
E X T R A C T S
FROM
R E M A R K S
ON
DR. CHANNING'S SLAVERY,
WITH COMMENTS
BY AN ABOLITIONIST.

E X T R A C T S

FROM

R E M A R K S

ON

DR. CHANNING'S SLAVERY,

W I T H C O M M E N T S,

BY AN ABOLITIONIST.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY D. K. HITCHCOCK,

1836.

res. 7585.72 no.4

STONER

STONER

STONER

STONER

STONER

STONER

STONER

STONER

STONER


P R E F A C E .

The following comments were ready for publication by the middle of February, which was previous to the review of the remarks by another citizen; but circumstances, over which their writer had no control, have prevented their appearing in print.

Presuming that most, if not all the persons by whom this pamphlet will be perused, have already read the remarks on Dr. Channing's Slavery, it is not considered absolutely necessary to republish the whole of the pamphlet, though this would have been done if objections had not been made to it by the person to whom the copy-right of the remarks is secured. It was intended, before this was ascertained, to republish the whole, believing that the lack of all argument, in support of our system of slavery, founded either on religion, reason or morality, would be, by that means, rendered as apparent, as the most fanatical abolitionist could desire. The remarks, therefore, to which the comments apply, have been selected, which, with some others, will be sufficient to show the spirit of the book and the intention of the author in publishing it. As the weight of a straw affects a balance, in like manner it is hoped that these comments may have their mite of influence on public opinion, when thrown into the balance of weightier, and much more powerful arguments, in favor of the abolition of slavery. As the Scriptures were designed to inculcate the duties of doing justly, and loving mercy, and express of reiterated assertions, God's abhorrence of every species of oppression, it appeared to me, when they were brought forward in support of the system of slavery, that something should be done to rescue them from the foul reproach.

They were likewise intended to show that history nowhere sanctions a system of slavery, originating in the nefarious and capital crime of man-stealing.

This was the actuating motive of the writer of the comments. For the success of the design, we are not accountable; it is the widow's mite—and as such, it is respectfully offered to the reader.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Associates of the Boston Public Library / The Boston Foundation

SLAVERY.

The remarker commences his pamphlet with an acknowledgment of the high standing of Dr. Channing, of his extensive influence as a writer, assents to the praise which has been bestowed on his style, and "to the purity, elegance, correctness, power and point of his language," but thinks his zeal, in the cause of abolition, as mistaken as that of the crusaders; censures "the cathedral spirit, in which his commands are conveyed," and expresses a suspicion that the censures he casts on grievous sins must proceed from an assumption of superior sanctity, which will be deemed a departure from that temper of humility, which, "as much as anything, is the doctrine of Christian philosophy." Physician heal thyself, is a retort which the best cannot expect to escape, when they endeavor to impress on a community the truths of morality and religion. If it is addressed to him who was without sin, how can his disciples expect to avoid it?

He then presents the following propositions, to which he asks the attention of the reader.

"First. Public sentiment in the free States, in relation to Slavery, is perfectly sound, and ought not to be altered."

What is meant by this proposition? That public sentiment here, is entirely opposed to slavery? Why then the brick-bats, hurled at the heads of the advocates of its abolition? If, as he states, the doctrine of the Northern States is, that domestic Slavery is a deep and dreadful evil, why are our halls and churches dependent on the will of the people to open or shut?—closed against every attempt to give utterance to their sentiments?

If it is in reality a deep and, dreadful evil, and as some of us believe, a stupendous sin, the requirements of Christianity would impose on us the duty of endeavoring to convince those by whom the system is upheld of these important truths, and likewise to persuade them to use their utmost efforts to accomplish its overthrow.

If every attempt to speak, or to print on the subject, is to be baffled by public opinion, or prohibited by such laws as the public resolutions of the slave-holding districts require of us, how is this to be effected? I do not anticipate this shocking result; I will not give so short a date to the inestimable privileges purchased for us by the blood of our Fathers.

In the course of his remarks, he observes, "that *he* does not think it desirable that domestic slavery should cease in the United States," because it could not be terminated in any way that would not produce vastly more aggravated and extensive evils than are suffered by its continuance." Does he not here express the opinion of a large class of our fellow-citizens? Very many persons, as appears by the numerous accessions to abolition societies, think differently. Why should we then be deprived of the privilege, which our Constitution secures to us, of meeting together to discuss the subject among ourselves? or of the right of letting our southern brethren know their result? Have they any reason to resent it, since the question involves the honor and interest of our common country? Its sectional divisions are little thought of by the world; it is spoken of as a whole.

Viewing domestic slavery as a deep and dreadful evil, a respectable minority here think that the danger of causing insurrections among the slaves, by the proceeding of the abolitionists, is far less to be dreaded by the planter than a continuance of this system.

"We know the fiery character of the slave-holders. Dr. C. describes it strongly:

'A quick resentment of whatever is thought to encroach on personal dignity — vehemence of the vindictive passions — and contempt of all laws, human and divine, in retaliating injury; these take rank among the virtues of men, whose self-estimation has been fed by the possession of absolute power.'

"With such views of their temperament, it is surprising he should deem his mode of attack calculated to accomplish the professed object of his book. It is pouring oil on a conflagration."

If such is really the temperament of the southern slave-holder, it appears to me just such labors of gospel love as the Dr. bestows on them, are necessary to change their characters, and to convert them to the temper and spirit of Christianity, of which they are a direct violation.

"Is it said this book is not, by its manner, calculated to produce disturbance among slaves? Let us examine it. Think you, if Dr. Channing was to go into the slave country, and, gathering round him a hundred negroes, preach the doctrines to them which he has published to us, it would be likely to produce disturbance? Or, what is the same thing, if he should send his book to some free negro, who should mount a stump, and read it to his race, would it produce disturbance? Is it a book that any slave-owner would permit to be published on his plantation? Is the existence of the book good cause of alarm to him, and an inducement to greater care that it should not be circulated? Nobody can doubt upon these points. Would slave-owners permit his pamphlet to be read to their slaves?

"The only remaining inquiry is, will the doctrines of this book reach the ears of the slaves?

"Whether they do or not, Dr. C. is equally culpable, by his own system of morals. For, by printing the book, he has done what he can to give it to the world.

"But it will get to its destination. Sooner or later its doctrines will reach the slave. The world is one great whispering-gallery, whose faintest echos are reverberated by the press. Slowly but surely, whatever it publishes moves through inferior agents and reaches all ears deeply concerned in its relations.

"I charge him — in spite of his disclaimer — with *the doctrine of INSURRECTION*. He inculcates the right of insurrection on the whole slave population of the United States. It is immaterial that he contradicts himself. It is in vain that he abjures this act in absolute terms. If the necessary and fair, and only proper deduction of his argument is insurrection; if all sound reasoning from his declared principles leads to it; if all rational men must so understand it; if the stupidest slave would so receive it; if it requires false logic and sophistry to escape from it; — then it is insurrection that he preaches; and for its horrors, when they come, and for their evils, in anticipation, he is answerable, to the extent of his exertion, at the tribunal of public opinion and the bar of God."

If the Remarker had substituted the first person for the third, throughout this paragraph, every candid reader of the Dr.'s book, and his own, would have admitted he came much nearer the truth.

"On the twenty-ninth page, the position that has before been repeated in every form and with every variety of illustration, is summed up in the following forcible and impressive words :"

'We have thus seen that a human being cannot rightfully be held and used as property. No legislation, not that of all countries or worlds, could make him so. Let this be laid down, as a first, a fundamental truth. Let us hold it fast as a most sacred, precious truth. Let us hold it fast against all customs, all laws, all rank, wealth and power. Let it be armed with the whole authority of the civilized and Christian world.'

Does it follow from these and similar remarks, when read in their context with the general arguments of the Dr.'s book, that he would urge the slave to fight himself free, or his master to give him his liberty?

"The negroes in the southern States are made slaves by acts of legislation and the coercive power which is exercised under those acts. If these acts were repealed, every slave would be as free as Dr. Channing. But if these acts of legislation are already made void by a power superior to all human constitutions and governments, if they cannot accomplish what they propose to accomplish, they have done nothing; they no more operate upon the negro within their jurisdiction, than upon the white man beyond it. There is, then, no *legal* Slavery, and can be none."

The Dr. nowhere denies the legality of Slavery by our laws, but insists that if our laws are a violation of God's laws they should be immediately repealed, viz: as soon as practicable.

"If the Bible, says Dr C., had forbidden the *evil* of Slavery instead of subverting the *principle*, if it had proclaimed the unlawfulness of Slavery, and taught slaves to resist the oppression of their masters, it would instantly have arrayed the two parties in deadly hostility throughout the civilized world."

If the doctrines of the Bible subvert the principles of slavery—How long must we wait, ere we make an attempt to promote its designs? are we not individually called upon to use our utmost influence to promote them?

"Slavery has existed in all time in the fairest regions of the earth and among the most civilized portions of mankind. Our own government not long since made a claim on Great Britain for the value of the property of our citizens in some hundred human slaves. The principle was admitted by the English nation. The amount to be paid was referred to the arbitration of the Emperor of Russia. Our claim was allowed, the money received, and distributed to the claimants for the loss of their property in slaves."

"When in public judgment it is wrong it will be changed. Arguments may very properly be urged to prove that it ought to be changed, but none can be tolerated in society to show that while it is allowed to stand it is inoperative and void.

"Dr. C. probably means to say that the law which makes property of a slave is inconsistent with the law of God. In deciding this question, the Doctor is not to be sole judge. It is a question about which other men quite as eminent have the same right of opinion. Its true solution is to be ascertained by the condition and circumstances of the case."

If the circumstances of the case are to decide its consistency with the law of God, it is clear that a system which originated in, and has been supported by man-stealing, must be one which the laws of God condemn. How can we escape this conclusion?

The Remarker commences his chapter on the right of discussion, by truisms which I have never heard disputed; the substance of them is — that in communities, where it is not restrained by law, it should be controlled by a high moral responsibility; which imposes on individuals the duty of self-restraint, when its exercise would be palpably inexpedient.

"If a discussion of slavery, in its actual state and condition in our country, excites in the people of the free States, indignation, resentment and pity; if it produces in New-England, horror, abhorrence and contempt, it must lead to action, in which these convulsions of the mind will pour out its concentrated fires, or it will compel us to brood, in sullen malignity and silence, over the compressed passions that policy stifles in the heart. We must be open enemies, or false and deceitful friends. If no action is proposed, and no safe action can possibly be devised for us, there is no alternative but sullenness and hatred. The bonds of our political union may remain indeed undivorced; but we have prepared for ourselves a condition of conjugal wretchedness, to which their actual dissolution would be infinitely preferable."

There is a class in the community who think the term Slavery (as practised in our country) synonymous with oppression, and that the Bible enjoins upon every man to cry loudly against this sin. Influenced by these motives, they consider it a duty publicly to condemn the system of Slavery, by the methods universally employed for the promulgation of ideas or doctrines. Their ideas of expediency have reference to the requirements of duty, leaving the conse-

quences to God. They therefore do not believe it to be right to refrain from speaking against oppression, lest it may offend the oppressor; they hope, by so doing, to convince him of his sin, that he may forsake it. They cannot go to him to endeavor by argument, and appeals to his conscience, to effect their purpose, because they threaten to Lynch them, and in some instances have put their threats in execution. "When ye are persecuted in one city, flee to another," and preach your doctrines there. No command to refrain from preaching *anywhere*.

The only means that are left to this class, is to endeavor to create a strong public sentiment against the system in the free States, which, united to the same sentiment throughout Christendom, will operate a change in the feelings of the slave-holding community, and induce them to listen to arguments which will convince them of their sin, and, it is ardently hoped, cause them to forsake it. This comment has not been written to give information of the schemes of abolitionists, as it is presumed they are generally known, but in answer to this chapter of rodomontade, about the danger of discussing a subject among ourselves, on which he asserts all classes of the community are agreed, and consider to be a deep and dreadful evil. If this were true, from whence would come the mobs, to arrest our discussions, and prevent our proceedings when we assemble together to devise means to remove *this deep and dreadful evil* from our common and beloved country. Oh, consistency! what a jewel art thou. How ornamental, even to a book!

Were it openly avowed by the opponents of discussion, that the panic which had seized them had originated in a fear that our efforts, instead of dissolving the fetters of the slaves would cause new ones to be forged for ourselves, we would admit from present appearances that their fears do not now appear altogether so shadowy as we should once have supposed them. But can it be that the cradle of liberty has rocked a race so unworthy of their sires? Can it be, that New England will sacrifice both honor, and conscience, to motives of interest or expediency?

Can it be, that the birth-place of liberty is so soon to become its altar of immolation? and that New-England, which enrols among

her many names of honor those of Franklin, Greene, Hancock and Adams, has become already, after the lapse of only one generation, so apostate to the principles which actuated her sires—as to be ready to sacrifice both rights and duty to motives of commercial and pecuniary interests, or to yield them to slave-holding domination, from an overweening regard to the advantages of our union!

That the union of the separate States, which compose our common country, was among the most precious bequests of our forefathers, I am as thoroughly convinced as any of its most zealous supporters; and also that it ought to be maintained by every sacrifice, but those of honor, and duty to ourselves, and our most holy religion. These principles I consider too sacred to be bartered for any earthly considerations. And woe to us as a people, when we shall give public demonstration that this is not the prevailing feeling of our community. Is not the union so valued by us equally promotive of the interests of the South? Why, then, should every sacrifice to preserve it be required only of us? Has not the threat of dissolving it been many times employed to awe us into submission to their dictation? is it not now being employed for that apparent purpose? And why should its dissolution be more appalling to us than to them? Are we more dependant on them for resources, and protection against foreign and domestic foes, than they on us? Is it at all probable that they will withdraw from the Union, to preserve a system which they are fully aware depends on that as its chief support? The blow that dissolves it, dissolves the fetters of the slave. And is it rational to suppose, that men who are fully aware of these circumstances will be the first to aim a blow, which, they well know, would crumble to atoms the system which they wish to support, under a pretence that they are doing it to lengthen its existence? Our path is the path of duty; may we conscientiously endeavor to find it! It is the only path of safety from which we cannot swerve without incurring the displeasure of Him who holds in his hands the destiny of nations, which with him are accounted as the small dust of the balance, and to whom belong the issues from death.

“Public sentiment in the slave-holding States cannot be altered. This arises from a very melancholy consideration, but one which should be deeply considered.

"Domestic Slavery is, in the United States, so intimately connected with civil society, that it can never be removed but by one of those tremendous convulsions in which nations perish.

"I speak not merely of the destruction of popular government, of the overturn of our democracy and the substitution of another. I say nothing of the dissolution of the Union and the establishment of several feeble and independent States. I speak not of civil war and its concomitants of butchery, massacre, and blood. Far less do I limit the statement to the waste of property, the desolation and ruin, the wretchedness and poverty of houseless and helpless fugitives from their once comfortable homes. I speak not of the deluge of crime that would sweep, like another flood, over all the moral monuments of the country; but of *CHAOS come again*, in the utter annihilation of all the elements of which our social, civil, religious, and political institutions are created."

Has the gentleman been frightened by an abolition ghost? Or from whence have sprung these bugbears of his brain? He surely has not seen them in any record of emancipation of modern times; I have not noticed them in the annals of history, either ancient or modern, though this is not evidence that they are not to be found there. We are surrounded by countries who have tried the experiment. What are its results in South America, in the East and West-Indies, in Mexico, and in St. Domingo? Have the evils, which he so pathetically deprecates, been realized in any of these places, as the consequences of emancipation? If emancipation on the soil really appears to the American planter an experiment too hazardous to attempt, there are other modes by which it might be effected. We have extensive and unoccupied territories which might be appropriated to the colonization of the slave after his liberation — when some or all of the slave-holding States shall call for the measure.

I have too exalted an opinion of the philanthropy and patriotism of my countrymen of the North, notwithstanding what has been said of their penny-catching disposition, to believe that this scheme would meet with opposition from them; nor have we reason to suppose that it would be opposed by the free States of any other section of our country. This is a scheme of colonization which would have every probability of success, and would probably unite the efforts of the Abolitionists, and such Colonizationists as have the welfare of the slave at heart, to promote its accomplishment.

The slave would, undoubtedly, joyfully accept his freedom to enjoy a home of his own, whether employed by his master for wages, or removed to another section of the country.

It would be at the option of the master, whether to give him his liberty on the soil, or on condition of his leaving the country, for the territory which should be appropriated for his Colonization. A part of our surplus revenue might be employed for the support of the disabled and superannuated; schools opened for the instruction of the young, in all the common and useful branches of education; Houses of Industry erected for the idler and vagabond.

The distance from some of the slave-holding States to some of our territories, which might be found suitable to colonize them on, is not so great as to require a very great expenditure to enable them to reach there. The territory might remain under the government of the United States, on the same terms as our others, if such should be the decision of Congress on the subject. This, in all probability, would receive the approbation of the colonists, as long as their government should be administered with equity. Should it cease to be so administered, they would have our example to justify them in revolting against it. As an individual, I should not approve of this measure, believing that means more conformable to the doctrines of Christianity might be devised to effect this purpose. To a humble individual, unskilled in politics, this scheme seems calculated to promote the best interests of all the parties concerned, and that from it, when compared with the existing circumstances of the parties, would be likely to result the greatest good to the greatest number.

I am fully aware that, by many, perhaps by most persons, it may be considered presumptuous, in a private individual, to propose a scheme for the consideration of others, to whom, in point of talent, he pretends to no comparison. But as they are called for by the Remarker on Channing, in terms which imply his belief that none could be devised which would afford any possible chance of success, I have ventured to offer the above, which will serve to show our reasons for differing from him in opinion, and supposing some might be devised not wholly destitute of plausibility, or some probability of success.

Abolitionists, as a society, do not propose schemes. They think, when the citizens of the South are ready to adopt one, they will

choose to devise it for themselves. As emancipation on the soil has been followed by beneficial results in the countries that have proved it, I believe they generally think it might be effected in our own, with perfect safety to the parties concerned. Their testimony is against the sinfulness of the system, which, besides the extreme oppression which it justifies, deprives both God and man of their rights. God, of his right to their obedience to his commands, which they are not permitted to yield unless it suits the will of the master, and likewise of the fruits of the talents he has bestowed on them for the good of mankind and his own glory. And man, of the right of employing these talents agreeably to the purpose for which they were bestowed.

Among them would be found, no doubt, if educated like the white man, eminent artizans, philosophers, philanthropists, divines, and men of science. Can this be doubted? From whence sprung the sciences? They have been traced to Ethiopia, which is allowed to be their birth-place, because they can be traced no farther. Can there be any doubt about the color of the Ethiopian's skin? "Can the Ethiopian change his skin?" The position of the country so near the equator, places it beyond a doubt.

That the black man is equally susceptible of religious impressions, and understanding the truths of the gospel, as the white, is evidenced by the labor bestowed on one of them by the Apostle Philip. It appears that Philip had been directed, by a vision, to take a road on which was travelling an Ethiopian of great authority, under Candace, their queen. He was returning to his country from Jerusalem, to which place he had been to worship God, conformably to the rites of the Jews; when overtaken by the apostle, he was reading the prophet Esaias. The Spirit said unto him, go near, and join thyself unto this chariot. Philip did not disdain his request to come up and sit with him, to whom he explained the Scriptures he was reading, and "preached unto him Jesus," in whose name he baptized him, after he had expressed his belief that he was Christ the Son of God. If it was thought necessary to bestow so much pains on one Ethiopian, to convert him to Christ, is it not evident that their souls are as precious to their Creator as those of the white man? and can we innocently deprive man of his rights, and God of his due?

The time of the deliverance of the African is, I firmly believe, from the signs of the times, near at hand. The efforts now being

employed by Christendom for its accomplishment, are to me an evidence that God's time for achieving it draws near; and that, either with, or without the consent of their present owners, he will accomplish it by the same outstretched arm which wrought deliverance for the children of Israel. That arm has not lost its vigor, neither is it shortened that it cannot save. Moses was commissioned by God to assure Pharaoh, that it was his will that he should let them go free. The message was not regarded by Pharaoh; the work was achieved by the Almighty, by means which he alone can employ.

Abolitionists are desirous of convincing the supporters of the system of Slavery of its sinfulness, holding opinions, with respect to the obduracy of the community in which it exists, more favorable than those expressed by the Remarker.

“The eminent patriot, to whom, more than to any man living, we owe the constitution of the United States, was a slave-holder, and his example will, in the land of their nativity, outweigh all the eloquence and all the learning of a whole colony of mere talking clergymen.

“The slave region has pronounced its decision. Within its borders, Slavery shall not be discussed. The people do not mean, by any affectation of liberality, to endanger their social system. They believe it is right; but they mean to maintain it, wrong, or right. Upon this subject, they ask no instruction, and they permit none. They have taken their stand. They refute all argument by silencing it, and to all force they are prepared for resistance.”

Have abolitionists uttered a fouler slander of the slave-holder than this? Do not these observations imply that he is wholly reprobate, has placed himself beyond the pale of moral or religious influences, and that, therefore, though convinced of sin, he is resolved to continue in it? From this circumstance, every effort to change his resolution must be the extreme of childishness and folly. The Southern community is now under Lynch law; therefore, their best and most pious citizens are compelled to silence. When these laws shall have lost their vigor, by the increase of the numbers opposed to them, we shall hear a different expression from some of them, than that which now comes to us as their united voice.

“The difficulty already stated might appal ordinary minds; but there is nothing too arduous for the efforts of fanaticism — nothing too quixotic for the knight-errantry of religious reformers,

“Let us then look at the case in another point of view. The masters of slaves, it is admitted, are not at present in a temper of mind to give them liberty; and the slaves themselves are not in a condition to receive it. What are the means of abolition?”

“I *only* ask” — says Dr. C. — “that the slave-holding States should resolve, conscientiously and in good faith, to remove this greatest of moral evils and wrongs, and would bring *immediately* to the work all their intelligence, virtue, and power.”

“The extreme simplicity of this modest request shows the value of the proposal for all practical purposes. It is only that the whole population of the slave district should change its habits, manners, feelings, tastes, inclinations, principles, objects, wants, and wishes. It is only that, while they think themselves in perfect health, they should believe this physician of souls, that they are gangrened at the heart. If only that for the purpose of curing a disease of which they are not sensible, they should submit, not merely a spouting artery to be tied up by this skillful surgeon, but as if there were any hope of life in the experiment, make bare the whole vascular system to be dissected from the quivering trunk.”

“They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.” The patient often thinks lightly of his disease, when the physician knows it to be incurable, unless the most skillful means employed for his recovery, should be attended with success.

“Force, power, authority, are to interfere; and what cannot be accomplished by argument, is to be made successful by the arm of the law.

“But government and legislatures, in our day, are not what they once were. Government and legislatures are but another name for the people. In the slave-country, slave-holders make them; and they who are thus created, are slave-holders themselves.”

If this were not true, another remark which he has previously expressed, — “That sympathy is due to the white man as well as the slave, affectionate assurances of regard and protection are due to the white woman of education and virtue, to the feebleness of infancy and the helplessness of age, as well as to the tawny-colored children of bondage,” — would be equally just. But the man who ties himself to a post, and then complains of his inability to move, will not excite as much sympathy as the man who is so confined by another.

“Slavery is an evil. The slave feels it to be so. But in what does he think the evil consists? In its physical, not its moral deprivations. Of these, the majority know nothing, and no more feel the want of them than do the brute animals with whom they labor.

“The freedom that they seek is relaxation from toil, from restraint, from industry. The liberty they desire is the liberty of sensual indulgences — to eat, drink, dance, sing and sleep, in idleness and ease. We see this in the free negroes who have once been slaves. It is the peculiarity of their character.”

Can these positions be satisfactorily demonstrated, until they are allowed the means of rising by education, and those employments which raise white men to wealth and distinction?

“There has been no insurrection among the slaves, in which, however temporary their power, it has not been exerted with dreadful cruelty and acts horrible to humanity. To implant better principles, is a pious, but a very hopeless task. For eighteen hundred years, the world has enjoyed the light of Christianity; and yet we are daily-witnesses of its feebleness to restrain the excesses of human passion. How many generations of slaves are to pass away in moral discipline before the descendants of the present are to be competent to freedom?”

I think it would puzzle a *lawyer* to tell how future generations of slaves are to be prepared for freedom, by their present mode of treatment,

“We must refuse, certainly, to share the gains of these man-destroyers and oppressors of human rights. If they have stolen the labor of the African, we may not be receivers of the spoil. We must taste none of the sugar, eat none of the rice, wear none of the cotton, purchase at no price any other article which is the product of slave labor. When the reverend teacher has acted on his own principles, and proves to us that in this respect he keeps himself unspotted from the sin of Slavery, he may have some better right to read us the lecture, which, as one having authority, he has so assumingly bestowed upon us.”

Reasoning from these premises, abolitionists have passed resolutions to refrain from the productions of slave-labor, when those of free labor could be procured, even at a higher price — some of them abstain altogether from articles produced by the forced, blood-stained, and unrequited toils of the slave.

“Are the sufferings of the slaves, in which we are invited to feel so much sympathy, comparable to what would be endured by our own laboring poor, if, for a single year, the Southern crop should fail for want of cultivation?”

“If the slaves must toil with wholesome and reasonable labor, or our own people must starve, though they double their exertions, which alternative does a wise and sound morality direct us to choose?”

Fudge! Must the New-Englander starve, though an article of food should not come to us from beyond Mason's and Dixon's line? Where is our commerce, which whitens every sea, mart and port of the globe? Where are our own resources? Were food and raiment withheld from that quarter, they would come from every other nook of the earth. Then also might our New-England farmers live by the fruits of their own industry, and our barren hills, like similar ones in other countries, where agricultural labor is sure of a ready market for its productions, become a fruitful garden.

Do not these constant appeals to our cupidity imply a belief in its existence? Shame on the New-Englander, who would endeavor to promote such feelings, by constantly appealing to them. Distant be the day, when our articles of consumption may not be supplied by our own territories. But soon may the period arrive when they shall be the productions of the labors of freemen, who have not been wronged out of their hire.

“A government would be absurdly defective in power which could not prevent the infraction of its peace, and as absurdly ignorant not to know that other governments require it, to prevent its citizens from intermeddling in their internal affairs. Neither do I say anything of the cruelty to the negro, bond or free, which these publications cause under the guise of humanity. This topic has been also well-enforced. We see it practically in our own colored population. Their character is wasting under the operation of a too sublimated morality which they cannot comprehend. We shall make worthless vagabonds of hitherto harmless and orderly citizens.”

Who will make worthless vagabonds of them? The abolitionists, who would have them instructed in all useful knowledge, both spiritual and temporal, if efforts were not employed to prevent it? or he whose prejudices against their color, would deprive them of every species of instruction, excepting that which would qualify them to perform the most servile labor? Is it not the mind which makes the man? Is it not intelligence, united to good moral conduct,

which gives respectability to all? How much is the white man, destitute of these recommendations, above the black man, who, in the same degree, exhibits a want of them?

‘If Slavery did not exist in the country, the question of introducing it would be settled by acclamation. No solitary voice would call it into being. If, like Columbus, we now stood upon the borders of a virgin world, and had what his great genius could not command, power to direct by whom it should be settled, or if over any part of it, like one of the eminent men of New-England, we had been favored by Providence with the right to say who should occupy its borders, all would join in the recorded mandate of the Ordinance for settling the North-Western Territory — *our soil shall never be polluted by Slavery.*’

Governor McDuffie (who is an echo of the sentiments of Southern statesmen) considers slavery a divine institution, the bulwark of a republican government. Would he sign the mandate?

“Second. Public sentiment in the slave-holding States, whether right or not, cannot be altered.”

Why not? has not public sentiment been changed, on many important subjects, by the same methods that abolitionists are now pursuing.

“Third. An attempt to produce any alteration in the public sentiment of the country, will cause great additional evil — moral, social, and political.”

“The first of these positions has been so long acknowledged, and so recently repeated, that it needs no additional enforcement; and he who attempts to stir up the public mind to a stronger feeling, or a deeper glow of indignation, does in effect join that little band of fanatics whose imprudent agitation has deranged the peace of the community.

“Whatever may be the disclaimer of our author, his book does this, and in the sensitive region of slavery will be keenly felt to have done this; and all the troubles caused by the inferior agents in this work of commotion, will be reproduced and augment the influence of his authority.”

The Dr. appeared to think that his calm and Christian-like manner of treating the subject, would screen his book from the censures cast on the writings of the abolitionists. The man of honor feels as keen resentment at the insinuation that he has uttered a false-

hood, as he would at a direct charge of it — it is the accusation which wounds, and not the terms in which it is conveyed. I know of no terms in which you could tell the Southern planter that he was possessed of stolen property that would sound pleasant to him.

“ Why are we told in detail of the vast evils of Slavery? of the moral and social and personal degradation that it brings with it? of the sin and misery and wretchedness, in which, with retributive justice, it involves all classes of the community in which it is found? This, and more than this, is the common feeling of our New-England population.”

Why is the gospel preached to us every Sabbath day? We all of us own it, and profess to believe in the necessity of obeying its precepts.

“ As addressed to the South, it is but a reiteration of the deep and powerful feeling which, to a very great extent, prevails among its best-informed and well-principled people. But, to them, it comes with all the bitter insult of intentional mockery.”

Gov. McDuffie's speech denies these assertions — the spirit of the public resolutions of the South, even of their churches, deny them. The speeches of the Southern delegates in Congress deny them.

“ Suppose the pretended masters of more than two millions of human beings, warned by Dr. Channing's denunciations, as by another earthquake, awake out of their deep sleep of sin, and come running to this modern Paul, with the heart-breaking exclamation—*Sir, sir, what shall we do to be saved?* Has our apostle of freedom one word of consolation or instruction to give them? has he devised the way of their escape from the moral guilt in which he tells them they are plunged? Does he propose any remedy for this leprosy of their souls? Is there any pool of Siloam in which, by his direction, they may wash and be clean?”

Yes — cease from their sin; then there will be a pool open for them to wash in and be clean.

“ None is known—nothing is proposed. No human security has been or can be suggested, that has the slightest practical efficiency. The Catholic priest, when he brings his penitent to the confessional, has some relief for his conscience; but here, all is desolation and despair.

“A practical philosopher would not think this mode of discussion calculated to awaken the conscience. Its tendency is to rouse the passions and arm the supposed criminal for defence.”

What mode? speaking the truth in love, and calling things by their right names? It was the false prophets that daubed with untempered mortar; if unjust epithets have been employed — if our writings have been addressed to the slave — convict us of it; we solicit investigation.

“Present pain, apprehension of future danger, uncertain, indefinite, but on that account more alarming, press everywhere on the free population of a slave country. They live, they know they live on the crater of a volcano, which every moment may pour forth its concealed but certain fires, in a torrent of indiscriminate destruction.”

McDuffie denies this also.

“I object to the severe and indiscriminate national reflections, which this teacher of morals deems himself at liberty to throw on our slave-holding countrymen. True or false, they are alike objectionable.

“‘Malicious slander,’ says an approved writer, ‘is the relating of truth or falsehood, for the purpose of creating misery.’ Such purpose would undoubtedly be denied by our author; but if misery is not the consequence, it will not be for want of poison in the shaft, but vigor in the bow.”

And I should think would be credited by every disinterested reader. I am no Unitarian; but an abolitionist of the school he condemns. This does not close my heart to the conviction that every sentiment he utters breathes sympathy and concern for the master as well as for the slave. The Dr’s. censures probably proceeded from the same source that has led thousands of others to condemn them, viz. ignorance of their writings and course of proceedings.

“If domestic Slavery, as the book avers, nourishes in the master of slaves the passion for power and its kindred vices, annihilates the control of Christianity, and is necessarily fatal to the purity of a people, — if a slave country reeks with licentiousness and crime — if it is tainted with a deadlier pestilence than the plague — it is unfortunate for our own moral habits that the facts were not known to our fathers, before they bound our virtuous New-England in a bond of amity and fellowship to all this iniquity and wretchedness.”

The facts were known to our fathers — but the perilous condition

of our country, at that time, decided them to yield to the expediency of adopting the union with this horrid excrescence on its face; thinking, no doubt, that the liberal and enlightened sentiments which were then prevailing in the community, and were expressed in our instrument of confederation, would, like the leaven hid in the three measures of meal, soon produce such a change in public sentiment, with regard to Slavery, as would shortly cause its final extirpation.

“A practical moralist is bound to find a remedy for the evils he enumerates, or keep silence till he can.

“Prayer meetings may be held by the faithful. Women, and men like women, may meet in secret conclave and preach about it. Little children may lose their gingerbread and give their cents to purchase tracts. Foreign renegades, whom fanaticism sends to us and folly encourages, may agitate the community with inflammatory exhortations and specious discourse. The gifted and fair, whom the misplaced hospitality of an abused people flatters into a brief notoriety, may join their factitious consequence to the throng, and even the splendor of great talents, the reputation of great piety and the influence of a great name may bring all the resources it possesses to remove Slavery from the land, — but the day of deliverance will not dawn upon us till all who now hold slaves and all who reproach them for it, and the slaves themselves who are the present living objects of pity and love, shall be together alike the “unsubstantial images of air.”

Why so, if the present generation of slave-holders should be brought to see the justice and expediency of abolishing the system?

“In my judgement the time will be protracted by these general accusations.”

“Rebuke a wise man, and he becomes wiser.”— Prov. “Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness; let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head, for yet my prayer shall be in his calamities.” Psalms, 41: 5.

“Besides the extreme offensiveness of national reflections, there is a passage of such point and particularity, that scarcely a husband or father in the slave country can fail to consider it a personal affront.

‘Early licentiousness is fruitful of crime in mature life. How far the obligation to conjugal fidelity, the sacredness of domestic ties, will be revered

amid such habits, such temptations, such facilities to vice, as are involved in Slavery, needs no exposition. So terrible is the connexion of crimes! They who invade the domestic rights of others, suffer in their own homes. The household of the slave may be broken up arbitrarily by the master; but he finds his revenge, if revenge he asks, in the blight which the master's unfaithfulness sheds over his own domestic joys. A slave-country reeks with licentiousness. It is tainted with a deadlier pestilence than the plague"

"It is among the most fruitful and pathetic subjects of Dr. C.'s complaint, that there is nothing sacred in the home of the slave; that the master enters it with impunity and dissolves those ties of conjugal fidelity by which the dearest relations of life are maintained. If it be so, it is a grievous offence, and sorrow and shame be on the nefarious agent in that scene of depravity.

"But it would seem that the negro's hut is not the only one that may be exposed to the licentiousness, not indeed of lust but of slander.

"In the passage above quoted, the charge is so general that no one may consider himself exempted. It is not made against the obscure, the low, the ignorant, the vulgar. It attaches to whatever in that country is deemed to be noble, elegant, refined, dignified or accomplished. It is the slave's master — the planter's family — the home of the opulent — the educated, the distinguished; the bed of the chivalrous, the high-minded, the eminent in the council or the field, that is said to be desecrated by unfaithfulness."

Are the natural children of a married man, any proofs of his unfaithfulness?

"Their wives and daughters, by their impurity, satiate the slave's revenge for the ignominy which, in the common course of events, taints his domestic joys!"

Does Dr. C. make this charge? What chapter? what page?

"On their part, they will complain, not of injury, but of insult. They will not be satisfied with the limitations here and there interspersed, in the course of our author's remarks, because the evils of Slavery, as he describes them, are treated as inseparable from its existence, and attach, in a great degree, to all slave-holders. The sin is on them all. The wrong, the injustice, the oppression is practised by all; and the retaliation and revenge, "by terrible connexion of crimes," falls upon all. The indignation, which it called up in the North by this mode of discussion, is and must be directed to all."

Abolitionists accuse the virtuous part of the community of per-

petuating the system. Were there no humane slave-holders, the system would fall under the execrations of the civilized world.

“ The continuance or removal of Slavery is solely within the power of the domestic legislation of the States in which it exists.

“ On this point, I do not find that our author differs from the common sentiment of his fellow-citizens; though, indeed, I could have wished to see the political duty of the Northern States a little more distinctly affirmed. He does, however, declare that the question, ‘ how Slavery shall be removed, is a question for the slave-holder, and one which he alone can fully answer;’ and that ‘ we have no right of interference, nor do we desire it.’

“ Upon this, I remark that there is in the book a singular discrepancy between the means and the end, and a direct assumption of the right which is disclaimed.

“ The means proposed are moral influences. To have any effect, they must find their way into the mind and heart of the slave-holder. The end, which we call abolition, the slave-holders consider a request to give up, waste, annihilate, what they estimate to be worth to them about five hundred millions of dollars

“ The moral influence, which is to work this stupendous miracle in their hearts, is first to commence by persuading them that they are guilty of atrocious crime; then, it is to make them penitent for their deep transgressions, — and as penitence is nothing without reformation, they are to be induced to part with this accumulation of ill-gotten wealth, and surrender it at the instigation of an authorized minister of the gospel of peace!!”

A modern Moses! And the king of Egypt said unto them, ‘ Wherefore do ye, Moses and Aaron, let the people from their work? get you unto your burdens.’” — *Exodus*, v. 4.

“ An Unitarian clergyman goes on a desperate enterprise, when he attempts to awe men or frighten them into a compliance with his will. He may deride, if he pleases, the arrogance of the slave-holder, and describe it as the consequence of power habitually maintained over one or two hundred dependents; but what will the slave-holder say, in return, of that temper of mind which ventures to intimidate five millions of freemen, by menace, denunciation, and indignity.”

Where is the attempt to menace, or intimidate? I do not recollect any, unless he means the menace of the wrath of Heaven for sin. This I should suppose was part of a minister’s vocation.

“ If, indeed, we mean to fight the slaves free, it is of no moment how angry we make their masters; but if we really intend to use

moral means and the powers of persuasion, it is extremely unfortunate that we give them strong reason to believe we are not sincere."

Did David spurn the message of the prophet, who, after explaining to him his sin, said to him, thou art the man?

"The first open question is, does this book and its doctrines interfere with the internal condition and domestic arrangements of the slave-holding States?"

"I say, they are intended to do it. Slavery is established by law; and the object of this publication is to abolish it."

Not so; but to persuade those who have a right to do it, that it is their duty.

"The whole doctrine of his book is, that man, under no possible circumstances, can be rightfully made a slave."

Then was it not the Dr.'s duty to express the opinion, since so much human misery results from holding him in Slavery?

"The force, therefore, that restrains the slave, is oppression, injustice, tyranny, despotism; and if, against all this, a man may not rightfully rebel, if, when he is thus unjustly made a slave for life, and his wife and children are made slaves with him, he may not rise, in his strength or his madness, and shake off his chains, and stand guiltless before God, with the blood of his oppressor on his hands, it is in vain to talk about human rights."

These were the doctrines of our revolution; but abolitionists propose other means for the deliverance of the slave, which shall be more in accordance with the spirit of Christianity. The slave is a man, and knows he is deprived of the rights of a man. Is not this the inference to be drawn from their past insurrections — most of which occurred previous to the anti-slavery movements?

"It is absurd to tell of wrong without remedy. For every human wrong there is a remedy; by law, when the law provides one; and by resistance, when, under the color of law, instead of a remedy we find only a wrong.

"Could we doubt a moment about this, if the law of Carolina should propose to detain every white traveller passing through its territory, and turn him on the plantation as a slave?"

Suppose they should; — should we have a right to remonstrate with them for doing so? or would this be incendiary — the doctrine of insurrection?

“ In such case, the law would be no more invalid and unjust than Dr. C. represents the laws about negro slaves. But is there a heart in New-England that would not beat high with sympathy for the abused white man? Is there an arm that would not reach him a dagger, if it could? Is there a tribunal on earth, or any law of Heaven, that would not excuse — excuse, did I say? — that would not command him to watch for an opportunity, *and make himself free?* ”

“ If a human being is made a slave under color of a law which is nothing but the law of force, which is against right, justice, and the will of God, which gives no title and can convey no property in his person, which is criminal and void in its conception and its continuance, all moral and Christian doctrine, all sound reasoning, and that spirit of humanity which makes man superior to a brute, give him the right of resistance and tell him to use it.”

Would the South permit these sentiments to be read to their slaves? or does the color of the skin deprive this argument of its force?

“ ‘But,’ says Dr. C. — alarmed, unquestionably, at the dangerous precipice to which he was tending — ‘government indeed, has ordained Slavery, and to government the individual is *in no case* to offer resistance.’ ”

“ Such a sentiment is fit only for a slave. It is the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance which was scouted from all human creeds, with the same breath that blew away the divine right of kings, and the dogmatical pretensions of the clergy.

“ Government is to be resisted by the sacred right of revolution, and the inherent and original right of rebellion, in those extreme and dreadful emergencies which carry with them their own justification. If government, when, without right, and against moral principle and Christian duty, it subjects two millions of human beings to abject Slavery, whom God made free, and intends, in his holy will, should continue to be free — if government may not, in such case, be resisted by them, all our sentiments of freedom are wrong — all reverence for our own revolution is folly — all respect for the liberty we enjoy is no more than idle pretension and senseless extravagance.”

Should the great whispering gallery convey these sentiments to the slave — what then? But the author did not mean they should be conveyed to him. He did not address his — books to them

pray do not condemn this pamphlet as incendiary, and unfit to be sent to the South on account of these sentiments. You know the gentleman's motive is to support the system of Slavery, and lengthen its continuance.

“ Dr. Channing is not contented with subverting the principle. He assumes to forbid the sin.”

“ It would be astonishing that, with his intellectual acuteness, he should have disregarded this plain distinction between his own course and his master's, but that we know the power of enthusiasm, like Slavery, ‘ to blind its supporters to the plainest truth.’

“ Where is the authority for the declaration that there can be no property in a human being? In the Bible?”

Yes; as Christ is the Christian's lawgiver, every law, custom, and practice, which is a violation of his laws, is annulled by them. As holding human beings as property, is a flagrant violation of his law of love, the law which commands each of his followers to love his neighbor as himself, which would lead him to consult his neighbor's happiness as much as his own, holding him as property must by this law be sin; and by another law, also — which says, “ Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.” Now if any man feels he would like to be held as property, without the right of choosing his master, to be sold and bartered, as often as the interests or passions of his master might dictate, then has he a right, by this law, to hold his fellow-beings in slavery. Does not Christ forbid the custom, by his example, likewise? Does he not say, “ If any man will serve me — let him follow me;” and again, “ Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.” How? Does he mean to follow his footsteps, or his example? Did Christ keep slaves? Did any of his disciples or apostles?

Paul sent a servant back to his master, and as this circumstance has been alleged in support of the lawfulness of Slavery, let us see how far it goes towards it. He begins his epistle to Philemon, Onesimus's master, by the usual salutations to his friends; he then commends the love, faith, and good works of Philemon, and adds, “ Wherefore I might be much bold in Christ to *enjoin* thee that which is convenient — yet, for love's sake, I rather *beseech* thee, for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds — whom I

have sent again unto thee; thou, therefore, receive him — not now as a servant, but *above* a servant as a brother — beloved. If thou count me therefore as a partner, receive him as *myself*; if he have wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put this on my account; I, Paul, have written it with my own hand, I will repay it. Having confidence in thy obedience, I wrote this unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do even more than I say." Observe, he says, he might be much bold in Christ to *enjoin* him to do it. Does not this imply that, according to the laws of Christianity, he could *enjoin* him to do as he said, but preferred beseeching him because he knew his petition would be attended to, and was more in accordance with his love toward him.

When such arguments, as this circumstance affords, are brought forward in defence of the cause, for want of better, it proves the case a lame one. This circumstance, I think, is the only instance mentioned of their having anything to do with Slavery. It has likewise been asserted, that the term servant, in Scripture, will admit of no other translation than slave. How does this read? Phebe, a slave of Jesus Christ — Peter, a slave of Jesus Christ — is not this David the slave of Saul, the king? Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his slave. Was Canaan the servant of Shem, in the sense that we give to the term slave? Did they not inhabit different countries, of which each of them was the founder? The slave honoreth his master; if ye are my slaves, where is my honor? The translation of these passages in Scripture, you are aware, is servant, and, it appears, will not well bear to be translated slave, or if so, that there were two classes of slaves, the bond slave and the free slave. By the last passage, it appears that a servant, to whatever class he may belong, is bound to honor his master. Why then should we insist that Paul was addressing slaves whenever he addressed servants? Servants, be obedient to your masters, &c. And again, let as many of you as are under the yoke, count their own masters as worthy of all honor, that the name of God and of his doctrine be not blasphemed. (How? by giving cause to say, that the Christian servant did not honor his master as the heathen servant did.) And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them—(viz. their servants,) because they are brethren — but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit; these things teach and exhort — if

any man teach otherwise, &c. he is proud, knowing nothing, &c. Are not these the doctrines that our Christian ministers teach our hired servants? If he should offer the really pious hired servant different advice from this, would he be listened to as a Christian minister? The apostles would no doubt have given the same advice to slaves: but can this be construed into an approval of Slavery? The abolition writings inculcate obedience on the part of the slave, and a patient endurance of their condition; but yet they detest the system of Slavery on account of its sinfulness, and counsel the master to bestow on the slave his freedom.

Many other customs and practices prevailed in the time of our Saviour, that pious Christians of all denominations have ever denounced as sinful, which he left no direct precept to forbid. The amusements of the circus, the theatre, and amphitheatre, in which the lives of men were sacrificed by wild beasts, and in many other ways, he did not so much as name, or forbid, except by his example. How would he have looked at such places? Do we ever read of his attending them? Duelling, piracy, and polygamy escaped his direct censures; — but how could a man engage in a duel with deadly weapons, without risking the life of his opponent? Therefore, does he not violate the law, 'Thou shalt not kill?' Do not pirates intend to take the lives of the possessors of the property they are in quest of, if they cannot obtain it any other way? there, the same law is violated. Do they obtain it without taking life? even then the law 'Thou shalt not covet,' is violated. The custom of polygamy is condemned by implication, when he says, 'for this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.' He does not say wives, or they three or they twenty shall be one flesh.

Thus we see his laws reach every case of crime, though he seldom specifies even those of the most criminal character.

The remarker asks if Dr. C. finds authority in history, for the declaration, that there can be no property in a human being. I reply that he does there find authority for this assertion.

Consult history and we shall find that its pages does not sanction holding human beings as property by any title or claim that we possess for holding them as such. Man is a free agent; he owns himself; and while he does so, has a right to barter

himself, or his services, for any good that may seem to him an equivalent.

History will show that the victims of Slavery mentioned in its pages, previous to the comparatively modern scheme of kidnapping them in Africa, became so by some voluntary act that reduced them to that condition. Captives taken in war were considered the lawful property of the captors. The man, therefore, that engaged in war, knew the risk he was running of placing himself in Slavery.

I believe it will be found that most of the wars undertaken in ancient times were carried on by volunteers to the service. In the civilized countries of those periods, war was considered the most honorable profession, the direct road to glory, and to the highest distinction of state. This motive crowded their ranks to overflowing, and was an inexhaustible source of Slavery. As war is the natural instincts of barbarians, they likewise furnished their full quota to the slave market, fully aware of their fate, in case of the failure of their enterprise. As the result to both parties was exactly reciprocal, it must have tended greatly to reconcile the victim to his lot.

The class of debtors likewise greatly increased the supply of the slave market. In ancient times, the personal services of the debtor were considered as lawfully due to the creditor, where the property of the debtor was not sufficient to satisfy his demands. If he did not need his services himself, he had a right to sell him to another, till his claims were satisfied. This law prevailed even among the Jews, with the proviso that they should go out free every seventh year. As running in debt is a voluntary act, the person who did it consented to this condition of the act; and whether he had or had not reason to complain of it as an oppression, it must have been an ameliorating reflection that he was suffering by the operation of a law that was binding on a whole community, and not confined to any particular class, of which he might happen to be a member. Many crimes were then punished with Slavery, (for it was not then considered an enviable condition, preferable to a state of freedom,) as these crimes were always voluntary, the criminal had no reason to complain of his lot, or of the laws which subjected him to it. These circumstances operated, no doubt, to keep the slaves in a state of tranquillity, favorable to the states in which they formed so numerous a class; as men will always suffer more patiently

the evils they have brought on themselves, than those that are unjustly inflicted on them by others.

Man-stealing was then considered a capital offence, and punished with death. It consisted, in seizing by violence, a man who had, been guilty of no crime, who had by no voluntary act, incurred the penalty of Slavery, and reducing him to that condition. Now let us consider the means that have been employed to supply our market with this commodity.

The ancestors of all our slaves were Africans. Had they ever committed any offence against our laws, or against any individual in our community? On which of the above claims, then, do we found the right of fitting out vessels, with every necessary preparation of manacles, chains, and cartwhips, powder, balls, and muskets, knives, daggers, and swords, trinkets, rum and tobacco, to go to the coast of Africa, there to seize on its unsuspecting, and innocent (as respects ourselves) inhabitants, to cram the holds of these "*floating hells,*" with victims, to supply our Christian market with slaves? Have not these guiltless inhabitants of a foreign land been, without any shadow or pretence of right but that of force, feloniously kidnapped by American men-stealers, on their own shores, while pursuing their peaceful avocations, within view of their own quiet dwellings? Nay, more; have not their dwellings been forcibly entered, and their defenceless inhabitants violently torn from them? Have not their little children, while indulging in their sports and gambols under the shade of their paternal palms, or pursuing the the gilded butterfly, or angling innocently at the brook, been inhumanly seized upon, and torn from their frantic parents, as lawful prey? Have not whole villages been enveloped in the midnight flame, while their unsuspecting inhabitants were quietly enjoying the repose of sleep, in order to seize on the wretched victims while endeavoring to make their escape from the devouring element. Have not the pretended disciples of him, who said, "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God," gone amongst them, and, by all the arts and allurements that have ever been found to rouse the unchristianized heart to action, sown discord and fomented wars between neighboring chiefs, in order to purchase the captives on both sides? For what? To supply our liberty-boasting, gospel-loving, and highly professing Christian community, with their cargo of human souls. To be thenceforth, with their latest posterity, considered our lawful property.

But our slave-holders were not guilty of the heinous act above stated — therefore should not be styled men-stealers. True; but does not purchasing the cargo of the man-stealer support the trade? Have we a right to inherit stolen property? Do we support the doctrine that the manner of obtaining property, does not in the least affect the right of possession? I appeal to professors of Christianity. Let them answer.

Permit me now to solicit attention to a few remarks on the subject of Slavery, as alluded to in the Bible, as this sacred book is referred to in justification of our system of slave-holding. Let us institute a short comparison between our system, and that mentioned in the Scriptures, which has been brought forward in justification of ours.

In the first place, the example of Abraham has been quoted, the first of the Patriarchs, the father of the faithful, to whom, for his faithfulness, and obedience, "because he knew he would command his household and his children after him, that they should keep the way of the Lord, to do justice, and judgment; to whom also was made the promise, by covenant, "that in him and in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed," as giving sanction to our system of Slavery. And what was the system of Slavery as practiced by Abraham? Let us try to get hold of it. The first mention that is made of it is in these words: "and when Abraham had heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, *born in his house*, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them to Dan," (a distance of several days journey) and in the end brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot. Now, because Abraham called these men his servants born in his house, it is affirmed that they were his slaves, and subject to the same treatment as our slaves. But what are the evidences of this? Does not the account just given go to disprove the assertion? Would our slave-holders trust themselves with this number of their slaves, fitted and equipped for battle, in a foreign country, without first promising them their liberty as a reward for their services? If the expedition did not lead them beyond the limits of our jurisdiction, the inhabitants of the countries which they passed would be bound to protect them from the insurrection of their slaves. Notwithstanding this, I question whether any one of them would dare to do it — much less to take them into a foreign country.

Again, where is the account of their task-masters, beatings, and mutilations? Is not the history of Abraham's life replete with evidence that this was not the kind of treatment his subjects received, nor the condition to which they were reduced? The next mention that is made of them, Abraham is complaining that he was childless, and that the steward of his house was *this* Eleazar of Damascus, whom, by his manner of expressing himself, he did not much like. He then continues, "Behold to me thou hast given no seed; and one born in my house is my heir." Does it not appear by this complaint that by some law of the times regulating the succession to government, and the heirship to property, that Abraham did not feel himself at liberty to choose his heir? that, by this law, it was to be inherited by a servant born in his house, probably by that elder servant he afterwards mentioned, "that ruled over all he had." Else, why not have selected his heir from among his kindred? for whom he appears to have retained a strong affection, as is evident from his having, after this, sworn his servant to select a wife for his son Isaac, from amongst them. Do not these facts prove and many others, that the relationship between Abraham and his servants was rather that of ruler and subject, than that of despot and slave?

Mention is likewise made of servants bought with his money. These, no doubt, were procured from the classes already enumerated, who had forfeited their liberty by some voluntary act, which made it lawful to purchase them. These were probably their domestic servants; and we do not read that they were treated differently from those born in his house, or houses within his jurisdiction; for it is not probable the three hundred and eighteen males selected, for actual service, with a proportionate number of females, and others unfit for service, were born in one house; especially as it is stated that his dwelling was a tent.

After this, we find Abraham calling the eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all that he had, and praying him to put his hand under his thigh, (the form of administering an oath, at the time) and swear to him, by the God of Heaven, that he would not take a wife to his son Isaac of the daughters of the Canaanites, but go into Abraham's country, to his kindred, and take a wife unto his son Isaac. Do our slaves choose wives for their master's sons? The servant swears — and departs, with ten camels, and other servants,

probably as many as ten, (for all the goods of his master were in his hands.) At the first interview of the servant, or slave, (if thus you call him,) with the damsel who became Isaac's wife, we find him taking a golden ear-ring, of half a shekel's weight, and two bracelets for her hands, of ten shekels of gold, and presenting them to her, inquiring of her if there was room in her father's house for him and his company? We soon find him in her father's house and her brother providing for his camels, and giving *him* water to wash his *feet*, and the men's feet that were with him. Is this the way slaves are received? and all this before he had told his errand. When he had told it and was favorably received, "he brought forth jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment, and gave them to Rebecca, and also gave precious things to her mother and brother." Are our slaves sent on long journeys, entrusted with ten camels, and as many slaves, loaded with the goods of their master, through countries not under our jurisdiction, with discretionary powers to select wives for their master's sons, and to dispose of his goods as they please? Do the masters pray their slaves to do thus and so? If so, then is the parallel not unfavorable to our slave-holders, and may be brought in justification of their system. Nothing, in the whole account, can be construed into evidence that Abraham's servants were harshly treated. We find Sarah at one time requesting her husband to send one of her bond-maids away. And why? because she said "she was despised in her eyes;" her son was sent away with her, because Sarah saw him mocking, (probably herself;) this was not jealousy; she was justified by the Almighty, who bid Abraham to comply with her request, but promised a blessing on Ishmael because he was Abraham's son.

These are all the circumstances related respecting Abraham's servants, excepting that they were all to partake of the covenant of circumcision, both the servant born in his house, and the one bought with his money; and can we infer from them, that their condition was at all similar to that of our slaves?

We next come to the bondage of the children of Israel in Egypt, which originated in Joseph's being sold by his brethren to the Midianites, who sold him to Potiphar, "an officer of Pharaoh's and captain of the guard." How was this slave treated by his master? Why, he was made "overseer of his house, and all that he had; he left all he had in Joseph's hand; he knew not aught that

he had, save the bread which he did eat." After this, believing a false accusation against him, he was wroth with him, and cast him into prison. The manner of his release we know. It proved the means of placing him as ruler over Pharaoh's house, and all his people, slave though he were — "Only on the throne will I be greater than thou."

This led the way for the introduction of Joseph's family into Egypt. How were they received by Pharaoh? "The land of Egypt is before thee — in the best of the land, make thy father and brethren to dwell. In the land of Goshen let them dwell." Gen. 47. And Joseph placed his father and brethren in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Ramases, as Pharaoh had commanded." After this, compelled by famine, the Egyptians, the subjects of Pharaoh, sold not only their possessions, but themselves also as servants to Pharaoh, in order to procure bread for themselves, and seed to sow the land to prevent another famine. They were then furnished with seed to sow their land, on condition that they should give a fifth part of the increase to Pharaoh, by way of tax. It is scarcely to be doubted, that, as the Israelites were strangers, and had their land given them by Pharaoh, and became his subjects, that they held it on the same condition as his other subjects.

When, therefore, another Pharaoh arose, who knew not Joseph, and who did not feel himself bound by the same obligations of gratitude and esteem to treat his descendants with the same favor that had been shown to their ancestors, in the time of Joseph — we read that they were greatly oppressed by him. In what way? We do not read that they were dispossessed by him of their possessions, of the best of the land; on the contrary they commenced their journey from the land of Ramases, the land which Pharaoh had given them. They had their dwellings amidst those of the inhabitants of the land; descendants, probably, of the families that happened to be located there at the time of their taking possession, and they were so similar to the dwellings of the other inhabitants, by which they were surrounded, that it was found necessary to put a mark on them, to distinguish them from the others, when the angel of the Lord passed through to smite their oppressors. In what, then, consisted their oppressions? Let us read Exodus 1. "Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph; and he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are

more, and mightier than we; come on, now, let us deal *wisely* with them; — lest they multiply, and it come to pass that when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land." (The doctrine of expediency this.) "Therefore, they did set over them *task-masters* to afflict them with their burden; but the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. The Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigor; they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and brick, and in all manner of service in the field." He likewise gave orders that all the sons of the Hebrew women should be destroyed at their birth; but the Hebrew women did not suffer this affliction, — his agents being too merciful to attend to them. Their great oppression, then, consisted in having *task-masters* placed over them to compel them to work beyond their strength, as appears by the expression of the Almighty to Moses: "And the Lord said, I have surely seen the afflictions of my people, which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry, by reason of their *task-masters*; for I know their sorrows, and I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians." Did he fail of his purpose?

Moses was the instrument by whom the message of the Most High, to let the children of Israel go free, was delivered to Pharaoh. He said, "Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice, to let Israel go? I know not the Lord; neither will I let Israel go." And he said to Moses and Aaron, "Wherefore do you let the people from their works? Get ye to *your* burdens; and Pharaoh commanded, the same day, the *task-masters* and their officers, saying, Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore. Let them go and gather straw for themselves. And the tale of the bricks which they did make heretofore, ye shall not diminish, for they be idle; therefore, they cry, saying, Let us go and sacrifice to our God." Thus, by reason of the message, their burdens were increased. When they complained to Pharaoh, his constant reply was, "ye are idle, ye are idle."

The children of Israel, finding this to be the effect of the message, began to reproach Moses and Aaron with having increased the hardships of their lot, — saying, "The Lord look upon you and judge, because ye have made our savor to be abhorred by Pharaoh." Moses likewise began to fear he had been an instrument of evil; for he said, "Lord, wherefore hast thou so evil entreated this people? Why is

it that thou hast sent me? For, since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name, he has done evil to this people; neither hast thou delivered them at all."

Though this people were thus oppressed by Pharaoh, in having task-masters set over them, we do not read they wrought without wages. They made no complaints of this. When Pharaoh's daughter was engaging Moses' mother to take the child and nurse him for her, not knowing her to be his mother, "she said to her, take this child away and nurse it for me, and I will give thee thy wages."

Throughout the relation, there is no account of personal bondage, no indications of it, no signs or evidences. The Israelites could retire to their dwellings at night, be encircled by the objects and pledges of their affection, and go to repose on beds of their own providing, unharrassed by the fear of being roused from a bed of plank, by the cane of a master, or the broomstick of perhaps a still more capricious mistress, as their real or imaginary wants may direct.

If oppressions like these, which have been shown to be far less grievous than those to which the personal bondage of the colored slave subjects him in our country, called forth the interference of an all-merciful and impartial God, what may we not expect from him, if he is the same to-day, yesterday, and forever, unless we repent and forsake our sins towards them.

Let us now enter into a short examination of the kind and character of Slavery that existed among the children of Israel after their settlement in the promised land. In the first place, we find that it was all under the regulation of law. No irresponsible power was to be exerted over the slave. We read nothing about *task-masters*; these, probably, being held in abhorrence.

From the laws given by Moses, we may come at a pretty correct idea of their condition. I shall give them as they come in course. They are to be found in Ex. 21: Lev. 25: Deut. 15: Deut. 23.

The Hebrew servant was, in no case, to serve longer than six years, unless by his own choice; in the seventh, he was to go out free. If a man-servant, and he were married when he came into service, his wife must go out with him. If, during the period of his service, his master gave him a wife from among his servants, and he had children by her, the wife and children were not to go out with him; be-

cause evidently (as the Hebrew was not permitted to marry any other than a Hebrew woman) her time of service was not yet expired, unless it commenced prior to or at the exact period of his.

A proviso is, however, made for the man who did not like to be separated from his family, during the remaining period of her service. If he found himself so well situated in his master's family, that he preferred remaining with him forever, viz. during his life time * he had a right to do so; and by the ceremony of boring the ear, relinquished his freedom forever; he did not bind his children to serve after him, nor himself to serve his master's posterity. It was because he loved his master that he bound himself to him.

It seems, by the succeeding paragraph, that women were sometimes betrothed to men, and then sold to them, that they might have an opportunity to ascertain before marriage how she would please him as a wife. If she did not please him, he was to let her be redeemed, and if he took another wife, her food and raiment and duty of marriage he was not to diminish. If he did not these things she was to go out free without money. Probably, by this law, domestic qualities were regarded in the choice of a wife.

Verse 16 of the same chapter says, "And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death."

He was not, it seems, to steal him even from the neighboring nations, whom the Almighty abhorred and was about to exterminate for their sins.

Verse 20th of the same chapter says, "If a man *smite* his servant or his maid with a *rod*, and she die under his hand, he shall surely be punished; but if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished; he is his money."

How does this differ from our laws on manslaughter. There was no malice aforethought; at least so our laws consider it, on the ground that it is better that ten guilty men escape, than that one innocent man perish.

His being his money was likewise a circumstance in his favor. Observe the word *smite*. This word is never, in any passage of Scripture employed to mean scourge, whip, or flog, it is one blow. †

* Cruden observes (who I believe is considered good authority by Christians,) that when forever is applied to man, it means his life time, or some limited period, and brings many passages to prove it. When applied to the Deity, it means eternity, because he is eternal.

† See *smite*, scourge, stripes, strike, in Cruden.

Observe, likewise, the word *rod*. If he had smitten him with an iron instrument, it would, by their laws, have been murder.

These six cities shall be a refuge &c. that every one that killeth any person unawares may flee thither, and if he smite him with an instrument of iron, so that he die, he is a murderer : the murderer shall surely be put to death. Num. 35 : 15.

The law, therefore, could not mean, if he whipped, flogged or beat him till he caused his death, he should not be punished. We do not read they ever employed this mode of punishment on their slaves ; and if they did, their laws forbade more than forty stripes for one offence, and no law to prevent a fellow servant from giving evidence against his master if he exceeded.

Verse 20 of the same chapter says, " If a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish, he shall let him go free for his eyes' sake ; if he smite out his man-servant's tooth or his maid-servant's tooth, he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake." If mutilations were to give freedom to our slaves, how many would now remain in bondage ?

Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee, he shall dwell with thee ; even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best. Thou shalt not oppress him. Deut. 23 : 15

The Hebrew servant was not to be subjected to any kind of ill treatment. It is often repeated — Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, for they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt.

When the African becomes a member of Christ's church, partakes of his communion at the table of his saints, is he not Christ's servant ? and should he not partake of the benefits of this law ?

The heathen bond-servants had, probably in most cases, been transgressors of their own laws, or captives taken in war, and in either case, were likely to be a hardened, stubborn race, therefore more severity was permitted to be exercised towards them.

When the Hebrew servant went out free on the seventh year, he was not to go away empty, — he was to be furnished liberally " out of the flock, and the flour, and the wine-press ; of that wherewith the Lord thy God, hath blessed thee, thou shalt give unto him." The heathen servant was not to partake of the benefit of the law of release ; they were to be held as a possession, and to be inherited by

their children after them forever, or (according to Cruden) until the year of Jubilee, which is in accordance with the words of the decree, "Then thou shalt cause the trumpet of the Jubilee to sound; in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet to sound; and ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the *inhabitants* thereof. It shall be a Jubilee unto you, and ye shall return every man to his family."

I think I have given all the laws relative to the treatment of the Jewish servant contained in the books of Moses, and they are all the passages which throw light on his condition.

We see by them that cruel and inhuman treatment of any class was forbidden; that no law existed to prevent their being instructed in all the arts and knowledge of the country; they were to be circumcised, and to partake of the passover, and to assist at their solemn assemblies; they were to do no servile work on the Sabbath, or at the time of their holy convocations, which happened three times a year, and lasted seven days. During the year of release, which was every seventh year, the ground was to lie fallow, and even the spontaneous fruits of the earth were not to be gathered, as the possession thereof belonged to the poor of the land.

One word now on the justification of holding the Africans in slavery as being the descendants of Ham. Noah was a descendant in direct line from Seth. Every other branch of the posterity of Adam was cut off by the flood. Was Seth's posterity black? Why? Ham was the second son of Noah. It was on Ham's youngest son, Canaan, that the curse, "a servant of servant's shall he be to his brethren," fell. Did this curse change the color of Canaan's skin? How does his honor, McDuffie, make it out that the Africans are descendants of Ham? Can he show his authority? "The border of the Canaanites was from Sidon as thou camest to Gerar, unto Gaza as thou goest unto Sodom and Gomorrah, and Hilmah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha." These cities are included in the country of Palestine; as its climate is temperate, I should infer that its inhabitants were not black, but tawny, as we see them at the present day.

This was the country whose inhabitants the children of Israel were commanded by God to dispossess of their land, and to cut off as a nation for their *sins*. "And Israel vowed a vow to the Lord and said, If thou wilt indeed deliver this people, (viz. the Canaan-

ites) into my hands, then will I utterly destroy their cities. And the Lord hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered them the Canaanites, and they utterly destroyed them and their cities. And he called the name of the place Hormah." Num. 21st and 3d.

After this, we find some remnants of them in possession of some of the strong-holds of the country; these became tributary to the Israelites. Thus I suppose was fulfilled the curse, "a servant of servant's shall he be to his *brethren*," as the patriarchs, to whom the descendants of Ham became tributary, were the offspring of Shem, the brother of Ham, in direct line. [See the genealogy of Abraham.] Canaan, as we have stated, was the founder of a nation, and as independent of his brethren till this time, (for anything we read in disproof) as his brethren were of him. We never read of his being in personal bondage to any of them. Could it be proved that he was, would this give us a claim to the African's service, unless we could prove his descent from Canaan, and our own from Shem, as it was to his brother his services were due.

Afterwards, it is said "God will put out those nations before thee by little and little; thou mayest not *consume* them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee" Deut. 7. By this it appears they were ultimately consumed. If not, can McDuffie shew this emigration of a colony of them to Africa?

Is it not as rational, and as consistent with our knowledge of facts, to suppose, that the stain of the African's skin has been produced by climate, as that it is the effect of a curse pronounced on his progenitors?

I have read of a colony of Portuguese, who, in times comparatively modern, I forget what century, had migrated to a tropical climate; in the course of a few generations; their skins and hair approximated very much in appearance and color to those of the natives of the country, who were blacks.

Do gentlemen of the free States now say, admitting the African's skin to be stained by climate and not the effect of a curse, that his condition in this country is far worse than that of the Patriarchal, Egyptian, or Israelitish servant or slave, that he has been unjustly, and feloniously obtained from his country, that continuing him in this condition is likely, according to the account of past ages, and the denunciations of the Omnipotent on the sin of oppression, to call down the vengeance of this avenger of the oppressed on us as a na-

tion? — what then? We have no slaves at home. We have no right to interfere with the institution of slavery in our sister States. Therefore what can *we* do?

Can you not use your utmost influence to procure its abolition in the District of Columbia, and in our Territories? While it remains there, it is a *national* sin, and involves us all in the guilt of its continuance. Our silence, on the subject of its continuance in the Districts, and Territories of the United States, sanctions it in our sister States; and while we sanction it, are we not partakers of the sin? Gentlemen are aware that it is the sin of omission that is to draw forth the malediction of "Depart from me, ye cursed," &c. "For I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat," &c. It is a case of hunger and nakedness and imprisonment, that we plead. And may not abolitionists likewise say, that by reason of your silence on the subject of their petitions, and neglect of using the means in your power, that some of us are scourged, some stoned, some cast into prison, some killed, and some sent shamefully away?

Abolitionists, as a body, do not solicit persecution; they deprecate it — both on their own and their persecutor's account. I believe, however, very many of them have less fear of man who can only kill the body, but after that can do no more, than of him who can cast both soul and body into hell. My best wishes for your welfare, individually, leads me to hope that you may be found of this class also — and that you may henceforth say, No mobocracy — no gag laws. But God speed abolitionists, in doing all they lawfully can to procure the abolition of slavery throughout the world.

"This idea of going behind and beyond the law, to find a rule for human action in civil society is getting to be somewhat alarming.

"One man thinks the law of marriage is a monopoly, and should be abolished; another thinks a distillery is an abomination in the eye of Heaven, and that its owner is out of the protection of mankind. Some men believe that there ought to be a community of goods, by a plain indication of Providence, and some, who do not care much about Providence, join in the denunciation of the laws. Some men think that the transportation of the Sunday mail is a great violation of holy time, and if they had their way would lay a weekly embargo on the post-office. Some men think that the law which punishes a felon with death, involves the whole country in the guilt of murder. Indeed, there is no end to the vagaries of the human intellect. If we once go beyond the law to ascertain in

what property or rights consist, we put everything in society on the wild ocean of uncertainty. The law is the expression of public wisdom. When in public judgment it is wrong it will be changed.

Is public sentiment always correct? A whole world was once destroyed, because the public wisdom of the times was not in accordance with the wisdom which is from above.

“If our Supreme Court could be asked the question whether human law could convey any right of property against the principles of sound morality, religion and the will of God, I have no doubt they would by an unanimous opinion decide that it could not. If they had to adjudicate on the question whether the law of Massachusetts before the constitution of 1780 did make property of a slave, they would as readily decide that it did. They have done so again and again.”

Then they must decide the law of Massachusetts before the constitution of 1780 was not contrary to the principles of sound morality, religion, and the will of God, and therefore did make property of a slave. They could not decide that they were inconsistent with the will of God, therefore could not convey any right of property, and then say, that they did make property of a slave — unless they acted on the dough-face principle.*

“If there is no law of the land that prohibits the free discussions of the most dangerous and exciting subjects of public inquiry; if the necessary freedom of popular government does not permit the arm of the law to stop the pen or the press, it is on the presumption — which, like other fictions of law, is sometimes strangely at variance with fact — that there is a moral and prudential principle, quite as operative and efficacious for the protection of society. It is on the presumption that they who have the power to move the mass of the community, will have the discretion to do it wisely; that they, who by their education, talents, and learning, “preaching to stones would make them moveable,” will take care that they do not remove the foundation stones upon which the temple of national liberty is erected.”

Yes, and they will take care, if the old stones prove defective, and

* Apropos of dough-face; Did or did not the conduct of the Northern delegation, in the time of Randolph, justify that Quiz in coining this vilifying epithet? Whether it did or not, let us make a compromise with the South, when we give up the right of speaking upon Slavery, that they also expunge this word from their vocabulary.

not likely to support the edifice, to supply their places with new ones, which will be likely to answer the purpose.

“ I know very well that Dr. Channing disclaims ‘ agitation’ and all ‘ indiscriminate and inflammatory vituperation of the slaveholder.’ But how much better than such vituperation are the highly-colored and exciting pictures of sin, ruin, disgrace, which this modern Angelo brings upon his canvass, in the freshness of instinctive life. How much more excusable are his strong appeals to duty and pride of character, and the lofty spirit of our people, which ring like the war-trumpet on the field of battle, to stir up the passions of mankind. But, are they true? Suppose they are. How much is this a reason for quietness and peace. How much is the artist, whose splendid and costly engravings were lately burned by order of a court of justice, excusable because every delineation of his pencil was most exactly faithful to nature. Truth, like nature, may not always be exhibited without the excitement of feelings, appetites and passions, that a wise and practical philosopher would deem it dangerous to move.”

When the ocean is wrought into fury by the sweeping tempest, there is danger to the property embarked on its bosom; yet is the agitation beneficial in its results, giving salubrity to the atmosphere and supplying it with principle necessary to the support of vitality.

Is it true that domestic Slavery is the perpetual and immoveable condition of our national existence?

Let us examine very summarily actual facts. Slavery is now firmly established in fourteen States and Territories of the Union and in the District of Columbia, the centre and common property of the whole. This slave district is the fairest and most fertile portion of the United States. It is the most progressive in population, the most extensive in territory, and of course most likely to advance in influence and political power in the government of the country. Without adopting in their full force all Dr. C.’s disparaging reflections on the character of white men within a slave district, it is obvious that the circumstances under which they are placed are not very favorable to the operation of nice speculative morality when it comes in opposition to direct personal interest. The population, already five millions, will double and quadruple in a short time by force of its natural productiveness and by new immigration. The natives born grow up accustomed to the state of things around them.”

And therefore do not reflect on its sinfulness.

“The immigrants go there acquainted with the laws and customs of the country, which they prefer to those of the adjacent free States. They go to better their worldly affairs, and not as promulgators of a new faith, or reformers of existing principles.”

Yes, they go with their eyes open to the wickedness of the system. Is it strange, then, that they are proverbial for their cruelty? “If the light within you become darkness, how great is that darkness.”

“Slavery is established by law in this vast territory, and always has been from its first settlement by Europeans. This law does not indeed change its proper character, but it is the indication of the sentiment of the people as to that character, and speaks the popular opinion of the country. By force of that law a slave is property, and may be owned, bought and sold as any other article of merchandize. Like articles of merchandize elsewhere, like leather, flour, sugar, cotton, coffee, ships, cloths, paper, or whatever is used among us for property, and with which the industry and enterprize of our citizens is concerned, this species of property is in the slave district the indirect means of a great proportion of all the activity and industry which is there visible in the accumulation of profit. It is an item indeed in the aggregation of capital which is not here particularly the subject of barter, the item, namely, of disposable human labor. It resembles the value which is represented with as by the labor of oxen or horses which we know to be, though immensely less in amount, yet actually of very considerable consideration in the estimate of our New-England wealth.”

At the north we have substituted labor-saving machinery, for the machinery of human bones and sinews, and by it are enabled to offer to the eye of the traveller as great an appearance of comfort, in our cities, towns, villages, houses and cottages, in our roads, and modes of conveyance, notwithstanding our physical disadvantages of soil, climate, as is to be found in the slaveholding section of our country.

With our kind of machinery, how much more comfort they might enjoy than we with our six months frost. I think I should like to go and partake it with them, though I should love my own New-England, still.

“The professed owners of this property are of every grade and class of society in point of wealth, integrity and reputation, from the affluent planter with his thousand negroes, to the day-laborer who owns a single boy perhaps to diminish his mechanical drudgery; from the

statesman of high intelligence, and the clergyman of acknowledged probity, whose domestic establishments are served by their bondsmen and bondswomen, to the keeper of the gambling house or the bagnio, to whose deeds of infamy these servile subjects lend their enforced assistance. It is doubtful whether in the free States there is any one article of property which enters so extensively and minutely into all the ramifications of society. Our society is more divided into portions and detachments, having a general connection, to be sure, but not that intimate and close union which binds the inhabitants to the common interests of Slavery. When our woollen interest was threatened, the manufacturers of cotton thought they could get along pretty well. When our navigation interest was in danger, the commerce of the country most closely allied to it did not feel the apprehension of immediate dissolution. If at this moment any one or two of our most productive occupations were closed by a war or a tariff that should ruin them, the rest might go on with only their proportional share in the common calamity. But Slavery, wherever it exists, is the sensorium of the country. It is the one nerve which runs through the whole political body, and connects every part of it with the seat of life."

As long as it is the one nerve, other nerves will lie dormant — paralyze this nerve, others will come into action, which, by their combined influence and power, will produce a healthier and more powerful system.

"Before Slavery can cease in the United States, this vast property must be annihilated. It must be surrendered by consent of its owners or wrested from them by force of law.

"Two hundred and fifty millions of dollars must be sacrificed by about four millions of people."

What does this prove but that the slaves are wronged out of this amount of property? It appears to me a man has a title to himself, if he has a title to anything.

Slavery must be put down by force, or surrendered by consent of owners, and until the New-Englander can be convinced of the duty of bestowing his property, acquired by honest industry, as a "votive offering," for the redemption of the slave, the slave-holder may innocently retain his grasp on property, to which, by the laws of God, he was never entitled; and it is the extreme of childishness and folly to expect, or even to hope, that for the mere bauble of eternal life, and securing an inheritance in the Paradise of God, he may be induced to relinquish it.

The New-Englander must likewise be convinced that his sugar, rice, and tobacco, will come to him at as cheap a rate as they now do, or he will be likely to make some little resistance to the Dr.'s glorious scheme of universal emancipation. This is the substance of the remarks omitted here.

“ Dr. Channing proposes to melt the iron chain of the slave by the soft breath of peace; he expects to dissolve his fetters by the charm of words.

“ He tells the slaveholder that he cannot have property in a human being — that to hold him as property is ‘to inflict a great wrong, to incur the guilt of oppression;’ ‘that man has received sacred, inalienable rights, which are violated by Slavery.’ That Slavery is a mighty evil, and he proceeds to argue out these positions with all the learning of the schools.

“ If he spoke with the voice of an Archangel, and carried conviction to every planter in the whole region of Slavery, it is hard to believe that such conviction would have any effect. Human nature must be improved and sublimated vastly beyond its present standard before such arguments on such a subject would have any practical effect.

“ But the whole of this reasoning will fall on deaf ears and marble hearts. It will not be credited for a moment. Education, custom, habits, all the forms of society, all the modes and manners of life combine to raise an atmosphere that will not transmit the sound. The law of the land refutes it. The teachings of the reverend, the learned, the eminent among them confound it. The immortal leader of the armies of freedom was a slaveholder.”

But gave freedom to his slaves in view of the approach of death.

“ The draftsman of the Declaration of Independence was a slaveholder.”

But said, when speaking of its sinfulness, that he trembled for his country when he considered that God is just.

“ Mathias professed to be a prophet. The elect Lady claimed to work miracles. The Mormonites have some pretence to supernatural power, but none of them ever ventured on a greater extravagance than this. In a contest with Slavery, the church itself would be destroyed, so far at least as its influence in other respects would be concerned. But the church is first to be persuaded. The church at the south is composed of slave-holders. Its priests and its levites are slave-holders. Its temples are erected, its altars are maintained, its offerings are purchased with the labor of slaves.”

No wonder, then, that its synods, and conferences, have decided that agitating the subject of abolition, is more sinful than holding human beings in Slavery.

When nations are to perish in their sins,
'Tis in the church the leprosy begins.

This plague-spot was on our churches at the commencement of our political career, or the great mass of society would not now be quaking in apprehension of mortal agonies, from its contagious and fatal influences.

“But, says Dr. C., ‘Government should devote itself to this, as its great object. Legislatures should meet to free the slave.’”

The Dr. evidently meant the legislatures of the slave-holding States.

“There is yet another day-dream of the learned Doctor, which would amuse us by its extreme childishness, if the honest simplicity in which it is made, did not redeem it from ridicule.

“‘Were the colored population (of the slave States) to be assembled in Sunday schools, and were the whites to become their teachers, a new and interesting relation would be formed between the races, and an influence be exerted which would do much to ensure the gift of freedom.’”

“There is certainly no gainsaying this proposition. The overseer might teach them their catechism. The field-driver, somewhat accustomed to the task of instruction, might give them lessons in the alphabet; and the masters, when they were further advanced, might impress upon their minds Dr. Channing’s homilies on the theory of property, and prove that all claim to it in a human being is altogether false and groundless.”

Childish indeed, in the Dr. to wish that the slave might be instructed in the religion of Jesus, by their white brethren, and that they should be qualified to read his laws and precepts themselves!

“With all our author’s modes and appliances to boot, it hardly seems that he contemplates a substantial freedom to the slaves. He puts them like a boy on his coasting-sled, but seems to dread the velocity of their motion, and to try vainly to stop them in their way.

“It is rather a transfer of masters than a freedom from all ownership, that is proposed. It is not, after all, that the slave is not to be considered as property, but that he is not to be the property of the present claimants. Thus it is said:

“It may be asked whether, in calling the slave-holding States to abolish property in the slave, I intend that he should be immediately set free from all his present restraints. By no means. Nothing is further from my thoughts. The slave cannot rightfully and should not be owned by the individual. But, like every other citizen, *he belongs to the community*; he is subject to the community, and the community has a right and is bound to continue all such restraints as its own safety, as the well-being of the slave demand. It would be cruelty, not kindness, to the latter, to give him a freedom which he is unprepared to understand or enjoy.’

“I confess I do not understand this nice distinction. I am sure the slave would not comprehend it. Whether he is under one man or all men, he is a slave still. How he can cease to be property and yet belong to the community I do not perceive.”

Is not the gentleman subject to the laws of the community in which he resides? and does he see no difference between his case and that of the slave?

“It was for no high moral objects that the insurrection in St. Domingo was excited.”

It was in defence of their freedom, which had been granted them in a case of great public emergency, to induce them to fight for the preservation of the colony. Sometime after this, when efforts were made to reduce them again to a state of bondage, in the struggle between the whites and blacks, the horrors were committed by both parties, of which so much has been said to prove the dangers of emancipation, and likewise the sanguinary disposition of the blacks, while the horrors committed by the whites are passed over in silence.

I have said it was in defence of their freedom they fought, and not to obtain it. Perhaps the gentleman makes a distinction between fighting to obtain freedom, and fighting in defence of it, as he seems to justify a resort to arms in one or the other of these cases.

“It was for no moral improvement that the liberated slaves of that garden of the West-Indies have made it comparatively a desert.”

Recent accounts do not represent it as a desert. Gentlemen are well aware of these facts; yet I did not like to let his allusion to St. Domingo pass unnoticed.

“If the object which our author proposes is impracticable, the book is useless. If Slavery be the law of our national existence it is

idle to urge its abolition. But we are pressed with a strong moral obligation."

"We are bound, it is said, to use every virtuous influence for the abolition of Slavery. 'We are bound to encourage a manly religious discussion' of it."

"I wholly deny this proposition."

Why is discussion so much deprecated by the supporters of Slavery? Is it that they fear it will cause insurrection among the slaves? Or do they fear more that it may have a tendency to arouse the consciences of some of the pious old ladies of the South to an examination of the subject. Somehow or other they are a class that, when they get hold of a matter, inquire and inquire, and talk and talk about it, till their husbands and sons are glad to do something to satisfy them, in order to get rid of hearing any more about it. Thus what they cannot accomplish by power, they bring about by the want of it. Is it not so?

While on the subject of the ladies, permit me to suggest, whether the right of talking at home, and the right of petitioning their high-minded and chivalrous lords in their legislative halls, are all the means in their power of influencing the councils of the nation. Is it treating them with the courtesy prescribed by the regulations of chivalry, to nail all their petitions to the table? more especially, when the prayer of their petition is to obtain protection for a large class of their sex from the very injuries and insults for which the order of chivalry was originally instituted?

"I see no obligation to interfere with the domestic laws of the South in regard to Slavery any more than with the internal affairs of any private domicile in the country. We have not made those laws and we cannot repeal them. If there are slaves there, they do not belong to us. We cannot give them freedom. If Slavery be a great sin it does not lie upon our consciences.

"I am at a loss to ascertain why this sin of other people, in which we have no agency, bears so heavily on our hearts, unless, like the mother of Cuddie Headrig, in *Old Mortality*, we are ready to exclaim, 'With this auld and brief breath will I testify against the backslidings, defections, defalcations, and declinings of the land, against the grievances and the causes of wrath!'

"But it seems to me, if we are bound to *talk* so much, we may be obliged to *do* something. We must do what we can to give efficacy to our preaching. We must not ease our consciences altogether at

the expense of other people. We must be willing to share the loss which will fall on our dear friends at the South, when they take our gratuitous advice and give liberty to their slaves. Are we ready to do this?"

What compensation had Pharaoh for the same sacrifice? Did the children of Israel leave with him their jewels, ear-rings, &c.

"I feel that our Constitution was a compromise, in which we agreed that each State should, in its own domestic affairs, be sovereign and independent; and that it is the highest infraction of all moral principle to violate the obligations which our contract imposes on us. I cannot reconcile it to my conscience, while I daily and hourly enjoy the blessings of this republican government, to take back any part of the price that was paid for it."

Did our fathers, in this compromise, engage never to discuss this subject among themselves? did the compromise bind our ministers of the gospel not to think of the subject in their closets, or not publicly to express the results of their prayerful examination? Did the Northern patriot bind his patriot son, who should have an opportunity to witness the effects of Slavery on the honor and welfare of our common country, not to express his convictions, if he should find its effects on both to be prejudicial? Did they bind the citizens of the free States never to expostulate with their Southern brethren on the subject? If so, it appears to me they wrote grievousness by a law which their sons should annul in obedience to laws of higher authority.

"I say nothing of the political duty of a citizen of Massachusetts to abstain from conduct which is dangerous to the peace of our fellow-citizens at the South, because men, whose consciences oblige them to carry on a moral war, think nothing of political duty. But I concur most unhesitatingly in the opinion which has been publicly advanced by distinguished jurists among us, and is a very general opinion among the profession of the law, that any measures obviously tending to produce insurrection are equally a violation of political duty as those that are intended to excite it. Men are legally answerable for the natural consequences of their actions."

He forgets the whispering gallery, and his own insurrectionary doctrines.

"Slavery exists. There are more than two millions of slaves among us. What can be done?"

“ To keep them in Slavery is an evil, but not the unmitigated evil which it is represented by the overstrained sensibility of enthusiasts. Heaven in its mercy never permits such unalloyed evil to exist. The slaves as a class are better fed, better clad, less worked, and have less care and anxiety about their condition, than a great proportion of the hard working day-laborers in freedom. As they are deemed to be property, there is no inducement to treat them inhumanly. If the work which they perform is to be performed by anybody, it is not probable that it could be done with less physical suffering than it is by the slaves. Our humanity need not be pained on this account.”*

If such is the depravity of human nature, no better argument could be advanced to prove the sinfulness of the system, which places one human being under the complete and arbitrary control of another, unprotected by law, and deprived even of the right of self-defence, against even the most outrageous cruelty and the most debasing insults.

“ If, however, by some supernatural operation — which is too fanciful to be made the subject of speculation — the owners would consent to give them up, and by a like miracle they could acquire the means of understanding the value of freedom, there are yet other evils of vastly more amount than the present evils of Slavery.

“ Suppose them to emerge from Slavery, intelligent, moral and industrious, with all the capacity and inclinations of the white man.

“ They would be negroes still. Two distinct classes of men could not live upon terms of equality in the same country and under the same government. The more their intelligence, the greater would be the mutual hostility of the two races; and the final possession of power would be the result of a war of extermination, in which one or the other race would perish.

“ Is it supposed they could amalgamate? God forbid! This is a matter of sentiment and taste, to be sure, upon which the feelings are to be umpires. There are those who see nothing disgusting in such an idea. But I fearlessly aver that, if this be the tendency and the result of our moral reformation, rather than our white Saxon race should degenerate into a tribe of tawny-colored Quadroons,

* “ It is doubtful if a child was ever in the slave country compelled to eat its own faces, as was proved in Pike’s case at Salem; or was subjected to the punishment of being tied under its arms and suspended in the vault of a necessary, as was proved in the case of a child of ten years old, in this city, some years since. The case of Washburn vs. Knight, tried in our Supreme Court, was unequalled for a series of cruelties which were proved, to the absolute horror of the jury. A man who would not harm a horse because he is his property, will sometimes delight in torturing a fellow-being, in whose existence he has no pecuniary interest. There are tyrants everywhere.”

rather than that our fair and beautiful females should give birth to the thick-lipped, woolly-headed children of African fathers, rather than the nice and delicate character of the American woman, which in its freshness and its pride is at once the cause and the consequence of civilization, should be debased and degraded by such indiscriminate and beastly connection, rather than the negro should be seated in the halls of Congress, and his sooty complexion glare upon us from the bench of justice, rather than he should mingle with us in the familiar intercourse of domestic life and taint the atmosphere of our homes and firesides, — I WILL BRAVE MY SHARE OF ALL THE RESPONSIBILITY OF KEEPING HIM IN SLAVERY.

If the slave-holders were now as delicate on this subject as you are, where should we find the degenerate, tawny-colored quadroons, of whom you speak? I do not say this to favor the idea of amalgamation. Do the white gentlemen and ladies of the free States select their mates from among the colored people? Do we see the colored people manifesting a strong desire for amalgamating with the whites? One would think from the horror he expresses at the very idea, that he would apprehend little danger from that quarter, unless he thinks his tastes peculiar to himself.

“ Dr. Channing reproveth the abolitionists, and reprobates mobs. In these respects his book conforms to public sentiment. The conduct of the abolitionists is bad, and that of mobs worse; but how one or the other can be the appropriate subject of his animadversion is not easily perceived.

“ A man who adopts his doctrine may be expected to act upon it. A very little infusion of zeal would make such an one a fanatic. If he preserved his reason to enable him to act consistently, and believed his immortal welfare depended on *reforming other people's sins*, he could hardly be blamed for any extravagance of action. The abolitionist, if he is sincere, must be extravagant.”

What acts of extravagance has he yet committed against law or personal security?

“ In respect to mobs, they are well represented as the usurpers of the people's rights, and the impersonation of despotism. It would be well if the sentiment expressed recently in the face of one of them by a worthy Alderman of our City could be adopted by our whole community: Over my dead body — said he — shall they be able to triumph over the laws.

“ Still, to a practical moralist, the question returns, whether he

who does that which will excite a mob, is not in some degree guilty of its excesses."

Then were Paul, Stephen, and others guilty of the excesses they occasioned.

"If we take human nature as we find it, we are sure that men, physically free, will resent what they deem insult and injustice; and, when they know the law will not redress the supposed wrong, that they will take the remedy into their own hands.

"He, therefore, who advertises an abolition meeting, if he has reasonable ground to believe it will produce a disturbance of the public peace, has an account to settle with his conscience, should such disturbance follow.

"If meat — says the apostle — maketh my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world lasteth."

And yet the same apostle says, "Five times received I forty stripes save one, — thrice was I beaten with rods, once stoned, &c. What for?"

"Upon principles of established law, I have some doubt in regard to the legality of meetings which are known beforehand to be the cause of a mob.

"It has long been a law that a mountebank who collects a crowd in the streets in front of his place of exhibition, to the disturbance of the neighborhood, is a nuisance; and what is an abolition meeting but a *new kind of HARLEQUINADE*, in which people are invited to see how the ocean might be bailed dry with a clam-shell?"

"These mobs will cease when such spectacles cease. All good citizens will discountenance them under all circumstances and at all times. But if the tide of popular feeling bursts its barriers and sweeps over the laws, the blame attaches to those whose moon-sick fancies raise these unmanageable floods."

With such ideas, why could he not himself head a mob?

Should these comments be branded with fanaticism, like most other writings which plead for the abolition of Slavery, I shall not regret having published them.

If to believe in the Bible, and in the necessity of obeying its injunctions, be fanaticism, then am I fanatic, and trust I shall glory in the reproach, both in time and in eternity. In obedience to the command, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you do ye even so unto them," I have written them — fully convinced that

were I a slave, and not permitted to plead for myself, I should wish others, who were at liberty to plead for me, to remember my bond as though bound with me.

The term fanatic, as it is now employed, no longer conveys to the virtuous and intelligent mind the exclusive definition which is given to it in our dictionaries, viz: an enthusiast, a man mad with wild notions. It is understood, by them to mean, also, a philanthropist, one who devotes his time and talents to the amelioration of the condition of his race; one who teaches the necessity of obeying the commands and precepts of the gospel, in order to be saved by its author; one who fears God more than man, therefore will not sacrifice his hopes of an "inheritance eternal in the Heavens" for human applause or any temporal interest.

Its application, by people of the "baser sort" to the very efforts which have given immortality to a brilliant constellation of names in the eastern hemisphere, has been the means of giving it this last definition in their minds.

A term which has been employed to stigmatize the proceedings and thwart the sublime and philanthropic efforts of a Wilberforce, Pitt, Fox, Burke, Luther, Calvin, Howard, Hannah More, and a host of others, who devoted their time and talents to the promotion of human welfare, and would be as applicable to the abolition efforts of our Franklin, Rush, Benozet, and Pinkney, as to those which are now being made to effect the same object, can no longer be considered by them as a reproach.

For this reason, I do not deprecate its application to any efforts of mine; and that all my readers may adopt the principles, and pursue that course of conduct which shall entitle them to this meed of praise, is the ardent wish of the writer of these comments.

It appears to me to be due to the supposed feelings of conspicuous abolitionists, to observe that these comments were not written by any of them; as probably they would not like to be suspected as their author.

