *enjoy* other liberties. Five millions of human beings perished in one year in India for want of food, because of certain monopolies held by the mercantile "portion;" and

more recently two millions, it is said, of the Irish "populace" have shared the same fate, for similar reasons. In India, the *free* British "people" only bought up the grain, and the Hindoos, who received their two-pence a day *when employed*, not being able to pay fifty dollars a barrel for flour, *went without it*, that's all. And as for Ireland, the Irish populace had to pay tithes, (often more than the whole of a little farm's *net* produce) and then to pay rent, and then taxes, direct and indirect, and the rates," &c., and, if anything to live on should not happen to be left over, why the "populace" must do as the Hindoos did—*just go without!*

When we come to speak of British *Slaves*, we will speak more of this; but we are now speaking of the *free* "British people." These "people" are composed, first, of the land-owners; next the 300,000 government-stock-holders; next, holders of other stocks; and next, of ship-owners, merchants and manufacturers. These principal holders of British wealth, with their families, number some million and a half of people. After these are their salaried agents and clerks, the learned professions, the well-to-do tradesmen, shop-keepers, hotel-keepers, comfortable farmers, mechanics, &c. All these, with their families, number over four millions more. They comprise the great body of the British Commons, and, with the wealthy classes, compose the governing power, the Lords and Commons—the numerous two-fold aristocracy of Britain. There are some other classes, swelling the whole number to about six millions of people, who, through the votes of their adult males, are represented in Parliament. They, it is most true, are a free and happy people. *They* direct the British government; *they* support and control the British press, and *they* shout for British freedom! And well they may. *They* are truly a great and powerful people, for they are prosperous, brave and free. But, beneath this great and powerful British "people," are three or four times as many British human beings, whom Blackwood *smells at* as "the populace," but whom we shall prove to be *the Slaves!*

#### THE BRITISH SLAVES.

This unfortunate class comprises the "hewers of wood and drawers of water;" the hired laborers on farms, the operatives in factories and

mines, and, in fine, all those whose wages average about 18s sterling per day: these, together with the paupers, whose condition is caused by this system—these we term the British Slaves, comprising three-fourths of the British people. Deducting women and children who are not operatives, the infirm, the aged, the paupers, &c. we shall find there are nearly five millions of *operatives* belonging to this class in Britain. The working days of these people are about two hundred and ten in the year; the remainder of the year being Sabbaths, stormy or other non-working days, blue Mondays, and days when the operatives are sick or not in employ. In short, these five millions, earn each about £15 per year. Is it more than this? Let us refer to statistics. It is known that factory operatives work more days, and are, on the average, better paid than farm laborers, as their work is less healthful, and requires a skill not so common. Well, the total produce of British manufacturers (exclusive of the cost of raw material) is about seventy-five million pounds sterling per annum. Now if the 2,150,000 factory operatives received *the whole* of this, it would only amount to about twice what we have allowed them. But we must deduct fourteen millions as the interest on the capital invested, we must deduct six millions for the yearly cost of buildings, machinery, and fuel; we must deduct ten millions as the manufacturers' profit, and remuneration for risks; we must deduct seven or eight millions for salaries to able and responsible clerks, agents, overseers, &c. and as much more to defray expenses and commissions of transportations and sales. In fine, out of the seventy-five millions, if the laboring operatives got *thirty* millions, they get a larger share than is generally supposed by themselves, by their employers, or by the British statistic writers. But, supposing £50,000,000 to be thus divided among the 2,150,000 laboring operatives, it will be seen at a glance that they get less than the £15 each. We have taken the reader's time to make this calculation in order to show that our estimates were liberal. And they appear still more so when it is remembered that farm laborers get no more than factory operatives, except for some three weeks in harvest time; and that they are necessarily much more often out of employ, and lose more days from bad weather, because of their work being mostly out of doors. But we will throw aside all these considerations—we

will be as liberal as possible to the poor fellows, and allow them what we have said—£15 yearly each man.

We are fully aware, be it understood, that in Britain there are many mechanics who can earn almost as much as this in a month. We know there are many, and we know *how* many. Of mechanics who can earn as much as American mechanics can, there are in all Britain about one hundred and forty thousand, or *one fortieth* of the working people. But it costs money to be even *apprenticed* to these trades in Britain—so much money, that not one farming or factory laborer in a hundred can buy for his child admission into this patrician order, or give him the slight necessary education. By these and other means, these trades are rendered a sort of working aristocracy; and we now are not speaking of any of the numerous grades of British aristocracy. We speak not of exclusives, but of *the excluded*. We speak of the “populace,” or the Slaves. We speak of that great body of the working people of Britain, who, *at the very most*, average £15 each per year for their labor. These, numbering about five millions, receive for their support, at most, £75,000,000 per year; just about what the taxes come to, *without the tithes, &c.*

Let us now consider what is the amount of taxes paid in Britain, and who pays them. The British revenue is some fifty-five million pounds; but in addition to this are the enormous poor rates, the parish and county assessments, etc., all of which amount to some twenty millions more. The agricultural product of Britain is about two hundred and ten million pounds per annum, a tithe of which is twenty-one millions; and this, added to the taxes above named, produces the handsome aggregate of ninety-six million pounds per annum.—Nor is this all. It is all that is *received*, but far from being all that is *paid*. We will suppose a British merchant imports a certain article, which costs him a dollar, and which, but for the tariff, he would sell for \$1.12. But suppose there is a duty on the article of 50 cents. The article itself the merchant buys on credit, but *the duty* must be paid in *cash*; which makes it proper for him to charge a higher rate of profit on the duty than on the balance of what the article costs him. In consequence of the duty, then, the cost to him being \$1.50, he charges the jobber for the article \$1.70. The jobber sells to the coun-

by dealer for \$2.00. The consumer probably gets it for \$2.50. But if the consumer is poor—not able to be particular, or to buy except in the smallest quantities—the article will cost him \$3.50 in penny-worths. The average cost to consumers, then, we will say, is \$3.00. If there had been no duty upon the article, the importer would have sold for \$1.12; the jobber for about \$1.25, and the consumer would have got it, on the average, as above, for \$1.75 instead of \$3.00. So that the consumer pays the duty at last, and pays, too, several traders' *profits on the duty!* In the case we have supposed, (which is a fair average of imported articles in Britain) the consumer *pays* 1.25 more for the article in consequence of the tariff, though the government only *receives* 50 cts. And this is true of every article which pays a duty, for, of course, traders must have a profit on the cost of what they buy and sell. Thus it is a certain and well-known fact, that for every pound sterling of revenue the British Government receives, at least *two* pounds are, on the average, paid by the consumer; and a greater proportion than this is paid by the *poor* consumer, for *he* pays a much larger profit on the inferior articles he buys by the ounce, than the richer man pays on what he buys by the barrel. If we, however, estimate this *profit on the duty* by the most moderate standard, and add it to the other taxes, we will have the aggregate of £151,000,000! Of this more than a third goes to the government, about as much goes to the merchants, traders and shopkeepers, as their fair profit on the cost and risk that the tariff causes them, and the balance pays the parish and the county assessments, and supports the poor and the church. One hundred and fifty-one million pounds sterling! Let us stick a pin there!

And yet we shall see that even this is far from being all. There are a thousand things *protected* by the tariff which pay *no* duty to the Government—being British or Colonial products—but to protect which enormous duties are paid by the people. For instance suppose a production of Canada is produced far cheaper in Russia, and to protect the Canadian production, the Government imposes a duty on the Russian article. The people thus are obliged to get from Canada an article that, but for the tariff, they could get far cheaper from Russia. They pay fifteen pounds, perhaps, for the same article they could have

bought for ten pounds. The additional five pounds *is paid*, (and that, too, with trader's profits on it) though the Government gets not a penny of it. And thus it is with a thousand articles, upon which millions on millions of duties are indirectly but unavoidably *paid*, but never received by Government—except as unrecorded tribute to the protective and colonial systems. But, though these duties amount to as much as the revenue, they are not so precisely estimated, and we leave them out of the account. If we were to tell the *whole* truth on this subject, it would seem too monstrous for belief, though it is made palpable by the incontestible evidence of figures themselves. With these reasons for moderation, then, we put down the taxes paid by British productive industry at £150,660,990.

We say these taxes are paid by productive industry; and, though it is generally *conceded* that the producing classes do in fact pay all the taxes, yet it is not so generally *understood*. We know that, in this city, though landlords pay the real estate taxes, yet tenants, in their high rents, pay those taxes to the landlord, and that with a profit on the landlord's added risk and outlay. We have just seen, too, that in Britain, though importers pay the revenue, yet that revenue really *comes from* the consumers, and that with a profit to various traders for *their* added risk and outlay. And as productive laborers form the great mass of consumers, so they of course pay the great mass of the taxes; particularly that portion which is paid as traders' profit, because their poverty compels them to purchase in small quantities, and at great disadvantage. All this is generally both *conceded* and *understood*. But what is *conceded without* being so generally understood is this—that *all* taxes come from productive labor, being necessarily deducted from what the laborer *would* receive if there were *no* taxes.—The nation's *product* is, of course, all the nation has to pay taxes *with*. And, though transfer and sale of products are productive labor, too, in one sense, because highly useful; yet sale is *not product*.

We can, however, be better understood by citing facts than principles. We will therefore cite an example based on statistical facts.—By a comparison of Parliamentary and census returns, we find that the average product of cultivated land in Britain is about £4.3s per acre. Of this, on the average, one third is stated to be paid for rent.

one third pays the farmer's profit, and the balance pays the expenses of cultivation. A comfortable farmer, then, with seventy-five acres of cultivated land, has, on the average, one hundred pounds for himself and family, one hundred pounds to pay his rent with, and another hundred for his other expenses. Now, by the statistics above referred to, we learn that there are about fifteen acres of cultivated land in Britain to each grown man engaged in agriculture. This would give us five men for the seventy-five acres, one of whom, we will suppose, is the farmer himself. Four laborers, then, on the average, are to be paid out of the remaining hundred pounds. But there are expenses of stock, seed, manure, repairs, &c. to come out of this hundred pounds *first*. And then the tithe alone on the product we allow for the farm is thirty pounds, and the county and parish rates at least twenty. The farm laborers have *what is left*; but, according to these statistics, we can scarcely find any thing left for them. We will suppose one of them is a pauper, and so reduce their number to three; for we have allowed them £15 per annum each; and, though this is evidently a *liberal* allowance, yet it is notorious that *those who have work* receive pretty near that sum yearly. We see, then, that the laborers of Britain pay the taxes, because, after the farmer's comfortable living is paid for—*q̄t̄. r̄* the rent, tithes, taxes &c. are all paid—then, *what is left* goes to the laborer—always provided he must have enough oats, potatoes or bread to give him strength to work.

But it seems to us that we hear some British "*pro-slavery*" man objecting to this, and saying it is the *farmer* who has to put up with what is left. Let us see if this is so. The farmer has capital enough to stock a farm and make him a safe tenant. If not, he could not *become* a farmer. If, with this capital, and with his labor and skill, he cannot be comfortably maintained in one place, he can go to *another*. If, with these advantages, he cannot have a hundred pounds yearly in England, for his skill, capital and labor, he knows he can have twice that amount in this country, and he has *the means* of moving, which is not possessed by one *laborer* in thirty. *The laborer*, if he cannot get good pay *in* Britain, is only so much less able to get *out of* Britain. This is one cause of another advantage the farmer has over the laborer. The farmer hires and discharges the laborer. And, al-



though the latter may discharge his master by leaving him, yet he cannot *hire* him at will. These are only the *natural* advantages of the small capitalist over the laborer, but in Britain there are others. We know that entail and primogeniture laws &c. produce a certain monopoly of British lands, and that corn laws and all sorts of laws are formed to keep up high rents. And why? Because the land owners of Britain have been her law makers, and have made laws for their own advantage. So it is now with the "better" class of land *renters*, who have, since the Reform Act was passed, held a large share of the law-making power. They *vote*, and laborers, as a class, do not. *Voters* are represented in Parliament, and have laws made to suit their interests. The *tendency* of laws *thus* made is, of course, to keep down wages; as on this, in a great degree, depends the wealth or comfort of that "*portion*" of the people which is the ruling power. These *artificial* advantages are added to the *natural* advantages which capital has over labor, and to the great advantage which the U. States offer to the man of some means; and which advantage is not shared by him who has *no* means—to pay even his passage with. All these causes taken together produce the result we see in Britain—that, though "it takes two to make a bargain," in *theory*, yet, in sad and sober *fact*, the wages of labor are really stipulated by the employer alone; who, very properly, deducts his own comfortable living first, and his necessary expenses, and what he finds he can *then* afford, he agrees to pay the laborer—always providing it must be enough to sustain life. Heaven has given forth the irrevocable law that *dead men* shall rest from work, and that, therefore, if a man works, he *shall* receive enough to keep him alive. The British laborer has this one last safeguard of his rights; and for this he is indebted to the laws of his God, and not to the laws of his country! *His* country, did we say? We beg Blackwood's pardon; we mean the country of the intelligent *portion*—the country of the six millions of *people*, not of the twenty-three millions of "*populace*!"

"I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word!"

We may thank Blackwood for the distinction. We mean that country which is *owned* and *ruled* by six millions of freemen, but mainly supported and tilled by twenty-three million slaves!

But this is digression. We have undertaken, not to *call* these unfortunate people slaves, but to *prove* that they *are* so. Slavery is involuntary servitude. We have not yet shown how the servitude of British labor is involuntary, except by inference, nor have we, as clearly as we intend to, shown that it *is* servitude. We have exhibited, as it were, *the rule* by which to show that British laborers are made subject servants of the upper classes, by systems and laws framed by the upper classes for that end. And we now design to prove that rule, as in arithmetic, by enquiring what those laborers would be *without* those systems and laws.

We have seen from British statistic tables that British farms average seventy-five acres: that the yearly produce of such farms averages £200; that of this, £100 (on the average) goes to the landlord, £100 to the farmer, £30 (the tenth of £300) to the church, £20 to the parish and county; and there is but £50 left for farm expenses, including labor. We have seen, too, that such farms have (on the average) at least three laborers, receiving, by a liberal estimate, £15 a year each, or £45 together—about one seventh of the whole product. The liberality of this estimate will be understood by British emigrants, and may be seen by all—for it leaves only £5 for all other farm expenses. Now, suppose we strike out one item of expense, and add it to the laborer's wages. Take the £30 from mother Church, and give it to its rightful owners, they whose labor produced it. The three laborers would then have 75, instead of 45 pounds to live on; and the effect would be that poor-rates might be abolished too.\* And *this* would increase the wages to at least £90. So that, by this one step alone, the wages of the British laborer might be *doubled!* Now, the British Church is richly endowed, (we do not mean with Christian virtue, but with property) and we do not think the cause of true religion in Britain would fail, because of the poor keeping what belongs to them, so far as to procure better food, clothing and education.

---

\* The unfortunate British "proletarian" men will certainly, against our want of charity for the poor, add, these *human* people well know that poor rates are in fact deducted from the produce of a poor man's labor; and that a large proportion is lost in the cost of collection and expence, and in peculation. It is lost, we mean, *to the poor*; but not to the farmers, speculators, commissioners &c. who handle the money. The laborers do not *take* these poor rates; and they get back, *at least*, but a small part of what is taken from them by the law.

But suppose, in addition to this, that the laws of primogeniture and entail, and the thousand contrivances for keeping up land monopoly and high rents were also abolished. The farmer, in this case, would be able to spare still more to his laborers, and live better himself, too, for the consequent reduction of rents. Yet all these changes, momentous as they would be for the laborer, would not be so great as those which might be effected for him by reduction of the tariff, that indirect, yet greatest of all the taxes on British labor. If, as we have shown, employers would be able to pay their laborers *twice* as much as now if tithes and poor rates were abolished, it is certainly moderate to suppose, if the *other* taxes on productive labor were abolished also, the laborer would get *three times* as much as now, and the employers would get no less. Landlords might not have so much to buy *with*; and the Church *would* not have so much for its non-working clergy, &c. And government would not have so much to keep down colonies with, to keep down "the populace" with, and to keep *up* other things with. Yet landlords, church and government would have all *their own*, and plenty for all true purposes.

But is it sure that what would be saved *from* the church &c. would be saved *to* the laborer? Yes, this result is absolutely certain, if the laborer had also *the right of suffrage*; but not otherwise.

It seems, then, certain that the church, the landlords and the government receive two-thirds\* of what the laborers of Britain *would* get for their labor, if they had the right of suffrage, and if the colonial, protective and tithe systems &c. were abolished. In other words, the poorer class, or the great body of laborers, work mainly to support those systems, being allowed to retain *for themselves only* about enough of their labor's product to keep them in life and strength to do the work! Now, what do slaves more than this? Servitude! How do slaves *serve* their masters? By their labor. And are not slaves allowed enough at least to live on? British laborers do by their work serve their masters (the Lords, the Crown, the Church, and the favored "*portions*,") and are, by those masters, allowed enough to live on.—

\* This, it may be remembered, corresponds with what we said in the beginning, as to the proportion that the taxes bear to the wages of labor—five millions of laborers, at £15 each, earning £75,000,000 a year; less than half of the £151,000,000. (the aggregate of the various taxes.) And if this latter sum were added to the laborers' wages, they would, of course, receive fully three times what they receive now.

Precisely so do our Southern Slaves, and it is just *because* they do so that they are called slaves. Why not, then, call those British laborers slaves who are also in this condition? It may be said that the British laborer can work or not work, just as he pleases. Well, so can the negro; and though the latter may be punished, his punishment will not quite equal that of the British laborer—starvation! But again, it may be said the British laborer is free, simply because he can choose his vocation. Yet this choice *does not* make a man free; and the laborer *has not* the choice. He cannot at will become a lawyer or a merchant. It is almost impossible for him to *become* a mechanic, as the negro almost always may if he pleases. The British laborer, it is true, may often choose between the farm and the factory; but as there is nothing to choose between them, he engages, generally, in what is nearest, and so does the negro. If choice in this respect, then, is freedom, the negro is the freest; for he can generally be a mechanic if he chooses, and the British laborer cannot. In short, there is *no* difference between the two, as to the fact of their servitude. The British laborers, by systems and laws made by their masters *alone*, are *compelled* to work for those masters, who allow them but one seventh of the whole product to live upon. Negro slaves, through laws made by *their* masters alone, are also compelled to work; but they are allowed, for their labor, about *twice as much* as are British laborers. There is a difference in the *degree* of servitude, but in the *fact* of servitude there is *none*! It is in both cases *the same*—the servitude of labor!

We have seen how this servitude is compelled; but if it is yet questioned that this is "*involuntary* servitude," let the 200,000 annual emigrants to this port make answer! Let the ghosts of the starved millers answer! And if the "*portions*" still persist that this servitude is not involuntary, let them give their servitors the right of suffrage, and see how long the servitude we have shown would continue!

Give them the right of suffrage, and what would they do? First, they would abolish tithes; and then poverty and poor laws together; then primogeniture, entail, and all high rent laws. Then they would abolish the colonial and protective systems; and then, nine-tenths of the army, kept *up* only to keep *down* the colonies and the "*populace*."

Britannia would lose the *glory* of holding in subjection nations of unwarlike Indians, and indignant, wide-scattered colonists; but over her beauteous and happy islands would dawn the brighter *glory* of *equal* liberty—the effulgent halo of true freedom!

And the national debt! If the British slaves had the right of suffrage, what would they do with *that*? Would they repudiate? Oh, not at all. Repudiate! No! But, commencing with the millionaires, they would, perhaps, *increase the income tax*, until this tax should pay the interest!

“Oh!” say the stock-holders, “they’d be sure to do something like that; so keep them down!”

“Impious heretics!” exclaim the fat Bishops, “they would deprive *Heaven* of its tithes; keep them down!”

“Base workmen!” say the army and navy officers, “they would free the Colonies, and put an end to British glory; keep them down!”

“Ignorant laborers!” say the wealthy, “they would repeal high rent laws, and raise wages; keep them down!”

“Jacobins!” cry the tradesmen, “they would derange commerce; keep them down!”

“Oh, the low, dirty mob!” says Mrs. Grundy, “they’d cut every body’s throat; *do* keep them down!”

And last comes Thomas Carlyle, and *he* says: “Idle rascals! make them work!”

Yet he seems to forget that the best way to *make* a man work, is to let him keep what by his labor he produces.

But all these, and a million more of British “pro-slavery” men, have not the power to “keep them down” *forever*! Judging from the past, the freedom of the British laborer may be still *delayed* a century or two; yet we hope that the time *will* come when every British man will be a *voter*. And in twenty years from *that* time, every honest Briton will be a *freeman*!

According to statistics, as we have seen, two-sevenths of the entire produce of British labor now go to the landlord or capitalist, two-sevenths to employers as their profit, two-sevenths to the Church and the Government; and but *one* seventh remains for that great class whose labor creates it all! But in twenty years after the right of suffrage is

given to that class *entire*, a different story will be told by British statistics. Then, of the produce of British labor, a fair, full *half* will be the laborer's portion, and the other half will be shared by the employer, the capitalist and the landlord. As for the Church and the Government, the little that they will get, will support a purer church and a nobler government than those which are now upheld by the labor and misery of millions. Then will the British laborer be free and prosperous: ay, and industrious, too. "The lazy Irish," whom Mr. Carlyle threatens to *drive* to work, in this country are *tempted* to work; and here they are "the *industrious* Irish." Let a man *keep* what he produces, and he needs no *driving* to work. When this time comes, of which we speak, then will be exposed the fallacy of that swindling, "*proslavery*" false pretence, that British laborers are poor because land is scarce. For then, and not till then, will the twenty-eight million acres of British *waste lands* be cultivated, of which statistics tell. And then, when "the populace" are interested in the result, and not till then, will the beautiful isles of Britain, *all* of them, be seen to "blossom like the rose."

When this time comes, the laborer will learn that universal suffrage, and only that, can secure to poor, swindled, bamboozled, *protected* labor, all its rights. Then will the British laborer begin to be a free man; and his freedom will consist mainly in the suffrage-protected right to *keep* what, by his labor, he produces. Of this great right most British laborers are now, by unequal laws,\* deprived, as are also the negroes: and they therefore, both *alike*, are *slaves!* Both alike are *compelled*—by laws\* the making of which they have no voice in—to *serve* others by their labor. This servitude, being thus compelled, is, of course, "*involuntary servitude!*" And this, in all English dictionaries, is the definition of that stern word "SLAVERY!"

#### THE AMERICAN SLAVES.

We will commence this branch of our subject by considering the *origin* of American Slavery, as such. Those Institutions by which the laboring population of Europe has been reduced to a condition of in-

\*The *law* which made the negro a Slave, is only the circumstance by which he was *originally* made so, by his African captor, or the *British* slave-trader who brought him here. For the traders who first bought the slaves were *British*, and there are in *this* country, no laws which create Slavery; though it is here partly *continued*, as the least of two evils. *American Slavery* is thus inherited from Britain, and partly continued only through humane necessity.

voluntary servitude were created in those respective countries in which that servitude exists; and the slavery systems thus created are thus of course, of European origin. But in this country the case is far different. American Slavery can, indeed, scarcely be called an *American* institution, for it is not of American, but of *African* or of *British* origin. The institutions of a portion of our country do, indeed, recognize the right of one class to the labor of another class, in return for substantial benefits conferred. Those institutions *recognize* Slavery, but they did not *create* it. And, in fact, so far are even those sectional institutions from having created Slavery, that they have in a great measure *abolished* the Slavery to which the African race was subject before it was introduced upon our shores. A slave in Africa is the absolute property of his master, but the local institutions of our country give him comparative freedom. A master in this country cannot inflict useless cruelties upon his slave with impunity. In Africa, the black despot who owns a slave *does* own him in reality—has absolute power over him. And, because of his own barbarous condition, he uses that absolute power in the most frightful modes. He tortures his slaves for his amusement; and, when he wishes for food rather than for amusement, he *eats* them. Now, the most orthodox of British *philanthropists* must allow that, in this respect, “the peculiar institutions” of our Southern States have rendered the condition of the slave *better* rather than worse. And, if he is thoughtful and honest, that philanthropist will also allow that, so far, our institutions afford an agreeable contrast to those of his own country. The institutions of the one country *make* men slaves, while those of the other *give* him (in comparison to his former condition) *freedom!*

The negro was a slave in Africa; his black master “owning” him *in fact*—“body and bones.” But in this country his slavery is comparatively no slavery at all. Here he is not absolutely owned by his master—the latter’s property in him consisting solely in his right to his *labor*. American institutions found the negro most absolutely a slave; and have made of him a fat, laughing, law-protected Christian! Of this position we intend to prove the correctness more at length. But it is most undeniably true that the negroes were brought into this country. Slaves, in the very fullest sense of the term, and that

here they are *comparatively* free. The fact of their slavery they owe, (as do the British laborers) to "the peculiar institutions" of the poor-rag "land of their fathers." The comparative *freedom* of the negroes they owe to the vilified and prayed-over institutions of our Southern States!

Having now, perhaps, sufficiently considered the origin of the Slavery which we find existing in this country, we will turn to the consideration of the *condition* of the American Slaves. There are many well-meaning but unthinking old ladies in New England and in Old England—old ladies of both sexes and of all ages—whose few ideas on this subject have been gathered from *moral pocket-handkerchiefs*, &c. and who almost believe that the slave is constantly—as they have seen him depicted—down on his knees, an enormous cat-o'-nine tails over his head, his fettered hands raised in supplication, and he exclaiming "Am I not a man and a brother?" And there are many other people who, without exactly believing the Southerner's whole business to be slave-whipping, have, nevertheless, strange, thoughtless, cruel, and ignorant ideas of the slave's condition. In treating of this branch of our subject, we shall consider, first, the slave's religious condition; next, his moral and social condition; and then his physical condition.

There are so many opinions, and those opinions are so widely different, in regard to what *is* religion, that this is, perhaps, the most difficult portion of the subject to consider to the satisfaction of all our readers. If we believe the bible interpretation, which say—"True Religion, and undefiled, is to visit the fatherless and widow in their distress, and to keep ourselves unspotted from the world;" or to "deal justly, love mercy," &c. we do really think that, if *this* is Religion, we will find the Southern Slaves are as religious a people as any on the earth. Perhaps they do not exactly understand what the rights of property consist in, but, practically, they are honest, as a general rule, and they, certainly, are kind-hearted and charitable, as every body knows who has been among them. No one can doubt that they *love mercy*, who believe them to be so unmercifully used as some think them to be: and there is, perhaps, no people upon earth who so frequently and kindly visit the fatherless and widow in their distress." As to dealing justly, and keeping themselves unspotted from the



world; though not entirely free from the opposite vices, they are at least as free from them as other people. There are some among them thievishly disposed, yet we believe there are comparatively but few of them who would consent to *fail*, and grow rich by the loss or ruin of friends who had trusted in them. And we believe they are so kindly and Christian-hearted a people, that but few of them would consent to live in idle luxury upon titles wrung from the honest labor of their starving fellow-creatures. If on the other hand, we take *other* definitions of the word "Religion," we think the result will be the same.— If earnest *prayer* is made the criterion, let any one pass within half a mile of a negro meeting during prayers, and he will certainly admit them to be as earnest as the average of Christians. And if *church-membership* be made the criterion, the negro slaves will be found to be the most religious of our people, for there is a much larger proportion of them who are church members than there is of our white population. There are but few of them Catholics, or high-church Episcopalians, it is true; but, except on sectarian grounds, their religion is not to be objected to because they are generally Baptists, Methodists or Presbyterians. Those sects are as respectable as any in our country; and the religion of the honest negro is not to be sneered down by sectarian objections, nor because his modes or places of worship are neither fashionable nor grand. In short, judging of them by all fair criterions, the Southern Slaves have among them not only as much *profession* of Religion, but as much practical piety, as any three millions of people in the world; not excepting the British priesthood or American Abolitionists.

We have proposed, in the next place, to speak of the moral and social condition of the American Slaves. Their moral condition is, of course, so nearly allied to their religious condition, that, in some degree, what we have already said of the latter, may properly be applied to the former also. The slaves have, undoubtedly, some "besetting sins," the principal of which are, probably, a disposition toward lying and stealing. But let us look at our police reports, and think of the thousands of *unreported* cases, before we admit that the slaves, as a class, are *peculiarly* addicted to stealing; and let us think of the social lies, and the lies of trade, the custom-house oaths, and the thousand

false pretences of society, before we admit them to be *peculiarly* addicted to falsehood. As to "crimes of deeper dye," if we may judge by newspaper reports, they are not one tenth as prevalent among the slaves as they are among the free blacks, or even among the whites. And this is not only a well-known fact, but it is the inevitable result of the slave's condition. His condition frees him from desire for, and opportunity to use, suddenly acquired wealth; and, it frees him, at the same time, from the temptations to great crime held out by false honor, pride and ambition. Hence absolute crime among the slaves is generally confined to small larcenies, sufficiently punished by a sharp reprimand, or, at most, a slight whipping. And in case of more serious crime, the master's interest always secures for his slave a fair trial, at least; and such an interest as this is often wanting in the case of poor men arraigned for crime, who have not the *good fortune* to be slaves.

But there is one matter in which the moral condition of the slaves is represented to be very deplorable; and that is, in the intercourse of the sexes; which is said to be more promiscuous, and less regulated by the moral law, than among other people. If this is so, as a general rule, among the slaves, then the moral guilt of it is certainly not so great as it is in society where, because of necessary conventionalisms, the *consequences* of the sin are more deplorable, as being more fatal to peace and happiness. The Abolitionists say that this sort of thing is encouraged by slave owners in order to further the increase of slave population. Now, we all know that this increase of population is physically impossible of attainment by *promiscuous* intercourse. It may be, indeed, that masters will, in some circumstances, favor the intercourse of which we speak, equally with or without marriage; but this is confined to a very few, and even with this few, the main requirement of marriage in this respect *must* be complied with, for the object is increase, and adultery renders this impossible. To prevent adultery, and thus favor the increase of the species, is the principal object of the moral law in instituting the holy rite of marriage; and the slave-owners interest and efforts favor these requirements of the moral law, even in those few cases in which the slave owner is entirely unconscientious in the matter. But, though slave-owners

differ in opinion with some weak-minded people, they are human beings after all, and are no more devoid of consciences than they are of noses. This being the case, and it being also an undoubted truth, asserted by all moral writers, that marriage is the condition most favorable to increase, it necessarily follows that slave owners will encourage marriage among their slaves, for conscience' sake, and for interest's sake also. And looking from the theory to the fact, we find that the two agree entirely. As want cannot come upon the slaves nor upon their children in consequence of marriage, and as their masters are interested to encourage marriage by all the means in their power, so we find it to be a fact that adult American Slaves are more generally married than *any* other people. There are, of course, exceptions, but *comparatively* there are indeed but very few. And there absolutely does not exist a people on the earth whose condition is so favorable to morality in this respect, as is the condition of these very American Slaves.

This leads us to speak of the *social* condition of these people.—The greatest of strictly social evils are, undoubtedly, those difficulties or impediments which various circumstances—pride, poverty, &c.—throw in the way of marriage, and the rearing of healthy and happy children. The fact that novelists almost universally rely on the recital of such difficulties, as the one sole means of exciting an interest, is sufficient proof of this. Business difficulties may be also considered social evils, but even *they* can be considered so, only because they produce those very *other* difficulties of which we speak. But it is useless to waste words in proving that which is the theory of all philosophy, and which is acknowledged by the common sense and experience of all humanity. It is, then, both undeniable and undenied, that the greatest of all evils, strictly social, are the difficulties in the way of happy marriage, and the rearing of healthy and happy children; and it is equally undeniable that it is the master's interest to allow no such difficulties to occur in the case of his slaves, and that no apprehensions of want can exist to prevent the formation of these social ties by the slaves. And thus it results, as an unavoidable conclusion and fact, that the slaves are, in their domestic relations, among the very happiest people upon earth. There are, indeed, some ex-

ceptions to this general rule: for, as has been most eloquently urged, slaves are sometimes sold, and families sundered. But for every such case among the slaves, there are *twenty* cases among the white people of our country, in which families are sundered by the formation of social or business relations. And if we compare their condition in this respect, we shall find that for every case among the negroes, in which families are sundered, there are *a hundred* among the British laboring; and that these cases among the latter inevitably result from their condition.

We must now turn to a brief consideration of the *physical* condition of the slave: and, in doing so, we will follow the plan in accordance with which we have considered his condition in other respects.—We will speak of the principal physical *evils* incident to all people, and, by the slave's immunity or liability to those evils, we will judge of his physical *condition*. The first and greatest of physical evils is, undoubtedly, ill health; and, after that, physical suffering from other causes—hunger and thirst, and exposure to heat and cold, &c. It would seem almost ridiculous to adduce statistics to prove the health of the slaves, or arguments to show that their condition is one which is calculated to render them healthy. That they are the healthiest portion of our whole population is a fact so universally known, that, to offer *proof* of it, would seem about as useless as would a labored argument to prove that they are negroes. Their regular hours—the effect of municipal or plantation regulations—their simple, plentiful, and *always* wholesome food, their regular habits of exercise in the open air, with the sufficient clothing and shelter which it is the master's *policy* and interest to furnish them with—all conspire to render them what they are so well known to be—perhaps the very healthiest race of beings in the whole world. It is not only notoriously true, but it is theoretically impossible that it should be otherwise. But there is one physical evil which some of their pretended friends assert they are particularly subject to, and over which whole hog-heads of crocodile tears have been shed—that dreadful cat-o'-nine-tails! The author of this book lived for a time, when a very young boy, where every family had its negro slaves; yet he cannot remember that he ever saw a slave sick, or ever saw one whipped, or even struck; or ever saw one

*industriously* busy; and he scarcely ever saw one who was not laughing. And this is about the experience of our numerous southern acquaintances. We have often asked the question, and always received the same answer. Our informants had never seen a slave even struck by a white man. Two or three had *heard* of slaves being flogged in their neighborhood; but it was for stealing—never for any thing else. We have never heard, or even read in Abolition pamphlets or newspapers any well authenticated account of cruel punishment for a slave's idleness or negligence. There are such cases, no doubt, sometimes—perhaps a dozen every year, among three million slaves; and of these the Abolition papers, with the aid of exaggeration and repetition, do make dreadful *stories*. But if the Abolition papers should seek for such cases *in the north* with the same avidity, they would find ten times as many instances of cruel punishment inflicted by masters upon white apprentices and dependents. A month or two since, a woman in New York was clearly proved to have caused the death of an apprenticed girl, principally by flogging. And cases of this kind, not so distinctly traceable to the cause, are not infrequent. If this poor girl had been a negro slave, what torrents of Abolition execration and indignant abuse would have been let loose upon our fellow citizens of the South, and on their Institutions! It would have been *piouly* multiplied into fifty cases of starvation, and as many, perhaps, of flogging to death; and many a good-hearted but weak-headed man, for a year after, would have regarded every Southerner he met with as a sort of murderer. She was, however, only a white girl; and so nobody was indignant, and the Union was not dissolved! Now, in sober fact, it is almost impossible for such cases to occur with the slaves. Masters, of course, will not suffer their slaves to be flogged *to death* with impunity. And even to cruelly punish a slave is to destroy his usefulness, and his market value also. If he is incurably idle or vicious, it is considered a great disgrace and punishment by the slave to be sold; and it is the best *policy*, too, for the master, in such a case to sell the slave. But to flog him first will spoil the sale, for a slave who is known to have been severely flogged will not sell for so high a price as if he is supposed never to have deserved such treatment. And a master will not wantonly punish a slave, when it

costs him some two or three hundred dollars in cash, and his own good name, too, among his neighbors. So we may see, both in theory and in fact, the condition of the slaves, even in this respect, is not so bad as that of apprentices and dependants generally; and, on the average, no worse than that of other laboring people. As for the other physical evils of which we have spoken—hunger, thirst, and injurious exposure to heat or cold—the master's interest is the best security that slaves will not be *allowed* to suffer much from either, while the proverbially robust health of the slaves is the best evidence that they *do not* suffer in these respects.

Excessive labor, also, may very properly be considered a physical evil. In judging of the slave's condition in this respect, it is best to classify the slaves. That class which is engaged in agriculture, comprises about two-thirds of the able-bodied men. During about two hundred days in the year, these are actively employed on the plantations, working, according to circumstances, from seven to twelve hours a day; though, even in the most hurried times, they have generally a daily *task* given to them, which almost any white farmer would do in half the time. The balance of the year is comparatively unemployed. The remainder of the able-bodied men are servants, porters, or inferior mechanics, performing certainly not more than about half the work that white men do in these capacities. The women are almost entirely employed as domestics, and in the care of their master's children or their own. And as on all plantations these women are very numerous, and as *their* children require scarcely any care at all, it necessarily results that they are three-fourths of the time free. The old people and the children grin and romp with each other, and, during about one month in the year, perhaps, all hands join occasionally in husking corn, &c. In fine, taking them all together, there are, perhaps, no other three millions of *men* people who do so little work.

To sum up, then, as to the condition of the American Slaves; we find that, while their social rank and mental acquirements are not so high as those of some other people, yet they are fully equal to the average of their fellow-creatures so far as concerns their moral and religious state, their domestic happiness, and physical condition.

Dr. Paley, and almost all other philosophers who have written on human happiness, agree in this—that the nearest attainable state to perfect human happiness is a condition of regular but not immoderate labor, in which man, with the fewest and simplest wants, finds those few and simple wants abundantly and *securely* supplied, both for himself and for those he loves. And we really do not know any class of human beings who come nearer to this standard of human happiness than do the American Slaves. Their Slavery originated in Africa, and only those modifications of it which make it happy, are of *American* origin. That “peculiar institution,” so sneered at by professional philanthropists, found these slaves the destined food, or the absolute, unprotected property of savage masters: and it has made of them—as we said before—“fir, happy, useful, law-protected Christians.”

#### THE CONTRAST.

HAVING now considered the condition of the British and American Slaves separately, we will next briefly *compare* their condition, in order to judge whose condition is most, or perhaps, rather, the least, to be envied.

In religious condition, we have seen that, both as to church membership and practical Christianity, the negroes are about equal to the white population of this country generally. In religious *education*, they are, of course, inferior: but even in this respect, we believe they are fully equal to the lower class of British laborers. But, as sectarians will take such widely different views of this branch of the subject, and as morality is, of course, closely connected with it, we will, merely claiming *equality* in this respect for the negroes, pass on from the consideration of the comparative *religious* condition, to that of the *moral* condition of the two classes.

In respect to the moral condition of the American Slaves, we have seen that their besetting sins are principally lying and petty pilferings, for which a reprimand, or some privation, or at the utmost, a slight whipping, is deemed sufficient punishment. We have seen that their condition tends generally to discourage adulteries, &c. it being their master's interest to prevent it. We have seen how they are freed from the temptation to large larcenies, counterfeiting, frauds,

highway robberies, &c. and the consequent murders which so often attend them. And, as the contrast, we know the temptations to this catalogue of the great crimes, which operate on the poorer classes in Great Britain. And, in the frightful lists of murders, robberies, &c. with which the British papers teem, and in the fact that an immense proportion of the crimes committed in this country also are committed by *men of British birth*, we may see the comparative *results*, in this respect, of the two systems of servitude we are considering. As to the comparative temptations to the *women* of the American and British Slaves, let the reader reflect upon what he already knows of the needle-women of London, and the cities generally, and the still worse condition of woman in many of the British rural districts, and in the factories, and on the beastly moral degradation of the mining districts *generally*. And then let the reader recur to what we have already said in the foregoing pages, as to the condition of American Slaves, in this respect—the master's interest in the prevention of adulteries, and the comparative universality of marriage which results from this, and from the fact that the negro's wife and children are sure of a comfortable support, in good or bad times. And, when the reader has thus thought of the temptations to morality, in this respect, on one side, and to *immorality* on the other, let him compare the two *as he pleases*.

And there is one crime—the very blackest upon crime's dark catalogue—which, for obvious reasons, *never* occurs among the negroes, but which is frightfully prevalent among the poor "populace" of Britain. We speak of Infanticide! Of the thousand newspapers supported by the six millions of British freemen, we scarcely ever see one which does not chronicle some new case of this dreadful crime among the twenty-three millions of British Slaves. The little corpse—the hapless little victim of the artful slavery systems of Britain—is, we are told, "found," though the desperate, starving, and *therefore* guilty mother, is generally never known. And this dread crime is committed twenty times as often as even *this* evidence of its commission ever comes to light. No eye beholds it, save the all-seeing and all-pitying eye of God! And that great, comprehensive glance beholds the crime's temptation too! It sees the grinding misery that caused the



crime, and the more dreadful anguish which is its punishment. And that all-seeing eye beholds, too, the *cause* of these great miseries and crimes—beholds it in that atrocious system of Slavery—the indirect robbery of unequal laws, made by the few to fortify their power, at the cost of right, of freedom, and even of life itself, to millions!—Think oftener of this, oh, ye motley six millions of free and happy Britons! And you, “my Lords and Bishops,” think ye, too—oh, polished intellects and noble hearts—think, ye refined and pampered by that wealth, wrung by your artful laws from the weak grasp of toiling misery—think, in the gorgeous pageant—think, in the pauses of the revel—think—God sees it—*all!!*

As regards the comparative *social* condition of the negro slave and the inferior laborers of Britain, they are widely in that social happiness caused by the negro's freedom from anxiety as to the welfare, the security and comfort of his wife and offspring. As to *social pleasures*, the negroes are as fond of music and dancing as the British laborers are of beer or whiskey; and as the one passion is innocent, while the other is not; so the effect of the one is to produce happiness, and that of the other to produce degradation and misery. If what travellers say is to be relied on, the British laborers are not peculiarly happy in their social relations. On the other hand, the negro slaves (whether it be that their tastes are superior, or because of their superior moral condition, or of their freedom from anxiety for themselves and those they love) are represented always as being the most truly social of all human beings. At all times, whether at work or in their careless and most luxurious leisure, they are continually engaged in social pleasure of some kind—joking, dancing, singing or laughing—always content, social and gay. We must conclude, then, that, socially, the condition of the American Slaves is vastly preferable to that of the British laborers.

We will next compare the *physical* condition of the two classes.—In regard to health, we have seen that the negroes are equal, if not superior, to almost any other people; while the laboring population of Britain are known to be necessarily far from a healthy people.—Even in the rural districts, the mere laborers and their families (because of their numerous privations) are far from enjoying such health

as that of the better class of farmers, and other people of higher condition in those same districts. And in the mining and manufacturing districts, (in which full half the British laborers work) they work too many hours a day in unhealthy employments or places. And protracted labor of such kinds, accompanied with privation of wholesome air, &c. necessarily produces that ill-health from which British operatives in mines, factories, &c. do so notoriously and generally suffer.— We could extract abundantly from British papers to show that they *do* thus generally suffer from ill-health; but almost every one has read these accounts. It is sufficient to *peruse* our readers of these well-known facts in order to convince them that British laborers, notoriously and necessarily, are an unhealthy people, while American Slaves, as necessarily and undeniably, are perhaps the healthiest people in the world.

In regard to punishments, we have seen that slave-whipping is generally only for stealing; and every one knows that stealing is punished more severely in Britain. As to severe flogging for idleness or negligence, we have seen it is very seldom resorted to with the slaves, and that it is contrary to the master's interest that it should be. Our numerous southern acquaintances all tell us they never knew of such a case, but our British friends tell us a different story in regard to British apprentices—ay, and British *wives* too! The quote from a London paper, we learn that in many factories, "when our nature, sinking beneath the task, is stimulated to fresh exertion by chastisement, sometimes of the most barbarous kind," &c. And, to be brief, (as we are compelled to) we have no room to doubt that there is twenty times as much flogging for idleness or negligence among British apprentices and operatives, as among American Slaves.

The principal point, however, in which the American Slave's condition is superior to that of the British laborer, is his comparative freedom from want. No possible contingency can deprive the negro slave of life's necessaries. If there is a failure in the crops, it makes the master poorer but not the slave. If the master becomes poorer by failure of crops, it is only so much more necessary for him to take care of what he has left—his slaves. Thus the slaves are not only free from want, but from the apprehension of it! But if there is a failure

of crops in Britain, the whole world knows how terrible are the consequences to the down-trodden laborers and inferior tenants. England is better guarded than Ireland is from such calamities, but when, from any cause, the cost of food is enhanced, even in England, the consequent suffering falls exclusively upon the laboring poor. The *American* slave, on the contrary, *never* feels this suffering, nor even the least apprehension of it. If there is any suffering in the case, it falls entirely on the master.

It is proudly asserted that "however poor the British laborer is, he is free; he has no master but the law!" No master *but* the law!—What, then, is the law? What is it? It is the cunning but stern steel gauntlet of Aristocracy, which grasps the product of the laborer's toil! "No master but the law!" Heaven knows that this is master: stern enough! But it is said he owns no *man* as master, and that this is the difference between him and the Slave. And so it is—this is the precise difference! Like the slave, he *has* a master who takes the produce of his labor. But, *un*-like the slave, he has *no* master interested in his early and happy marriage, and in his health and condition, and who meets a heavy loss when he dies!

"Rattle his bones over the stones:  
He's only a pauper, whom nobody *owns*!"

The cruel Law (the harsh, stern master of the British laborer) does not *own* him, save while he works. The law-making Aristocracy—crafty as it is cruel—grasps the *profits*, but avoids the *responsibilities* of ownership. The labor's produce is cunningly appropriated, but "nobody owns" the laborer! The *negro's* master (for his own profit, and reputation, too) is necessarily interested in him from his birth to his death. On the other hand, the British laborer has also a master, stern as fate, but who, individually, cares nothing for him. "He has no master *but* the law!" And this is precisely the reason why, as we have seen, the *negro* is a *happy* slave, and the other is simply a slave, *without the happiness!*

#### THE MORAL.

To American Abolitionists.—In Britain, there are eight times as many Slaves as in the South. Their Slavery, too, is eight times as cruel. Emancipate *them*! They need no *persuading*, as the negroes

do. The cost is only the passage money. It will cost no bloodshed; nor will it peril that holy Union which (in the peace and freedom it gives our country) is the main surety for *your own* freedom, and for the hope of freedom to the world!

To British Aristocracy.—Your missionaries may sow their dragon's teeth of one sort in the South, and of another in the North, but the armed men *our* soil produces will strike for their country! Recall, then, your missionaries, and dry your *philanthropic* tears! Our country, no doubt, is an example to your slaves you do not like; but neither your tears nor your missionaries can destroy her! And as to *other* modes, remember Plattsburgh! Send your armed "populace" here, and, when they can, they will desert! And we have no "Fugitive Slave" compact with Britain! We will not return them! And, if the number of emigrants, who leave you to avoid oppression, continues to *increase* as it has in the last ten years, in sixty years from now you will have not one laborer left in Britain, from whose hand to draw your tithes, or pay your rent, or taxes. And the number will increase, if emigrants even have to bind themselves to a month's labor here to pay their passage. One only way exists to keep your laborers; and you *must* come to it! Give your laborers the right of suffrage, that they may destroy that Law which is their cruel master, and make *for themselves* a Law that shall be their servant! In other words: Emancipate your Slaves, or our country's example and our country's *clips* will do it for you!





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 818 2

3  
it 10.