



THE

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

NO. VI.—For January, 1837.

THE ballot-box is not an abolition argument. Hence the political parties wasted breath last year in charging abolitionism upon each other as a crime; and they will equally waste breath next year in claiming it is a virtue. Abolitionism knows nothing of parties. It attacks all men as men, without inquiring for whom they vote. It opens its batteries upon the mind and conscience of our common nature, and will play away till the man who goes into office, of whatever party, will, on this subject, have as little desire as he has courage to do otherwise than right.

Abolitionists have but one work,—it is not to put any body into office or out of it, but to set right those who make officers. It is not an action upon state or church, but upon the materials of both. Success will certainly develop itself both through those who make human laws and those who interpret the divine. But it would seem the natural order that it should show itself first through the latter. The interpreters of divine law are, in fact, the chief sinners. They have given license *ad libitum* to manstealing, and it cannot be expected that the statutes of a state should be better than its religion.

Hence, abolitionists will enter carefully upon the inquiry whether or not the christian Scriptures countenance the doctrine that human beings are or may be fit subjects for the right of property. Taking it for granted that these Scriptures, as contained in the Bible of the old and new testaments, are a harmonious whole, they either do or they do not countenance that doctrine. If they do, the believers in a certain "self-evident" truth must fall in with the infidels. If they do not, the visible church, to a great extent,

must fall in with Satan. How every other controversy dwindles to vanity and nothingness in the comparison ! Here is the question of all questions. And it is a question that can be solved. A fair investigation will enable any man to decide with absolute certainty whether the Bible does or does not teach the doctrine referred to.

For ourselves, we are ready to stake the cause we plead on the position that the Bible is irreconcilably at war with every manner and form of slavery—that it both saw and foresaw the sin, and laid the axe eternally at its root. Were the wisest of men, with the best light of this marvellous age, to take advantage of the enthusiasm of a people just rescued from the yoke of bondage, in framing a civil polity whereby all kinds of slavery should be forever excluded, and the manifold tendencies of riches to the oppression of the poor should be everlastingly held in check, we unhesitatingly affirm that he could not excel the polity which God gave to his ancient people by Moses—a polity steeped in anti-slavery, drenched and overflowing with kind regard for the poor, the stranger, and the helpless.

And what shall we say of the new dispensation, of which the Mosaic polity was confessedly but the type and forerunner ? It is one blaze of abolitionism—a fire which at its kindling burnt up yokes and melted chains. Its doctrines, carried out in the humility and universal benevolence of its first converts, made any *special* attack upon slavery as useless as a candle in the noontide sun.

If we have not overstrained the limits of a fair and candid interpretation in getting at these conclusions, what abominable rottenness must be garnered up within the palings of our most ambitious sects ! Real Christianity must—and she will be disenthralled from the putrid carcase to which she has been bound. She will then again breathe freely and go about her work. We shall see, after she gets abroad, what will become of laws declaring *men* to be “chattels personal.”

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1837

NO. 2.

SLAVERY, AND THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

BY REV. SAMUEL CROTHERS, PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, GREENFIELD,
OHIO.

An examination of the Scripture proof that "the Mosaic institutions recognize the lawfulness of slavery," in a pamphlet entitled "*View of the subject of Slavery contained in the Biblical Repertory, for April, 1836, in which the Scripture argument it is believed, is very clearly and justly exhibited.*" Pittsburgh, 1836. *For gratuitous distribution.*"

THE article in the Repertory, of which this pamphlet purports to be a reprint, is ascribed by current, uncontradicted fame to the Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. The circumstances in which it made its appearance at Pittsburgh, and the ground which the author assumes, indicate a change in three respects, within the last year, for which the friends of human rights ought to thank God and take courage.

1. *Slaveholding ministers and their apologists have generally resolved that they will be silent; and that the Professors in Theological Seminaries only, shall discuss the subject with the abolitionists.* This pamphlet was published during the sessions of the General Assembly at Pittsburgh; and was industriously circulated by those members who declared that, in accordance with instructions from the South, they would take no part in the discussion of slavery; and if the Assembly permitted the subject to be agitated, they would leave the house and abandon the Presbyterian church. It would seem from their zeal in circulating the arguments from Princeton, that they were not opposed to having their views defended provided it could be done by

one whom they considered competent. About the same time, at the instance of the members of the Synod of Virginia, the Professors of Union Theological Seminary took the field. In future the advocates for universal liberty will have to fight with neither small nor great, save only with theological professors.

2. *Our opponents have changed their ground.* Dr. Baxter, and the author of the pamphlet before us, declare in substance that if slaveholding be a sin, it ought not to be tolerated in the church for an hour. But they contend that, in itself, it is right, according to the word of God. The former declared, in his speech before the Virginia Synod, that you can never cope with the abolitionists while you admit that slavery is a sin. The latter assigns a more christian-like reason for the position he has taken, viz: to admit that slaveholding is a sin, and in the mean time, contend that it was authorized by the Mosaic institutions, "would bring them into conflict with the eternal principles of morals, and our faith in the divine origin of one or the other must be given up." Hitherto the argument has been, "We are as much opposed to slavery as you. We admit that, in principle, it is sinful, and that its influence is ruinous. But it has been entailed upon us, and Moses allowed the Jews to have slaves," &c. &c. But by the sword of the spirit they have been driven from their entrenchments and compelled to take the open field. This is cheering. We are to have no more whining about our *consciences* and *our unfortunate situation*. The public mind is no more to be shocked by attempts to prove that we ought to live in sin. The man who persuades our children that one part of God's word is at war with another, or with the "eternal principles of morals" is to be classed with infidels. Our professors with a chivalry peculiar to theological professors, or with a confidence peculiar to those who are just girding on the harness, have proclaimed that they will meet the abolitionists, not behind those miserable refuges where their predecessors had concealed themselves for four hundred years, but on the open plain, prepared to decide the matter by the *final appeal*. This is manly.

3. *The character of the contest is changed.* It is no longer merely an effort to put down the abolitionists, and to rivet the chain on millions of the oppressed. *It is open war*

with the God of Heaven. Those who have retired from the discussion used to admit, that although slavery was tolerated in the Jewish church, yet the Scriptures in many places condemn it; and all the perfections of the Almighty are in favor of universal liberty and opposed to oppression in every degree and form. But those who have taken their places are not going to spoil their arguments by any weak admissions. They are going to prove that although the most High glories in the title, *the God that executeth judgment for all that are oppressed*; notwithstanding his threatenings against the sin of oppression, and his many and sore judgments on oppressors, he is himself the patron of slaveholding. And they are going to prove it before the universe from his own word. The matter now to be decided is neither more nor less than the question, What god shall we and our children worship? And if the angel cursed those who held back when the trumpet summoned them to the help of the Lord in putting down the worship of Baal, let those Christians see to it who stand aloof from the present struggle.

The fore front of the battle has been assigned to our theological professors, from the belief that as their time is devoted to the study of the Scriptures and training young men for the ministry, they must be in possession of all the Scripture arguments. We are glad that they have undertaken it. They will either soon overwhelm the abolitionists, or announce that they too are opposed to discussion. In the latter event, slaveholders will perceive that their cause is indefensible, and that they must either turn infidels or break the yoke and let the oppressed go free.

We shall notice but one paragraph in the pamphlet before us—that which points out five ways in which the author assures us the law of Moses allowed men to be made slaves, with the list of texts adduced as Scripture proof.

“It is not denied that slavery was tolerated among the ancient people of God. Abraham had servants in his family, who were bought with his money, Gen. xvii. 13. Abimelech took sheep and oxen, and men servants and maid servants, and gave them to Abraham. Moses finding this institution among the Hebrews and all surrounding nations, did not abolish it. He enacted laws directing how slaves were to be treated, on what conditions they were to be lib-

erated, under what circumstances they might and might not be sold, he recognizes the distinctions between slaves and hired servants, (Deut. xv. 18.) he speaks of the way by which these bondmen might be procured, as *by war, by purchase, by the right of creditorship, by the sentence of a judge*; but not by siezing those who were free, an offence punished by death.* The fact that the Mosaic institutions recognized the lawfulness of slavery, is a point too plain to need proof, and is almost universally admitted. Our argument from this acknowledged fact is, that if God allowed slavery to exist, if he directed how slaves might be lawfully acquired, and how they were to be treated, it is in vain to contend that slaveholding is a sin, and yet profess reverence for the Scriptures. Every one must feel that if perjury, murder or idolatry had been thus authorized, it would bring the Mosaic institutions into conflict with the eternal principles of morals, and that our faith in the divine origin of one or the other must be given up."

We thank the author for the unequivocal acknowledgment that the Mosaic institutions are in harmony with the "eternal principles of morals;" of course any exposition which would bring them in conflict must be false. But we feel pretty confident he will abandon this principle or cease to defend slavery. We also cheerfully admit that if "God regulated slavery it is in vain to contend that it is a sin, and yet profess reverence for the Scriptures." God never regulated sin, nor showed his people how they might lawfully practice it. We wish we could say as much for some ecclesiastical judicatories who professed to act in his name and by his authority. Abolitionists have labored to convince their opponents that these are correct principles; and for saying that those who take contrary ground, slander the word of God, and propagate infidelity, we have been charged with bitterness and fanaticism. Before we notice the list of texts, let us analyze the five ways of slave making.

"By war, by purchase, by the right of creditorship, by

* "On the manner in which slaves were acquired, compare Deut. xx. 14, and xxi. 10, 11; Exodus, xxii. 3; Neh. iv. 4, 5; Gen. xiv. 14, and xv. 3, and xvii. 23; Numbers, xxxi. 9, 35; Lev. xxv. 44, 46."

"As to the manner in which they were to be treated, see Lev. xxv. 39—53; Ex. xx. 10, and xxi. 2—8; Lev. xxv. 4—6."

the sentence of a judge, by birth, but not by seizing those who were free, &c."

This with some verbal alteration, is the stereotyped account of the law of Moses, by the Jesuits, when the Pope piped "all hands" to his defence in making the African slave trade a divine institution. It is evidently taken from Jahn on Archeology, a favorite author in our seminaries, a thorough Papist, in whose writings are to be found the substance of nearly all the Scripture arguments advanced in favor of slavery by pope's and protestant divines, during the last four hundred years. We do not mention this as proof, or even presumption that *the five ways* are founded on a false exposition of the law of Moses. But in the prospect of being shortly constrained to renounce fellowship with Congregationalists, and some Presbyterians, to preserve our faith and morals in their purity; it is important the churches whom we wish to take with us, should know that there are others of different names and on different continents, with whom we agree. Mr. Jahn's ways of slaveholding are as follows.

1. By *captivity in war*. 2. *Debts*. 3. *Thefts*. 4. *Manstealing*. 5. *Children of slaves*. 6. *By purchase*. He insists that the laws against manstealing were restricted in their operations to those who made slaves of Hebrews.

We can hardly believe that Mr. Jahn and the Jesuits who preceded him, adopted these *five ways* of turning human beings into property, as the result of prayerful and successful study of the Word of God; for it seems they had just enough of Bible knowledge to spend their hours of devotion in counting beads and worshipping the Virgin Mary! The truth is, they are just so many props invented originally for the special purpose of supporting the African slave trade; and handed down to us as holy institutions given to the church at Mount Sinai. And we are indebted for them to the same kind of men who used to sell quills out of the wings of the angel Gabriel. As proof, we need only mention the fact that no exposition ever gave such a view of the law of Moses, prior to the commencement of the slave trade.

If this pamphlet be a fair sample of the instruction which our young men receive at Princeton; so far as servitude and human rights are concerned, they are not a hair's breadth

in advance of the morality which prevails on the coast of Guinea, and in all those petty kingdoms and hordes in Africa where the slave trade is in operation. No one will ask for the proof that in those regions, they enslave captives, and those who are born of slave parents. But there may be sceptics as to the other three ways. With all that we have heard of the brutalized condition of Africa, we may not all be prepared to believe that the poor man who cannot pay his debts, and he who has committed a crime and he whose neighbor is mean and wicked enough to sell him, are all punished with slavery. Any full history of Africa or the slave trade will furnish the proof. In the *Edinburgh Encyclopedia*, in the articles *Ardrach*, *Dahomy*, *Angola*, and *Guinea*, we find the following accounts.—“Persons who are insolvent are sold at the pleasure of their creditors—When a man is accused of crime he is condemned to slavery.—During the continuance of the slave trade, the most trifling offences were every where examined with the utmost strictness, and almost every punishment was commuted into slavery.—In all ages, and in all countries, slavery has been as fatal to virtue, as liberty is friendly to it.—The day, says Homer, that makes a man a slave, takes away half his virtue.—Husbands sell their wives, parents their children; friends and neighbors are tempted to betray each other for the trifling reward of a little brandy, or for a mere bauble. Not only do the avaricious governors exact, with the utmost rapacity, the severest tribute from the poor natives, but even make their inability to pay, a pretext for condemning the richest families to slavery.”

How shall we account for it, that the untutored savages of Guinea have attained to the same perfection in the moral system of turning bodies and souls into property, as the Professors in our Theological seminaries with all the aids of revelation and science. Shall we ascribe it to the superiority of African intellect? No; our professors say they obtained theirs by diligently studying the Word of God. The Africans obtained theirs by intercourse with some worthless foreigners who taught them to make money by setting up a traffick in human bodies; and then the *five ways* became as necessary to its support as air is to breathing.

We have one question to ask of the author of the “view of slavery”; and unless it can be answered satisfactorily to

the churches it requires no spirit of prophecy to say, that the days of Princeton seminary are numbered. Does the Professor of Biblical Literature believe that these five ways of making men slaves are a part of *the whole counsel of God* as revealed in the law of God by Moses, and are they a part of the Biblical instruction by which he is preparing our Missionaries for foreign lands? If so—we may expect to hear that through their labors, the slave trade in Africa is reviving—that the missionary and his wife are trading with kidnappers, and storming the towns and hamlets around them, in imitation of what they tell us was the example of Abraham and Sarah in Haran, when preparing to go to the promised land. We may soon hear that he is at the head of his 318 slaves, armed and trained to war, bidding defiance to the petty kings around him, and occasionally pursuing and slaughtering them for practicing the divine principle of slavery by captivity. But perhaps these *five ways* are not taught in the seminary as a part of the word God. Perhaps their publication was only a prudent manœuvre for the purpose of abashing the abolitionists, and preserving *the union* of northern and southern supporters of the institution. This is the most charitable supposition we can make. If so—how long will the Head of the church smile on a seminary which resorts to such measures to secure popularity. Let us examine these ways of making slaves.

1. *By captivity.* It is passing strange that men devoted to the study of the Scriptures should be so far in the rear as to imagine that making slaves of captives in war, was licensed in the Jewish church; and that such a license should be placed among the institutions in harmony with the “eternal principles of morals.” The Jews were not permitted to make prisoners of any of the seven nations whose land was given them for a possession “Of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth; but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely the Hittites and the Amorites, &c.” Deut. xx. 16. Fond as some men are of slaves, they would not have such as could not breathe. The remaining question is, how were they to treat the other nations called the “nations round about” and the “nations afar off.” When they came nigh to a city they were to proclaim *peace to it.*

If peace were accepted, they were to serve Israel as tributaries. If not they were to *smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword*, and take home the women and little ones. Deut. xx, 10, 11. It was to blast in the bud every thing like a disposition to enslave them, that God said, "Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry; and my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword; and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless." From the simple fact that they might take home those widows and children, some theologians infer that they were to be slaves. The inference supposes that in a land governed by a divine law, where God himself is the chief magistrate, there can be no alternative for the widow and her fatherless children, but starvation or slavery! It also betrays gross ignorance of the laws of Moses. We can hardly excuse a professor of Biblical literature for not knowing that a tythe was taken up every third year for their relief and the support of the Levites; and the gleanings of every harvest and vintage, and the privilege of going into any field or vineyard to eat when hungry, were secured to them expressly by law.

But the question is expressly decided by two inspired men, one under the old dispensation, the other under the new. When Obed, a *prophet of the Lord*, heard that the Israelites were bringing home captives for slaves, he met them and convinced them that it was such a flagrant violation of the law as would unquestionably bring the wrath of Heaven upon them. And with all the wickedness of these apostate ten tribes, they were stricken with remorse, and after clothing and treating the persons most kindly, they sent them home to their brethren, 2 Chron. xxviii. 8—15. Tell us not that the captives in this instance were their brethren, and that if they had been strangers God would have approved it. That maxim—*the heathen are nobody*—is the chief corner stone on which the Pope built the African slave trade; but it is equally at war with humanity and those terrible threatenings of the law against those who vex the stranger. The other decision is by the apostle Paul. The name, in Xenophon and other Greek writers, for the *slave by captivity* is *Andrapodon*. Of course, *andrapodistes* is the name of the enslaver. But the apostle classes the *an-*

drapodistes (translated manstealer) with murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers and others, for whose punishment the law of Moses expressly provides, 1 Tim. i. 10.

Let no one say that although the Jews could not take captives and enslave them without sinning, they might hire their neighbors to do it for them. Our professors are not prepared to defend such morality, even when they find it in Jahn. It would suit the meridian of Madrid, where no gentleman need keep a stiletto because he can at any time hire an assassin to take a neighbor's life for a mere bauble. Besides, if the slave, while the bargain was in making, should raise the cry for help, the whole nation was bound to protect him against his master, (Deut. xxiii. 15,) and see to his freedom. It is evident also that the statute which required every servant bought with money to be circumcised and admitted to the passover, (Gen. xvii. 13; Ex. xii. 44,) never contemplated the erection of shambles in the Holy Land for the sale of heathens who had experienced no conversion to fit them for holy ordinances, excepting that of being beaten in a military fight.

This *slavery by captivity* is as shocking to humanity and common sense, as it is contrary to the word of God. It is admitted in the paragraph under consideration that "seizing on those who were free was an offence punished with death." Suppose then that the two parties are equally free when they join battle; and the strong man, of course, overpowers the weak. Now what wizard influence is there, in such a process, which strips the weak man of his inalienable rights, and justifies the other in doing that for which, one hour before, he would have been condemned by the laws of both God and men to be hanged by the neck till he was dead? Unless we can find a command of God for it, we must pronounce it absurd. Have any of the nations of Europe acted on this principle in their wars during the century past? The truth is, there is not a christian on earth who ever pretends to believe it to be right, excepting when the freedom of the African is opposed.

Let us apply the principle to a case during our revolutionary war, of which, the following is believed to be in substance a correct history. Our venerable President Andrew Jackson was taken prisoner at the battle of King's moun-

tain, but owing to his extreme youth, he was permitted to go where he pleased without being exchanged or released. Is it true that we have exalted to the presidency, not a free-man, but an Englishman's slave? Suppose the soldier who took him prisoner should recognize him in the streets of Washington, and yoke him as his property, to some of the coffles that are driven by the capitol daily, to the tune of "Hail Columbia." Would the word of God, and the "eternal principles of morals" bear him through? It seems our seminaries are furnished with long lists of texts to defend such morality.

When we examine the moral tendency of a license to enslave captives we are equally puzzled to see why it should be given, unless we admit, as we are told in this pamphlet, that the existence of "this institution (slavery) among the surrounding nations," induced Moses not to abolish it. If the author of the Sinai Covenant was under the necessity of consulting the tastes of these pagan nations, the permission to enslave as many of them as they could capture, was well calculated to reconcile them to the existence of such a people, and such a religion in their neighborhood. And as the obvious tendency would be, to make the Hebrews fight desperately, it would go far towards recommending them to the favor of the pagan gods. Mars, the god of war, was supposed to look with supreme delight on the bully who could fight like a tiger. But we are sorry to see our author so soon abandon the ground that we must not "bring the Mosaic institutions into conflict with the eternal principles of morals."

2. *By purchase.* One would think, the lawfulness of holding men by purchase would depend on the question—who sold them, and what right had he to do it? Our laws allow us to hold horses by purchase. But the man who buys a horse knowing him to be stolen, is, by the court of heaven, and by every court under heaven, classed with the thief. A minister who would preach that it is right to own bought horses, irrespective of the manner in which the seller obtained them, would soon find himself *in want of a place*. A congregation of horse-thieves would not employ him; for though they might be willing to be villains themselves, they would insist upon it, that the minister ought to be a decent

man. The punishment, by the law of Moses, for him who made property of a man, was death.

It is sometimes troublesome to prove a negative. Our author has given a list of texts, not one of which, has any connexion with slave selling. A thief could be sold by the sentence of a judge, but that is the fourth way of slave making, and must not be confounded with this second way *by purchase*. It is admitted that a father could sell his daughter to the man who betrothed her for a wife; that a Hebrew could sell himself for six years; and a pious stranger could sell himself until the jubilee. But this is nothing to the purpose. Abolitionists have in vain challenged the host of their opposers to produce the text which authorizes one man to sell another as a slave. It is insulting the understanding of the community by a most pitiful shuffle, to point to texts which authorized men voluntarily to sell their own services for a limited time. Such sales take place in every free country, and have been pronounced lawful without a dissenting voice from time immemorial. We have German servants in Ohio, at this moment, where slavery and involuntary servitude are not tolerated. Such servants, from Britain, bought with money, were to be found in all our states until slavery made such servitude disreputable. We take for granted, that, by *slavery*, our author does not mean *voluntary and limited and requited servitude*. This would be as unfortunate a blunder as that of the hero who fought with windmills and fulling mills, under the notion that he was battling with giants.

We are willing to prove a negative. We shall show that it was contrary to the law of God by Moses, for one man to sell another as a slave. We shall not do it by an endless list of those texts which are utterly irreconcilable with such iniquity. Happily for our purpose God has recorded, with the proper judgment, a case which brings the principle fairly before us. We might search in vain the whole history of the traffic in human bodies, for a case conducted more fairly and honorably on both sides, than the sale of Joseph. The sellers were reasonable as to the price. He was a goodly child, yet they asked but twenty pieces of silver. They concealed none of his faults, not even his ugly habit of dreaming. The purchaser paid the money down. And as to apologies, they swarmed like the lice in Egypt. If being professors of

religion, and descended of pious parents, must screen the sellers from the charge of manstealing—if saving the person sold from hardships, and even death, will excuse the purchasers—if the fact that God overrules the whole transaction to the advancement of his glory, and the ultimate good of many will canonize the deed, the sale of Joseph was a very pious affair. But Joseph says—*Indeed I was stolen*. And God has recorded that judgment in his book, that he *who reads may understand*?

But let us take a case still more favorable to our opponents. Our missionaries tell us of a region in India where parents in a time of famine sold their children. The pious English families, to save them from destruction, bought them and established schools and hired teachers to instruct them in literature and religion. Suppose the next ship should bring us news that missionaries, initiated into the *five ways*, had convinced those benevolent families that making *slaves by purchase* is according to the word of God, and that they have resolved to hold these children as their property. A burst of indignation from the whole civilized world would be the result. Every church on earth, from which the glory has not departed, would pray with uplifted hands—"From all theological seminaries and from all missionaries who teach, we are taught to believe, that making slaves by purchase is right in the sight of Heaven, the good Lord deliver us." The Professors in the Seminary at Princeton would be the foremost to pronounce the report a base slander. And they would do it in the absence of all proof excepting the known piety of the missionaries. That is, they would say the young men had too much sense and piety to believe the instructions they had received from their teachers. Until those Professors shall announce that they are able to believe their own expositions of the word of God, when fairly applied, they must excuse us for not believing.

3. *By the right of creditorship*. In other words, if a poor man, or widow, or fatherless child were, through imprudence or affliction, involved in debt and unable to pay, it was the privilege of the creditor to seize and enslave that poor man, or widow, or fatherless child. To the honor of the author, we notice that he has quoted no text as proof; but we think it would have been still more to his credit had he omitted the doctrine itself. As it is taken, however, from

Jahn, who has quoted two texts as proof, we feel bound to examine them.

Mr. Jahn, and the Jesuits who preceded him, quote 2 Kings, iv. 1—a case which occurred among the apostate ten tribes under the reign of Ahab and Jezebel. A pious prophet, who had been driven from his post to make way for more convenient tools in wickedness, had died in debt. And just as Elisha arrived at the house of his widow, directed thither by the unseen hand of God, in perfect keeping with the spirit of those ungodly times, the creditor arrived to tear from her two fatherless children to doom them to slavery. Could Jezebel have found a professor of Biblical literature willing to hold up such diabolical cruelty, as a sample of the law of Moses, she would have established seminaries in every corner of the land, and entertained the professors by the thousand at her own table. The other text quoted is Matt. xviii. 25. Our Saviour alludes for illustration, not to the law of Moses, but to the conduct of a certain king who commended a poor creditor *to be sold, and his wife and children and all that he had*. To make it bear on the law of Moses it is assumed that those characters to whom our Saviour alludes for illustration, must be such as the law approves! in face of the fact that he sometimes quotes for illustration, a steward who was unjust, and a judge *who feared not God neither regarded man*. And the doctrine which they wish thus to establish is one which no righteous man can think of without horror. Historians say that such morality, in reference to poor creditors, is considered infamous on the coast of Guinea. “Another oppressive law peculiar to the Fantee country deserves to be noticed as demonstrating the baneful effect of the same odious trade in human beings. If a person became involved in debt, and either unable or unwilling to pay, the creditor was at liberty to ‘panyar;’ that is, to seize and confine any person or persons belonging to the family, or the town, or even the country of the debtor; and these captives, if opportunity offered, were sold as slaves without any delay or ceremony.”—*Encyclo. Art. Guinea*. Should our missionaries be trained to believe in *slavery by the right of creditorship*, such a custom will not long be peculiar to Fantee.

Had any intelligent farmer asserted, as the result of his examination of the law of Moses, that it licensed making

slaves of poor men because they were unable to pay their debts, we should not have known how to excuse him. But we have learned to make great allowance for professors in theological seminaries. The truth is, they are so busily engaged in teaching the young men theology, that they have not time to study their Bibles. On no other principle can we account for the ignorance betrayed in this pamphlet, of the following regulations, by the law of Moses, all of which are utterly irreconcilable with distressing a poor creditor. Every seventh year the atonement released all the poor, foreigners excepted, from debt, Deut. xv. 1—12. If a brother, *yea though he be a stranger*, had fallen into decay, the nation were required to relieve him with money and victuals without increase, Lev. xxv. 35—39. Under pain of God's displeasure, they were forbidden to refuse lending through fear of having to forgive the debt in the seventh year. "Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart saying, the seventh year, the year of release is at hand," &c. Deut. xv. 9, 10.

We have only to apply the principle, in question, to be frightened with it. Suppose that the present war by our theological professors on the abolitionists, contrary to all calculation, should be unsuccessful, and that the funds of seminaries should fail, and the professors become unable to pay their debts, would it harmonize with "the eternal principles of morals" to seize them as property? We question whether it would be possible to conduct a drove of them through the state of Virginia without an insurrection. Even the slaves of Southampton would rise again at the sight of such injustice and cruelty. Again, suppose that some of our missionaries educated at Princeton, should write home that they are acting on the principle of *slavery by right of creditorship*; and that in consequence of many of their neighbors being unable to pay for food and clothing obtained in a time of great scarcity, they have become the owners of many slaves. Would our professors be willing to own it as the fruit of their instructions? Would they not say that such conduct was at war with the eternal principles of rectitude as revealed in the word of God?

4. *By the sentence of a judge.* This phrase seems to say that men for several crimes were doomed to slavery; and that, so far, the holy land was like the coast of Guinea.

The fact, however, is, that the only man who was doomed to labor for another on account of crime, was the thief who was too poor to make restitution, Ex. xxii. 3. We have often wondered that discerning and honest men could quote this as proof that the law of God approved slavery. With equal propriety they might quote the constitution and laws of Ohio as proof that they legalize slaveholding. It is a fundamental article in our constitution that no slavery or involuntary servitude shall be tolerated. Yet in our penitentiary we have hundreds of criminals doomed by our laws and the sentence of the judge, to hard labor as punishment for theft, and other crimes. Suppose another British Fiddler or Trollope were to pass through our land, and report this fact on the other side of the Atlantic. Would any but such a logician as Hamlet's grave digger infer that the state of Ohio is a slave state? Yet the premises in regard to the state of Ohio and the holy land are much alike.

This text is certainly an unfortunate one for the slaveholder. 1st. It proves that appropriating to one's own use a sheep or an ox belonging in the eyes of the law, to a neighbor, is in equity punished by the judges. Much more does it prove, that appropriating to our own use, the body and soul of a neighbor who has not forfeited the right to his own person by crime, is in equity to be punished by the judges. 2. It proves that dooming a man to labor for another is, in God's estimation a punishment—a sufficient punishment for a thief—and a punishment sufficient to deter others from stealing. It, therefore, proves that slaveholders are inflicting on innocent men and women the thief's punishment; and that those who say that the Africans are happy under it, and that it is favorable to their literary and religious improvement, profess to understand the matter better than their Maker. If the masters, however, are sure that the author of the law of Moses was mistaken, and that they are right, we would advise them to put their slaves through some of the higher grades of punishment, omitting hanging, except in cases where it seemed to be necessary to give the finish to their religious and literary education.

4. *By birth.* In other words, it was a part of the will of God that if the parents had fallen into the hands of thieves, and had chains on them when the children were born, the children ought to be slaves. We object to this, because it

would follow that all who were born under the political slavery against which our fathers rose in 1775, ought to have continued under it; because it is at war with the principle on which we claim our own freedom, viz:—that all men are created free and equal—and that the right to liberty is universal and inalienable; and because it would follow that those persons to whom the law of Moses was given, having been born of slave parents, were Pharaoh's lawful property, and that the Lord punished him for holding that which was his own according to "the eternal principles of morals." If the wrath of God and man awaits the villain who breaks into an African village, and seizes men and women, are there no stones in Heaven or earth for the wretch who breaks into the hut of a poor slave mother, and seizes her little babe before it opens its eyes?

In the name of all who feel an interest in the instruction of our future ministers and missionaries, we ask—do our professors believe that these *five ways* of slave making are a part of God's revealed will? That they do propagate such principles when contending with the abolitionists seems unquestionable. But that they consider them worthy of God, and therefore a part of his word, is not even probable. On the contrary the mind of the author of the pamphlet seems to have revolted at such a frightful picture of the law of Moses, and he thus apologizes, not for himself, but for his Maker.

"Moses finding this institution (slavery) among the Hebrews and all surrounding nations, did not abolish it. He enacted laws directing how slaves were to be treated, &c. &c."

This, with some slight alteration, is taken from Jahn; it is the same story by which the Jesuits defended the African slave trade, long ago. To persuade the world that the law of Moses harmonizes, in point of morality, with that nefarious traffic, they represented it as not being a pure law, but the result of a compromise between Moses and some Hebrew and pagan slaveholders. We almost rejoice that our author has copied so closely from Jahn, as scarcely to mention the name of God as concerned in the making of the Sinai covenant; it seems to have been all the work of Moses. But we can scarcely conceive how a Protestant divine could gravely give us this story, without supposing that in his admiration of the writings of the Jesuits, he had swallowed

that favorite dogma—*shyness of the Scriptures is favorable to devotion. Let us analyze it.*

1. *Slaveholding was among the surrounding nations.* This we can readily believe. Of course they would not easily consent to the existence of a system, in their neighborhood, calculated to excite discontent and insurrection among their slaves. They had heard that the Lord was angry with Pharaoh for the sin of enslaving; that he had executed judgment upon all the gods of Egypt; that he had emancipated his people by “showing signs and wonders, great and sore upon Egypt, upon Pharaoh and upon all his household,” and that he had given to the Hebrews that pass-over as the pledge that his right arm, in all generations, should be made bare for all that are oppressed. If an abolition meeting, at a thousand miles distance, throws our slave states into confusion and alarm, what must have been the consternation of these nations when they heard that these emancipated slaves had reached Mount Sinai, and that the *great and terrible God* was about to give them a law which would be a transcript of his own perfections, and in harmony with eternal principles. But the God of Israel quiets their fears of any interference with their *domestic institutions*, by making slaveholding part of the religion of his own people. And he legalizes five ways of making slaves!—more ways, perhaps, than some of the pagans had ever heard of. Let the young gentlemen remember this when making sermons for the South.

2. *Slavery existed among the Hebrews.* Now our children in the Sabbath school know that the Israelites received the law fifty days after they had celebrated the passover. They reached Mount Sinai in about forty-seven days after they had left Egypt, escaping from slavery, and a part of the time hotly pursued by their masters. But our young men must believe that they had been so successful in stealing children by the way, or in trading with kidnappers, that when they stood before the Mount to receive the law, they were such inveterate slaveholders that the holy God considered it imprudent to abolish that institution. And to satisfy them that nothing serious against the sin of slavery was meant by the plagues of Egypt, and that in the many threatenings of his law against oppression, more was said than was seriously intended. He declared it to be his holy

will that slaveholding and slavemaking should be continued in five ways! His people had sufficient experience of that *domestic institution* in the country they had just left; and the prospect which was to cheer up their spirits under all the hardships of the wilderness, was that of soon being in a land where they could have as many slaves as Pharaoh had; or become slaves themselves in five ways—whereas, in Egypt they had enjoyed but one way, by birth.*

Seriously, we ask, is it not high time for all the churches to arise and put away a sin which cannot be defended without such blasphemy of God and his word? Is it not passing strange that with the approbation of those who are most loud in the cry against error and heresy, sentiments should be uttered from our high places, of such infidel and corrupting tendency, leaving out of view the dishonor done to the name of God. Were a Presbyterian minister, intentionally, to prepare his sermons so as to accord with the existing morals of a corrupt church, and the vicious tastes and habits of their ungodly neighbors, he would be solemnly deposed as unworthy of the ministerial office, and as a scandal to the Presbyterian church. What then should we think of imputing such iniquity to the most high God? The truth is—defending slavery is a levelling business. Let any man employ himself in degrading to a level with the brutes his fellow men, including some whom the Son of God *is not ashamed to call his brethren*, and he can soon impute to his Maker things which he would be very unwilling himself to bear. But we do not charge the author of this pamphlet with any intentional impropriety. There is this apology

* Just at the time this pamphlet made its appearance in Pittsburgh, a company of *slaves* arrived there on their way to Liberia. Various reasons have been assigned for the elopement of a number of them during the night. Some ascribed it to their having imbibed abolition principles from some of the members of the Assembly. Perhaps some of the opposite party had been reading this pamphlet to them. If any of them had taken up the idea that these five ways would be considered sound Biblical literature in Liberia, it is not surprising that fourteen of them decamped during the night. The wonder is that a single soul was remaining by the morning light, excepting the poor old blind woman who could tell nothing about her age, only that she was sixteen years old when Braddock was defeated. We can clear the manager, who had the care of them, of all knowledge of their having seen this defence of slavery. He would have considered it in vain to terrify the community with the threat that they should be ferreted out, and sent back to end their days in slavery. For he must have known that, after such a fright, the most expert man-hunter in Mississippi, with his best pack of bloodhounds, could not catch them till they reached Canada.

for which he will not thank us—to write a book to prove that slaveholding is justified by the Bible, without blaspheming God and his word, is among the impossibilities.

In our next, we propose to examine the author's list of texts.

[To be continued.]

ABOLITION, A RELIGIOUS ENTERPRISE.

BY REV. HENRY COWLES, PROFESSOR OF LANGUAGES IN OBERLIN COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, OHIO.

THE abolition of slavery has a legitimate claim to be regarded as a great religious enterprise. It savors not of fanaticism or intolerance; and the effort to brand it as if it did, is extremely misguided and unjust. It savors not of the selfishness and ambition of a political party scheme—it has no sympathy with such motives—it disdains such measures, and partakes not at all of that spirit. Nor does it hold communion with the wildness of maniac folly or of reckless desperation. It seeks to accomplish a great religious object purely by religious and moral means. It has, of course, a righteous claim to be regarded as a great religious enterprise, and ought to have a place amongst the most purely Christian and Godlike enterprises that have ever called forth the sympathies and energies of the people of God. This may seem to some like bare and bold assertion. Such are invited to the proof. It lies—

1. *In the fact that American Slavery is sin.* The system of American Slavery is fraught with sin against God and against man. This sin is not merely *incidental* to it, happening occasionally as an unfortunate perversion of a thing good enough in itself, but it is inwrought into its very nature;—American Slavery cannot exist without sin.—What is slavery? Not merely involuntary servitude,—a thing which the law of God may in some circumstances tolerate;—but something far beyond this. It is unmaking man hurling an immortal being from his high rank as man down to the rank of a brute, a thing—a mere article of sale and

use. This is American Slavery, and this, if any thing can be, is a sin against God and man. Does that man sin against himself who prostitutes his powers to vicious indulgence, sinks himself into pollution, and makes a covenant with degradation? Does he wrong his own soul who scorns immortal life and chooses death? And does not that man sin against his fellow who drags him down from being man, and so far as *he can*, makes him a brute,—who locks up from him the Bible—plunders without mercy his domestic and social blessings—tears away his civil rights, and robs him of that impulse toward improvement and virtue which only can raise man to his true dignity? Is not this *SIN*? Is it not sin to make like brutes those whom God made like himself and like angels—to doom to ignorance those whom God sent his Bible to enlighten, to repel from our sympathies as men those whom Christ died to save? Is not this high-handed rebellion against God an impious attempt to defeat his plans of gracious benevolence? I speak not now of the robbery of that poor man's wages, of the cruelty of that lash, of the toil unrequited and exhausting on the plantation nor of the tearing asunder the dearest domestic ties; I pass these things, because, though most horrid and but too common, it may yet be said that they are not universal. I dwell not, therefore, on these things. They do pertain, however, to the system of American slavery, and wherever you make man a thing, and consign him to the will of an owner, such results will follow. And a system which produces such results, and is always liable to produce them; nay more, which tempts man's selfish nature and strongly draws it toward such results is surely a horrid sin. Of course the effort to abolish sin is a religious enterprise. But the subject demands more detail. I specify then

2. *That American slavery takes away the key of knowledge from two and a half millions of our countrymen and consigns them either to a doubtful and imbecile piety, or more commonly to vicious degradation and eternal ruin.* The proof of this position is furnished amply by our southern brethren. In regard to the first and fundamental fact, that they take away the key of knowledge, their laws both create and prove it. And what is still worse, the law is an index of the people's will, and proves therefore that at least a majority heartily concur in the measure, and will faith-

fully carry it out in practice. Of course, slaves must live and die in gross ignorance. That their piety is generally doubtful, and always imbecile, requires no labored proof.—Of course, piety combined with ignorance is imbecile—it can neither have much power over the individual himself, nor over others. And in such a case, piety can hardly fail to be doubtful. How can his piety be sure who knows little of himself and less of God, of Christ, and of the way of salvation? Besides, the whole system under which he comes up has trained him to deceive, and may he not deceive, not his Christian teachers only, but himself? The declaration of Dr. Nelson,* has much natural probability. He says:—"I have heard hundreds make such professions of love to God and trust in a Saviour, that the church did not feel at liberty to refuse them membership. I have reason to believe they were poor, deluded, mistaken creatures. The concentrated recollection of thirty years furnishes me with three instances *only* where I could say I have reason from the known walk of that slave to believe him or her to be a *sincere Christian*."

Consider also what multitudes are repelled from the gospel because it comes to them through the hands of their oppressors—how many sink down in ignorance and despondency to die in appearance like the brutes that perish, and how many others are swallowed up in the vortex of those vices which are incident to slavery. All these things entitle slavery to the character of the *murderer of souls*. And is not its utter abolition then a religious enterprise?

3. A third fact challenges our regard. *In the case of those who support it, this system cherishes passions which are exceedingly uncongenial to the gospel spirit.* Is it too much to say, that pride, revenge, barbarity and lust are the natural products of slavery in its effect upon those who hold the power? I do not say that every slaveholder becomes thus vicious, or is necessarily affected by these influences; but the fact is regarded as undeniable that these are the natural and the very common results of the system upon the slaveholding community. The testimony of Jefferson on this point will be remembered. The results also are sufficiently manifest. The pride of aristocracy, the spirit of duelling, the heart that can lacerate with the scourge, and tear families asunder in cold blood, and an illegitimate off

* See New-York Evangelist. for May 9, 1836

spring like grasshoppers for multitude—these things are not often found where slavery has not been. They are traceable to this cause mainly, and not exclusively to any other. Now these things are most uncongenial to the gospel spirit. They hold no fellowship together. The gospel must make war against them even to extermination. And this war I deem a great religious enterprise.

4. *The system of American slavery involves principles and practices which are utterly hostile not only to piety, but to every benevolent enterprise; and therefore it must be deemed the natural foe of them all.*

Among these I specify the following. (1.) *That it is right for us to practice our fathers' sins.* This is one of the fundamental props of the system. "Our fathers entailed it upon us—it is our inheritance, and what they left us we have of course a right to keep. If they sinned in it, that sin is their own, and for us to perpetuate the system under such circumstances cannot be wrong."

(2.) *That because we have the power, we may rob the poor of his wages and of all legal right to claim them.*

Adhering evermore to

—"the good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can."

(3.) *That we may shut out the light of heaven, even the word of God from a class of fellow beings, for the sake of making them better servants to our lusts.*

(4.) In order that the community may endure and sustain this system of legalized oppression, we may exclude from our sympathies and benevolent regards a whole race whom God has made our fellow creatures in his own image, and for whom as for us Christ has died; and all this we may do on no other grounds than these, that they have a darker skin than ours, that we found them and have kept them exceedingly degraded, and that their great forefather in the days of the flood was cursed to "be a servant of servants unto his brethren."

Now if we may hate one brother for our convenience, why may we not another? If we may neglect the improvement of one race because of their degradation, why may we not of another, and of the whole human family, and leave the heathen to perish forever? What principle can be more

subversive of every great scheme of benevolence, nay of benevolence itself!

(5.) That *for our pecuniary benefit*, we may annihilate the marriage relation, and tear asunder husbands and wives, parents and children at our pleasure. Can virtue ever flourish on the ruins of the domestic constitution? Can it flourish where Christian men can ruthlessly break up this constitution, and fatten themselves on the price of its sacrifice? Can real benevolence, enlarged and pure as that of Christ for ruined men, find place in such hearts?

(6.) That to secure our own gratification the more effectually we may strip of all civil protection those who by natural right, and all right law, have the best claim to such protection.

That the colored race under slave laws are really not protected I need not stand to show. The master's property is protected, but the rights and well being of the MEN whom he holds, are not at all. The law which rejects their testimony against their constituted enemies annihilates their civil protection, and public sentiment sustains the spirit of that law. But who does not know that they, of all others, have the highest claim, in reason and right to be protected? Of what use is law but to protect the weak against the more powerful, and secure protection especially there where it is most needed! This principle therefore stands in deadly hostility against God's law, and against the spirit of benevolence.

Now these principles of slavery are all carried out to a greater or less extent into their legitimate and corresponding practice, and in our system of slavery they always will be. And can this system—such being its fruits, consist with the spirit and labors of Christian benevolence? Impossible.—Then the system is the natural and mighty enemy of benevolent enterprise, and one of the first great benevolent enterprises before the Christian world is to slay this enemy.

5. Our main position is sustained also by the fact *that American slavery is not only a sin, but a sin of giant magnitude and strength*. By this I mean not merely that in the number and extent of its evil consequences and self-created iniquities its name is Legion: I allude not merely to its prolific offspring of oppressions, cruelties, degradation, ignorance and lust; but also to other facts which give it a

giant power of resistance. It is nursed by the strongest passions of the human heart, love of power, indolence, avarice and sensuality. I need not stop to show that each of these base passions is fed and fattened on American slavery. Nor is the inference doubtful that some men will struggle long and desperately before they relinquish so sweet and rich a gratification. But this is not all. The system has the energy and compactness of mature years, if not the venerableness of advanced age. It pleads the names of men whom the nation venerates. It has moulded into its own image the customs, habits, laws and prejudices of a vast people. And, finally, it has fortified itself in the very citadel of our republic, and claims to have taken refuge in the temple of our Constitution. It will not be vanquished without a struggle. The contest will be hard fought, and "the weapons of our warfare must be mighty through God." A struggle of this sort deserves the name of a great religious enterprise. The conversion of a nation is not a greater work, nor more worthy to be regarded as a mighty enterprise of Christian benevolence.

6. Another fact as painful as it is pertinent, is *that this system of legalized oppression is not only practiced in the church, and tolerated by the church, but is in fact so sustained by the church that it lives mainly by her indulgence, and her example.* This specification contains two parts. (1.) That the church as such does justify the present continuance of slavery, and, (2.) That her justification of it does in fact sustain the system, while her universal and decided condemnation would destroy it.

The church as such justifies slavery inasmuch as her members and ministers speak and write, preach and practice in its defence. Excepted, are three or four denominations, less numerous but not less worthy, but the great leading denominations stand firm in justification of slaveholding *for the present.* True they do not justify slavery in the abstract, and there is no need that they should. Nobody asks that of them in order to hold slaves with a quiet conscience.—Until recently it has been supposed that few, even of the most devoted advocates of slavery have justified the abstract principle. The defence of that is a hard case, and by a little metaphysical subtlety they have managed to condemn the whole thing in the abstract most unceremoniously, and

yet justify it most decidedly in practice. And in this manner the church gives slavery her sanction and yet thinks to save her conscience. In proof of the fact I appeal to the action of the last Presbyterian General Assembly, of the last Methodist General Conference, and to the recent communications of the Baptists with the English brethren. The church then as a body justifies slavery.

Now this justification by the church in fact *sustains the system*. In several of the states, the vote of the church thrown into the scale of emancipation would renovate the laws and abolish slavery. In all, the decided influence of the church would rouse and correct the public conscience, and in the language of a southern member of Congress, "make slavery so disreputable that no respectable man can hold slaves." The fact is that the human conscience is naturally galled and troubled sorely with slavery. The whole system makes sad war against both the common sense and the moral sense of mankind, and could not live without the holy sanction of the church. Yes—slavery in a Christian land never can live without the sanction of the church. There is too much conscience, and conscience rebels against slavery too obstinately to allow the latter to live an hour after the church shall have condemned it with her whole heart and voice and example.

Does not the church then need reform? And whose business is it to effect this reform? Whose, but her own? This, then, is a great religious enterprise. Yet more apparent is this as we contemplate our next position.

7. *That this sanction which the American church gives to slavery does greatly if not utterly paralyze her moral power.* How can she plead the cause of righteousness with the wages of unrighteousness in her hands,—or the cause of the poor with two and a half millions of her own poor under her feet,—or the cause of the heathen while she is making heathen of her laborers, nay, of her own sons and daughters? How can she push forward the principles of civil liberty with the practical lie of slavery on her very front,—or spread the light of knowledge and education while she tolerates and virtually *makes* laws to prohibit some millions of her own people from reading even the Bible? "O consistency thou art a jewel;" and a jewel not only most lovely in beauty but most indispensable to the character and efficiency of the

church. Let that man preach repentance to his neighbors who defrauds them as his business every day, and what avails it? And what can the preaching and influence of the church avail, while she tolerates in her very bosom this sin of hydra form and giant power? What sort of conscience can she have, while it is cultivated under such a regimen, and what sort of influence in rebuking sin and recommending holiness? How much of the *blessing* of Christ can she have while she thus prostitutes his name, and renounces his spirit? Oh! my heart sickens under the conviction that the church is dead and must rot in her moral grave, until she shall wake to the life and power of righteousness in regard to this great sin. This effort to resuscitate the church I must regard therefore as a great religious enterprise, vital to her moral energy and action.

S. I take my last position on this point. *American slavery is a mighty barrier against the success of the gospel.* The American church has promised much and sustains vast responsibilities. The name, *American*—her commerce opening every land to her access—her wealth, princely and competent to the work, her resources of men and mind fully adequate—all concur to fix the eyes of men and of angels on her as the instrument under God for the conversion of the world. And will she do it? Is she girding herself to the work? Ah! *can* she do it, with the pollutions of slavery on her hands—with the price of blood in her offerings—with the paralysis of slavery upon her conscience and with its lie against all righteousness and benevolence in her example? Impossible. However much Christians beyond the waters may do, and those in our land who have come out from the midst of slavery and washed their hands of its participation, the barrier yet remains. The drawing back of the American church, which ought to be first and foremost, throws a heavy chill over the spirit of practical benevolence. The church thus casts herself as a vast stumbling block across the high way of the Lord, and her prophets cry “cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people.” And this is a great religious enterprise. Who can deny it? Who can fail to see and feel it?

II. Having thus rather stated, than fully illustrated certain facts as proof of my first position, I pass to another view

of the subject, and take the ground *that the friends of the cause of abolition ought to prosecute it as a religious enterprise.*

I am aware that to no small extent this has been done. This enterprise originated in Christian benevolence. Its corner stone was laid with faith and prayer. Many, yea most of its advocates have warmed and sustained their hearts with the spirit and the faith of Christ, as they have toiled on amidst suspicion and rebuke, against insensibility and opposition. Yet there has been some party feeling and some asperity. Possibly it may have been, for the moment, forgotten that this cause is the cause of God—is really a great religious enterprise, and ought to be prosecuted as such and as nothing else. Be this as it may, my brethren will bear with me in a word of exhortation touching this point, in giving which I would not be understood to assume that they are especially guilty of departing from the course recommended.

I take the ground that the friends of this cause ought to prosecute it as a religious enterprise

1. *Because it is such in its nature, and ought to be treated according to what it is.* Its nature has been sufficiently shown. If we would bring forward this cause with strength, it must be in its own true character. It must stand on its real merits. The nation must see it as it is. And they *ought* to see it as it is. We as honest men are bound to show them. And we have no occasion for concealment. No; let the southern people and the world know that this is a religious enterprise; that our religious principles demand it of us; that for the love we bear to Christ and to the souls of the oppressed, we cannot hold our peace. Yet further. Here lies the strength of our cause. It is a controversy against sin, and never can succeed except by the power of truth and holiness. Then let us clothe it with this power, and hold it forth before the world as it is.

2. *Allow me to suggest that in prosecuting the cause in this way, we shall more surely and more easily keep our hearts in that humble, tender frame which is always requisite in the reprovers of sin.* It is obvious that reproof is rarely effectual unless given with great meekness and tenderness of spirit. The reprovcr must not feel himself to be without sin and above all condemnation. Rather let

him regard himself as deeply guilty, if not of the sin which he reproves, yet of many others perhaps not less odious before God. This conviction may save him from censoriousness and pride in exposing the sins of others.

Again, we are creatures of sympathy, especially in regard to that ill feeling of *resistance*. Resisted ourselves with harshness, we are exceedingly prone to catch the same spirit. We see human nature developed thus in the numberless quarrels and disputes that occur in the every day business of life. So that abolitionists must be more than men, if, before this omnipresent temptation, they never fall. The grand preservation against falling is, doubtless, to feel that you are doing the work of Christ, *and must by all means do it in his spirit*. You are not fighting a political warfare, nor contending for victory. You seek only to do away a great sin so that the Gospel of Jesus may have free course, and God be glorified in saving a multitude from ignorance, vice and hell. Imbue your mind with this object, go forth with much prayer and faith, and you may be kept in safety.

Another circumstance in this case enhances the difficulty of giving reproof. The sin itself is so heinous in many points of view, as to wake up feelings of perfect indignation. This we are in danger of transferring unconsciously from the sin itself to the person of the guilty. Now do not suspect me of holding the strange doctrine that sin is a sort of abstraction which can be condemned and punished while the sinner goes free—but I say these two things: that we may have indignation against a sin and pity for the sinner, for Christ has: and second, that we may condemn a sin unsparingly, without condemning whole classes of men indiscriminately. The least appearance of injustice, on our part, is magnified and blazoned against us as if there were no other means of defending slavery. Against these dangers the spirit of Christ is the best antidote. Let us feel that our object is to abolish sin by convincing and reclaiming the offender, and that we ought to pity him and, by all means, never exaggerate his offence. This is laboring in the right spirit, and it affords great hope of success.

3. *We shall thus secure the co-operation of most, if not all, the real piety in the land.* I will not disguise the fact that some have been, for a season, repelled from sympathy

and union with the abolitionists by the asperity, real or imaginary, which they have been supposed to exhibit. Now any occasion of this nature is deeply to be deplored. It ought not to be—it need not be. Only let the benevolence of the Gospel sway our hearts, and love and compassion would soften our reproofs and denunciations of even this enormous sin. Let it be made purely a religious enterprise, and no real Christian, walking in the spirit of his Master, could be repelled. No; such would rally at once when the standard of the cross was lifted up. Let them see that this is the work of Christ, the cause of his kingdom, and you appeal to all they hold most near and dear. They will see this to be their *own work*. They will recognize it as the very thing for which they have long prayed, and long desired without knowing how to do it, or even find it. The great cause of abolition will stand forth before them in a new light, and they will hail it as their own. Let me allude to a fact. Thousands have been made abolitionists by the mobs. How? Partly through sympathy for the persecuted which led them first to examine and then embrace; but mainly because they saw all their civil and social rights in jeopardy. The appeal was made to their spirit of liberty, and they could not resist it. The cause of abolition stood forth before them as the cause of human rights—the cause of freedom against slavery, and of law against anarchy; and their election was soon made. Now let the cause of abolition stand out before a Christian in its own true light, as a religious enterprise, and you make a similar appeal to him. As he loves Christ and the cause of Christ, he cannot resist it. He comes with all his heart. His piety draws him. He neither would, nor can refuse. Happy the day when the strength of American piety shall be enlisted in this great work. It can be done—and it will be. Then, and not before, the great question will be carried—the great and good cause will triumph.

4. *No power but that of God and of his truth can ever accomplish the work.* So I believe most firmly. Political economy is too weak to contend against the giant passions which sustain slavery. So is the principle of fear. The spirit and power of faction can never avail—abolitionists will never try it. The providences and judgment of heaven may wash the stains of this sin from our soil with blood—but against this we pray most fervently. God grant it may

never be. The only mode then in which we wish to have the work accomplished is that which alone is feasible, namely,—by the power of God and of the truth. Let Christians see that slavery is sin and renounce it. Let the public conscience be enlightened and quickened. Let the energy of the gospel of love be felt. Let the glorious efficacy of religion in promoting human happiness and protecting human rights be really seen; and the developement would honor God, and his truth inconceivably. This object alone—apart from the accessions which would be made directly to human happiness, would be worthy of a great religious enterprise. To honor God as the God of the oppressed, and his truth as the salvation of our race, the great antidote for every evil and curse which men bring on themselves and on each other, would be a glorious achievement. For such a developement of God and of his truth, the world has long waited in vain. “The whole creation has been groaning and travelling in pain together for it until now.”

But deliverance is at hand. God's kingdom shall at length come, and Satan's throne shall fall. That power by which the prince of darkness has so long chained down the millions of Africa in bondage, physical and moral, must cease.—The sons of Ethiopia are soon to shake off their manacles, and stretch forth their freed hands to God. And the oppressor too shall come bending to the Saviour's feet, and his hard heart shall melt before the cross for his sins against his despised brother. His pride of power, and avarice and selfishness cannot stand before the subduing power of Jesus. As truly as Jehovah lives, the nations are giving to his Son, and his truth and grace shall bow their hearts, abolish their sins and soften their spirits into the sweet simplicity and tenderness of the gospel. Then slavery will have ceased. Its last groan will be over—its last tear will have fallen—its last bitter cup will have been dashed forever. O what a Jubilee! But I may not give vent to the feelings of my heart. Yet one thing I must say. To the friends of the oppressed throughout the nation, if my voice could reach I would cry.—Be men of God and mighty in prayer, and the cause of God will triumph. Make this a great religious enterprise—make it such in spirit, in argument, in appeal—make it such in all your measures and operations, and you cannot fail of success. So Jehovah will be with you—yea, he himself will be your strength and victory.

THE CONSTITUTION.

BY N. P. ROGERS, ESQ.

AMONG the lions in the way of the "progress" of northern pro-slavery towards the *desirable* overthrow of our republican slaveholding, one of the grimest, most *roarious*-growing and dismaying is the GLORIOUS CONSTITUTION. You cannot advance in direction of the castle of this pet-monster of the republic—slavery—even to reconnoître, from a distance, its "sublime mysteries,"—but your ears are assailed from every quarter, with cries of, "Compact"—"Pledges to our Southern brethren"—"Guaranty of their peculiar institutions"—"The great compromise." By the way, we of the North, have nothing to do with slavery—absolutely nothing at all—it is a southern affair wholly—we have nothing (compact) to do (guaranty) with slavery (compromise.) Why do you come here to accuse *us* (have pledged ourselves) who are opposed to Slavery, &c. &c. But the absurdities, which grow on every bush, by the anti-abolition wayside, must not tempt us from our brief purpose—to write a rambling, post haste notice of the constitutionality of United States' Slavery. We draw bow at the uncouth monster at venture—*currente, volante*, no pausing to sight,—no solicitous adjustment of shaft to bow-string as if the beast might be missed. Our light arrow must hit him "stretched out many a rood"—and that between joints of his gaping and unguarding harness.—*Imprimis* then. Is the Constitution of these Federate States pro-slavery? So they say, and that it barricades it about with impregnable and perpetual barriers. If it be so—if it sanctions the oppression of the colored people of this country, directly or indirectly ever so remotely,—why it is the most nefarious document ever perpetrated by the hand of human depravity. And those revolutionary fathers of ours—if they did (as their hopeful descendants unblushingly avow) enter into solemn league and covenant to enslave the innocent colored people,—were, we indignantly proclaim, the most ferocious miscreants that have profaned the earth since Cain! What! They—reeking hot from a revolution, kindled for universal liberty—inalienable—the in-

defeasible birthright and incident to every body under the round cope of heaven,—a right so grossly self-evident that they would not argue it but with the naked bayonet,—they—the daring hypocrites, when God had given them victory for the justice of their principles—sealed with the blood of the colored as well as the colorless man,—with *Te Deum* on their breaths, assemble deliberately and solemnly and enslave their fellow men!—Are these the ancestors we bluster about 4th July's! Then indeed “has our ignoble blood crept through” at least one generation of SCOUNDRELS. Why a charter so diabolical should have been writ out in man's blood and on human parchments, and executed amidst accursed incantations around the “charmed pot.” A Constitution, by republicans, for the enslavement of men! An Algerine Divan would not have been caught at it. There is but one imaginable assemblage that would be “up to it,”—a pandemonium, styled, instead of a convention,—and even with Satan himself and his despairing peers, it would have raised a laugh to see men attempt it on the earth—a league to subject man to the boundless caprice of his fallen fellow! Oh! it would have transcended all their expectations of depraved human service—it were a piece of supererogation disgusting to their extremity of wickedness. But it is contended that *our ancestors* did it. It is possible they conceived it in their hearts. Why else did they not demand the abolition of slavery as the sine-qua-non condition of confederation? And why did they expressly protect the infernal slave trade from the interference of their own Congress? Ah! they were embarrassed and the South would not unite. But were they not embarrassed when Great Britain would not unite? They plunged to the neck in revolution for an abstract right. They waged war to the knife against a mere nominal oppression. But it was for their own white selves. Rights were not so “abstract” but they could fight for them when they were *their own*. But when the life and soul of their unoffending and most deserving colored brothers were at stake—why, forsooth, they were embarrassed and must “*compromise!*” But they did not succeed in reducing their compromise to writing. If they conceived it in their treachery, they did not get it down upon the deed; God did not vouchsafe them the art to do it. They were after securing their own

personal liberties and it was utterly past all their scholarship to pen the security and leave the colored man a slave. The written Constitution is a warrantee deed of universal liberty,—equal and absolute freedom to every mortal man who comes within its outmost protection and territorial limit. Slavery is unconstitutional. It has been perpetuated in defiance of the old charter every moment since its adoption. A flying consideration or two in support of this fanaticism—premising that we harbor not a spark of care to convince a solitary republican. So we can help summon the stupid public attention to the *nobile par*. Slavery and The Constitution, we care not how the public holds—constitutional or unconstitutional—the sight is one the nation cannot bear.

Will they travel beyond the deed for intents and purposes? If they do, we point them to that “flourishing” piece of “rhetoric,” the famous “Declaration,” and to the state Bills of Rights, as indications of the *quo animo* of the times—concomitant or precedent acts these, and anti-slavery to ultraism. But we hold them to the deed. To this the Declaration was the preliminary “flourish.” Let us see how the sages followed it up. First, the preamble. We may gather some inklings of their *intent* from the preamble—some means of conjecturing their *purpose*. “We, the people,”—not five sixths, but the whole—the *people*. And what goes to make the constituent parts of that we call *people*? a pointed nose? a thin, termagant lip? a larger curling of the hair? a pallid complexion, unburned by the vertical sun? We call on pro-slavery for a definition of *people*. “In order to form a more perfect union.” Union of what? Fire and water? wolf and sheep? fox and poultry? Union! Slavery is as big with discord as a volcano is of combustibility and eructation. But patience—and look a little further. “To establish *justice*.” Not come to the slavery yet. Henry Clay, in a slaveholding speech before a Colonization Society, seems to *justify* it. The American Union* thinks it has discovered that it is, as it were, a “wrong.” But further, “to secure domestic tranquility,” among the masters? “What makes the mother hug her infant closer to her breast as she hears the midnight bell at Richmond,”

* The nom de guerre of Colonizationists, in and about Boston.—Ed.

cried the mad Randolph, as he disclosed the tranquilizing influences of negro insurrections. Domestic tranquility! The war whoop, as the old settlers used to tell, scared the frontier mothers as, sharp and quick, it "broke the sleep of the cradle." But what is dread of Indians to the dismay of the heartless woman of the South, when she hears the alarm of a slave rising? What imagination can conceive the consternation of the planter? It scares him like the bursting scenes of the judgment day, which it images forth to his guilty, coward soul. It cannot be the *master's* tranquility—but peace among the sovereign states and the sections of the Union. How naturally it springs from the deadly collisions of free and slave interests, habits, feelings and labor!—Surely slavery is a tranquility-breeder among the states and sections! "To provide for the *common defence*." What *defence* does a pro-slavery Constitution afford the colored millions of the country—or are they not a portion of the commonalty. Is the constitutional enslavement of one sixth of the people "*common defence*?" Defence against what? Colored people have become quite *common* in the land, but slavery is no *defence* to them. Defence against foreign enemies perhaps. Gen. Hayne regards slavery as the very essence of national military strength. It leaves the white chivalry at leisure to hunt and fight, while agriculture is kept up at home by the slave. The soundness of this will not here be questioned. But "to promote the *general welfare*," viz. oppressing, degrading, treading under foot, unmaning, unsouling, imbruting, transforming, dismounting of soul and spirit, extinguishing—we want words! here is an unlooked-for and unprovided-for occasion of words of terrible significance! Slavery demands a nomenclature for her own use! "*General welfare*!" *General* to a frightful extent. Let the slave speak as to the *welfare*. So *general* has the system come to work, that it will augment itself to its own and the nation's catastrophe, unless anti-slavery makes haste to the rescue. But we come to it at length. The genius of thralldom at last speaks out for itself, "And secure," mark the phrase, "the blessings of LIBERTY to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution." 'Liberty to be sure,' cries pro-slavery, 'but for whom, not for the nigger, but for "*ourselves* and *our* posterity,"—strongly, by implication, excluding the black folks

from sharing it. "*Ourselves*" were the enslaving preambles.' But "posterity" is a little too general. They should have added *legitimate* by way of limitation, if legitimacy can be predicated of that brothel, a slaveholding community. White posterity—not comprehensive enough, for many a whiter than some of the preambles, pines in bondage. Who are "posterity?" Go to the gloomy gang that drag the heavy foot to the toils of the plantation. "Posterity" linger there rank and file. Go to your federal city and there see the posterity of these constitution-mongers gracing the *coffle*, (that word of sweet import to republican ears,) as it parades the avenues of the capital, to the tune of Hail Columbia, marching to a more summary servitude at the prosperous and fertile south-west. Let that word "*coffle*" sound in the ear of the northern freeman. Let it ring upon the soul of the Church of this republic. Those for whom the Lord died are chained in that hideous phalanx. His professed, perhaps his own real disciples are fettered there. There are the posterity of the framers of the Constitution—of this same "*ourselves*," and these are the blessings of liberty secured to them by the Constitution if it sanctions slavery.

But to the compact proper, section and article. The second section speaks of the whole number of free persons, and of "three fifths of all other persons,"—*other* than *free* must be slaves, and thus the Constitution *recognizes* slavery. There was slavery at the time, and the valiant formers of the compact do allude to it in regulating taxation and representation. They speak of it as an existence, but do not provide it or enact it. So they speak, in section 8th, of "piracies and felonies on the high seas," but not by way of institution or guaranty—though they might have done both with comparative consistency and innocency. Section 8th provides that Congress may call out the militia "to suppress insurrection." Insurrection is a forcible resistance to the laws of the land. Against what law does any man rise in vindication of his just rights? A rising against oppression is justifiable self-defence, and is no "insurrection."* An universal bursting of the fetters of slavery from Washington to the hopeful regions of Texas, were no insurrection. If there be any insurrection connected with slavery, it is the rising

* Our correspondent here speaks as a sound lawyer, not as an abolitionist.—ED.

of the slaveholders against humanity, the law of the land and Almighty God. But this is fanaticism. Section 9th is pro-slavery. It protects from Congress a commerce known, and hunted on the highway of nations, by name of the *slave trade*. It is styled "migration or importation of such persons," &c.—good republican words and fitly spoken. Reader, art thou acquainted with that sort of migration? It is *peculiar*, like the "institutions" in this country which sustain it. There is an account of it by one Thomas Clarkson, detailing it from the seizure of the "*emigrant*" through that branch of it styled "middle passage," and on to his delivery over to final Christian bondage. Our puritan pilgrim fathers called it "migration." The shark attends it over the deep—fit attendant he—cruellest of sea monsters, and of mariners most abhorred. He instinctively scents out and waits on the *emigrant* ship. The peculiarities of the emigration strongly induce him to become party to the voyage. Shadow does not follow substance more industriously and faithfully than this sea-cannibal the *importer* ship. Happy the emigrant—thrice happy and favored of Providence—who falls to the lot of this submarine partner in trade. But this protecting clause was limited to 1808, and has expired. Indeed Congress has since that styled the emigration by a different title, and has given it a different legal effect—prohibiting it, in favor, doubtless, (for it is a protective Congress) of the home market—a kind of "American System" to promote the domestic manufacture of slaves.

Sec. 2d, Art. IV. arrests the fugitive slave and remands him to his prison-house. What says it? "No person held to service or labor in any state, *under the laws thereof*, escaping into another," &c. Any person *lawfully* held to service, ought to be arrested, if he escape. There is no pro-slavery in this, we deny that *slave* service or labor is lawful, even in Carolina. First, we dare question, if the nullifying little state can show a statute on her books, that provides for the enslavement of any human beings. She may have statutes regulating the condition of the enslaved in fact, and against law. But their enslavement is not by law, even in Carolina—or if she has enacted such a statute, it is contrary to her own Constitution, which is republican and so void and no law. Or if not against hers, against

our Constitution, and is no law. Our Constitution, Art. V. of the amendments, expressly declares against the taking of any man's life, liberty or property, but by legal process. But of that anon. Slave service is unlawful any where this side the infernal regions. There it is lawful. There it is constitutional and according to first principles,—but no where short of there. By Sec. 2d, Art. IV. a man flying from slavery, can no more be arrested than if he were escaping a pirate or a boa constrictor. Let "persons" that are fugitive from labor *that they owe*, be stopped and remanded, and it is liberty and not slavery. "The United States shall guaranty to every state a republican form of government." What is this but a government by a majority of the people? The majority in South Carolina are violently and forcibly enslaved by the minority. Is this republican government according to the Constitution? "The citizens of each state;" but stay—we forgot the Black Act of Connecticut, which decrees that a citizen must be white, or he is no citizen. So at least *Justice Daggett* decides,—a second Daniel come to judgment.

Article V. of the amendments. As we cannot amend this, we here after a remark or two close our excursion, bidding, as we do so, slavery and its apologists, welcome to all the consolations of the Constitution. The people finding in their state and sectional controversies they had overlooked individual and personal rights, adopt amendments to the Constitution. First, they guard against abridgment of the freedom of speech and of the press, and the right peaceably to assemble, and the right of petition. Now whether this be directly anti-slavery or not, we aver that the exercise of these rights, will abolish slavery and that the toleration of slavery, will, and has well nigh abolished these. Mobs in the service of slavery, have violated the rights that the Constitution protected from the interference of Congress, and Congress has presumptuously trampled under foot the sacred right of petition, for love of slavery and fear of slaveholders. "The rights of the people to be secure in their persons against unreasonable seizures," would seem to be anti-kidnapping—but pro-slavery explains, by saying that pouncing upon the black man is one of the most reasonable "seizures" in the world, and therefore constitutional to an eminent degree. We give it up. But upon article V. we fasten and shall

hang on upon the *habeas corpus* of the colored man under it, as the Greeks did upon the body of Patroclus. "No person shall be deprived of his *life*, *LIBERTY* or *property* but by due process of law." Ajax Telamon could not spread a broader or more multifold shield over the corse of Achilles' friend, than this broad explicit and absolute clause of the Constitution. We heave it in front of the victim of slaveholding. You can't take his property—even his old hoe with which he delves his rice plat between sun set and dark a Sundays—you can't plunder him of that, without the solemn legal process it takes to arrest the body of your Gen. Jackson for a thousand pound debt. You must have *due* process of *law*. That process by which free men may be divested of their goods, chattels or personal liberty or life.—You can't construe it away or sneer it away. You can as well argue John Hancock's sturdy signature from the old "Rhetorical Flourish." "No person."—Judge Daggett may deny citizenship to the black man, but he would pause at denying him personality. If the negro be not a person, and the enslaved negro too, then slaves and negro people are not alluded to throughout the Constitution. "Three fifths of all other *persons*,"—"the migration of such persons,"—"no person held to service," &c. "No person shall be deprived of property."—If a black man "labor" for another, is he not "worthy of" and entitled to "his" equitable "hire?"—Are not his justly earned wages, *quantum meruit*, his own, his *property*, as absolutely as a man can acquire any thing by labor? We scorn to answer the knavish objections that will be made to this simple statement of the enslaved negro's right of property. Every cent he earns is his by paramount right, and he who denies it to him is a thief—or worse.—Away with your paltry quibbles about purchasing and inheriting men and their wages and all that palpable particeps criminis with kidnappers and pirates. The negro man's wages are his property before God and man, and he who lays a finger on a farthing to withhold it, the curse of God will rest upon him, and it will eat his flesh "as it were fire." Does not slavery deprive of property without legal process? a brief word presently upon process. It isn't kidnapping by the way. "Of life." Does slavery deprive a person of life? To say nothing of the partial and abominable slave laws (not *slavery* laws) which make acts penal and capital in

the black man which are no offence in the white, of "moderate" slave correction which takes life, of exclusion of the black man from the stand of the witness against the white man—what takes life if slave service does not? What consumes life with a prodigality enough to sicken the strong nerves of a Wade Hampton? Slavery. But it undoubtedly takes "liberty," and is it by "due process of law?" No, no. Every body living in a county where there is a court house knows what is due process of law, and that it is the court's forms of administering remedies, your writs and what not. Enslaving and slaveholding have a very different process from all this, and allow us now with all deference to Messrs. Franklin and Armfield, Governor George McDuffie, the whilom "star of Carolina," Austin Woolfolk, and the whole pro-slavery fraternity in its infinite departments, to venture the doctrine, here within a summer day's ride of Canada,—that our republican slaveholding is contrary to the Constitution of these United States.

ON THE USE OF SLAVE PRODUCE.*

BY CHARLES STUART.

THIS question is here presented, not as *theoretical* or *scientific*, but as a *practical* one—not as relating to *other nations*, but to *ourselves*!

The articles embraced in this view, are, Sugar, Molasses and Rum—Cotton, Rice, Tobacco,—the Indigo which is raised in the slave states, the flour which we receive from slaves states, &c.

Why do we call these things, *slave produce*?

* Though not exactly agreeing with our valued correspondent in some of his conclusions, much less in the logic by which he arrives at them, we cheerfully acknowledge that he sheds light as well as heat on his subject; albeit, the former seems to us more refracted than the latter. We shall find room for a few paragraphs of comment at the close of the article, to which, and to the article at page 393 of the first volume, we would refer the reader as containing about all we have to say. There seems more need just now of exposing the sinfulness of slaveholding, than the innocence of buying some sorts of slave produce.—Ed.

Because they are produced by *slave labor*—that is, by *forced* and *unrequited toil*: because from the *poor*, by whose labor they are obtained, their *bodies* are stolen—their *time* is stolen; their *rages* are stolen: their *liberty* is stolen; their *right to their wives and children*, is stolen; their right to cultivate their minds, and to worship God as they please, is stolen: their reputation is stolen: hope is stolen, and all virtuous motives are taken away, by a legalized system of most merciless and consummate iniquity. Such is the expense at which articles produced by slave labor, are obtained—they are always heavy with the groans, and often wet with the blood, of the guiltless and suffering poor.

It will be perceived, that by *slave produce*, articles, obtained, *viciously* by *free* and *hired labor*, are not meant. A merchant may impose upon you, in the quality, &c., of his goods; a farmer of *his produce*: a shoe-maker of *his leather*: a tailor, of *his work*: a lawyer may *flatter or betray you*—and a minister may *leave you at peace in your sins*—and all these are abominable things—but *they are not slave produce!* If you deal *fairly* with the merchant, and the farmer, and the shoe-maker, and the tailor, and the lawyer, and the minister, &c., their guilt is on their own heads: you do not compel it; you do not sustain others in compelling it; it is all their own. “You must needs go out of the world,” 1. Cor. v. 10, if you would avoid all commingling with *such* things. The occupations themselves, together with the articles which they supply, are lawful and right. But it is not so, with *slave-produce*. The business of holding slaves, is, in itself, eminently felonious; and sugar, molasses, rum, &c. &c., wrung by force out of the unrequited toil of the outraged poor, are stolen goods, obtained by the worst species of fraud. The occupation is the most criminal on earth: and the articles which it supplies, are, of all others the most loaded with robbery and wrong.

I affirm, that it is a transgression of the divine law, to purchase or consume such articles, *without a strict necessity*: and my reasons are the following.

Slaveholders *generally* hold slaves, in order to make money by their labor. Some, I know, hold slaves, especially *domestic slaves*, for purposes baser still; and some, I am willing to suppose, hold slaves temporarily, for better purposes; but *generally*, and so far only, my argument goes—

slaveholders hold slaves, in order to make money by their labor. For this purpose, the slaves are put to cultivate the cane, cotton, rice, tobacco, indigo, &c., and sugar, molasses, rum, cotton, rice, tobacco and indigo are brought by these nefarious means into the market.

Yonder then are the hogsheads of sugar and molasses; yonder are the puncheons of rum: yonder are the bales of cotton; and yonder, the rice and the tobacco and the indigo! Now suppose that *no one* would buy them, *because* obtained by robbery. Suppose that the cry of our brothers wrongs, going up to heaven against their oppressors were to turn our hearts within us; *we*, feeling for the down-trodden sufferers as we would wish *them* to feel for *us*, were our situations exchanged, what would become of the sugar molasses, rum, &c. &c.!! No one buys them. No one consumes them—not *because* they are not wanted; for *they are wanted*; but because the curse of the suffering and outraged poor is upon them: *there* they lie, mouldering, putrefying! Will the masters go on to raise another crop, by the same nefarious means: the former still mouldering and putrefying on their hands. Certainly not, if the principle stand firm against their tear-bedewed, their groan-burthened, their curse-commingled, their blood-polluted produce! and as certainly, all men wanting these things, and being eager to purchase them as soon as they can be honestly obtained, would not these same slaveholders, idolizing money and its accommodations as they do, procure these same things for us, by honest and manly means, as they may do, whenever they please, rather than ruin themselves, out of their love for fruitless tyranny? They indeed love tyranny, as all men love power, no doubt for its own sake—but they love it ten times as much for the sake of its golden fruit. Throw its golden fruit into the opposite scale, and the *fair rights of men*, instead of the *nefarious rights of tyrants*, would quickly become their choice.

What prevents this result?

It is not power, nor the love of power—for neither of these could be sustained in civilized society, without money! It is not exclusively the wickedness of the slaveholder, or of the slave trader, for as both of these are too lazy to work, and too proud to beg, they would soon perish with their putrid and unsaleable goods, unless they would so far relax their wickedness as to bring to us honestly-gotten, instead

of atrociously stolen goods! goods in obtaining which the laborer had been treated like a man, instead of being plundered of all that is most dear to man, of all that most powerfully conduces to make man, *man*!

But what is it that prevents the result above mentioned? What is it, which causes the slaveholder still to hug to his bosom, the nefarious system, and to rave like a goaded bull, whenever it is assailed?

It is simply and eminently the purchase and consumption of slave produce! The purchasers and consumers of slave produce, have slavery completely and despotically in their hands. They can crush it, lawfully, peaceably and effectually whenever they please, without a petition—without a remonstrance—without a lecture—without a paper a pamphlet or a pen, they can themselves abolish it. Let them refuse the purchase and consumption of its productions, and it is gone—and the slave converted into a free laborer, will pour into the market, in return for his wages duly received, the articles which they covet, into the employer's pocket, the money which he worships, then obtained by him by honest enterprise.

The whole matter is comprised in this. The slaveholder for some reason or other (and his reasons are various) wants money—and finds or thinks he finds his most convenient way to be, buying and driving to labor like beasts, his guiltless fellow men. The abolitionist, for some reason or other (and *his* reasons too, are various,) wants sugar, molasses, rum, cotton, tobacco, rice, &c., and finds that he can most conveniently supply himself by buying from the slaveholder, either directly or indirectly, the sugar, molasses, &c. &c., of which the slaveholder has become proprietor by the most deliberate, atrocious and complicated villainy. Both are satisfied—and both equally at the expense of the outraged and guiltless poor. The slaveholder is the *hireling*. The abolitionist, is the *hirer*. If there were no slaveholders (no hirelings of this description) there would be no slaves. And if there were no purchasers and consumers of slave produce, there would be no slaveholders. Human wants call for these articles. "I will supply you" cries free labor. "But I," cries slave labor, "will more cheaply and conveniently supply you," love and equity interfere, and exclaim, "yes, slave labor will supply you; "but it will be at the expense of a system of iniquity, at

“which human nature shudders; which is essentially under the divine curse—and against which truth is lifting up her holy and trumpet voice.” “Yes, slave labor will supply you,” groans the slave, “but it will be at the expense of my tears and of my blood; it will be at the expense of blotting me as far as possible out of being as a man, and of consigning me to ignorance, pollution, disgrace, bondage, suffering and despair.” “Who will supply me most conveniently and cheaply,” cries human want. “I,” vociferates slave labor. “Then from *you* will I buy,” replies the other, “I indeed pity the slave, condemn the slaveholder, and abhor slavery; but sugar, &c., I want—and sugar I will have; and who don’t see that it would be a greater evil for me to pay two or three cents a pound more for it, than it is for the slave to suffer the loss of all things in being driven like a beast to procure it for me.”

But plain and solemn as these things undeniably are—and imperative as is the soul trying duty which they involve, still difficulties are made. I proceed to notice some of them from a person, whose general principles and conduct, I admire and love, as much as I detest and lament the opinions which he asserts on this subject. I mean the editor of the *Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine*, Vol. I, No. 4, page 393. “On abstinence from the products of slave labor.” I *cordially* yield him the credit of *sincerely intending right*—so, I should, as cordially, to many a slaveholder! but the *sincere* delusion of neither one nor the other, could sanction in my eyes, the pernicious principles or practices which they sustained.

“To help to a right decision,” says my friend, “we sometimes meet with an argument which may be comprised in the following syllogism. If slave-holding is a heinous crime in the sight of God, all participation in it, must be also criminal. But using the products of slave labor, is a participation in slaveholding. Therefore using the products of slave labor, must be criminal.” To the minor proposition of this syllogism, viz:—“that using the products of slave-labor, is a participation in slaveholding,” ing,” my friend demurs. Yet what can be a more self-evident fact? the fact the same, whether we do it, consciously or unconsciously. *Ignorantly* I may poison a man—*ignorantly* I may abet another in a thousand crimes; but *my*

ignorance, neither renders poison heathful, nor crime innocent, nor does it at all alter the *fact* of my participation. If my ignorance was *fairly excusable*, then am I innocent—this is a fundamental difference, in the *morality* of the act, if my ignorance was not fairly excusable, then am I guilty; the *participation* as a *matter of fact* being the same in both cases; but differing in its morality—in the one case being innocent, in the other, criminal! I fully agree with my friend that very little sugar or cotton, &c., is consumed with the *intention* of thereby maintaining the bondage of the slave—and whenever *excusable ignorance* exists of the fact, that such consumption does actually and powerfully maintain the bondage, I entirely believe that there is no crime. But I as decidedly, aver, that that consumption *does* maintain that bondage, and that it is criminal, whenever the fact might have been known. Nothing can be more undeniable, than that if the products of slave labor were not consumed, they would not be bought, if they were not bought, they would not be raised, if they were not raised, slaves would not be wanted—and if slaves were not wanted, there would be no slaves—but we should have the same articles, by honest enterprise, and by willing and requited labor, free from the tears and the blood of the innocent and outraged poor!

But, says my friend—"In order to show that our use of these or other products does actually have the effect, to aid and encourage the slaveholder to continue his sin, it must be shown that our abstinence will prevent, or at least tend to prevent his continuance. And this cannot be done, without showing a reasonable probability, that our abstinence will produce a sensible effect upon the market."

Surely my friend, when he penned the above, must have forgotten Mark xii. 41. 44. How much did the two mites of our blessed sister of old *tend* to the preservation of *the temple*? And what probability was there, that if she had kept her two mites in her own pocket, her parsimony, would have produced any sensible effect upon its magnificence? Her two mites were in value, about one cent. Estimate the temple and its revenue at \$500,000, and her share would be 1-50,000,000 (one fifty millionth part.) Her two mites then *tended* one fifty millionth part, towards the preservation of the temple; if she had withheld them, 1-50,000,000 part would have been withheld; but how difficult it would

have been to have shown to a carnal eye the *sensible* influence of such a lack upon the temple!! Yet God who saw the minuteness of her contribution towards the preservation of the temple, and how *insensible* the effect upon its magnificence would have been, if she had withheld it, pronounced it more than all the rich and mighty gave. The error of my brother here. I think, is, in looking at *the result* as *man sees it*, instead of looking at the principle, connected with its result, as God sees it,—viewed in the former light, nothing could appear more contemptible than the widow's mites—viewed in the latter, the gold and silver of the wealthy sunk into insignificance compared with them. The consumers of slave produce, as connected with slavery in these states, may be 50,000,000—supposing this estimate correct, each individual of these 50,000,000, has just about as much to do with slavery, as the widow had with the temple. By consuming slave produce, they as powerfully and as effectually sustain *slavery*, as the widow did the *temple*; and if the curse of supporting transgression be equivalent to the blessings of sustaining righteousness, as her blessing was great, how great will the curse be? The money given for slave produce, as undeniably and as directly goes to sustain slavery, as the widow's mites went to support the temple. The withholding of her mites, would not have destroyed the temple, would not have deranged one of its massy blocks; nay, would scarcely have been felt by a particle of dust on its walls. As little would the abstaining from slave produce by a single person affect slavery; but there is something antecedent to the *effect* produced upon slavery, which it would *infinitely affect*; that is, God's appreciation of the moral aspect of the action. *He* would see, that the individual, *did what he could in that particular*, to sustain the most ferocious and impure iniquity, and although the support yielded, was but the 50,000,000 part, yet has He not told us, that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all." James ii. 10.

But here my friend goes over to the *difficulties* of the case; he shows us, that slave *cotton* is mixed with almost every thing: that, industry and enterprise would be blighted; travelling arrested, clothing made extensively impracticable, printing and correspondence abolished, reformation crushed, and anti-slavery societies themselves put to a stop without it.

the bread and the cotton must be used, but they must be used *as exceptions, attesting, not overturning* the law. The *sin of using them unnecessarily* remains the same; because in using them *unnecessarily*, the *sin of slavery is unnecessarily* sustained. David and his followers, together with the priests in the temple, would have sinned in doing as they did without the *necessity* which rendered them blameless in doing so. *That necessity did* render them blameless, but *that necessity* touched not the integrity of the law. The Sabbath remained God's day of rest as much as ever—and the shew bread remained, as much as ever, the peculiar portion of the priests. So, *the necessity* for using slave cotton, where that necessity *does really exist*, while, *in such cases*, it renders the use of slave cotton blameless, touches not the integrity of the general prohibition. “Neither be partaker of other men’s sins” remains a divine injunction, *a law for our guidance*, as much as if no exception to it had ever existed—and still it remains a crime as truly as ever, when we see a thief to consent with him.

But, exclaim, my brother, “We say confidently, that a man *may buy* and use any product of slave labor, which is, in itself proper to be used, without at all participating in the crime which attended the production.

But, I ask, where *is that product* of slave labor which *is, in itself, proper* to be used? *Bread*, let us remember, and *poisoned bread* are two different things—so are *sugar* and *slave sugar*; *cotton* and *slave cotton*; *rice* and *slave rice*, &c. Bread, in itself, is very proper to be used—so are sugar, cotton and rice—but bread *poisoned with arsenic*; and sugar, cotton and rice *poisoned with slavery*; with the guilt of the oppressor, and the tears and blood of the oppressed, are quite different things. *In themselves* they are always *most improper* to be used; and nothing but a strict necessity, such as that adverted to, can ever render their use blameless. This fundamental difference is, I think, generally lost sight of by my brother abolitionists; they think and speak of slave produce *as if* there were no *slavery* in it—*as if* slave sugar were, *sugar*—and slave rice, *rice*—and slave cotton, *cotton*. They might much better think and say, that a tallow candle was a spermaceti one; or poisoned bread, was *bread*. It is time for them to learn and remember, that *there is poison in it*; the *poison* of the masters’ tyranny and

lar to that of condemning the dishonesty of the slaveholder, and yet purchasing and consuming his nefariously gotten goods. But are the cases similar?

The miller's business is a lawful business. The slaveholder's business, however legalized by wickedness for a time, is always eminently unlawful! The miller works for you himself, or pays a fair equivalent for the work which he gets performed for you. The slaveholder in order to supply *you*, is guilty of the most atrocious robbery: he gets sugar for you at the expense of bereaving your guiltless brother of all that is most dear to man! and he does not do this incidentally: but *fundamentally*, as an inherent and essential part of his system, so that remaining a slaveholder he can no more supply you, without thus horribly robbing your brother, than he could live without breathing; this atrocious felony committed against his down-trodden brother, being as inseparable from *forced servitude*, as breath is from life. In rebuking the miller for his dishonesty, you obey the divine commandment, Lev. xix. 17. In continuing to deal with the miller, (I mean in any *ordinary* case, such as I doubt not my friend intended,) you suit your own *lawful* convenience: "You cannot disentangle yourself from connexions of this kind without going out of the world." 1 Cor. v. 10. But were the miller a *thief*, and you knew it! whenever you took your grist to his mill, were he to go out amongst his neighbors, and, with the lash suspended over them, were he, *to your knowledge*, to drive them like beasts to grind your grain, and then to dismiss them without wages, merely giving them some pittance in order to preserve their strength for another similar occasion, could you *then*, as a kind and honest man, send your grist to him, or purchase *his* grist thus obtained by violence and fraud, or if you did do so, would you not plainly be a partaker in his sin: a tempter and a sustainer of his iniquity?

But to me the most grievous part of my brother's argument is, his representation of *abstinence from slave produce*, as a *physical* expedient; and when he inveighs against it as a physical expedient arresting moral evil. What does he mean by a physical expedient in an objectionable sense? Does he mean that when I know a tradesman to be an idler or a drunkard, or a lawyer a villain, or a professor of religion a hypocrite and a cheat, and therefore refuse

to employ them, that I am guilty of an objectionable physical expedient? or that regard for God's law and for human virtue and happiness, does not prohibit my giving them countenance in their iniquity? Does he mean, that when I know intoxicating drinks to be the direct and dreadful source of such a vast accumulation of vice and misery as is pouring over the land, my refusing to buy or use the liquid poison, is an objectionable physical expedient? or that holy love does not require me neither to touch, or taste, or handle the polluting and accursed thing? Yet if he do not mean such things as these, how can he fancy that refraining from slave produce is an objectionable physical expedient? I will not deal with an idle and drunken mechanic; I will not deal with a treacherous lawyer; I will not support a religious professor who is a hypocrite and a cheat; and my brother, I suppose, approves of my prudence and my benevolence. But do I do a more grievous wrong to the law of God or to human virtue and happiness, by countenancing a drunken mechanic, or a roguish lawyer, or a professor of religion who is a hypocrite and a cheat, than I do by countenancing a slaveholder? or, *which* is the most destructive character in society; and which does holy love most loudly call upon us to discountenance, the poor, idle, drunken laborer? or the treacherous lawyer? or the hypocritical professor? or the deliberate and unbending plunderer under a system of complicated mischief framed by law, of all that is dear on earth to his guiltless brother? And if because intoxicating liquors are pouring vice and misery over the land, I rightfully and benevolently refuse to deal in them, with their makers and venders, and users—why should it be an objectionable physical expedient for me to refuse to deal in slave produce, with its perpetrators or venders, or users, because it sustains a system of vice and misery more deep and deadly than even that which flows from intoxicating drinks? Intoxicating liquors are *physically* poisonous, and therefore should not be used; slave produce is replete with *moral* poison, should *it* be used? or, am I bound to be more careful of my body than of my soul? or, of the virtue and safety of the *freeman*, who, *in this country*, is always more or less able, if willing, to take care of himself, than of the guiltless and writhing *slave*, who is *dumb*? whose soul is seathed, and whose mouth is sealed by desperate oppression? or is

drunkenness a greater enemy to God and man, than tyranny? Which are doing most evil to this nation, drunkards or slave masters? which yield the most mighty and horrible power? which produce most mobs? which practice most *lynching*? which threaten the Union most? which are the proudest, the most irascible, imprudent, factious, rebellious, untameable, cruel, impure and unjust? Are they not mates, alike immense, misshapen, destructive and portentous! and can we then rightfully and benevolently encourage and sustain one, while we are doing, and are bound by duty to do, all that we can to bring the other to repentance? Can we lawfully take from drunkenness its meat and drink, yet nurture slavery with the choice food on which it revels and destroys? Take away intoxicating liquors, and drunkenness is gone! Take away slave produce, and slavery is extirpated! Shall we call it a righteously moral means to refrain from the aliment of drunkenness, and an objectionably physical expedient, to refrain from the aliment of slavery? Shall we deem it *lore*, to *starve* the one and to nourish the other? Can we with righteous consistency come over at the cry of his misery to the help of the drunkard, yet turn a deaf ear to the wail of the slave?

"Ah," said a young slave in Jamacia, a few years ago within the hearing of one my of acquaintances, as with his fellow slaves, he was rolling a hogshead of sugar to the shore, "if the people in England knew how much of our blood, and how brutally, has been shed to make the sugar in this hogshead, there is not a kind heart amongst them that would ever taste a grain of it." A friend of mine returned from the same island about three years ago. I visited him just before I last left England. "A short time before I started," he said to me—"I was conversing with a very intelligent slave on a sugar plantation and asked him, if it was really true that they suffered as much as was reported. I found it difficult to persuade him that I was in earnest, but when at length satisfied that my question was serious, he exclaimed with every gesture of surprise and pain. "They masse, dem not know, dat kill me?" In other words. What sin! don't every body know that it kills us! Many years have not elapsed, since the *moral expedient* of starving out drunkenness, by abstaining from the food on which its existence is dependant, appeared as chimerical, as now appears

the *equally moral expedient* of starving out slavery by abstaining from the food, by which alone it lives. But should this last expedient, *notwithstanding its sound and sacred morality*, prove at last chimerical, what will be *the reason*? Will it be *want of power* in the consumers of slave produce thus to extirpate slavery? Certainly not, for no proposition in mathematics is more plain or more undeniable, than that they have the *absolute power*, whenever they please to extirpate it. *All that is wanting, is the will*, and if the will be wanting, *whose fault is it*? Is it not the fault of *every individual* who does not do *his share, without waiting for any body*? Is it not yours, and yours, and mine, brother, who look more to *human concurrence*, than to the *divine law*? Who *will not do our part*, which we *can do whenever we please*, because we cannot get others to do their parts? But if so we live, and if so we die, will not our brothers' blood be found in our skirts?

My dear brother is unwilling that the *Anti-Slavery Society* should also become an *anti-slave produce society*. So am I—but on grounds different from his. I am unwilling on the same grounds, on which I am unwilling, that the *Sunday School Society*, or the *Temperance Society*, &c. &c., should become also, an *Anti-Slavery Society*. Those societies *sin*, I think grievously by rejecting Anti-Slavery facts and Anti-Slavery principles, so much as they do, from their measures and their publications—in this respect, they are guilty I think, of a base and criminal subserviency to public wickedness. Noble and lovely, and beloved as they are, yet better in my opinion were it, that they should cease to be, than that they should thus compromise God's law and their outraged brother's cause. But yet, I would by no means have them become anti-slavery societies. Their appropriate cause is already marked out, and it is a glorious one. They have enough to do, each in its own department. No important work can be accomplished efficiently, without a wise division of labor. The little pin is made and afforded so abundantly and so beneficially, by twenty different and distinct trades, working separately and appropriately at it. The body wants toes and feet, as well as fingers and hands and head and heart. So the glorious work of love through Christ flourishes, by the various associations, which conduct its different parts. Bible societies, must not become Sunday

school societies—nor Sunday school societies, temperance societies—nor temperance societies, anti-slavery societies—nor anti-slavery societies, anti-slave produce societies, any more than feet must become fingers, or fingers, brains.—Hands and feet and eyes and ears are bound indeed to serve one another; and so are benevolent societies, and they sin when they do not—but still they must not be confounded—each must retain its own distinctive character. The Bible Society is bound to sustain the Temperance Society; and the anti-slavery society, is bound to urge and sustain abstinence from slave produce. But each of these departments, in order to be conducted beneficially, needs a distinct and appropriate organization—and they can no more be *rightfully* confounded together, than they can *rightfully* stand aloof from one another, whatever be the motive, or whatever the influence when they do stand aloof from one another, they are recreants in *that particular*, from the common cause. They prefer their *own parts* to the whole. They seek partial, not universal righteousness, they are Sectarian, not Christian.

One other position of my brother, I feel bound to combat, He says, “suppose the whole world,” (one twentieth part of it would suffice.) “should abstain from these products, and “the slave states should thereby be compelled formally to “abolish slavery. So far as the abolition was produced by “these means, it would rest on no principle but necessity, it “would be a slavish act. The sin would be unrepented of, “and the chance is, that the reformation would be rather “nominal than real. For there could not be, in the southern “states, as in the West Indies, hosts of special justices, to “watch the unwilling benefactors, and secure the rights of “the weaker party.”

But does my dear brother mean, that the rescue of sufferers from suffering, is not desirable, unless the *inflictors of suffering* repent? Would he leave his neighbor's house to burn, until he could prevail upon the incendiaries to be heartily sorry? Would he leave *slaves* perishing, until *slaveholders* are brought to repentance? If, in traversing the ocean, he should be cast away on the shores of Morocco, and reduced to slavery there, would he reject the rescue, and a restoration to his native country, until his Arab master, could be convicted of sin and brought to Christ?—Would he reply, “no! my master's releasing me under these

circumstances would be a *slavish* act, and I will remain a slave, until he releases me *holily* ! Or does he forget, that on the supposition which he makes, the emancipation would be quite *voluntary* on the master's part, and enacted strictly by himself, out of regard to his own interests ; however much he might despair or abhor the *fanaticism* which urged him to it ! By my dear brother's supposition, *all* the consumers of slave produce refrain from it, *because* it is *slave produce*, not because they do not want sugar and molasses and cotton and rice, &c., for they do love these things, and want them greatly—but *because* they love their God, and their brother more ! *because* they will deny themselves these desirable articles, rather than participate in the slaveholder's guilt, or aid in the misery and degradation of the guiltless slave !—Does he not perceive, that as soon as the slaveholders were satisfied that they could never sell another pound of sugar, &c., wrung by force and fraud out of the outraged slave, but that they would be sure of an abundant market for the same things *fairly obtained* by hired and voluntary labor, they would be as eager for *immediate and thorough emancipation, at home*, under law, as the abolitionists now are, and that in this awakened and dominant sense of *their own interest*, benevolence would have a better security for the new liberty on these principles bestowed, than all the *special* justices in the world could yield ? We have a striking instance of this in Antigua. I know of no ground whatever for believing that the former slaveholders of that island have repented of their sin. It was *policy*, not righteousness, *interest*, not benevolence, which prompted them somewhat upwards of two years ago, to the *immediate and thorough* emancipation of their slaves on the spot, it was, in my dear brother's sense, a *slavish act*, and I have no doubt, that in God's sight it was so. Yet it was a *perfectly voluntary act*, properly speaking, *their own act*, in view of exactly the same influences, as all the world's abstaining from slave produce, would exercise universally upon slaveholders ; and the same sense of interest which prompted them to the act has been found ten thousand times more efficient than any *extraneous superintendence*, could possibly have been, in securing the rights of the weaker party, the fact is, that in such cases, the power which rules, is not physical, as my brother supposes it, but is moral, exercising its might not

upon the body, but upon the mind—not by physical penalties, but by moral persuasion—not by force, but by motives, the person thus governed, yielding not by compulsion, but by choice, the choice of good instead of evil, of right instead of wrong, of liberty instead of slavery, of honesty instead of theft, of justice and kindness instead of violence and fraud, of interest in some measure wholesome, instead of their tyranny and pride.

I remark in conclusion, that *truth* is eternally the same. That it is not strengthened by human attestation, nor enfeebled by human denial. Slavery is *high treason* against God and against human virtue and happiness, whatever slaveholders or their apologists may think or say : and alike whether the slave is kindly or cruelly treated ; alike in *fact*, though differing in *amount* : and it is equally, and *as obviously* true, that *the use of slave produce*, sustains slavery more directly and powerfully than does any other thing, *guiltily* if the use be not strictly and fairly speaking *necessary*, *blamelessly*, if strictly and fairly speaking it be *indispensable*. The Anti-Slavery Society and any other society, my dear and honored brother, the editor of A. S. Quarterly, or any other person friend or foe, may deny this, if they please, or admitting it, may refuse to advocate the conduct which it requires. But the *truth* remains the same, unchanged by their assent or denial ; and by God's unchangeable truth, must every man stand or fall. *Every moment* that slavery continues, God's law is outraged, and the most dear and sacred of human rights, are trampled in the dust. *Every atom* of slave produce which is used, actually and directly sustains slavery as far as it goes, for slavery could no more exist without the consumption of its products, than life could be preserved without food ; the consumption of these products being *criminal* where *unnecessary*—*blameless* where *indispensable* ; and every individual who uses slave produce, does all that he can in that particular to support slavery. He is not the *fifty million*, and what the fifty million can do therefore, he is not required to do—but he is the *one*, and what *one* can do, *is required* of him ! If he unnecessarily sustain slavery, he is partaker in the guilt of tyrants. If he do it *necessarily* the *necessity* pleads his excuse. God who makes the law, sees and recognizes the exception. No precept of scripture is more absolute than that against

theft. Yet the thief is excused, when hunger compels him. "Men do not despise a thief, if he steals to satisfy his soul when he is hungry," Prov. vi. 30. So the abolitionist who resides where he cannot sustain life without using slave produce, is excusable in using slave produce, as far as it is really necessary for his life and health. A compensation indeed may be required of him. "But if he be found, he shall restore seven fold, he shall give all the substance of his house," Prov. vi. 31. This compensation, the abolitionist richly pays, when being unable to travel, or speak, or correspond efficiently against slavery; without the use of slave cotton, he buys and employs it, for the extirpation of slavery. This is one of the ways in which God takes, "the wise" (the worldly wise) "in their own craftiness," 1. Cor. iii. 19. The slaveholder raises cotton for the support of slavery. The abolitionist buys the cotton and pulls slavery down. The starving man, *compelled by hunger* uses *food without blame*, which would *otherwise* be unlawful. The abolitionist *compelled* by an impulse mightier far, even by *love*, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," seeing his guiltless brother in bondage, and realizing what he would justly wish, were situations altered, uses for his *brother's* deliverance, what he could not use without guilt for his *own* convenience. Just as the Temperance Society man will not hesitate to give alcohol to his neighbor, if alcohol be really necessary for his neighbor's life or health, but *without that necessity*, would rather lose his right hand, than put alcohol within his neighbors reach.

We may observe, that the whole *apparent* difficulty of this solemn question, relates to *cotton*. The other articles of slave labor, in our market, sugar, molasses, rum, tobacco, rice, indigo, &c., are clearly *unnecessary*, and therefore *never* can be *lawful*, except in *strictly medical cases*. Besides, with very little trouble perhaps, and a small additional expense, sugar, molasses, and indigo *produced by free labor* can always be obtained. Rum and tobacco, should never be used except as medicines, and rice can be dispensed with till it can be gotten undefiled by the pollution of tyranny—unmoistened by the tears and unbedewed with the blood of the guiltless and down trodden poor. Situated as we are, and with the whole world, excepting *a few ultra abolitionists* to sustain us, it is very easy now to make light of these

eternal truths. But will it be as easy to give a *satisfactory answer* to God, when He shall make inquisition for our brothers' blood, and require to know, why we aided in shedding it? Consumers of slave produce, look well to it.

My dear brother's principle, "of doing to others, as we would have them do to us, of remembering them that are in bonds, as bound with them," is dear to my whole heart, but with my whole heart, I reject *the preservation of my influence*, as the rule of this principle. The clear and thrilling claims of my God's law, and of my perishing brother's rights and blood, are *my rule*; and when the *preservation of my influence*, comes up against this rule, or *as a substitute for it*, I cast it from me, as I should cast from me a venomous serpent that would otherwise sting me to death.

God demands that every man should do his duty, *his own duty*, without waiting for any body, and without depending upon any body. What *ought* to be done, *can* be done.—Nothing but a *corrupt will* prevents it. And amidst all the *eulogia* which have crowned with praise the glorious spirits that have adorned the world, all others sink into insignificance compared with Mark xiv. 8, "she hath done, what she could."

C. STUART.

Whitesboro', Nov. 14th, 1835.

Our correspondent affirms that buying slave produce is a violation of the divine law. His chapter and verse for the *why* and *wherefore* are developed on the 155th page, and amount to this. If no body would buy the products, slaveholders would abandon their wicked system. Hence, we are bound to abstain as a *means* of bringing slavery to an end—as furnishing a grand and irresistible argument *ad crumenam*. Now, granting for the arguments' sake, and that only, that it would be irresistible, *if* all non-slaveholders would unite, does it certainly follow that we ought to prefer *this* means to every other? Slavery would cease as soon, *if* all non-slaveholders would unite in a purely moral rebuke of it—*if*, denouncing it as piracy, they would withdraw from it the props of their 'compacts' and 'compromises' and mealy-mouthed engagements to restore fugitives. The divine law surely binds me to extinguish, if I can, the fire

that threatens to devour my neighbor's house, but it does not bind me to do it by stopping off the supporter of combustion with blankets, when I think I can better gain the end by throwing on water.

But if there is no probability of enough uniting in abstinence sensibly to affect the market, or rather to make slaveholding a losing business, the argument *ad crumenam* is with things unborn—it is less than nothing and vanity.

Our correspondent refers to the widow, who for giving two mites received the divine commendation. Did that commendation apply to her *object*, or to her *motives*? Now the question is not about the *motives* of the abstinent from slave produce, but about the *obligation* to abstain. It is quite possible that the Lord might have commended the widow's act, while he considered giving for the support of the temple of no moral obligation. He was looking, not at the *support* of the temple, but at the *motives* of the supporters. We are looking at the overthrow of slavery, and not at the motives of any body. And we apprehend our friend's argument goes legitimately to commend the *motives* of those who abstain from its products, with a sincere intention, however inefficient the means, to overthrow slavery, and to condemn the *motives* of him who buys even an ounce of cotton, consenting to the robbery by which it was raised; but no further. Now, our correspondent, if we understand him, holds that the buyer of an ounce of cotton does, to a certain fraction, be his *motives* what they may, either ignorantly or knowingly *support slavery*. We say, no—not necessarily, any more than we support the odious, and dishonest bank monopolies whose notes we pass while we are using all our power as a free citizen to put them down. He does not necessarily, for our correspondent has failed to show that his abstinence would be either *the* means or *a* means of abolishing slavery. But does not the buyer furnish to the slaveholder both the motive to tyrannize and the means of surrounding himself with the instruments and safe-guards of tyranny? Yes, but both the cotton and the money are *bona in se* and fit objects of barter, and the buyer of the cotton is no more responsible for the use which the other shall make of the money, than the buyer of the money is responsible for the use the other shall make of the cotton. It may be said that the common law holds the buyer of stolen goods

to be *particeps criminis* to the theft. Granting that slave products are stolen goods, which we have not much disposition to deny, the question is not one of legal technics but of morality. The buyer is certainly *particeps* if his motive be thievish—if he consents to the theft or silently enjoys its profits. But let us put a case sufficiently near the parallel for the purpose of illustration. A man offers to sell me wheat which I know to have been stolen from one who keeps it for sale. Suppose there is no law or public sentiment by which I can compel him to restore, or bring him to justice, and suppose my refusing to buy will not in any considerable degree spoil his market. Here is a case substantially like the slaveholder's. Were I to buy the wheat silently I should be a *particeps*. But I say to the seller, You stole this wheat, and were I to take it without paying a cent, I should serve you no worse than you served the owner. But as I know the owner wants the money, and I want the wheat, I pay you a fair price for it—go and hand the money to the owner, and know that if there is an honest man above ground he shall hear of the transaction. Am I a *particeps*? I spend more to bring the thief to justice than the profits on the bargain. Am I to be considered a *particeps*? There is a point somewhere at which I stop being responsible for other men's wickedness. If non-intercourse were the appropriate cure of common avarice, overreaching and dishonesty, we should be bound to use it with many of our neighbors, but our correspondent himself confesses that it is not, and it is difficult to see how the mere enormity of slavery excepts it from the same rule.

From these considerations we think that our correspondent in showing that the purchase or consumption of slave produce is "a transgression of the divine law," has been obliged to rely solely on his reason, and his reason has failed him. Still, though we differ from him altogether as to the *reason* for abstinence, we do not probably differ much as to the *practice*. He admits in his exception of "necessity" as much license in the purchase and use as our rule would allow.—The difference is this. We hold the purchase or use of any slave *products* to be no wrong in itself, but perfectly right unless it appears that abstinence would so much benefit the slave as to be required by the *divine rule* of doing to others as we would be done by. And we do regard every

sacrifice of these things which can be made without materially impairing our usefulness, of which conscience must judge, to be a duty we owe to the slave, *simply as a testimony of our sympathy with his sufferings and remembrance of his wrongs*. This rule will certainly exclude slave sugar and molasses, to say nothing of rum and tobacco which ought to be *tabu* as *mala in se*. And it will give a decided preference for linen and free labor cotton over fabrics which are partly, though in very small part, the products of slave labor.

Our correspondent thinks the purchase or use of any products of slave labor to be *sin*, *except* where a "*strict necessity*" requires the use. This rule, after all, gives as much play to the conscience as ours. What is a *strict, actual necessity*? It would seem from our correspondent's own interpretation that it includes much more than merely saving life—some degree of usefulness and comfort must be saved. And how is conscience to decide the *how much* any more surely under his rule than ours? We leave the candid reader to judge.

Slaveholding is a *malum in se*, which no circumstances or consequences can convert into a *bonum*. The use of some of the products of slave labor is a *bonum in se*, which may and often does become a *malum, per consequentia*.

THE EDITOR.

CASTE IN THE UNITED STATES: A REVIEW.

BY THE EDITOR.

MARIE ou L'ESCLAVAGE aux ETATS-UNIS, *Tableau de moeurs Américaines*; par GUSTAVE DE BEAUMONT, l'un des auteurs de l'ouvrage intitulé; Du Système Pénitentiaire aux Etats-Unis. Bruxelles, 1835.

[MARIA or SLAVERY in the UNITED STATES, a *Picture of American manners*; by GUSTAVUS DE BEAUMONT, one of the authors of the work entitled: Of the Penitentiary system of the United States. 2 vols. 12 mo.]

IN our country religious tyranny and toleration are equally unknown. All sects are quite at home here. None have a monopoly of power. None live by sufferance. Hence a

common feeling of patriotism is to be found in all. Indeed, we may say, the more singular and extravagant a man's creed, the more does he love the country which protects him in the full enjoyment of it. We think it will be found on examination that none are more devotedly attached to American institutions than the members of the weaker sects, or indeed, than the insulated and unbelieving dissentients from all sects. Now we presume that any scholar who has mastered the A B C of American politics will say that our country owes much of her quietness and safety to her not respecting creeds, to her looking at what a man does and not at what he believes, to her not having a favorite church. Here are men whose *doxies* are at everlasting war, and yet the men themselves live together in tolerable peace under the same government—simply because, with their *doxies* the government has nothing to do. And our scholar need be little more profound to discover that the whole charm would be broken by putting any one sect, however small, under the ban of the government, or what would amount to the same, under the trampling feet of popular proscription. The moment the governing power begins to measure men's rights by their creeds, liberty of conscience is overboard with a millstone around her neck.

Here a practical inquiry meets us. How comes it that a government which never cares for the color of a man's creed should take him to do for the color of his — coat? Is it that a man's religious belief has less to do with the well being of society than the tint of his broadcloth? Lest the governing power should excuse itself by saying that belief is involuntary, while the color of a coat may be changed at pleasure, we will just suppose that in spite of drapers and tailors a man's vestments, by a sort of anti-chameleon property, are infallibly assimilated to a certain dingy hue, which is fated to stick to him as tight as the skin in which he was born. Where would be the righteousness or the good policy of teasing and worrying this individual to dress in orthodox blue, when it is out of his power to wear any thing but brown, be his desires what they may? Now the folly and wickedness of such tyranny, bating that our supposition should have been carried a little deeper, to wit,—*skin-deep*, is precisely that of which the governing power in our republic is deeply guilty. It would be thought downright injustice to

make a man ineligible to office for want of belief in the trinity, and monstrous bigotry, to exclude one from a table, or a pew, or a coach, or a steamboat-cabin for a belief in transubstantiation. Such crimes are unheard of. Yet it is thought no injustice nor bigotry, but a very just and proper and politic thing to proscribe a man for wearing the skin which his Maker gave him. It would be thought a very barbarous thing for men of learning and talent to stigmatize and condemn all people of slender intellect, and a very impolitic thing for the rich to make enemies of the poor, and a very unpatriotic thing for any body to increase the temptations of the vicious; but so common, nay, universal a thing is it to stigmatize and maltreat persons of a certain color, or rather who are *NOT* of a certain color, that some who in their hearts abhor it, feel compelled, as they love their daily bread, to do it; and those who, following their hearts, refuse to follow custom, are thought to injure, by their *ultraism*, the very cause they love. Yes, let a *white* man invite a *colored* one to sit with him in his pew or in his parlor, and he can hardly expect to be able afterwards either to rent or purchase a pew or a house without being called upon to pledge himself never to repeat the act. If he had declared open war upon decency and spurned from his house the very mother that bore him, the white public would not shrink from him with more pious horror, than they now profess to feel. Pray, what is the matter? we ask of a generous and enlightened public. The reply is couched with quaking apprehension, in the appalling interrogatory; *would you have your daughter marry a negro?* And the utter slavery to which this tyrant prejudice has reduced every thing that is noble and good in the land, is evinced by nothing more clearly than by the pains taking of even abolitionists to show that colored men *may be* enfranchised and elevated without bringing on the dreaded consequence. Not a word to vindicate your daughter's sacred right to the disposal of her own affections! Not a word for the equally sacred right of the colored brother to win affection where he can! But a tacit, crouching, slavish assent to the terribleness of the bug-bear.

From such slavery, we humbly pray, good Lord deliver us.

Call submission to it policy or what you will, it is too much in the line with the driving of the tyrant we oppose

for us to have any complacency in it. We must fling off the last fetter before we can breathe freely. We have a mind to let the public know that they may as well attempt to scare us from common civility to the professors of a different creed by asking—*would you have your daughter marry a heretic?*—as to choke our friendship for the deserving colored man, by the other question. If the immaculate advocates of *pure blood* deem this a punishable heresy, let them come upon us where we sit, with tar—apt emblem of their own virtue—and feathers of the goose, and work their will, but we beg of them not to commit any more of those dastardly assaults upon the innocent colored people.

Being sure that this caste of color, skulking among our free institutions like the devil in paradise, is the natural offspring and prime minister of slavery, and lives nowhere apart from its parent abomination, we were not at all surprised at the book which we have placed at the head of this article. A refined Frenchman, who had never learned to curl the lip at his Maker's taste in tinging some of His roses and violets of a darker hue than the rest, could hardly resist the temptation to entertain the Parisians with the incidents to which the courtship and marriage of a colored damsel by a white gentleman would lead in the United States. The object of M. de Beaumont is to paint the manners of our people, especially as they stand related to slavery.

We will glance at the tale on which he has seen fit to build his remarks, premising that he was associated with M. de Tocqueville, as a deputation from the French government to examine our penitentiary system, after despatching which jointly, in a luminous report, M. de Tocqueville has taken up in scientific style our democratic institutions, while M. de Beaumont has served up our manners. Here is the story. A Frenchman, disgusted with his country, where his political predilections were on the popular side, while his family connections were with the aristocracy, betakes himself to America. From New-York he follows the current of emigration up the majestic Hudson, traverses the grand canal and the lakes till he finds himself in Michigan on the borders of the Saginaw. On this outmost wave of civilization the traveller discovers among the rare indications of human labor which begin to disturb the primitive wilderness, a remarkable structure, a cottage, whose elegance of form is

strongly contrasted with the rudeness of its materials. A beautiful lakelet whose flowery margin hides the light canoe, is spread before it, and nature on either side owns the taste and skill of the possessor. But who the possessor can be, the nearer the stranger approaches the more does he marvel. A solitary man is at length discovered,—a brother Frenchman, who hospitably entertains the new-comer, not in the mysterious cottage, but in a simpler cabin near it.—This man of the wilderness is named Ludovic, and the curiosity of the traveler elicits from him the sad tale which illustrates American manners,—a tale which greatly allays his admiration for America and sends him back to the country from which he came, never to quit it.

Ludovic's ambition had made him the football of fortune in his own country till he was tired of life. America was his resort. He was received by Daniel Nelson a distinguished citizen of Baltimore, who was under obligations for certain favors received from Ludovic's family. This Daniel Nelson was one of the cool-headed, sharp-sighted sons of New England, who had commenced making a fortune in New Orleans, but for reasons disclosed in the sequel had retired to spend his days in quiet seclusion in Baltimore.—He had a lofty national pride; was a hater of the English; an ardent Presbyterian, of which sect he had become a preacher; a distinguished promoter of Temperance, Bible, Missionary, and Colonization Societies,—and though not a slaveholder was a believer in the invincibility of prejudice against the people of color. His family consisted of two motherless children,—George and Maria of the ages of twenty and eighteen, respectively as brave and as beautiful as the necessities of novel-writing require her brother and the *heroine* to be. It is needless to say, and to say whereabout, the tender passion was in due time hatched. It grew vigorously, and, if we are to credit the author, the food it fed on was quite ambrosial. The crisis of its full revelation to the damsel *revealed a mystery* to the lover. Indeed the enigmatical foretokenings of this had made part of the aliment of love. Maria was not only as interesting in herself as such a character should be, but there was something as interesting as it was unaccountable in her ways. She saw no company; with all the accomplishments of the world, she was out of the world. Her amusements were not in the

ball room nor the theatre, but in the Alms House. With angelic innocence she shrunk from observation like a criminal. With more social affections than her heart could hold, she lived a recluse. When the Frenchman told his love, "a ray of joy sparkled in her fine eye, but a cloud of sadness veiled it the next moment." What was the matter?

The mystery which it cost the enamored Frenchman, long time and pains and well nigh despair to penetrate, we will despatch with a word. Maria was *colored*! Not *chromatically*, reader, but *genealogically*. Nelson had married in New Orleans a young creole, not less distinguished for her beauty than for her modesty and piety, named Theresa Spencer. George and Maria were the blessing on this union. But among the discarded suitors of Theresa's youth, was Fernando d'Almanza whose disappointment suffered his revenge only to sleep. In process of time it awaked for mischief. D'Almanza possessed a secret more terrible in America than a thunderbolt. He divulged and proved that Theresa's *great-grandmother was a mulatto*! The *une goutte de sang noir* sunk into the family peace like the leaden bullet of the hunter. The *eclatante blancheur*, like the lily, of Theresa's complexion was no charm against the destroyer. She withered under the public scorn and died of a broken heart. Nelson forsook New Orleans and found for a while a refuge for his motherless babes in Baltimore. They profited by the ignorance of their new acquaintances, and only "felt the trouble *in their souls*."

This revelation was far from being a death-blow to the passion of the generous Ludovic. He heard it from the lips of Nelson himself in reply to his request for the hand of Maria, and it gave increased importunity to his suit. Nelson foresaw the *perils* of the match, and with his characteristic prudence and firmness dissuaded the applicant.— "When he saw our emotions a little calmed, he said to me:— "Enthusiasm misleads you, my friend; beware of yielding "to a generous passion. Alas! if you look with an unprejudiced eye at the sad reality, the sight will be more than "you can sustain, and you will perceive that it is impossible "for a white to be united to a woman of color."

"I cannot describe to you," continues Ludovic, "the "trouble which these words threw into my soul. What a "strange situation! at the moment when Nelson spoke

“them. I saw near me Maria, whose complexion surpassed
“in whiteness the swans of the great lakes.”

The Frenchman uttered in no measured terms his indignation against prejudices so much at war with our national professions, and Nelson entered into a labored explanation of the origin and nature of these prejudices, tracing them to the fountain-head of slavery. After having discussed the treatment of the slaves, the dialogue of Nelson and Ludovic proceeds as follows :—

“LUDOVIC. But whence comes it that you brand with
“so much disgrace, those to whom you have given liberty ?

“NELSON. The black who is no longer a slave *was* one,
“and, if he was born free, it is known that his father was
“not.

“LUDOVIC. I understand the reprobation which befalls
“the negro and the mulatto even after their enfranchisement,
“for their color refers incessantly to their servitude ; but
“what I do not comprehend is, that the same brand should
“attach to the people of color who have become *white*, and
“whose whole crime is to count a black or mulatto among
“their ancestors.

“NELSON. This rigor of public opinion is doubtless un-
“just ; but it appertains to the very dignity of the American
“people. Placed before two races different from his own,
“the Indians and the Negroes, the American has mingled
“himself with neither. He has kept pure the blood of his
“fathers. To prevent all contact with those nations, he has
“branded them in public opinion. The brand rests upon
“the race, when the color no longer exists.

“LUDOVIC. In the present state of your customs and
“your laws, you do not recognize an hereditary nobility ?

“NELSON. Certainly not. Reason rejects all distinction
“accorded to birth and not to personal merit.

“LUDOVIC. If your manners do not admit the transmis-
“sion of honors by blood, wherefore do they sanction the en-
“tail of infamy ? A man is not born noble, but he is born
“infamous ! This is, to speak the truth, an odious pre-
“judice. But still, a white could, if such were his choice,
“marry a free woman of color ?

“NELSON. No my friend you deceive yourself.

“LUDOVIC. What power would prevent him ?

“NELSON. The law. It contains an express prohibition,
“and declares such a marriage void.

“LUDOVIC. What an odious law! Such a law I shall
“brave.

“NELSON. There is an obstacle graver than the law, it
“is custom. You are ignorant of the condition of colored
“females in American society.

“Understand (I blush for the shame of my country) that
“in Louisiana the highest condition of free colored females
“is that of prostitution to the whites.

“New Orleans is peopled in a great part by Americans
“from the North, who come to enrich themselves, and go
“when their fortunes are made. It is rare that these tran-
“sient inhabitants marry, and here is the obstacle which pre-
“vents it.

“Every year during the summer New Orleans is ravaged
“by the yellow fever. At this time, all to whom a removal
“is possible quit the city, ascend the Mississippi and Ohio,
“and seek in the central or northern states, in Philadelphia
“or Boston, a climate more salubrious. When the hot sea-
“son is past, they return to the south and resume their
“places in the counting house. These annual migrations
“are no trouble to a bachelor, but they would be incom-
“modious for a whole family. The American avoids all
“embarrassment by going without a wife and taking an ille-
“gitimate companion—he chooses her always among the free
“women of color—he gives her a sort of dowry, and the young
“woman finds herself honored by a union which connects
“her with a white man; she knows she cannot be his wife—
“it is much in her eyes that she is loved by him. She
“could, according to our laws, have married a mulatto, but
“such an alliance would not have raised her from her class.
“The mulatto, besides, would have had no power to protect
“her. In becoming the wife of the man of color, she would
“have perpetuated her degradation; in prostituting herself
“to the white she elevates herself. All the young women
“of color are educated in these prejudices, and from the ten-
“derest age, their parents fashion them for corruption.—
“There is a species of public balls where only white men
“and females of color are admitted; the husbands and bro-
“thers of the latter are by no means received, the mothers
“themselves are accustomed to be present; they are witnesses
“of the homage addressed to their daughters, they encour-
“age and rejoice in it. When an American is smitten with

"a girl, it is of her mother that he demands her ; she makes "the best bargain she can, and exacts a greater or less price "according to the freshness of her daughter. All this passes "without mystery ; these monstrous unions have not even "the reserve of vice which conceals itself from shame as "virtue does from modesty : they expose themselves openly "to all eyes without any infamy or blame attaching to the "men who have formed them. When the American of the "North has made his fortune, he has attained his end. The "day has come in which he quits New Orleans, never to "return. His children, and she who for ten years has lived "as his wife, are no longer any thing to him. The woman "of color then sells herself to another. Such is the lot of "females of the African race in Louisiana."

This raking open of the kennels of American shame did not reconcile Ludovic to the prejudice, nor inspire him with a particle of submission. He proposed if Maria would join her lot to his, to leave the land of "odious prejudices," and go to that land of "light and liberty," New England.— "Alas," replied Nelson, "the prejudices against the people "of color, it is true, are less powerful in Boston than in New "Orleans, but they are no where dead." "Well," I replied, "I "detest these prejudices and know how to brave them : it is "infamous baseness to forsake the victim of undeserved re- "proach."

The young lady herself made no concealments. She frankly apprized the foreigner what he had to expect and in terms worthy to be remembered. "Do you know," said she to me, "how you dishonor yourself in speaking to me ? If you "were to be seen with me in a public place, it would be said— "that man has parted with decency—he is in company with "a colored woman."

"Ah ! Ludovic, look at the sad reality coolly : to "associate your life with a poor creature like me, is to em- "brace a condition worse than death.

"Never doubt it," she added with a voice of inspiration, "it is God himself who has separated the blacks from the "whites. This separation is found every where : *in the "hospitals where humanity suffers ; in the churches where "it prays ; in the prisons where it repents ; in the grave- "yard where it sleeps the eternal sleep !*"

"What, I cried, even in the day of death ?"

"Yes," she answered with a serious and melancholy accent; "when I die, men will remember that a hundred years ago there was a mulatto in my family, and should my body be borne to the burial ground, it will be rejected, for fear its contact would soil the bones of a privileged race. Alas, my friend, our mortal remains must not mingle on earth, is not that a sign that our souls will not be united in heaven?"

But we will not dwell on the story. Nelson insisted that Ludovic, before he "braved" the monster prejudice, should fairly reconnoitre him—that he should spend six months in traversing the United States, and observing the manners of the people, and especially the relations of the whites to the colored. The "*epreuve*" was fruitful of discoveries.—In the city of New-York, to which he first directed his steps, the court of sessions, the prisons, the hospitals, the schools and the churches, furnished places and occasions in which he saw the most cruel insult heaped upon the blacks.

From a theatre which he visited in company with George Nelson, the latter was brutally thrust out for being a colored man, and the officers of the peace refused to give any redress. Before the third part of his probation was gone he had obtained a sufficiently deep insight into the matter of prejudice, and the more he saw of it, the more he clung to the unfortunate. An unexpected event hastened matters. The same Fernando d'Almanza who had driven Nelson from New Orleans, now routed him from Baltimore, and by the same means. He repaired with his daughter to New-York. It was agreed that the knot of Hymen should be tied, and as the bridegroom and bride were Catholic and Presbyterian,—it should be doubly tied according to the ceremonials of each church. At the date of this conclusion an anti-abolition *mob* had broken out in the city, and was making havoc of the humble dwellings of the colored people. This, however, did not disconcert the contracting parties as they supposed the secret of Maria's African blood safely concealed in her veins. But the same satanic d'Almanza, who it seems had pointed out George in the theatre as well as routed the family from Baltimore was preparing mischief for them here. They repaired to the church for the performance of the nuptials, the Catholic priest commenced; a rabid and blaspheming mob rushed upon them; the priest dropped the ring

and, *re infecta*, the parties were obliged to fly for their lives. Those who in sober fact witnessed the scenes of July, 1834, will appreciate the resolution which was now taken to postpone the ceremony till it could be performed in the wilds of Michigan, beyond the reach of the urbane and courteous mobocrats of our exalted white race. Thither Nelson, his daughter and Ludovic proceeded, in company with a tribe of emigrating Indians to which Nelson was to act as missionary. At Detroit they separated, Nelson proceeding up the lakes with the Indians, and Ludovic and a servant tarrying with Maria till she should recruit from the fatigue of the voyage. This she soon did, but for the want of a vessel the party left behind were obliged to proceed to their destination on the Saginaw by land—following through the forest an Indian trail. Weary, they arrived there, but did not meet Nelson. His vessel had not been heard of. They were hospitably accommodated in the cabin of a hunter, till they could build their own—that mysterious cottage on the border of that little flower encircled lake. It was completed only to be the tomb of Maria! Her father arrived to see his daughter lifeless, and to hear that his son George, who had been left behind, had fallen, in endeavoring to excite an insurrection of the slaves in Carolina. Such is a very bare outline of a story which M. de Beaumont has filled up for the entertainment and instruction of his countrymen with vastly more fact and philosophy than fiction.

Here it occurs to us that some cunning colonizationist (chromatologist), catching us in the talk, will ask. If Gustavus de Beaumont honestly wished to illustrate the wickedness of this prejudice, for the benefit of the world, why did he not show himself above it by selecting a heroine of the genuine black? Why must the Dulcinea be, after all, like the “swans of the great lakes,” if there is not really a *foundation for the prejudice in nature*, which the Frenchman had not the frankness to confess, nor the art to conceal? But the ingenious inquirer must not thus escape the edge of the author's argument both against the absurdity of the prejudice and the baseness of its origin. A word for M. de Beaumont, by and by. In the mean time the consequences which he has attributed to the *une goutte de sang noir*—“the single drop of African blood”—are not exaggerated.—And they show, first, that our prejudices are altogether and

in themselves inexpressible absurdities. We dislike certain people *because* they are *black*—but take away the black, and make every thing very nearly or quite as it should be, and, like spoiled children, we still dislike them, *'cause*.—Nay, it seems to be an aggravation that the rascally “one drop,” should be able to course the arteries unbetrayed but by the pedigree. The consequences of “the one drop” prove, in the second place, that we of the North are the most convenient possible tools of the slaveholders. It is one of the perquisites of slaveholding, which the masters exceedingly value, to mix the blood. Now, were the mongrel offspring to approach the high prerogatives of the exalted white race, *pari passu* with their approach to the complexion, it would operate completely to let down the bars of the slave system. The captives would march out of their prison house in a very few generations. The slaveholders understand the matter, and wisely *resist beginnings*. They hide themselves from their own flesh when they see it in mixture, and give it no sort of countenance. All this, however, would be in vain, but for our own theory of the “one drop.” Most opportunely we stand by and stop the leaks and hold down the cover for the slaveholder, so that the amount of population he has to operate upon in the great cauldron, shall not, in consequence of his mixing himself with it, leak out or boil over into the white race. That we do not overstate nor misapprehend this charming and useful theory we quote it as enunciated by a Connecticut divine. “In every part of the United States there is a broad and impassible line of demarcation between every man who has ONE DROP of African blood in his veins and every other class in the community. The habits, the feelings, all the prejudices of society—prejudices which neither refinement, nor argument, nor education, nor religion itself can subdue—mark the people of color, whether bond or free, as the subjects of a degradation *incurable* and *incurable*. The African in this country belongs by birth to the very lowest station in society; and from that station he can never rise, be his *talents*, his *enterprise*, his *virtues* what they may. * * * * They constitute a class by themselves, a class out of which no *individual can be elevated*, and *below which none can be depressed*.”* What turns “African

* Address to the Conn. Colonization Society. See *At. Repository*, Vol. IV. p. 113.

blood" into a poison so unconscionably strong that dilution will not weaken it,—but a single drop will kill no matter what "talents, and enterprise, and virtues," as a drop of prussic acid kills a dog? We need not say, it is slavery.—The necessities of slavery require that this theory of the non-dilubility of the African blood should be co-extensive with the United States. The pious deprecants of amalgamation are laboring to extend it, and well they may be, for truly, if it be true, never did theory do so much for its believers. It makes amalgamation an impossibility, inasmuch as by it the mongrel is no mongrel, but a true African, on the otherside of a line harder to pass than the bile-heaving Atlantic. What boots it to colonize when we have such a line—impassible and eternal! But we digress.

Thirdly, the consequences of the "one drop," prove the insincerity of the common zeal in behalf of our Anglo-Saxon blood—for the love of slavery, rivers of it are given up to the downright tyranny of the *sang noir*. There is already in servile arteries enough of the "best blood" of our glorious ancestors to float a tolerable navy, yet if it should swell and whiten all the millions in bondage, it would still be under the dominion of the "one drop," and slavery, though of *whites*, would still be *African*. See here the curious process by which the descendants of Europeans by being born in America become Africans—by which the Anglo-Saxon blood, by flowing through the veins of chivalric slave-masters, becomes enslaved!

We undertook to say a word for M. de Beaumont, on the question whether he is himself free from the prejudice which he holds up to scorn. It is common for us, the enlightened people of the United States, to feel that in our prejudices all enlightened and refined people must sympathize, and we can hardly believe that in France or England a black face and woolly hair are no bar to a man's being received in good society. We shall not enter upon the question whether or not prejudice against color is known in Europe. It is obvious from the work before us, not to mention a cloud of other witnesses, that multitudes of not the meanest people feel no repugnance to the society of colored persons and no horror even of intermarriages. So little out of the way did M. de Beaumont think the latter enormity, that he gravely took for granted the truth of the stories set afloat by the

newspapers for the sake of raising mobs against the abolitionists—which charged them with having united colored and white in holy wedlock. Of the copious notes, in which he details matters of fact, one is devoted to the New-York riots of July 1834. He thus speaks of the abolitionists, “They are called *amalgamists* because, by means of intermarriages, they wish to effect the mixture of the two races. They have organized a society under the title of the Anti-Slavery Society, &c.—This body has the energy, which is imparted by profound conviction, an *honorable end*, (*but honnete*) and generous sympathies, but it is not numerous.” Couple this with his noble and enthusiastic admiration of our really free institutions and it can leave no doubt that M. de Beaumont is perfectly sincere in his abhorrence of our prejudice. It seems never to have entered his mind that there was any thing improper in marriages across the cord of caste, the parties being left to their choice. Indeed he frankly expresses his opinion that “intermarriages are certainly the better, if not the only means of a harmonious union of the black and white races. They are also the most manifest index of equality; for this two fold reason the marriages of this sort provoke the irritability of Americans more than any thing else.” He then relates, giving credit to the most respectable daily papers, stories of which the following is an example. “About the commencement of the year 1834, a minister of religion, the Reverend Doctor Beriah Green, having celebrated at Utica the marriage of a negro with a young lady of white complexion, there was in that city a sort of popular insurrection, in the upshot of which the Reverend was hung in effigy over the public street.” The enemies of the abolitionists may now console themselves that, admitting the truth of their heaviest charges, the verdict of the world is against them. The very acts which they sold their consciences to fasten on the abolitionists as crimes, by the unprejudiced are accounted praiseworthy. And so unable is our author to perceive even the indiscretion in the face of American prejudice, of such acts as were charged to the abolitionists, that he took the disclaimer of any design to encourage and promote intermarriages, published by some of the abolitionists during the reign of the mob, as an instance of yielding to the tyranny of public sentiment. After quoting the “Disclaimer,” he

adds, "All this proves that in the United States, there is, "under the rule of popular sovereignty, a majority whose "movements are irresistible, and which crushes, grinds to "powder, and annihilates every thing which opposes its "power and restrains its passions."

We will here beg the reader's attention to the comments of this high-minded and courteous foreigner, on the cause and tendency of the mob.

"Those who were not so severe against the partizans of "the blacks, were, at least, very indulgent towards their ene- "mies. The press wonderfully seconded these dispositions, "and furnished arguments to those who had only passion.

"The true cause of the hostility to the negroes, was, as "I have said before, the pride of the whites wounded by "the pretensions of equality set up by the people of color. "Now, a feeling of pride does not justify hatred and revenge. "The Americans would not have had justice on their side "in saying, 'We have let the negroes be beaten in our "cities,—we have suffered their private houses to be torn "down, their sacred temples to be profaned and demolished, "because they had the audacity to wish to equal us.' This, "which would have been the language of truth, would "have been a little too barefaced.

"Observe how the press relieved the Americans from this "embarrassment:—

"The partisans of the negroes, who wish the people of "color to be equal to the whites, demand the abolition of "slavery throughout the Union;—now this is to demand a "thing contrary to the Constitution of the United States: "in effect, this constitution guaranties to the slave states "the preservation of slavery so long as they shall please to "continue it. The North and the South have distinct in- "terests. Those of the South depend upon slavery. If "the North labors to destroy slavery in the South, it does "a thing hostile and contrary to the union of the states. "Therefore, to be a friend to the enfranchisement of the "negroes, is to be an enemy of the Union."

"The natural consequence of this reasoning, is, that "every good man in the United States, ought to advocate "the slavery of the blacks, and that the real enemies of the "country are those who oppose it. The factious, who "gave themselves up for three days to the commission of the

“most iniquitous outrages, and the most impious, were, at least, animated with a good sentiment, whilst those who, by their philanthropy for an unfortunate race, had excited the just indignation of the whites, were traitors to their country. Such are the consequences of a sophism.

“Doubtless the southern states alone can abolish their own slavery; but how long since the citizens of the North lost the right of pointing out the faults of a bad law? They have destroyed slavery among themselves, shall they be forbidden to desire its destruction in a neighboring country? They make no law: they express a wish;—if this wish is criminal, what becomes of the right of discussion, the liberty to think and write? Shall this right cease because it is used to attack the most monstrous of institutions? The Americans permit the vilest pamphleteer to write publicly that their president is a scoundrel, a swindler, an assassin; yet an honorable man, filled with the deepest conviction, shall not be able to say to his fellow-citizens that he is sorry to see a whole race devoted to slavery: that his nature revolts at seeing the child torn from the bosom of its mother, the husband separated from the wife, man beaten and torn by man, and all this in the name of law! Finally, because there are still slaves at the South, must the free negro, who, at the North, aspires to the rights of a free man, be crushed without pity?”

But why do *we* meddle with the subject of caste? Our object is the abolition of slavery. Were this accomplished, the cord of caste would soon fall to pieces itself. So would we let it perish, were it not inseparably connected with slavery itself, so that the latter cannot be successfully attacked without breaking through the former. It was the conviction that our attack upon slavery was *honest*, that raised the cry of *amalgamation*. It is the verdict of common sense, that if slavery be opposed on the ground that a *man* cannot righteously be made matter of property, then a *man* must not any where be treated as if he were a *dog*. It was not the amalgamation of intermarriage, nor of social intercourse that was feared, but the amalgamation of rights, interests, means of acquiring wealth, and respectability, and power. Grant the negro the same rights as any other citizen, admit him to the same facilities of prosecuting his fortune, and the public would not care a rush about intermar-

riages. It is the substantial equality they hate, not the "index" of it.

Nor do they hate the color, nor the hair, nor the acuteness of the facial angle, nor the size of the lips, nor the protrusion of the heel, nor any other, if there be other, physical peculiarity. We are told the blacks may thank the abolitionists for all the persecution they have suffered; that before the abolitionists taught them to aspire to *equality* with the whites, they were kindly treated. So it is the equality which is hated—not the color. The abolitionists have not made them blacker, but have got them out of their *places*. And the very places that many of them occupy, show that their persons are not the objects of disgust. Why are they admitted, as musicians and waiters, to the most brilliant and tasteful assemblies, where no expense is spared to have every thing that can please and nothing to disgust. Why does the wealthy citizen place two negroes on his splendid coach, one of whom is to have the honor of handing in and out his delicate wife and daughters? Individual deformities may be avoided in the selection in these cases; but the race is honored,—as mere animals, the negro men and women are greatly rejoiced in.

The people who indulge what is called the prejudice against color, but which is truly the prejudice of caste, may be divided into two classes. First come the violent negro-haters. They not only hate colored people, (we do not say despise, for there seems to be a suspicion about them that, with fair play, the colored man would be their superior,) but they are determined others shall hate them too. They would thrust their negro-hatred down our throats. They are not only resolved that we shall not bring negro-equality between the wind and their nobility, that we shall not disturb their *devotions* in the house of God by seating negroes in our pews, but we shall not seat them in our own parlors. They take it upon them to say, that we shall not choose our familiar friends except from the orthodox color. They take upon themselves the care of our tables and our daughters, to see that we conform to the true Brahminical code. Kind souls!—they beg us not to put them to the trouble of breaking the riot act, profaning churches, pulling down houses, and making the condition of the "wretched negroes" worse than it was before. These worthies are mightily dis-

tressed for the peace and good order of society. They abhor slavery, many of them, but are so troubled with the "anomalous condition" of the free blacks, that they think they would be better off either in slavery or in Liberia. They are sure that, if the abolitionists succeed in elevating the colored people to an equality with the whites, civil war will be the consequence,—hence how justifiable a little rioting and blood-shed by way of prevention! If any inquire why these valiant defenders of the white blood cannot bear that abolitionists should associate with colored people, the reply is easy. The abolitionists have stood in society upon an equal footing with themselves, and if they now place themselves upon an equality with colored men, the whole world are mathematicians enough to see, that, things which are equal to the same being equal to one another, the negroes are equal to the negro-haters. And what an insult this would be to their "brethren of the South!" Negroes in the condition of chattels, in one part of the Union, and in another, to all intents and purposes, equal to white citizens! The *nominal* freedom of brutes, semi-homines, turned into real liberty and honorable regard! The class of which we are speaking, cannot bear to allow such an insult to be given to the dignity of slaveholders—whether from a natural sympathy, or from a desire to be slaveholders themselves, we will not undertake to decide.

These are the men who scorn intermeddling with other men's matters, interfering with other people's "domestic" affairs, yet they are pleased to dictate to their neighbors in regard to their social arrangements, and especially to direct them as to the marriage of their children. These are the men who have installed the FEAR OF AMALGAMATION into the office of *Pontifex morum*, and wo to the man or woman who shall not make pilgrimage and kiss His Holiness' great toe.

The second class of the prejudiced seem to bear to the other somewhat the relation of dupes to deceivers. They would not dictate to others, nor drive the colored people out of the country. They wish to have them rise and do well, but they do not like to associate with them. They think there is after all some foundation in nature for separate tables, and corner pews—an amicable sort of caste. It must not be supposed that they have no substantial benevolence

towards the colored people. Many of them have not a little. Their hearts overflow with kindness for all flesh. Would that we possessed a tythe of it. Their prejudices are *Lamb-like*, after the pattern of the author of *Elia*, who says in his felicitous way, "In the negro countenance you will often meet with strong traits of benignity. I have felt yearnings of tenderness towards some of these faces—or rather masks—that have looked out kindly upon one in casual encounters in the streets and highways. I love what Fuller beautifully calls, these 'images of God cut in ebony.' But I should not like to associate with them, to share my meals and my good-nights with them—*because they are black.*" We would respectfully inquire whether Mr. Lamb settled his likes and dislikes by "casual encounters in the streets and highways." If he did, he is a very good prototype of the class we are describing. The established customs of society prevent any nearer approaches than these "casual encounters," and it is very natural that they should not wish any nearer. A child thinks he shall never like to sit in the lap of a man with shaggy eyebrows, or a long nose, but a few candies and *trials* change his opinion. Mr. Lamb was delighted to meet black people in the street—because he had often met them there. Perhaps if he had seen them only in Africa, he would have said, 'I have had yearnings of tenderness towards some of those faces, but I would not like to meet them in London, *because they are black.*' Perhaps, on the other hand, if he had often met their kind looks, connected with due proprieties of dress and behavior, in social circles, he would have admired their very blackness. Somebody says we are a bundle of habits. There are a great many good things that we are quite averse to, till we have given them a fair trial. Now be it remembered that we do not wish, as has been a thousand times foolishly and falsely said of us, to force social intercourse with colored people down the throat, either of the public, or of individuals; there is a sacredness of *free-choice* belonging to every individual which we neither dare nor wish to violate; but we affirm that a white person does injustice to the people of color, as a class, by proclaiming, that he does not like to eat with them, till he has made a fair trial. The question to be decided is, whether a man is necessarily a disagreeable companion to a white man, "because he is black"—not be-

cause he is ill-mannered, or slovenly, or selfish, or vain, or stupid, or contentious—but *because he is black* ;”—it is to be decided how far the physical peculiarities which God himself has stamped upon the colored man, form an anti-social wall of partition. What right has any man to dispose of this problem, pregnant with human destiny, by his baseless, question-begging prejudices? It would certainly seem to be the duty of a philanthropic white person, in view of the enormous evils of caste, to seek out proper cases, where, *besides the “African” characteristics*, as few preventives as possible shall stand in the way of social intercourse, and see, by a sufficient number of trials, whether individuals of the two castes can pleasantly “share their meals and their good nights together.” This, not to broach the question whether the intercourse between what are called the upper and lower classes of society needs reform, would seem to be the least that even patriotism could accept of any one professing to be her votary.

And suppose the trial to have been fairly made, and to have resulted, as when *fairly* made it always will, against the cord of caste, shall a man, out of regard to custom, refrain from intercourse with the colored, shall he abandon the fruits of his discovery? The tyrant custom has been tried, and brought in guilty; is he to retain his throne? And will reasonable third parties—mere lookers-on, though not uninterested, object to an intercourse which is not only agreeable to the directly concerned, but which tends to heal that wound of society hitherto considered immedicable? Will those who wish for peace and harmony, seek to electrify all others with their own repellencies? We believe they will not. We shall be disappointed if there is not found to be a large class, who, when they are made to see the intimate connection of caste with slavery, will refuse to recognize the distinction on which it is based. We do not think so meanly either of the science, or humanity, or religion of our countrymen, as to believe that they will *always* mistake the color of the skin for the criterion of the soul, or prove themselves brutal by denying the manhood of others, or seal their own hypocrisy by preaching against caste in Hindostan while they cherish it at home. When the mighty delusion which has repressed the benevolent tendencies, both native and christianized, of the human heart is dispell-

ed, there will be a reaction. We shall no longer fear to show common kindness to the man who has fallen among thieves, lest we should be taunted with being about to adopt a despised Samaritan into our family circle ;—we shall no longer fear to cultivate friendship with the colored, lest, peradventure, it should lead the willing parties somewhat further ! Far from us be the wish, *in the abstract*, to spoil any of our fellow-citizens of that choice store of witty, and wise jests, and gestures whereby they seek to maintain that honorable distinction which they owe to the color of their outer integuments—let them use their jokes while the wit is in them—but we look for the day when it will not only be less creditable to control individual free agency by brute force, but when it will take a great deal more wit to do it by ridicule.

It is no part of our present purpose to show that the negro is a man. He is in truth admitted to be so, by the very laws which hold him in bondage—by the very customs which consign him to an inferior caste. Nor is it our purpose to prove that, as a man, he is naturally equal to the white. No matter whether he be equal or not. If he be equal, surely he ought not to be made inferior ;—if he be naturally inferior, there is no need of *caste* to keep him so. The law, which supports caste by reason of inequality, should forbid the intercourse, and especially the marriage, of unequal individuals. No man should admit guests to his table till he has had them gauged and weighed, both corporeally and intellectually. No man should take a wife either above or below his own degree on the scale of humanity. There should be public weigh-masters in these matters. If the principle is good for classes, it is good for individuals,—we mean, simply, the principle of *other people's dictation*, whether in the shape of law or custom.

Our limits will confine us to a glance at some of the mischiefs of caste. In the first place, it injures our national character. The civilized world look upon our quarrel about color with disinterested coolness. On the one side they see the rich, the honorable, the learned whites, clamoring against the blacks as a poor, inferior, ignorant, degraded, incurably wretched race of people, who would be better off out of the country than in it, and without whom the country would be better off. And yet they see these

boasting whites in terrors, lest the blacks should become rich, intelligent, virtuous, and every way as respectable as themselves; shutting them out of honorable employments, out of schools, out of every avenue to preferment; mobbing down all their attempts to become what they are banished from society for not being; calumniating a whole class of men, and then laying out all their brute force to make their calumny true. On the other side, they see the blacks striving to rise from a condition to which they have been degraded without their own fault; asking only for fair play; claiming to be judged of after enjoying equal advantages. Is it doubtful on which side the sympathies of disinterested foreigners will be found? They cannot fail to see that the treatment, which the colored people receive, is evidence of unutterable meanness on the part of the whites. To shut the door on the victim of misfortune is disgraceful enough; but to abuse him as a beggar, and then kick him from the threshold for offering to earn his bread, is much more so; yet it is only a faint type of the working of our American caste. Here is a foul blot on American character, a share of which every white American, who goes abroad, must bear with him.

Again,—our caste is a reproach to republicanism. Let it be understood, that, in the model republic of the world, there is a minority, or a sect, or a caste, which has nothing to expect but to be trampled upon without mercy, and who will not choose despotism? Let it be understood, that, in a republic, men may be born to infamy, though not to honor; and what honorable man will not prefer monarchy with its hereditary nobility? Our prejudice props the tottering thrones of all Europe; it rejoices the tyrant-hearts of the nabobs of Asia; it strengthens every where those vampires of the human race,

“Whose robber rights are in their swords.”

Again,—it is a disgrace to our Protestant Christianity. We profess to reverence the BIBLE;—we appeal to it as of paramount authority; yet we are condemned by it in unequivocal terms. “My brethren,” says James, “have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, with *respect of persons*. For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel; and

“there come in, also, a poor man in vile raiment; and ye
 “have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and
 “say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to
 “the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool;
 “are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become
 “judges of evil thoughts?” In our churches, men are *cornered up*, not for the vile raiment in which they have clothed themselves, but for the raiment in which God has clothed them. And though in Christ Jesus, there is to be neither “Barbarian nor Scythian;” yet certain of our own fellow citizens are bid sit by themselves, because they are Africans! “That which long astonished me,” says de Beaumont, “was to find this separation of whites and blacks
 “in the religious edifices. Who would believe it?—ranks
 “and privileges in Christian churches! Sometimes the
 “blacks are confined in an obscure corner of the temple,
 “sometimes wholly excluded.* Imagine what would be the
 “displeasure of a genteel assembly, if it were obliged to be
 “mingled with coarse and ill clad people. The meeting
 “in the holy temple, is the only amusement which the
 “Sabbath authorizes. For American society, the church is
 “promenade, concert, ball, and theatre;—the ladies there
 “display themselves elegantly dressed. The Protestant
 “temple, is the saloon where one prays. Americans would
 “be distressed to meet there people of low condition.
 “Would it not be grievous, too, if the hideous sight of a
 “black face should come in to tarnish the lustre of a brilliant
 “assembly? In a congregation of fashionable people, the
 “majority will necessarily have a mind to shut the door
 “against people of color: the majority willing so, nothing
 “can hinder it.

“The Catholic Churches are the only ones which admit
 “neither of privileges nor exclusions: the black population
 “finds access to them as well as the white. This tolerance
 “of Catholicism, and this rigorous police of the Protestant
 “temples, is not accidental, but pertains to the very nature
 “of the two systems.”†

* M. de Beaumont, perhaps, did not understand that it is the *cornering* which operates as an exclusion.

† If the work of de Beaumont had been of the Fiddler and Trollope kind, it would long ago have been printed in our language for the gratification of those who know how to repay such travelers, principal and interest, in their own coin. But our booksellers have no notion of having their houses pulled down about their ears, for translating too much truth about American prejudice.

If it be true that colored people are admitted, on equal terms, to catholic churches, we are quite sure, with M. de Beaumont, that it must be due to the *nature of the catholic system*—an implicit submission to foreign authority in spiritual matters—and not to its better morality or the greater freedom from prejudice of its American devotees. But in furnishing to the Frenchman ground for this unfavorable comparison we think the Protestant churches have not unlikely done more to confirm Catholicism in Europe, than all their “Protestant Associations” will ever do to check it in America.

The inhumanity of the church is the food of infidelity.—Slavery in the church makes infidels by thousands, caste in the church is still more mischievous, because more extensive. If Christianity cannot be purified from this corruption, her doom is sealed. Her efforts to convert the world will recoil to her own destruction.

Finally, this institution of caste, this disfranchising of a whole class of our countrymen, is an immense waste of the resources of our country. The people of a country are its riches. A country in which there are all varieties of men, and in which all the departments of human achievement are open to all, is like one in which there are all sorts of mines, and all of them open. What mines of incalculable wealth are there not hid in the hardy constitutions, the patient industry, the light-heartedness, the peaceful dispositions, the thirst for knowledge, the strong social affections, the patriotism and the noble generosity of our colored brethren ! All this wealth, some of us, forsooth, would keep buried, or fling it across the ocean, because we do not like the looks of the ore !

We deny that he is the greatest hero who has climbed to the greatest height. In estimating what a man has done, we must take into the account what he had to do with. George Washington saved his country. But he was born to her smiles, and dandled on the knees of her favor. Toussaint Louverture also saved his country. He was born a slave. We avow that when we look for those examples of heroism, of which a nation does well to be proud, we shall expect to find them most noble and most abundant below the summits of society—individuals who have not risen to the top, but have started from the bottom. We shall find among

them the hero, who, with his wife and children, started from a cotton plantation in Georgia, and followed, over floods and mountains, the *north star*, till he trod a soil which cannot be trodden by slaves, and is now the honest cultivator of that soil; we shall find among them the heroine, who has ransomed herself and her children by nightly toil over the wash-tub, and her, who, by the same honorable occupation, has ransomed eleven of her enslaved brethren and sisters; we shall find among them the noble-hearted colored men and women, who, when the yellow-fever was desolating Philadelphia, and white people fled from their own brothers and sisters, stood by to wet the parched lip, to soothe the dying agony—to perform the last sad offices, for the race that despised them. Talk about the misfortune of having such a population among us—the natural repugnance which prevents us from walking or sitting or eating with such people, because they have black skins—pass about, in mock-benevolence, contribution boxes to freight them across the ocean! Oh! it is the consummation of cruel insult, cursed pride, base ingratitude, abominable sin and self-destructive folly!—May our reputation stand before the world in everlasting pillory, if, consenting to be the slave of this insane custom, we ever refuse to honor those to whom honor is so justly due,—that portion of our fellow citizens falsely called Africans.

THE DIVERSITIES OF MEN.

IN examining the question—*whether the known influence of natural causes is sufficient to account for the diversities, which characterize the inhabitants of the different continents*,—it seems appropriate to inquire what causes act with greatest energy in each, and what analogies can be found, showing the tendency of any of those causes to produce the peculiarities of the people subjected to their influence.

The influence of *heat* over all material substances is al-

most omnipotent in changing their magnitude and form, and consequently their color. For the color of a body depends wholly on its power of transmitting, absorbing or reflecting the rays of colored light, as they severally fall upon its surface.

The similarity of the vegetable and the animal kingdoms, in a number of important particulars, is a subject of common remark, and the ground of innumerable daily comparisons. Every observant person has been struck with the changes produced in the growth and appearance of plants by variations of temperature, or by a change of soil. When the appropriate food of the plant is afforded in abundance, it acquires a rapid growth: but dwarfish hardy plants are produced by dry or sterile soils. The diminutive oxen of our oakland neighbors, and the little horses fed by the Indians with the undergrowth of the forest, are uncommonly hardy. In like manner *the poor people* of countries where the law of caste deprives them of the sympathy and assistance of the wealthy, are generally much inferior, both in beauty and in size. The Soodras of Hindostan are not only blackened by continued exposure, but, owing to their restricted food and frequent destitution, *dwarfed*; while the lordly Brahmins sitting under the shade and reveling in abundance, possess a commanding stature and comparatively fair complexion. The *larvæ* of most kinds of insects, that burrow in the cavities of the earth, the roots of plants, and the leaves and stalks of vegetables kept in a cellar or a thickly shaded nursery—when exposed to the direct influence of the solar rays—exchange their whiteness for a deep tinge of black, brown or green. It may here be remarked that the leaves and flowers of plants consist of two transparent coats, containing a colored pulp, which gives them their peculiar hue. It has been found that the human skin, also, consists of three layers, or coats: the outer and inner skins, which are colorless, and an intermediate substance called the *mucous web*, whose color varies in different individuals, according to their complexions. Now the color of men, as well as of plants, increases in proportion to the thickness of this mucous, or pulpy, substance, in the same manner that a heavy coat of paint gives a hue to the surface which it covers, distinguishing and well defined. The leaves of *corn* planted in a barren spot, owe their *paleeness* not less to the

thinness of the pulp, than to a deficiency in its color. Both these causes operate in the production of the deep rich tints of the tropical regions; for *there* the size and thickness of the flowercups, and the leaves (one of the former being large enough for a child's hat, and of the latter for a good sized tent) are equally astonishing with the richness of their dyes. It is evident, therefore, that the mucous coat being of precisely the same color in two individuals, but *thicker in the one*, his complexion must have a darker cast than that of his thinner-skinned companion. If we find, then, people remarkable for the thickness of their skin, even in a cold climate; their complexion, according to our rule, will be similar to that of people in general, who live in a much warmer clime.

Plants, removed to a climate, or soil, very different from their own, manifest a wonderful power of adapting their conformation and habits to the circumstances, which principally affect them. Thus several of the *annual herbs* of the polar regions, when transferred to a temperate clime, become perennial shrubs; our shrubs become in the torrid zone, stately trees. The *quincetree*, in the south of France where it is cultivated, is an evergreen. The tendency of the largest kinds of *corn* to depreciate, and of the smallest to improve in size and fruitfulness in this climate, is another example of this adapting power; and will appear especially striking, when we consider that all the varieties of this plant, from the luxuriant gourdseed of the South to the pigmy species of Nantucket, are from the same original stock. Some *trees*, covered in their wild state with thorns, when cultivated, cast off this formidable armor of defence, and present only smooth and verdant branches. All the different kinds of the *apple*, also, are derived from the same original, and owe their peculiarities, principally, to their various climates, soils, situations, and to the degrees of culture they have received. "The *ranunculus*, in its native soil is yellow; when transplanted, it acquires various colors.—Tulips, auricolas, and dianthus, of the same species, differ greatly from one another in color. The smell, taste, color, and size, of pears, plumbs, and other fruits, are changed by a difference of seasons." As the *year* changes its seasons, beasts, birds, and insects, change their covering, and to some extent, their form and habits. The mirth and activity of

spring laying aside the cumbrous garments and haggard poverty of winter for the beauty and abundance of summer, cannot fail to suggest to every mind many a subject of astonishment and gratitude for the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, who, with their varying circumstances varies the wants and habits of the animal creation. "As we approach the *poles*, we find every thing progressively whiten; bears, foxes, hares, falcons, crows, and blackbirds, all assume the same common livery." The air in those icy regions, is always of a low temperature, and consequently, it must be of the highest importance to the preservation of animal life *that the heat of the body should not be transmitted*; accordingly a white covering, the best of all colors *for retaining heat*—is found universally prevalent. In the warm and tropical regions, on the contrary, deep hues and often black, form the prevalent color of all animated tribes. In the tropics, the external heat, though rarely raised to the temperature of the body, is still so great as to impel the system to excessive action, and in this way, would destroy life by the ragings of fever, unless the color were such as to allow of the transmission of heat from the body with the utmost freedom.

Let us now consider briefly, whether the diversities of the *human* race are greater than clime and manner of life have made in single species of the *brutes*. "*Quadrupeds*, of the same family, in the state of nature, are generally of one color, but they become of various colors by domestication and rich pastures. *Wild cattle*, are brown, tame cattle are of many colors. *Horses*, *deers*, and *goats*, brought into a state of servitude, or handled and fed by men, change their color. The *horse* of Arabia is strong and beautiful, with short hair and a smooth skin—in Russia, he is clumsy, and is clothed in winter, with a shaggy, frizzled coat—in China, he is weak and spiritless. The *cow* among the Eluth Tartars, is seven or eight feet high—in Cuba she has large horns, in Iceland, no horns. The immediate descendants of excellent wool-bearing *sheep*, have been known to alter in form, and become hairy as goats by removal from a temperate to a hot climate. *Birds*, of the same species, in their wild state, are all of the same color; they acquire different colors by domestication and a change of food. *Pigeons*, in the state of nature, are alike; but domestic pigeons are of many

colors. The *turkey* in America, its native country, is a dark colored bird, almost black ; and the whole family are of one color. By domestication, many of them have become speckled and some white." The English, by separating into herds by themselves, the horses, cattle, sheep, and swine, excelling in some particular ; and by carefully removing, for successive generations, all the young of only ordinary quality, have succeeded in forming several distinct breeds of each kind of animals, distinguished for their peculiar excellencies—some for size, some for speed, some for beauty. The *swine*, which, in all its varieties, is known to have sprung from the wild boar, not being indigenous to America, we are enabled to trace their changes with perfect certainty ; thus the swine imported from Europe into Cuba by the Spaniards have become a race of monsters, double the height and magnitude of the stock from which they were bred and with *solid hoofs*, not less than 12 or 14 inches in circumference. In several instances, swine have been reared of the enormous weight of 12 or 1500 pounds, equal to a yoke of good sized oxen. "The fineness and coarseness of the wool or hair, the firmness and flavor of the flesh, and in some degree the color of the skin and extent of the stature, are all influenced by *the nature of the diet*." Thus swine and other animals, fed on madder root, are found to have their bones tinged with red. In Piedmont, the swine are black ; in Batavia, reddish brown ; in Normandy, white. Among the white swine of Normandy, the bristles on the body are longer and softer than among other swine ; and even those on the back are flaccid, and cannot be used by the brush-makers. In like manner, *fair hair* is soft ; in the Albinos, or chalk-white persons, being a perfect down ; black hair is coarser and often crisped. Keeping in mind *that the countenance is darkened by whatever has a tendency to render the skin coarse and thick* ; as frequent exposure to a changeful atmosphere, strong and greasy food, as well as stimulating drinks and heat of climate, (to say nothing of the coloring matter applied to the external surface in the form of dust and smoke,) we will take a cursory view of the nations of the earth.

"In the different climates of Africa, Asia, and Europe, there are men of all the different shades, or colors, from white to black, there are hardly any two nations perfectly

alike ;—short, middle-sized, and tall ; white, brown, tawny, red, olive, copper-colored, swarthy, and black ;—*features*, very coarse, or very fine ;—*hair*, brown, fair, red, and black, long, curled, frizzled, or woolly ; we find innumerable combinations of these different shapes and colors, according to the different degrees of latitude, temperature, or civilization. *How many races shall we count ?* The number five has been taken ; but fifty might be taken for the same reason. Among the blacks, there are coarse and delicate features ; strong and slender forms ; deep black, and innumerable varieties of lighter shades, until they become swarthy ; from flat noses and thick lips to high noses and thin lips ; from short frizzled wool to long straight hair. Among the nations, who are called fair or white, there are so many shapes and shades, that no two men could be expected to agree in fixing where the white ends, and where the tawny, the red, the brown, or the olive begins.” The *thick-skinned Esquimaux Indians*, far-famed for filthy habits and smoking huts, “are of a yellowish gray color. Their blood is dark, dense, warm, and oily ; their hands and feet are as clammy as bacon ; and the effluvia from their bodies is extremely offensive.” The Mogul Tartars are another example of the disgusting effects of barbarian habits. While the “Moguls, who invaded India, and settled in Hindostan, have acquired the darker complexion, the figure and features, of the people they supplanted ;” and the *Portuguese* colony, settled at Mitomba, have become perfect negroes ; the Falatahs, or *Foulahs*, who have sojourned with their flocks for successive generations, among the gross features and thick skins of the naked aborigines of *Guinea*, by their mode of life, and peculiar neatness of dress, and cleanliness of person, have preserved their general elegance of form and the delicacy of their features. Owing to these circumstances, the hair of the Foulahs is fine, and the skin thin ; consequently their color is only of a brown, or tawny, caste. *America*, although it stretches from the extreme North beyond the fiftieth degree South of the Equator, cannot strictly be said to possess any *torrid region*. “The immense extent of ocean by which its shores are bounded, its lofty mountains, running continuously from one extremity of the continent to the other, with their tops covered with perpetual snow,”

and its dense forests, "cool the scorching breezes of the torrid zone, and convert it into a temperate clime." Of the inhabitants of its *frozen region*, mention has been already made. All the other parts of this vast continent, have a moderate temperature, compared with that of Guinea; consequently the curly hair and black skin of the negro, are not to be expected among the aboriginal Americans. We find, however, different shades of complexion according to the actual variations of heat. "The Araucans of Chili," says Molina, "are white and red, with blue eyes, fair hair, and regular features, like Europeans in the middle of the northern temperate zone." "In *Europe*, the complexion grows darker as the climate becomes warmer. The complexion of the French is darker than that of the Germans, while the nations of the South of Germany and France are darker than those of the North." In *Asia*, the same change is observable; the people of the temperate clime of Asia Minor having a fair complexion, while the inhabitants of the South of Persia are remarkably sallow, and those of Hindostan, nearly black. "The *Jews*, though scattered over the face of the earth, have, in general, remained a distinct and separate race; yet they are found fair in Britain, brown in Spain and Portugal, copper-colored in Arabia and Egypt, and almost wholly black at Cochin," on the Malabar coast of Hindostan. It should be further remarked, that the Jews, by the force of climate alone, approximate in features, as well as complexion, to the original inhabitants of the several countries in which they reside. As the surface of the ocean, and of other large bodies of water, can never freeze, until the whole mass of water becomes intensely cold, and as the perpetual agitation of the waves in summer mixes the cold waters of the deep with the heated surface, the *wind* passing over it acquires a moderate temperature. On this account, small islands and countries abounding with seas and lakes, are noted for the mildness of their climate. Hence, the superior fairness of the complexion of the *Greeks* to that of other nations in the same latitude. *Abyssinia*, both on account of its *elevated position* and the abundance of water, though in the same latitude with the burning region of Guinea, enjoys a milder climate, and its inhabitants are lighter colored by several shades. The southern extremity of Hindostan, also, being fanned by the

breezes of the ocean, both from the East and West, is cooler by far than countries of the same latitude, in the central and western parts of Africa and in New Holland. Indeed the color of the *New Hollanders* is scarcely distinguishable from that of the blacks of Africa. The vast extent and compact form of this region, its excessive drouth, and the savage manners of its inhabitants, sufficiently account for the blackness of their complexion. Wherever a colony of people have settled among others of a very different complexion, although they have been a great length of time in acquiring the characteristic appearance of the natives, *yet, in all cases, where the native customs have been adopted*, the features and complexion have gradually assimilated themselves till no trace of distinction remained. "The descendants of French and English families, who have lived two or three generations in the *West Indies*, are tending fast towards the complexion of the original inhabitants; indeed the finest skin, by a few months residence in the *West Indies*, and frequent exposure to the sun and wind, becomes almost brown." It is on all hands admitted that the people of these *United States*, "descended, as they are, from many different European nations, have acquired a uniform cast of features," the complexion being considerably darker, and the form more slender, than of the original colonists. "The *African*, with a flat nose, thick lips, arched shins, and large hips, in a few generations after he is removed to a *better climate*, and has been accustomed to sit, and dress, and feed, like civilized people, *is greatly improved in form*." It is even maintained by Dr. Smith, of New Jersey, that the negroes in this country, *not amalgamated with the whites*, are gradually losing the curled hair and black complexion of their African progenitors. The fact that a colony of *gipsies*, who settled in one of our southwestern states a number of years since, have so completely lost their distinctive traits, as to be entirely similar to the other inhabitants,—the analogy of the vegetable world, and the well-attested change of the color of every kind of animals into white in the polar regions, render it highly probable that his statement is correct. We have, indeed, testimony as full and positive on this point as need be desired. We learn from Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, that the *Egyptians* in their day were woolly headed and black, and were sup-

posed to be a colony from Ethiopia. Historians, writing some hundred years after, have described them as somewhat less black than formerly. At the present day, the *Copts*, who are accounted the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, are a *brown* race. *It seems certain, therefore, especially since the discovery of statues of the negro caste in Egypt, and the investigations of Professor Blumenbach, who has found Egyptian mummies to possess the features characteristic of the negro,—that, in the process of time, the descendants of negroes have acquired the very same complexion, which the descendants of Europeans have acquired by residing for successive generations in the same climate.*

Seeing that it is sometimes alleged, in disproof of the oneness of the human family, that some of its tribes have scarce a perceptible advance of the brutes in intellect, I sub-join a little *touching the evidence* on which that allegation is based. Spanish travelers of high repute, describing the Indians of this country, say that “stupidity, gluttony, cowardice, and effeminacy, characterize them. Abstraction, or a chain of reasoning, is far beyond their power. *Even the negroes from all the different provinces of Africa, learn more readily, and comprehend subjects above the capacity of the Americans.*” Cicero pronounced the savage Britons blockheads, fit only for slavery. The Greeks called all men barbarians *but themselves*. *Only sixty years since, English officers, who had served in America, said in parliament concerning our grandfathers, “the Americans are, by nature, cowards, and so effeminate, that they are disabled from going through the service of a campaign. Five regiments will drive them from one end of the continent to the other.”* What are the Greeks *now* but savages? What are the descendants of the old Romans, compared with those of the despised Britons, but slaves? The poor Indian, traduced below the brutes, has not only shown all the virtues of the ancient Spartans,—he has also put the defamers of his intellect to eternal silence. The Chaldeans, the black Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Saracens, have each in turn held the supremacy in the literary world; each in turn has sunk into listlessness and ignorance. The Chinese and Hindoos, for many hundred years, have been wasting away their stock of knowledge. Paganism and tyranny

combined, have never failed to cover a land with darkness that may be felt. Liberty alone has given a momentary light. *Liberty and Christianity* will render all men of every shape and every shade intelligent, reasoning, and holy. In view of the evidence presented, *can* any one doubt that custom and climate fully account for the diversities of the human form? Shall the baseless and disproved theories of the infidel *always* hold professed Christians in covered, but real and practical, skepticism? Shall "the mother of harlots" and "the father of lies" persuade us that God and mammon, uniting their interests, require the enslavement of pagans, to fit them for Heaven; and when we have debased them that they are merely noble, but soulless, brutes? The withering dogma, that no man can gain without another's loss, begins at last to be found a pestilential lie. Soon may equal and exact justice be mutually rendered by all men of every state and nation; then shall liberty, wealth, and happiness bless the world. M.

See Williamson on Climate, Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Lander's Travels, Good's Book of Nature, Sumner's Botany, Robertson's America, Marshall's Washington, &c.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF AMERICAN COMMERCE.

THE Constitution of the United States makes it the duty of Congress "to regulate," if need be, "commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states." Hence it seems to us, that if under the name of "commerce," either external or internal, there should spring up any nefarious system of outrage upon mankind—any atrocious violation of the laws of nature, it would be the duty of Congress utterly to weed it out, and leave nothing but commerce properly so called. In our cities a power to *regulate the streets*, gives the proper officers authority to *remove* nuisances, and even to *shut up* a street which it would be dangerous to pass through. There is abundant evidence to us that the American inter-state slave trade is an intolerable evil, and consequently we think that Congress, in *regulating commerce* ought to regulate it out of existence. A highly valued correspond-

ent has furnished us with some striking illustrations of this subject, which we give below.

SLAVE MONGERS.—A person has lately been hung in North Carolina for kidnapping—but dealers in slaves, and slave drivers in Maryland and elsewhere, are not to be reached by the laws. The time will come, when this business will be as severely punished, as it is heartily detested by all honorable men. We do not mean to cast reproach on the owners of slaves. Humanity itself forbids general emancipation unless gradual, and with provision for the relief of the emancipated, but we cannot conjure up to our imagination a character more monstrous than that of a dealer in slaves, as ordinary merchandise.—*Niles' Register, for June 28, 1828.*

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.—The New-York Gazette says, "It is but a few weeks since we observed the arrival at New Orleans of three vessels from Norfolk, having on board nearly six hundred slaves."—*Niles' Register, Dec. 27, 1828.*

It appears from the reports of the Comptroller of South Carolina that the number of slaves in that State decreased in one year, from 1824 to 1825, thirty-two thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven; and in the next year, one thousand one hundred and twenty-nine: total decrease in two years, 33,856—being more than one eighth of the whole number (260,282) in 1824.—*Niles' Register, April 8, 1829.*

THE INTERNAL SLAVE TRADE.—A Portsmouth (Ohio) paper gives the details of a bloody transaction that occurred between a drove of negroes and their drivers about 8 miles from the above village, in the state of Kentucky. It appears that the negroes, 60 in number, were chained and hand-cuffed in the usual manner of driving these poor wretches, and that by the aid of a file, they succeeded in separating the irons which bound them in such way as to be able to throw them off at any moment. In the course of the journey two of the slaves dropped their shackles and commenced a fight, when the wagoner, Petit, rushed in with his whip to compel them to desist. At this moment every negro was found perfectly at liberty, and one of them seizing a club gave Petit a violent blow on the head and laid him dead at his feet. Allen, who came to his assistance, met a similar fate from the contents of a pistol fired by another of the gang. Gordon was then attacked, seized and held by one of the negroes, while another fired twice at him with a pistol, the ball of which each time grazed his head, but not proving effectual, he was beaten with clubs and left for dead. They then commenced pillaging the wagon, and, with an axe, split open the trunk of Gordon, and rifled it of the money, about \$2,400. Sixteen of the negroes then took to the woods. Gordon in the mean time, not being materially injured, was enabled, by the assistance of one of the women, to mount his horse and flee; pursued, however, by one of the gang, on another horse, with a pistol. Fortunately, he escaped with his life, barely arriving at a plantation as the negro came in sight, who then turned about and retreated. The neighborhood was immediately rallied, and a hot pursuit given, which we understand has resulted in the capture of the whole gang, and the recovery of the greater part of the money.—*Niles' Register, Sept. 5, 1829.*

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.—The schooner Lafayette, with a cargo of slaves, from Norfolk for New Orleans, narrowly escaped being captured by them on the voyage. They were subdued after considerable difficulty, and twenty-five of them were bolted down to the deck until the arrival of the vessel at New Orleans.—*Niles' Register, January 9, 1830.*

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.—According to the New Orleans papers, there were imported into that port, during the week commencing on the 16th ult., from the

various ports of the United States, 371 slaves, principally from Virginia, as follows:—

By the Tribune	from Alexandria,	141
“ Sarah	“ Baltimore,	4
“ United States	“ Norfolk,	150
“ James Ramsay	“ Baltimore,	2
“ Susan	“ Charleston,	14
“ Atlas	“ do.	60

Total, - - - 371

Niles' Register, November 26, 1831.

— It is among the abominations that attend upon slavery, in which, in some cases, we fear that fathers have made a traffic in their own children as slaves. We well remember a conversation with Mr. CALHOUN when Secretary of War, in which he introduced the subject. He stated a case, in which the feelings of a large assembly had been much outraged by the exposure of a man placed on the stand for sale as a slave; whose appearance, he said, in all respects, gave him a better claim to the character of a *white man* than most persons so acknowledged could share; and he thereupon suggested that some regulation ought to be made, by which individuals so circumstanced, should be declared freemen.—*Niles' Register*, October 25, 1834.

OPINIONS AND TESTIMONY OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.

A friend has kindly put us in possession of a letter from Mr. JEFFERSON to Dr. PRICE, of London, for which we are exceedingly obliged. It was written more than half a century ago, while Mr. Jefferson was in France, and shows with authority, which few will dare to dispute, what was the state of public sentiment in the United States in regard to slavery at that time. By the help of this letter as a sure signal we may ascertain what progress we have made in respect to liberty. The letter may be found in Jefferson's Posthumous Works, Vol. I. page 268.

PARIS, AUG. 7th, 1785.

TO DR. PRICE.

SIR—Your favor of July 2d came duly to hand. The concern you therein express as to the effect of your pamphlet in America induces me to trouble you with some observations on that subject. From my acquaintance with that country I think I am able to judge with some degree of certainty of the manner in which it will have been received. Southward of the Chesapeake it will find but few readers concurring with it in sentiment on the subject of slavery. From the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake, the bulk of the people will approve it in theory, and it will find a respectable minority ready to adopt it in practice. A minority which for weight and worth of character preponderates against the greater number who have not the courage to divest their families of a property which however keeps their consciences uneasy. Northward of the Chesapeake you may find here and there an opponent to your doctrine, as you may find here and there

a robber and a murderer, but in no greater number. In that part of America there being but few slaves they can easily disencumber themselves of them and emancipation is put into such a train that in a few years there will be no slaves northward of Maryland. In Maryland I do not find such a disposition to begin the redress of this enormity as in Virginia. This is the next state to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression, a conflict wherein the sacred side is gaining daily recruits from the influx into office of young men grown and growing up—these have sucked in the principles of liberty, as it were with their mothers' milk, and it is to them I look with anxiety to turn the fate of this question. Be not therefore discouraged, what you have written will do a great deal of good, and could you still trouble yourself with our welfare, no man is more able to give aid to the laboring side.—The college of William and Mary in Williamsburgh, since the remodeling of its plan is the place where are collected together all the young men of Virginia under preparation for public life. They are there under the direction (most of them) of a Mr. Wythe, one of the most virtuous of characters and whose sentiments on the subject of slavery are unequivocal. I am satisfied if you could resolve to address an exhortation to those young men with all that eloquence of which you are master—that its influence on the future decision of this important question would be great, perhaps decisive. Thus you see that so far from thinking you have cause to repent of what you have done, I wish you to do more, and wish it on an assurance of its effect. The information I have received from America of the reception of your pamphlet in the different states agrees with the expectation I had formed.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

At what time during the last twenty years would one of our foreign ministers have dared to court "foreign interference" with our "domestic institutions?"—Let our maligners and the persecutors of George Thompson settle their account with THOMAS JEFFERSON. It is in the language of THOMAS JEFFERSON—one of the southern parties to the "compact"—that we say,—*Be not discouraged, GEORGE THOMPSON; your mission will do a great deal of good, and could you still trouble yourself with our welfare, no man is more able to give aid to the laboring side. So far from thinking you have cause to repent of what you have done, WE WISH YOU TO DO MORE.*—In saying this, are we traitors to our country? So was THOMAS JEFFERSON. In saying this do we violate the spirit of the great compromise? We were taught by THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Again, are we wrong in agitating the subject of slavery because slaveholders are opposed to such agitation? So were the great majority of them in 1785. Are we wrong in agitating the subject at the North, where there are none or very few slaves? Dr. Price was encouraged to write Anti-Slavery pamphlets, though he could find few readers at the South, and at the North emancipation was already in a train of accomplishment. At the North he had but here and there an opponent—few will pretend that our opponents at the North are as rare as "robbers and murderers."

Again, we are accused of being young ourselves, and of endeavoring to excite the young. It was to the young, too, that JEFFERSON looked "with anxiety to turn the fate of this question." Much as we revere age, and we trust no one more sincerely honors the hoary head, that is found in the way of wisdom, we have no faith in age, for reform. The mature generation cannot be expected to rebuke itself, nor mar its own hold on immortality. The great men of ripe years have built their reputation upon, and mixed up their interests with existing institutions. They cannot be expected to pull down the old, now that it is too late to build up

anew. We think that a certain poet was not far from the truth when he sang that

— grave and hoary men were bribed to tell,
From seats where law is made the slave of wrong,
How glorious Athens in her splendor fell,
Because her sons were free—and that among
Mankind, the many to the few belong,
By Heaven, and Nature, and Necessity.
They said, that *age was truth*, and that the *young*
Marred with wild hopes *the peace of slavery*,
With which old times and men had quelled the vain and free.

We are blamed for meddling with the colleges. The youth at our colleges, it is said, have nothing to do with slavery. All discussion of it interferes with the business of their education. Why should mere "boys" trouble their heads with grave matters of legislation—let them leave such things to their fathers. Instructors, too, are blamed if they venture to express unequivocal opinions in regard to slavery. It is traveling beyond their calling.—THOMAS JEFFERSON, in 1785, had other views on these points. He looked, as we do, to the young men of our colleges as the nation's hope, and wished to have them *exhorted with all possible eloquence*, with a view to their action on the decision of this important question. The hopes of Jefferson will yet be realized, though during his life time they waned exceedingly, as is evident from the following letter to Governor Cole of Illinois.

MONTICELLO, AUG. 25, 1814.

DEAR SIR,—Your favor of July 31st was duly received, and was read with peculiar pleasure. The sentiments breathed through the whole do honor to both the head and heart of the writer. Mine, on the subject of the slavery of negroes, have long since been in possession of the public, and time has only served to give them stronger root. The love of justice and the love of country plead equally the cause of these people and it is a moral reproach to us that they should have pleaded it so long in vain, and should have produced not a single effort,—nay, I fear, not much serious willingness to relieve them and ourselves from our present condition of moral and political reprobation.—From those of the former generation, who were in the fullness of age when I came into public life, which was while our controversy with England was on paper only, I soon saw that nothing was to be hoped. Nursed and educated in the daily habit of seeing the degraded condition, both bodily and mental, of those unfortunate beings, but not reflecting that that degradation was very much the work of themselves and their fathers, few minds have yet doubted but that they were as legitimate subjects of property as their horses or cattle. The quiet and monotonous course of colonial life had been disturbed by no alarm, and little reflection on the value of liberty. And when an alarm was taken at an enterprise of their own, it was not easy to carry them to the whole length of the principles which they invoked for themselves. In the first or second session of the legislature, after I became a member, I drew to this subject the attention of Colonel Bland, one of the oldest, ablest, and most respected members, and he undertook to move for certain moderate extensions of the protection of the laws to these people. I seconded his motion, and as a younger member, was more spared in the debate; but he was denounced as an enemy to his country, and was treated with the greatest indecorum. From an early stage of our Revolution, other and more distant duties were assigned to me; so that from that time till my return from Europe in 1789, and, I may say, till I returned to reside at home in 1809, I had little opportunity of knowing the progress of public sentiment here on this subject. I had always hoped that the *younger generation*,

receiving their early impressions after the flame of liberty had been kindled in every breast, and had become as it were the vital spirit of every American, in the generous temperament of youth, analagous to the motion of their blood, and above the suggestions of avarice, would have sympathised with oppression wherever found, and proved their love of liberty beyond their own share of it. But my intercourse with them, since my return, has not been sufficient to ascertain that they have made towards this point the progress I had hoped.—Your solitary, but welcome voice, is the first which has brought this sound to my ear; and I have considered the general silence which prevails on this subject as indicating an apathy unfavorable to every hope. Yet the hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time.

I am sensible of the partialities with which you have looked towards me as the person who should undertake this salutary but arduous work. But this, my dear sir, is like bidding old Priam to buckle the armor of Hector "*tremantibus aëvo humeris, et inutile ferrum cingi.*" No: I have overlived the generation with which mutual labors and perils begat mutual confidence and influence. This enterprise is for the *young*; for those who can follow it up, and bear it through to its consummation. It shall have all my prayers; and these are the only weapons of an old man.

It is an encouraging observation, that no good measure was ever proposed which, if duly pursued, failed to prevail in the end. We have proof of this in the history of the endeavors in the British Parliament to suppress that very trade which brought this evil on us. And you will be supported by the religious precept, "he not weary in well doing." That your success may be as speedy and complete, as it will be honorable and immortal consolation to yourself, I shall as fervently and sincerely pray as I assure you of my great friendship and respect.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

EDWARD COLE, ESQ.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRENCH SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

From a report which gives the proceedings of this society down to the 10th of August, 1836, we are enabled to quote some particulars which may be interesting to our readers. The society was formed in 1834, and embraces among its members men of high political importance. Its officers are:—

PRESIDENT.

The duke de BROGLIE, peer of France.

Vice Presidents.

M. PASSY, minister of commerce and public works.

M. ODILLON BARROT, member of the chamber of deputies.

Secretaries.

M. Count ALEXANDER DELABORDE, *aide-de-camp* of the king, member of the Institute, &c.

M. ISAMBERT, counsellor of the court of cassation, and member of the chamber of deputies.

Treasurer.

M. A. THAYER, banker, Rue de Menars, Paris.

The following articles are extracted from the "statutes" of the society.

1. The object of the society's labors is to invoke the application of all those measures which tend towards the emancipation of the slaves in our colonies, and at the same time to seek the most prompt and effectual means to ameliorate the condition of the colored class, to enlighten their minds, and to make their liberty useful and profitable to all the inhabitants of the colonies.

2. The society is composed of twenty seven founding members, and of an unlimited number of associated members.

3. The candidate for admission to the society must be presented by two of its members, and proposed at the following sitting, by the central committee.

It is also necessary to pay an annual subscription, of which the amount is optional, but which cannot be less than 25 francs for each member.

4. All the members of the society have the right to be present at its sittings and take part in its deliberations.

5. The founding members form a central committee. This committee has power to elect on committees for the direction of the society's labors such associate members as are distinguished for their labors, and these members shall enjoy the same rights as the founders.

6. The central committee shall render account of its labors at the general and public meetings.

7. The amount of subscription, after defraying incidental expenses, is devoted to publications, and to the collecting of documents which can throw light upon the question of the enfranchisement of the slaves.

8. The treasurer of the society shall render an account of his administration quarterly.

Addition, June 1st, 1835.—The society admits corresponding members in the departments, with a voluntary payment which is to be addressed to the treasurer.

The report of the society's operations is arranged in the form of minutes of its sittings. From these minutes we make a few extracts.

JANUARY 11th (1836).—M. Passy, one of the vice presidents, announced that in concert with M. de Tracy, he had drawn up the *project* of a proposition to the chamber, it consisted of three parts.

By the first, slavery would be abolished on the first of January, 1840.

By the second, royal ordinances would provide the necessary measures to prepare the people of the colonies.

By the third and last, certain financial measures would be proposed to the chambers, in the session of 1839, to effect the liberation.

FEBRUARY, 15th.—It appears by documents received from French Guiana, that the decree of the convention for the abolition of slavery in 1794, did not cause any disturbances, but that it impaired industry, because it was published alone, without any measure relative to the cultivation of the estates. Slavery was again established there by order of the consular government, by a proclamation of Victor Hugo, of the 5th Floreal, year XI.

At the time of this re-establishment, *the colony exported more products than in 1789, with a considerably smaller number of laborers.* The colonists were free from their old debts. Most of the actual fortunes date from this epoch. The re-establishment of slavery, therefore, is to be considered as a useless and impolitic measure; after eight years of the enjoyment of liberty, there was resistance; five or six hundred blacks lost their lives in the struggle.

FEBRUARY, 25th.—In the sitting of the chamber of deputies, of the 9th of March, (1836), M. admiral Duperré, upon the interrogation of M. Roger duLoiret, a member of the society, said that in imitation of the president of the council, "the government was occupied in collecting all the facts which could throw light upon the important question of emancipation."

After the session, he continued, I shall lose no time in addressing to the governors of our colonies, a note which indeed I have already communicated to the colonial delegates, that they might have it to submit to the colonial councils, and enjoin upon them to consider it. Consequently, the colonial councils are at this

moment possessed of the note which I have sent them. It is at this present session of 1836 that they will be occupied with it. The results will be forwarded to me, and the government will take measures accordingly; but on account of the great distance, the chamber will see the necessity of giving time.

The department of the marine, for its part, is spontaneously occupied with all the means of ameliorating the condition of the slaves; it has also sought by the provisions of a law which is already drawn up, to augment the number of enfranchisements in yielding to the slave the power to liberate himself, either by means of ransom, creating for this purpose a peculium of which he is assured the legal possession, or by other means, for example, requiring that every slave who quits the colony to accompany his master shall be freed before his departure. He added that the government would neglect no means of promoting religious and moral education, so as to advance the civilization of this class of the population. He thought this the best way to insure to them, as well as to all, the peaceable enjoyment of the boon which would one day be granted them.

MARCH 21st.—The society heard a statement from M. Ramon de la Sagra, for a long time Director of the Botanic Garden at Havana. He employed only emancipated blacks, who had gone through an apprenticeship of five years; he was perfectly satisfied with them; their number is from four to five thousand. They work for hire. There will not be in this island (Cuba) any great obstacles to emancipation, inasmuch as the prejudice, so to speak, does not there exist. Children found or left destitute, who are fully black or mulattoes, are placed in the hospitals, under the protection of the king, and by virtue of this are considered noble, as well as the whites; they are admissible, and, in fact, admitted to all employments, for which they have the necessary knowledge.

APRIL 11th.—Since the ordinance of 1832, in regard to enfranchisements, among 20,000 claims of liberty in Martinique, there have been but 20 objected to; among these objections, there has been but one put in by creditors; all the objections have been declared ill founded.

MAY 9th.—A member proposed to petition for partial and successive emancipation, commencing by the enfranchisement of the children without indemnity.

The society thought that it ought to hold on to the principle of general abolition. The Chamber of Deputies and the government, are but too much disposed to avoid the financial difficulties of the question by adopting such means. Besides, a partial emancipation, to say nothing of its injustice, would not prevent the dangers which are apprehended, and would be more injurious to the colonies.

JUNE 6th.—The secretary gave an account of an interview, which he had had with the director of the administration of the colonies, in consequence of the discussion in the chambers.

He inquired what was the disposition of the administration since the discussion. He was answered that it was sincerely abolitionist; but that under this name it had been already vigorously attacked by the colonial party.

How long time will the administration require to carry its abolition designs into execution? Answer. *Three years.*

More than this, the director is not a partizan of the English system. The apprenticeship, he says, is useless. The experience of it has taught that it needs rigorous rules to insure the continuance of labor. This will make a slavery almost as cruel as the old.

Besides, it will be necessary to consult the interests of the treasury. France will never consent to give 200 millions to the colonies to ransom 200,000 slaves.

The director grants that the two ordinances published in the month of May, however useful, are no step towards emancipation. From this time to the next session of the chambers, the minister will prepare measures more efficacious. M. the director, has also promised to publish an analysis of the votes of the colonial councils.

A member complained of the little aid which the society obtained from the Catholic clergy.

As to the Protestants, M. Guizot, has pronounced a remarkable discourse as president of the Bible Society, at its sitting on the 20th April, 1836. In this dis-

course, published in the *Moniteur* of the 30th May, the ex-minister has said, "that religion has for its essential object the soul of man, not the soul in a general and abstract manner, but the soul of every man; the soul of every living and immortal being."

"The most of the ameliorations effected among us, he added, for the last 50 years, have had for their object the social condition, the relations of men to each other. Amidst so many projects, the soul of man itself has often been forgotten."

"This love of humanity, which has so much honored our times, has given place to a shuddering timidity; there must be more devotedness, more ambition for this great and holy cause."

It is to be regretted that a civilian in so high a place, has not up to the present time, uttered a single word, nor taken any part whatever in labors which have for their object to ransom the souls of our 260,000 blacks and their posterity; these people are not taught to understand any moral duty; they live and die like brutes.

A NATION'S BROKEN VOW.—On the 20th of October, 1774, the delegates of twelve colonies being assembled in Congress, in Philadelphia, for the purpose of obtaining relief from British oppression, entered *unanimously* into a solemn agreement binding upon themselves and their constituents, which with their names was placed on record before God and the world. The second article of this instrument was as follows:—

"WE WILL NEITHER IMPORT NOR PURCHASE ANY SLAVE IMPORTED AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF DECEMBER NEXT, AFTER WHICH TIME WE WILL WHOLLY DISCONTINUE THE SLAVE TRADE, AND WILL NEITHER BE CONCERNED IN IT OURSELVES, NOR WILL WE HIRE OUR VESSELS, NOR SELL OUR COMMODITIES OR MANUFACTURES TO THOSE WHO ARE CONCERNED IN IT."

Agreeably to this vow, the several states shut their ports against the foreign slave trade. Mr. Walsh, in his "Appeal," says Virginia formally abolished the trade in October, 1778, and the other states followed her example, at different times, before the date of the Federal Constitution. South Carolina, in 1803, was the first to break the vow, by a small majority of her legislature; and she plead the "provisions of the Constitution." Congress prohibited the traffic in Louisiana, in 1804. In 1805 the prohibition was repealed,—from that time to December 31st, 1807, the trade flourished horribly. 39,075 slaves were imported into Charleston alone; 8,638 of these were torn from Africa by the human-flesh-brokers of *New England!*

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, BRIEFLY.—The President's message of December, 1835, accused the American Anti-Slavery Society, of issuing insurrectionary publications. The society threw open its doors, and invited the President, by a congressional committee, to examine *all its doings and publications*. The President made no reply. His message of December 1836—*IS SILENT*.

Last year the Governor of South Carolina would have abolitionists "hanged without benefit of clergy"—would dissolve the union if Anti-Slavery Societies were not suppressed. This year he would have a "solemn declaration" asserting the *right* to recede, in case slavery be abolished in the District of Columbia. Last year slavery was his "corner stone, &c." This year it is his reason for not provoking foreign wars.

Last year the governor of New York thought abolitionism was dying. This year he is sure of it. Ecce signa—Gov. Ritner.—Vermont resolutions—chop-fallen mobocrats in Utica. Mr. Birney's *new press* in Cincinnati.—Abolitionists in Congress—increased number of lecturers. Anti-Slavery Societies doubled.

