



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

D. W. B. Channing
A. B. Allen

REVIEW

OF

ABOLITIONISM,

OR THE

QUESTION OF SLAVERY,

1795.
AS IT EXISTS

IN THE

UNITED STATES,

CONSIDERED.

BY SETH LEWIS,
One of the District Judges of the State
of Louisiana.

Presented to the *Conservative Society of Citizens of Louisiana*
and published by their order,

PREFACE.

The object of this little tract is to meet the Abolitionists, on their own ground, and shew that, far from sanctioning their proceedings, Christianity condemns them. Many able speeches, on this dangerous controversy, have been delivered lately in Congress; but none of them have taken this ground, nor do I recollect to have seen the argument fully sustained by any other writer. I consider it our strong ground of defence.

Should any zealous Abolitionist quarrel with my arguments, and seek to put them aside by the cry of heresy, or by evasion of any kind, or by denouncing me as an enemy of freedom, &c. &c. to such a one I would say, stay my good sir, all that is wide of the mark. Have I told you the truth? that is the real question: and it is a question of tremendous importance to every man, woman, and child, white, or black, in these United States. If I have not, then answer my arguments, and shew wherein I am wrong. If I have, then your denouncing me, or my work, cannot alter the truth. But one thing it may do,—it may serve to throw a mist over truth, and prevent its being seen, and thus deceive and mislead. But I hope better things from all who profess themselves Christians.

res. 5579.50 no. 2

THE QUESTION OF SLAVERY CONSIDERED

No question has ever arisen in our country so important, nor one so full of danger, as that which I propose, in this essay, calmly to consider. In eleven States of our Union there are, at this time, more than two millions of Slaves. In the same States the whole population, including the Slaves in 1830, was 5,195,493. Deduct the number of slaves from this, and there will remain of white people 3,195,445,—something more than three to two. Such is our situation in the slave holding States.

Can these slaves be safely liberated, and remain among us? Impossible. On this question there is but one opinion throughout these States. To emancipate them generally, would inevitably bring on a servile war, that could end only in the destruction of one, or other of the two races of people. Of this no man among us, who thinks at all upon the subject, entertains the smallest doubt. This opinion has not been lightly, nor hastily formed, nor without sufficient grounds, as will afterwards be shown.

And yet, it appears, that in the Northern States, a resolution has been formed by a numerous, wealthy and powerful body of people, to compel us to abolish slavery entirely among us!—“ Societies, and combinations of individuals have of late been formed in some of the Northern States, (as the Societies themselves report,) ‘ to the number of three hundred and fifty, with daily accessions to the multitude who have embraced their faith;’ in many instances possessed of wealth and influence, whose avowed object is, the extermination of slavery in the Southern States; and if credit is due to their own statements, as contained in the report of one of their parent societies, ‘both males and females,’ and a much larger number than is generally supposed, of clergymen of different denominations, and of other respected and influential individuals, are engaged in the cause. ‘ Associations have been formed, meetings held, and addresses delivered; and every day witnesses the formation of new Anti Slavery Societies.’ These Societies have ‘ resolved that slavery must be universally abandoned,’ that ‘ as freemen and Christians, they cannot yield to intimidation from any earthly power,” and have solemnly avowed that the *truth is there is no discharge in this war*.” (First annual report of Executive Committee of the Maine Anti Slavery Convention.) For the purpose of effecting their object, and facilitating their designs, these societies have established a system of rules for their governments and appointed Officers and

Committees for the dispatch of business. The plan of their operations, as partly exhibited by themselves, in their various publications, is, to issue through the medium of their Executive Committees their protests, manifestoes, and other documents, which are designed to be circulated through the Slave holding States, either by their agents travelling thither, or by the United States' Mails. They have also established presses at the common expense, and, for months have been actively engaged in printing and disseminating, in every quarter of the Confederacy, incendiary pamphlets, papers, prints and publications of a description well calculated to arouse the passions of the coloured population, to embitter them against their masters, and to excite them to violence, insurrection and bloodshed"—(Speech of the Hon. Mr. Shields in Congress.)

Now why, we may fairly ask, why this war, thus begun and waged against us by these Anti-Slavery Societies? A "war" they themselves call it, in which "*there is no discharge.*" in other words, a war of the most obstinate character,—a war of extermination. Such it must, and will prove, if persisted in. On what grounds will they undertake to justify it? Does our holding slaves do them any injury? Does it injure them in their property? Does it take from them in the smallest degree, any of the comforts of life? or render them less secure in the enjoyment of their liberties, civil or religious, than they otherwise would be? No such thing. We invite them to shew, if they can that they suffer any, the slightest injury from this cause. But this they cannot do. Then why, I ask again, this unprovoked war against us? Why, it is, they say, a sin to hold our fellow men in Slavery; and for this cause they are waging this war against us.

Well, if it be a sin, you have faithfully warned us of our sin, and there you are clear: you cannot any longer be partakers with us in the guilt of that sin. What more then have you to do in the matter? Surely, in all fairness, you have nothing more to do with it.

But we deny that slavery, *as it exists in our country*, is a sin; and this I shall presently proceed to prove. Mean time we conscientiously believe we are right in this opinion. You think otherwise; and what are you doing? Why you are waging an obstinate war against us, in order to *force us to adopt your belief* in this matter, and thus you are persecuting us for conscience sake! Does any scripture warrant this?

Now we readily agree that if the holding of our slaves, *under all the circumstances* in which we are placed be a sin,—

if it be really forbidden by the Divine Law, we are bound to give them up. We must obey God rather than man. Is it then so forbidden, in our case? We think not; and in support of our belief we appeal both to scripture, and to reason.

And 1st to Scripture. By the divine law, as given to the Jews, that people were clearly permitted to buy, and hold slaves. Levit. 25, 44, 46. "Both thy bondman, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you: of them shall ye buy bondman and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers, that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And you shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; and they shall be your bondmen forever."—In this passage we see slavery exactly described, in every particular, essentially the same as it exists among us; and we see it expressly allowed to the Jews.

To shew then, that this law is still in force, and applicable to our case, let it be observed, that the Jews were, at the time of giving this law, the chosen people of God;—that for their sin, in rejecting, and crucifying their Messiah, they were degraded from that high privilege, and the Gentile nations, converted to Christianity, who have since constituted the Christian Church and have been substituted in their place.—See Rom. 11 throughout; so that Christians are now the people of God, as the Jews then were. Now it cannot be denied, that in a *moral* point of view, christians are bound by the same laws, and are allowed the same liberties and privileges, that were allowed to the Jews. Unless, therefore, this law has been repealed, it is still in force among the people of God, i. e. among Christians; is it in force *as a moral law*; for, to consider the holding of slaves as a sin, is, most clearly, to consider it in a *moral* point of view.

Has the law then been repealed? It certainly has not. Jesus Christ alone has power to repeal it, and he has not done so. He says in express terms, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law; or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." He means the moral law, and he then proceeds to review that law, and to explain and correct it, in various points.—particularly the law of homicide,—that concerning adultery,—concerning oath—the *lex talionis*, that concerning divorce, &c. But concerning the law in question he is entirely silent; and consequently he leaves it as it was,—in full

force. Now when we reflect, that the religion our Saviour came to establish, was intended to embrace all mankind, of every nation on earth,—that at that very time, there were millions of slaves in the Roman Empire, as well as in all other nations;—that to the very men who held those slaves in bondage, the Gospel was to be preached, and consequently the privilege was offered to them of becoming christians,—when this is considered, is it possible to believe; that our Saviour would have overlooked, or neglected this important question, if to hold slaves had been really a sin? Can any man believe that he would have thus left the old law in full force? or, that he would not have expressly forbidden the practice of holding Slaves! Surely not. The conclusion then is obvious: Our Saviour did not intend to forbid the holding of slaves, as a sin; and the law he has left in force clearly allows it.

Let us then turn to the writings of the Apostles. Do they forbid Christian men to hold slaves? Do they abrogate the law before noticed? Not at all. The relation of master and slave, we have seen, is one that actually existed in their time; and, so far from forbidding it they recognize its existence, and give rules for regulating the conduct of both the master and the slave. “Servants,” says St. Paul, Col. 3, 22 “obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service as men pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God. Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ.” And to masters he says, “Masters, give unto you servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in Heaven.” See also Eph. 6, 5, where the same directions are given: And here note, that the original Greek word, which is translated “servant,” means also a *Slave*.* The same direc-

* See Dr. A. Clarke’s note on this passage where he says “the Greek word frequently signifies a *slave* or *bondman*: yet it often implies a *servant* in general, or any one bound to another, either for a limited time, or for life. Every slave” he adds, “if a Christian, was bound to serve him faithfully by whose money he was bought, however illegal that traffic may be considered.” Bound how? By the express command of the inspired writer,—in other words—by the command of God: and if thus bound to obey, the master surely had a right to hold the slave and command his obedience. And if this was lawful *then*, how has it become unlawful *now*? It is then with

7

tions are also given by St. Peter, 1 Pet. 2, 18. And again in 1 Tim. 6, 1, 2, we find the following passage, "Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worth of all honor, that the name of God be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort."--Here again the Greek word which is translated "servants" means slaves.*

Here we see, that the Apostle is clearly speaking of the relation of *master* and *slave*, as a well known relation of civil society, then existing. He speaks too of slaves that have "believing masters who are christians: and, far from requiring such masters to liberate their slaves, he requires the slave to "count his master worthy of all honor," and to "do him service" In the Apostle's judgment then Christian men might lawfully hold slaves, and required obedience of them in all things," i. e. in all things consistent with the duties he enjoins on masters to perform. If then this was lawful in the Apostles' days, how comes it to be unlawful now? If it was then lawful, *it could not be sin*; how then comes it to be sin now? It is absurd to say that it is sin now, if it was not so then; and I think the passages of Scripture above quoted clearly shew that it was not.

To this let me add, that the relation of master and slave, is clearly one of *the relations of civil society*, and the whole tenor of the New Testament shews, that neither our Saviour, nor his Apostles, ever intended to abolish, or change any of those civil relations. All their laws—all the principles they have given to us, go to *regulate* our moral conduct in *these relations*, leaving the relations themselves as they then were.

unfeigned surprize that I find added in the same note, "In heathen countries slavery was in some sort excusable; among Christians it is an enormity and a crime for which perdition is scarcely an adequate punishment." In this he clearly contradicts what the Apostle allows, and contradicts what he himself before allowed in the same note—a striking proof of how easy it is, for a great and good man's feelings to cloud or mislead his judgment.

*Here Dr. A. Clarke himself allows the proper meaning of the word to be *slaves*. See his note. In the French translation it is *esclaves*, in the Spanish it is *siervos*, both of which mean *slaves*.

In this I am glad to find that I am sustained by the resolution of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, past at their late session in Cincinnati, a resolution passed in view of the very question now in hand—It is as follows—

“Whereas great excitement has prevailed this country on the subject of modern abolitionism, which is reported to have been increased in this city recently, by the unjustifiable conduct of two members of the General Conference, in lecturing on this agitating topic; and whereas such a course, on the part of any of its members, is calculated to bring on this body the suspicions and distrust of the community, and misrepresent its sentiments, in regard to the point at issue; and whereas, in this aspect of the case, a due regard for its own character, as well as a just concern for the interests of the church confided to its care demand a full, decided, and unequivocal expression of the views of the General Conference in the premises therefore,

“Resolved by the delegates of the annual conference in General Conference assembled, That they disapprove in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of two members of the General Conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently, upon and in favor of modern Abolitionism.

“Resolved by the delegates of the annual conference in General Conference assembled, That they are decidedly opposed to modern Abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, or wish, or intention to interfere in the civil and political relation, between master and slave, as it exists in the slave holding states of the union.”—*West Christ. Advocate*, May 20th 1836.—The first of these resolutions passed by a majority of 122 to 11—the other was divided, and that part which expresses decided opposition to Abolitionism, past 120 to 14, and the rest, which disclaims all interference with the relation of master and slave, as it exists in our country, past unanimously.—See same paper.

Now, it is believed, that Abolitionists themselves will not deny, that in that body, there are many men of profound and extensive learning, who are deeply versed in the Scriptures, and whose piety is as deep, and sincere, as that of any others to be found, in any denomination of christians whatever.—They have too, the advantage of coming from all parts of the Union;—many of them from the slave holding States, where they reside, and have long been eye witnesses of the state of society, and have seen Slavery as it does really exist in our country. Such men, surely, are competent to judge correct.

ly in this, if any men on earth are. But these men do not condemn slavery, *as a sin*, taken *as it exists in our country*. On the contrary they imitate their divine Master by "wholly disclaiming," as his disciples, "any right, or wish, or intention to interfere in the relation between master and slave;" which they consider, as it really is,—one of the established "*civil and political*" relations of society in our country,—one which, *as christians* they have no right to disturb. I can but consider this, as an invaluable testimony in our favor, and no less so, in favor of the cause of humanity. It is a testimony they could not have given, if they had considered that Slavery, *as it exists among us*, is a sin. I consider it indeed as bearing me out in all the positions I have taken.

2. I have said that the resolutions of the General Conference are an invaluable testimony *in favor of the cause of humanity*. Reader, whoever thou art, be not surprised at this. The abolitionists, though believe they are not aware of it, are really, if their schemes succeed, preparing for us, and must bring on us, a scene of the most inhuman butchery and slaughter that ever the world has seen. It is the natural and necessary consequence of their proceedings. And on this we ground our appeal to reason.

Slavery, they say, "must be universally abandoned." In other words, we must emancipate *all our slaves*. This, we cannot do, without involving ourselves, and our slaves along with us, in utter ruin. It is not, as they suppose, the loss of property we should sustain, that deters us. Our lives, the honor and purity of our females, and the lives of our wives and children, are at stake. And surely no law, either human or divine, requires us to surrender these to the lawless violence of an infuriated negro mob: and such a mob we should very soon have to contend with, were all our slaves to be emancipated. I speak now of their being, *voluntarily* emancipated by their masters. Nor am I alone in this belief. It is the settled conviction of every reflecting man throughout the slave holding states.

The causes of discord between the white, and the negro race, are so numerous, and so powerful, as to forbid the hope of their ever being able to live together, in such bodies as they are with us, in peace and harmony. 1. The Creator himself has made them different, so much so, as to render it impossible for them ever to mix, and assimilate, so as to become *one people*. They must, consequently, forever form *two separate*

and *distinct bodies of people*, each having *separate and distinct interests* : and these interests will be continually coming in conflict with each other. 2 The white man, being really superior to the negro, in arts, in science, and in improvements of every kind, and having been long accustomed to rule over, and receive the submission of the black race, has imbibed a feeling of superiority, that must oppose an insuperable bar to his ever admitting the negro to associate with him, on terms of equality. He will consider, and treat the negro race as inferior. The negro, on the other hand, puffed up with the idea that he also is a freeman, will consider this as an indignity, and will seek revenge for it. Daily and hourly will occasions of quarrel, of strife, of insult, and violence, arise from this source ; and if violence once begins, where will it end ?— It is not the quarrel of one individual against another : It is the *negro* against the *white man*—of one race of people against the other, in which the feelings of the parties will be keenly enlisted on both sides. A single spark, in such a quarrel, may be blown up into a devouring flame.

Call this prejudice if you will. The prejudice, if it be such, exists, and is universal with all the white people in our country ; and is too deeply rooted, ever to be removed by any human power. It is not confined to the slave holding states.— In the other states, where the negroes are free, are they not considered, as they are with us, as a distinct class of people ? Are they not there also treated as an inferior race ? Will white men *there* associate with them, on terms of equality ?— Will they receive them as equals, and companions, in their families, and in their social intercourse ? or suffer them to become allied to them in marriage ? Would the most enthusiastic of the abolitionists give his sister, or his daughter to a negro in marriage ? I trow not. Away then with the cry of prejudice, in this matter. The feeling exists, it is universal, and so long as it does exist, it will produce its natural effects, and what those effects are, we have just seen. Counteract this feeling forcibly, and you inevitably produce a dangerous explosion.

Will it be argued, that the treating of the negro race as inferior, in the states, where they are, free, produces no evils, such as I have mentioned, and therefore none are to be apprehended with us. The answer is obvious and decisive.— *There* the majority of white people is so overwhelming, that the negro influence is as nothing. Far different is the case

with us, where, as we have seen, their numbers rise so nearly to an equality with ours. Two millions of such enemies, as we should soon find them to be, could not be turned loose among us, without producing the most fatal consequences.

3. Are our Slaves, if set free, to be vested with all the rights and privileges of free American citizens? If it be possible for them to live at all among us, in a state of freedom, they will certainly claim an equality with white men; and, consequently, all the rights of citizens. And all this, I believe, the Abolitionists claim for them. Can it be allowed? Let us see—What is the character of this numerous host of slaves, that are to be thus turned loose among us? They are all of the negro race, constituting, as we have just seen, a *separate distinct body of people*,—one with whom, though living among us, the white race never can mix and harmonize. In the next place they are in a state of profound ignorance, altogether ignorant of the rights and duties of citizens, as such, and totally in the dark as to the nature of free government. With all this, the negroes possess inherently, all the vices incident to human nature, (the virtues, alas, even with white men are too few.)—The negro, (I speak from a thorough knowledge of their character: having long known them) is naturally proud, haughty, vain, glorious, ambitious of honors and distinction, and fond of power, and of domineering over other men;—not less so than white men.—nay, I think, more so. Now take this people as they are, and I ask are they fit to become free American citizens? or rather, can an equal number of people be found, in any country on earth, more completely unfit for these privileges? Turn them all out by themselves, free to govern themselves as they please, and how long would there be any thing like regulated civil liberty among them? How long before they would become slaves to one another? Not long, assuredly. Are they then fit to be invested with the rights of citizens among us? Most certainly not: and never, certainly, will white men agree to allow them those rights.

Here then must arise a contest between the two classes of people, *for political power*, a contest in which, from its very nature, men are more likely than in any other, to become heated, and to fall out and get to fighting. And this contest will arise in either case, whether the privilege in question be granted or not.

First suppose it to be granted: One of the rights the negroes will acquire, as free citizens, is the possession and use

of arms ; and of this, we may be assured, they will soon avail themselves. Another is, the right of voting in our elections, and of being eligible to office. We should then very soon find them aspiring to become our Legislators, our Judges, and officers to rule over us. Negroes will be seen coming out as candidates for office, in opposition to white men ; and they will be supported by the whole mass of negro electors ; and these, in many parts of our country, will be the majority. In two entire states they outnumber us. Now, is there a man, who can believe that such an election would be carried on, through the whole canvass without violence ? without ending in bloodshed and slaughter ? A moments reflexion will convince any reasonable man, that it could not. And note, that here again the contest is not between one favorite candidate and another, but is *negro* against *white man*—a contest in which the whole race on each side will engage, and that with the most bitter animosity and hatred. The very first election like this, and such would be sure to occur, would be the beginning of a servile war, that could end only in the destruction of one or the other of the two races of people, or in reducing one, or other of them to a state of slavery, for worse than that which now exists.

On the other hand, say that the privilege is refused to them, and what follows ? Why, then, we shall have among us all this multitude of lazy, idle, ignorant, vicious negroes, all turned loose from the authority of their masters, all poor, wretched, and discontented. I say *poor* and *wretched* ; for I presume we shall no longer be bound to supply their wants, nor longer called on to furnish them houses to live in ; nor to give up to them our lands to live on, for nothing, nor to feed, and clothe them ; and furnish them with medical aid, and nurses to attend them in their sickness. All these necessary things will be wanting. We shall in truth have two millions of idle vicious paupers turned loose among us. These must be governed in some way : how is this to be done ? We have just seen that they are totally incapable of governing themselves, and that to trust them with the privileges of citizens, would be either ruin, both to them and to the white people also. It remains, that the white race, in their own defence, must retain all the powers of the government exclusively in their own hands.

But if this be so, what will the negro race have gained ?—Just nothing, or worse than nothing. They will still be slaves,

under another form of slavery ; for it would soon be found that a police of the most rigorous, and severe kind, would be indispensable : White men would still be their masters ; and a rod of iron would be wielded over them. Nothing less than the powers of a military despotism, would avail, to keep them in order ; and such a despotism the law of self defence would justify, and require to be established, and exercised over them by white men.

Without it what would be our situation ? Why, we should have among us a multitude of these poor, wretched and vicious paupers, too ignorant to manage any business on their own account, by which to gain a subsistence ; too proud, and too lazy to be employed by white men, and submit to be governed by them, and destitute of the means of subsistence, when left to themselves,—how are they to live ? They would live, or try to live; by becoming thieves and robbers,—by committing all manner of depredations on the property of the white people : and to carry on their business of rapine, they would soon be seen forming themselves into organized bands, to support each other, and to oppose and set the laws at defiance. That such would be the case, no man, who knows the character of our negro population, and the true state of our country, can entertain a doubt. And such a state of things certainly could not be borne for an hour. It would every day give rise to the most dangerous conflicts ; in which the quarrel would still be that of the *negro* against the *white man*, in which every negro would be ready to engage : and it is hence obvious that nothing but the strong arm of a rigid military police would restrain the negro race from rising *en masse* to butcher and destroy the white people.

Thus the alternative is forced upon us, either to retain our slaves as they are,—or to encounter all the horrors of a bloody servile war, in which we must either fall victims to the brutal fury of the negro race, or reduce them again to a state of slavery, certainly as bad, and very probably, far worse than that which now exists.

With this necessity resting upon us can we hesitate in choosing our course ? Will the abolitionists any longer charge us with being guilty of sin, in holding our slaves ? We plead, as I have shown, the authority of scripture : and we plead the great and paramount law of self preservation, in justification of our course. We cannot, I repeat, emancipate our slaves, without bringing on ourselves, and on them along with us,

evils a thousand times greater than slavery itself, as it now exists among us.

And will the abolitionists still continue to print, and scatter among us their papers, and pamphlets, and prints, containing the most impassioned and inflammatory appeals to the passions, and prejudices of our slaves? appeals evidently calculated to inflame their passions, and excite them to insurrection and revolt? Have they reflected on what it is to stir up such an insurrection? that it is to excite the incendiary to fire our dwellings, at the dead hour of mid night, and to raise a worse than savage mob to destroy our lives, and cut the throats of our wives and children? that it is to instigate rapine, and murder, in their most horrid furies.* Such, and no other, must, and will be the effect of their proceedings. And is this acting according to the golden rule. Do unto others as you would they should do unto you? Is it not rather a plain violation of that rule?†

And yet, it is, I believe, solely on the ground of this rule, that they charge us with being guilty of sin, in holding our slaves.‡ The argument is this. You say they, who hold a slave, were you in his situation, would certainly desire to be set free: Go then, and do, as you would that another should do unto you, go, and set your slave free. Now, we have just seen the fatal consequences of this application of the rule to our case. It is clear then, that it cannot be so applied; for it never could be the intention of its divine Author, that it should be so applied as to produce evil. The error lies here. The rule is applicable solely to *individuals*, considered in their relation to each other *as such*, and is intended to regulate their moral conduct towards each other, *in that relation*:—but to men, *in the relation they bear to the community* in which they live: in other words, to men, as they stand in any of the *civil, or political relations of society*, the rule is not applica-

*Let me not be misunderstood. I make no charge of any *intention* to do these injuries:—I speak only of the tendency, the inevitable consequences of their proceedings

†It has been said in excuse, for this, that these publications are not intended for our slaves, but for us. Really we think we are in no need of those productions to enlighten us and teach us our duty. We do think that we understand the case, at least as well as the authors of those publications do.

ble at all. Shall the indented servant say to his master, Sir, if you was in my situation, you would desire your master to set you free. Do thou unto others, what you would they should do unto you;—you are bound sir by this rule to set me free? Shall the child, on the same ground, be set free from the authority of the parent? the wife from that of her husband? If so, every man may, on the same ground, claim to be set free from the authority of the magistrate; and then there is an end of all order in civil society. It is a perversion of the rule then, to apply it, in any of these cases.

And why is it so? It is because these *civil* and *political* relations are necessary to the preservation of peace and order in society; and for that end they are established by law. But the moment you apply the rule to these relations, you destroy them; and along with them you destroy all order in society.

Now the relation of master and slave is but another form of the relation of *master* and *servant*. It is, if you please, that relation in its most rigid form. But it exists, and without any fault of ours. It is established *too by law*, and is now one of the lawful established civil relations of society in our country. It is one of the most important of these relations too—one which, as we have seen, cannot be broken upon, in our case, without breaking up all order in our country. Our laws on this subject then stand justified on the same ground of *necessity*, that justifies all the civil relations of society, which are established by law in other cases, or in other countries.

Will you then deny the validity of our laws on this subject. Pause, and consider. Our laws establishing this species of servitude, emanate from the supreme power of the state. No earthly power is superior to it. Exactly similar were the Roman laws, in this respect, under which such multitude of slaves* were held, when St. Paul wrote his epistles. The Roman law, like ours, was ordained by the supreme power of the state. What command then does the apostles give concerning these “higher powers?” “Let every soul” says he, “be subject to the higher powers: For there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God &c.” “For,” he adds, “rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil, &c.” By “rulers” he evidently means *civil* magistrates, and other officers of the civil government;

* See Gibbon's *Decl. and fall of Rom. Emp.* vol. 1, p. 63.

And to Titus he says, "put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, and to be ready to every good work." See Rom. 13. 1, and Tit. 3, 1. And St. Peter says, "submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake : whether unto the king, as supreme : or unto governors that are sent by him, &c." 1. Pet. 2, 13.— Now, the terms "every ordinance of man," clearly include the Roman laws authorizing slavery ; and to these, consequently, christians are commanded to "submit themselves." If this was their duty then, how come they to be realized from "submitting themselves" to exactly similar "ordinances of man" now ? Are not our abolitionists acting in direct violation of these commands ? Let them pause and consider this, before they drive their measures to the fatal result I have already pointed out.

Pause then, fellow citizens of the abolition school,—stop short, we beseech you, where you are. If you persist in your course, you will inevitably spread desolation and ruin throughout the southern states, from which no possible good can result, either to our slaves, or to us, or to yourselves, or to any other human beings.

POSTSCRIPT.

In a paper "The Philanthropist," *Cincinnati*, which has fallen into my hands since the above was written, we are denounced as the supporters of—"a system of ever beginning, and never ending oppression." Now, as to the *donation* of this "oppression," it would be easy to shew, that slavery has its origin, and its *cause* in the inherent vices of human nature, not the vices of the master only, but those of the slave also ; and so long as human nature remains corrupt, as it is, it will break out in disorder, and violence, out of which slavery, by the very laws of human nature will grow. Remove the *cause* then, and the effect will cease. When mankind shall become universally virtuous, slavery will cease ; but not till then. No *force* emancipation is but to change its form, and aggravate the evil. Until the Millinium is ushered in, mankind will, I believe, remain vicious, as they are. When that event takes place, "all shall be righteous" and then all will be free,—but not till then.

Again, in the report of the anti-slavery society of New York they boast that Massachusetts "will not hatch the cockatrice.

eggs that have been laid for her.' No : but the abolitionists will. Let them, however, take heed lest they hatch a brood of vipers that will turn and sting them. I allude to the natural reaction of their proceedings. They are stirring up an intestine war in our country that once begun can end only in raising up a military despotism that will stretch its iron sceptre over our whole country : So that really they are forging chains for freemen, instead of giving freedom to the slave. They have already kindled the fire of a yet smothered volcano beneath our feet : a few more efforts in their enterprise, and the explosion will burst forth, and then who can stay its course. Meantime *all we ask of them is to let us alone.* Surely as Christians—nay as men, they cannot refuse this reasonable request.

POSTSCRIPT 2.

If, to the foregoing arguments it be objected, that Christians, being the people of God must, as such, be bound by all the obligations, and entitled to all the privileges pertaining to the Jews in that character ; and that, consequently, as a Jew could not hold his brother in slavery,* so neither can a Christian hold his fellow Christian as a slave ; Levit. 25. 39.—If this be urged, I answer, the objection is specious, but not solid.

For, the whole Jewish œconomy was typical, prefiguring the Christian dispensation, which was to succeed it : but in this point, the type is not yet fulfilled.—the thing prefigured has not yet come to pass ; though, we are assured in scripture, that it will hereafter take place. To shew this, let it be observed, that the Jewish government was a *Theocracy*. God himself was their king *dwelling sensibly* among them, and himself administering their government, both *temporal* and *spiritual*, Ecod. 25, 22 & 40, 34—38 Levit. 26, 11, 12. Under the Christian dispensation God has not yet assumed the administration of the *temporal* government of mankind, but has left it in the hands of men, to be administered. In this point therefore, the type has not yet been fulfilled. And this takes away the whole force of the argument. For

Slavery is, in its nature, a *temporal evil only*, confined exclusively to this world, as to all the evils, the slave can suffer by it. It falls therefore exclusively under the *temporal* government of mankind, to allow, to forbid, or to regulate it.—Emphatically this is so, as far as the *administration* of the government is concerned. The *evil*, if remedied at all, must be

remedied in this world : and the administration alone can apply the remedy. But God does not now administer the temporal government of Christians, as, of old, he did that of the Jews. The analogy therefore, on which the argument is built, fails ; and with it, the whole argument falls to the ground.

It was under the *Theocracy*, when God himself administered their temporal government, that this privilege was secured to the Jews. It will, doubtless, be again secured to mankind, under the Christian dispensation, when God shall be pleased to set up his kingdom, foretold by the prophet, Dan. 2, 44 ; when the Jews shall be again " grafted into their own olive tree," Rom. 11, when " the wolf shall dwell with the lamb ;" when " the people shall be all righteous," Isaiah 11, 6, & 60, 21. Then the thing prefigured by the type, will come to pass, the analogy, on which the argument rests, will be restored, and the argument will be conclusive ;—but not till then.

Mean time, it is obvious to every reflecting mind, that slavery, as I have already observed, has its root in the weakness, the ignorance, the vices, and wickedness of human nature — These are its *cause* ; and it is but a truism to say, that so long as the *cause* remains, it will necessarily produce its natural *effect*. But that *cause*, no human government can remove.— It follows, therefore, that as God has been pleased to leave the temporal government in the hands of man, weak, ignorant and vicious as he is, he has thereby chosen to tolerate, for the time being, all the evils necessarily resulting from that order of things. He alone can remove the *cause*, and until it shall please him to interpose, and remove it, it is mere quackery for man to set himself to remove the *effect*.

And let me add, that this view of the subject is in perfect harmony with the commandments delivered by the apostles, (as above stated in this work,) prescribing rules for regulating the conduct of *Masters* and *Slaves*, thereby allowing that relation to exist. I say *allowing it to exist* : for otherwise these commands would be absurd :—there would be nothing for them to regulate.

But, while I thus argue that slaves are bound, let me remind *Masters*, that they also are bound to obey those commandments. They are the *law prescribed* to them,—the *condition*, on which alone it is lawful for them to hold slaves.

*A Jew might be held in servitude until the year of jubilee, at which time he became free.

