

E 449  
B 92  
1849





0 011 899 010 9

**Permalife®**  
pH 8.5

## THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

### NO. 1.

Our readers are aware that for many years we have been engaged in a sort of desultory warfare with the fanatical abolitionists of the North. We have, however, never meddled with slavery as a political question. What we have written upon the subject has been, mainly, designed to expose the fallacy of the schemes of abolitionists, the deleterious tendency of their principles and policy upon the religious organizations of the country, and the interests of religion in general; and, as far as possible, to arrest its progress and counteract its pernicious effects upon the unity and fellowship of the churches, the harmony of the people, and the stability of the government. But though we have written much in a desultory and controversial way upon the principles and policy of modern abolitionists, we have never given our views upon the question of slavery, abstractly considered, either in a religious or political point of view.

So long as the discussion of the question was confined to its ethical bearings, we regarded it as peculiarly belonging to the religious press; and we therefore felt it our duty to speak out whenever we thought the cause of truth would be subserved by so doing. But since the question has been made a purely political one in this State, we resolved to surrender it, at least for the present, to the political press, and hence our silence, in regard to it, for months past.

We have been induced to adopt this course of reservedness, not from any unwillingness that our views should be known, but because, in the first place, we have an utter repugnance to introducing political matters into our columns in any shape or way; and in the second place, because, having hitherto exerted all our influence to observe and perpetuate the peace of the Churches, by resisting the introduction and influence of abolitionism among them, we have felt resolved that, now that it has been thrust up on them as a political question, if the peace and harmony of the churches is disturbed thereby, the Banner shall not be charged as having contributed to a result so much to be deprecated.

While these motives have hitherto controlled us, and we trust will still control us, we candidly confess that we have not been able to satisfy our mind whether a perfect silence, upon our part, in regard to the matter, was either compatible with our duty, as editor of the denominational paper of the State, or best calculated to promote and preserve the unity and peace of the churches. Our brethren every where, as members of the civil compact, will be called to act in reference to, and decide upon the question politically, and their views of it, in a religious point of light, will necessarily have paramount control over their action as members of the body politic. They must act, and the presumption is they will be somewhat divided upon the question; but we trust that no difference of opinion, as politicians, will be suffered to disturb their relations as church members. The subject, as a controversial one, should not be introduced, either into the columns of your paper, the churches, or among church members, as such.

It is therefore, not a matter of question with us, whether the slavery question, as it is now before the people of Kentucky, should be discussed through the columns of the Banner or not; upon that point our mind is fully made up: but the question

whether a brief statement of *our views* upon the subject, in its religious and civil aspects, abstractly considered, might not promote harmony and concord among the members of our churches; and whether, occupying the position we do, it is our duty to lay our views before our brethren and the public, before they act finally upon this important question.

The subject is one of great moment in its moral, social and political bearings, considered either in reference to the slaves, their owners, or the country; and those who have the power and who are about to be called upon to decide upon this question, so far as the interests of the parties in this commonwealth are concerned, should calmly and dispassionately investigate it in all its bearings, so that when they come to act they may be prepared to act conscientiously and intelligently, and have no occasion to repent of their action when it is too late to undo it.

Now we apprehend that there are thousands, even among our church members in this commonwealth, who, while they have fixed in their minds how they will vote upon the subject, have never given it the calm and thorough investigation which it merits, and which it is necessary they should do in order to a faithful discharge of their duty as *Christians* and good citizens. Their present determinations may be honestly intended, but they may nevertheless result from political preferences, from early prejudices, or the local influences which persons and circumstances around them have exerted upon them, while the merits of the question have occupied no part of their thoughts.

Various persons have urged it upon us, as a duty which we owed to the public, to come out and let our views be known, but for the reasons above stated, we have declined doing so. It has, however, occurred to us that a mere statement of our views, as the result of our investigations of the abstract question of *slavery*, both in its religious and civil aspects; and a brief statement of the reasons which have and will govern us in the exercise of our civil franchise, in reference to the question, as it is now presented to the people of Kentucky, would not necessarily open the columns of the Banner for the discussion of the subject; while such an expose of our views might do good by exciting others to a more thorough investigation of the subject than they otherwise would do.

Under the influence of these considerations, and in pursuance of the advice and opinion of others, we have consented to prepare a series of articles, stating as briefly as possible, our views of the several matters involved in the question of slavery, as it is now before the people of this commonwealth; and we offer this as the first number of the series.

---

## NO. II.

The will of God, as revealed in the Scriptures of divine truth, is, with us, paramount law in matters of morals. What is proved as morally right, by this law, no finite being should dare impeach. And on the other hand, that which is condemned by this law as morally wrong, no finite being should dare attempt to justify or defend. If, therefore, we would arrive at just conclusions in regard to the moral quality of any action or thing, we must candidly and ingenuously search the Scriptures for information in regard to it; resolved to receive its instructions and abide its decisions, avoiding all attempts to pervert its language or to misconstrue its plain import. No man can, in the true sense of the term, believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God who, to maintain his peculiar views, is driven to the necessity of quibbling upon its verbiage, with a view to force it from its obvious meaning to subserve his purpose. Such a course of procedure by whomsoever resorted to, we look upon as infidelity, made more infidel by professing to believe what is at the same time denied.

With these views of the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures in determining all questions of morality, we of course appeal to them as the only adequate rule by which we can arrive at just conclusions in regard to the moral qualities of slavery.

Admitting, as we do, the imperfection of human understanding, we readily admit, also, that persons equally desirous to arrive at the truth, and equally candid and honest in the investigation of facts, reasons, &c., involving any question, may come to very different conclusions in regard to it. All we ask, therefore, is that due credit be given us for candor and honesty, and that we be tolerated in the exercise of our opinions to the same generous extent that we recognise the right to exercise freedom of opinion in others.

As the first commandment in the first table of the Moral Law, as defined by Christ, is the "chief commandment" of the decalogue and pervades all the rest, so the first commandment of the second table is the "chief commandment" of that section of the decalogue, and pervades all the other commandments of that table.— While the obligation to love God supremely, prevades all our relations, both to God and men, the obligation to love our neighbor as ourselves prevades all the relations which we can possibly bear to one another in this life.

These great pervading principles of the moral code, are, however, to be so understood, as not only to harmonize most perfectly with each other, but with each and every other precept of the moral law. No interpretation, therefore, of either of these first principles of the moral law, which would interfere with the relations among men recognized by any other commandment in the decalogue, can be admitted as warranted by divine authority, or as calculated to promote the happiness of men.— *There must be the most perfect harmony throughout all the precepts of the Divine Law.*

Let this principle, therefore, be understood as pervading our whole theory, whether of domestic or national government: *that God approves of that system of things which, under the circumstances, is best calculated to promote the holiness and happiness of men; and that what God approves is morally right.*

With this broad and comprehensive basis as a foundation, we proceed briefly to state our views; *First: Of the nature and design of Human Governments.*

Had sin never been introduced into our world, no other law or system of government would have been required but that law which was incorporated in the nature of the pre-moral-man, as he came from the hands of his Maker, and which law we now have embodied in the decalogue. But when man fell from his primitive holiness, and, with sin, all its sad and blighting concomitants were introduced into our world, God in His infinite mercy authorized the institution of human governments for the control of mankind, and the bettering of their condition upon the earth.

The great fundamental Principle which it was intended should pervade all human governments, in subordination to our obligations to the Divine Arbiter, was the *moral happiness of the human family*. In searching the divine record, therefore, we shall find that form of government which, under the circumstances, was best calculated to *promote the moral and social happiness of the people, was sanctioned and approved by God.*

The first form of Government which we have any record of, is that which grew out of the paternal relation, and is denominated *Patriarchal*. This form of government, though imbued with the spirit of the paternal relation, was nevertheless an absolute despotism. The will of the Patriarch was the absolute law of his tribe; life and death were in his hands, and from his decision there was no appeal. The Patriarch exercised authority over his tribe as long as he lived, whatever might be the ages or circumstances of his descendants; unless where a head of a branch of the family moved beyond the bounds of the original Patriarchy; and in that case he became the patriarch of his own tribe.

As tribes were multiplied upon the earth, a diversity of circumstances ensued.— Some grew more potent, some more feeble. A collision of interests, and consequently wars supervened. Tribes were broken up and families scattered, defenceless and exposed to the oppressions of the more powerful around them. In this con-

dition of human affairs, slavery seems to have been introduced, as a system of amelioration and protection to the helpless and oppressed. We have not time here to enter into minutias as to what were the circumstances under which the first contract for a slave was made, nor is such an inquiry material to our present purpose. It appears upon record that, in process of time, whether from wars or other controlling events, others beside the descendants of the Patriarchs were incorporated into these Patriarchates. In the first place purchased, and in the second place born in the family. These servants, or slaves, were evidently the *property* of those who had bought them or in whose families they were born. This relation God evidently sanctioned, and in the case of the family of Abraham, provided for, by special enactment and covenant. So that the servants of Abraham, bought with his money and born in his house, were as directly incorporated, though without any change in their condition as servants, into the Abrahamic family, and was as much under obligation to receive circumcision as was Isaac or any of his lineal descendants. To this subject we shall recur again in its proper place.

A multitude of circumstances conspired to introduce other systems of civil rule and authority, into which the various Patriarchates were ultimately urged. The crude and unsystematised national organizations which immediately succeeded the Patriarchal age, were despotisms of the worst sort, being without any other law than the will of a tyrant. Even these, however, afforded an imperfect protection to their subjects, and especially where they were imbued with the paternal spirit of the Patriarchal form of Government. Almost any form of government, however, is preferable to a state of unbridled anarchy.

The Paternal Government is the form of government which by the fiat of our Maker is stamped upon our nature, and is therefore best adapted to the necessities and interests of mankind. Not, however, in the form in which we have found it to exist in the patriarchal age; but thus. By the law of nature every father is vested with the government of his own house-hold; and as a necessary qualification to fit him for this high office, has impressed upon his nature as a husband and father, towards those under his government, so much of the spirit of the first commandment in the second table of the law, that he is by the spontaneous impulses of his heart inclined to love his wife and children as himself, and to protect and provide for them accordingly. It is clearly assumed, however, by the law of nature, or rather by the Great Founder of nature's law, that no man is competent to govern a family *who is not capable of self-government*. Hence, while the son is in non-age, or for other reasons being incapable of *self-government*, he remains under the government of his father, and differs nothing from a servant. When, however, he shall have acquired the requisite capabilities, he may colonize a family of his own and assume the government of it, independent of the restraints of his father.

Now, we hold that whatever system of national government approaches nearest to the nature of the paternal government, (is best calculated to secure the great ends contemplated thereby,) is the best form of human government. That form of government is to be found in a NATIONAL COMPACT OF FATHERS, *morally and intellectually qualified for self-government*. Such a national compact of NATURE'S SOVEREIGNS, controlled by organic law, which they have all had a voice in establishing, whether in the form of a simple or representative democracy, is the most perfect system of national government known to enlightened man, and is best calculated to promote the great ends of his moral and social being. It must be understood, however, *but no individual, who from any cause is destitute of the requisite qualifications for self-government can, upon any consideration of reason or justice, claim a participation in such a government*. Such disqualified persons may be taken under the protection of such a government, but cannot be made parties in it.

If we look into the history of the past, we shall certainly find that in proportion as intellectual culture and moral light were diffused among the masses, despotisms were weakened; and, *vice versa*. Despots have always found it indispensable to the safety of their thrones, to partition out their power among their subjects *in the*

*exact proportion of their capabilities for self-government.* Hence, we find that as nations have advanced in moral and intellectual culture, the government of those nations have changed from absolute despotisms to monarchies, more or less limited, and thence to Republics.

Now, we feel authorized, from the inspired history of the past, to say that God, in all ages of the world, has intimated his preference for that system of government, which, compared with its contemporaries, most nearly approached to the model above described; and the reason, to us, is obvious—because, best calculated to promote the beneficent ends contemplated in the second table of the decalogue, concerning the human family.

As a proof that the above is not mere theory or bare opinion, we beg leave to present a brief analysis of the first *organized government* in the world :

When God called Israel from the land of Egypt to the possession of the land given in covenant to them as the seed of Abraham; he assumed the paternal right to govern them himself, and appointed Moses to be his special minister of state. Through Moses he gave to Israel the first system of organic national law the world ever saw; and constituted them into a government composed of twelve Patriarchates, with a representative assembly of seventy elders. Here we have not only the first model of an organized national assembly, but also the first model of a representative government; and this organization was upon the paternal basis. It will be seen, however, that the individual paternity of Israel (i. e. the fathers of families as individuals) were not at this time, either intellectually or morally capable of self-government, and hence God assumed the paternal right to legislate for them Himself; but at the same time He gave us a bright example of what a representative government, upon the paternal basis, should be, by partitioning out the administration of the law, which He had established, into the hands of seventy elders, chosen from among the people.

The Theocracy of Israel, as originally constituted, was, when viewed simply as a human organization, a Republic of *Fathers*. And it is remarkable, that so legibly were the peculiarities of the paternal form of government impressed upon their perceptions and national organization, that their rulers were distinguished by the title of "ELDERS OF ISRAEL."

As a further proof that the principles which we have laid down is not unfounded speculation and mere theory, by a further inquiry into the history of Israel, we shall find that when subsequently the children of Israel had degenerated in their moral and intellectual capabilities, by contact with the surrounding idolatrous nations, and were less qualified for self-government, God instituted a *monarchy*, for the government of those who were not capable of governing themselves. The Israelitish monarchy was, however, a limited one, not only because the law established by divine authority was unalterable and governed the throne itself, but also because the original representative form, was preserved in the perpetuation of the shanhedrim.

From this brief and imperfect survey of the past, the reader may gather what our views are of the *moral nature and design of human governments*; or what the divine beneficence intended to promote by their organization. He will also perceive how, according to our views, the divine sanction could be given to certain forms of government which, as we suppose, were not so perfect as they might be, and which under other circumstances He would not have sanctioned: thus, had Israel been capable of self-government, it is evident from the history of the times, God would not have established a monarchy in Israel. But as to have left them to themselves in their then condition, would have been virtually to have shut them up to anarchy and ultimate destruction, a system of government, better suited to their then condition and necessities, was instituted for their good, and special preservation.

In the kingdom of Israel, by special enactment of God, slavery was instituted and provided for; which never could have been the case if it necessarily rendered the condition of the slave worse than it otherwise would have been, and still more

possible would it have been for God to have given his sanction to it, if it were sin in the abstract.

We have deemed the foregoing disquisition upon the nature and design of human governments, indispensable to an enlightened and Scriptural enquiry into the moral nature of *slavery*; to the consideration of which our next number will be devoted.

We are aware that our views of the subject under consideration, are somewhat novel; or, rather, that we are presenting the subject in a new point of light; and it may be well for us to request our readers to suspend a decision upon the propriety and fitness of the positions taken until we are fully heard.

---

### NO. III.

It will be understood, from what we said in our former number upon the "moral nature and design of Human Governments," that we assume that the following positions have been established:

*First.* That God has beneficent and gracious designs to be accomplished in behalf of the human family.

*Secondly.* That in accomplishing these designs, God is pleased to employ human instrumentalities: and that Human Governments are among the instrumentalities instituted and employed for this end.

*Thirdly.* That it is perfectly consistent with the infinite wisdom and purity of the Divine nature, and perfectly compatible with the nature and aim of the Divine intention, not only to allow, but, by his immediate authority, to institute and establish such social and civil relations and such forms of government as, under the circumstances then existing, are best calculated, in the estimation of infinite wisdom, to promote his beneficent and gracious designs in behalf of our lapsed and degenerate world.

*Fourthly.* That those forms of Government which are more perfect in their nature, and are the best calculated to promote the happiness of a morally refined and enlightened people, are far from being the best adapted to subserve the benevolent ends of the Divine intention in all conditions of human society. But that an absolute despotism, in the hands of an enlightened and benevolent Prince, is altogether better adapted to meet the wants and secure the safety and happiness of unenlightened barbarians than are the most liberal and enlightened forms of government. And hence the reason, the benevolence and the moral justice of the Divine procedure in the premises.

We have seen also that the relations of master and slave were recognized and provided for in those forms of government which were, at that time, the most enlightened, liberal and best adapted to promote the happiness of men, and most favorable to the benevolent intentions of God towards them: and that God, by special covenant and enactment of law, ratified and sanctioned that relation. We now proceed to enquire more particularly into the details of that relation as recognized and tolerated by God, and to compare it and contrast it with the slavery of this country.

We commence the enquiry by a brief investigation of the facts developed in the history of the Abrahamic family touching the subject under consideration. Were we disposed to inquire into the probable circumstances under which the servants bought by Abraham were first brought into bondage, as hinted in our former number, the multiplication of tribes and their opposing interests giving rise to wars and conflicts among them, as in the case of the herdsmen of Abraham and Lot; the impoverished and unprotected condition of feeble tribes and isolated families, &c., &c., would afford an ample field for speculation; but there is no necessity for any speculation where we have facts altogether sufficient for our purpose.



The fact is fully confirmed that Abraham owned servants, or slaves, (for they were slaves in the full sense of the term) some of which were bought with his money and some were born in his house. It must be evident to every believer in the Scriptures, that a man so pre eminent for piety, as was Abraham; a man so elevated in moral excellence and virtue, as to be called the *Friend* of God, and so pre-eminently distinguished by God as to be made the *Covenantee* in the great scheme of redemption, would not, in the first place, have purchased a slave, had the act been sinful, much less would he have lived in the habitual practice of that sin for so long a time. It will not do to attempt to escape from the admission that Abraham was a slaveholder by an infidel quibble upon the import of the original term, rendered "servants" in our version, for the specialities in the inspired record concerning them prove beyond all possible refutation that they were verily slaves in the very sense in which that term is understood in our language. In addition to all the other conclusive proofs of this fact, the peculiar relations which they are made to sustain, in the covenant which God made with him, places the matter beyond cavil. By that instrument, the *lineal relation of the slave, is blotted out, and he is identified with the family of Abraham forever—but as a slave.* The covenant binds Abraham to circumcise his slaves, whether bought with his money or born in his house, just as absolutely as it binds him to circumcise his own sons. Thus distinguishing between the hired servant and the bought slave so definitively that the distinction cannot be misunderstood.

Now we maintain that God approved of, and by solemn covenant and compact with Abraham, ratified and confirmed the relation of master and slave which subsisted between him and those servants, bought with his money and born in his house, forever; and in this position we are amply sustained, not only by the covenant itself, but by the testimony of Abraham's chief servant, who testified to Laban and Bethuel, that the "*LORD had given to his master man-servants and maid-servants.*"

It seems to us, therefore, that it would be the height of impiety to challenge the Divine procedure in this transaction, or to institute a doubt that the relation subsisting between Abraham and his servants was not perfectly consistent with the moral perfections of the Deity.

But as a further manifestation of the Divine approbation of the relation referred to, we refer the reader to the case of the absconding Hagar. In this case God sent a special messenger from heaven to command Hagar to return to her mistress, and submit herself, unconditionally, "under her hand." This case of Hagar's does not only furnish unequivocal proof that God approved of the relation that subsisted between Hagar and her mistress, but it also furnishes a beautiful and striking illustration of the principle laid down in our former article, "that good approves of that system of things which, under the circumstances, is best calculated to promote the holiness and happiness of man." For that the good of Hagar and her posterity was contemplated in the mission of the Angel, and not the profit or special happiness of either Abraham or Sarai, is most certain from the declaration of the Angel, as well as from the subsequent history of Hagar and her son Ishmael.

The foregoing facts, it would seem, would be quite sufficient to satisfy the mind of any honest inquirer after truth, that God had approved of the relation of master and slave; but we have still another fact, if possible still more conclusive, that God has affixed his seal to the relation as one founded upon principles which lie at the very foundation of his moral government.

The decalogue is regarded, by all who recognise the Bible as the word of God, as the fundamental law of God's moral rule among men. Yea, divines have affirmed it to be "a transcript of the moral perfections of Deity." And yet it is true, that the relation subsisting between the master and the slave is not only

recognised, but interwoven into the very texture and nature of that fundamental law—that moral transcript of the perfections of the Deity. We may endeavor to escape from the force of this testimony by carping upon the translation of the word, but it can avail us nothing, for no quibble of this sort can turn aside or evade the fact that the law itself places the man-servant and the maid-servant precisely in the same relation to their master, as articles of property, that it does his ox, his ass and other possessions.

Here, then, we pause for a moment, that we may turn the attention of the reader back to what we said in the forepart of the preceding article, upon the unity of the precepts of the divine law; because we wish to lead him to such a conception of the moral nature of the slavery which God approves as will be understood by such an exposition of the tenth commandment in the decalogue, as we have just given, and such an exposition of what the Saviour denominates “the second” great commandment, i. e., “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” as that they shall appear to harmonize most perfectly and absolutely. Let this be done and you have “slavery in the abstract”—the slavery recognized in the Abrahamic covenant, which was approved of God and incorporated in the decalogue.

Slavery, as thus defined, was incorporated into the Mosaic law, by divine authority, and recognised by our Saviour and his Apostles: and we now proceed to show by a brief examination of the Mosaic law, and the history of the times, that the slavery of the Scriptures was conceived in divine benevolence, and intended, mainly, to secure the happiness of the slave—to preserve life—to afford protection and to furnish the means of moral culture, to those who would otherwise have been destitute of one or all of these great blessings. Slavery was never intended by God to minister to the cupidity and luxury of the master without an adequate, and even more than an adequate return of good to the slave. *Its principle design was, benevolence to the poor and defenceless, and religious instruction to Idoliters, &c.:* and this we hope to make appear.

For the proof of the position which we have assumed above, we shall confine ourselves to the divine record. The patriarchal age affords a vast field for conjecture and theory in support of our position, and poets might revel in its fertility of themes for the muses in our support, but we propose to deal in facts alone, and we shall refer to but one other fact, in the family of Abraham, in proof of our position, in addition to the Divine benevolence in behalf of Abraham’s slaves in the covenant provisions made for them, and the obvious intentions of God in the case of Hagar. For in both these cases it is obvious that God intended specially to benefit the slaves and not Abraham. The other case to which we allude is, that Abraham regarded it as a natural consequence of his dying childless that his *slave* (for such a result could not have occurred with the child of a hired man) born in his house should be his heir. This fact speaks volumes: for from whatever source the law emanated that governed Abraham, this declaration of his is a fair exposition of it.

We proceed, however, to examine the law of Moses, and the history of the times it covers, for the proofs and illustrations of our position, as assumed above, in regard to slavery.

Our readers are all aware that the land of Canaan was inhabited by a number of Tribes, or petty Kingdoms, the descendants of Ham, who had sunk into the grossest Idoltry, and that it was surrounded by nations of a similar character. Those tribes inhabiting the promised land, God appointed to extermination, by the hands of Israel; not merely to make room for his chosen people, but as a judicial punishment for their Idoltry, (as in the cases of the antediluvians and the cities of the Plain;) and to preserve Israel from the contamination of their example and influence. And where remnants of these tribes were suffered to live, God assigned them to perpetual slavery in Israel.

That the reducing of the Gibeonites to slavery in Israel was a measure of Divine clemency, will appear from the following considerations. Though by circumventing the Elders of Israel, they had escaped the death to which God had appointed them, yet the fact of their having deserted the common cause of the Idoliters around them, against Israel, those nations had resolved upon their extermination, so that no alternative was left, seeing that by the covenant with Abraham, they could not be free nor hold estates in Canaan, they must be slaves in Israel; or, being driven out, perish by the hands of their enemies. Moreover, as slaves in the house of Israel, they were brought under the religion of the true God, and the provisions of the Abrahamic covenant, as set forth above. Slavery, under such circumstances, instead of death, was mercy divine. In regard to the heathen nations roundabout, of whom the Israelites were authorized to buy bond-men and bond-women, it is to be remarked that the heathen man or woman thus purchased, was not thereby made a slave; but being already a *slave* with the heathen, he or she might be purchased, as such, by an Israelite and retained in perpetual bondage. As to how they became slaves among the heathen it is no part of our business to settle. The fact that they were *slaves* in the possession of *cruel, rapacious and blood-thirsty Idoliters*, seems to have been a sufficient reason with the Divine law-giver, (at least we so understood it,) as to authorize the children of Israel to rescue such slaves from a condition so deplorable in its social and moral tendencies and results, that they might be brought under the influence of the religion of the true God; controlled, protected and provided for by masters whose hearts and lives were swayed by the law of the living God; and who recognised their accountability to him for their conduct to their fellow men. That such a change was unspeakably more beneficial to the slave than the master, it seems to us, no reasonable person can doubt. Now, in addition to what we have said above, if this provision of the Mosaic law is understood as providing the means of propagating a knowledge of the true God and of arresting the progress of Idolitry, it seems to us that we must admit that such slavery is perfectly compatible with the moral law. We call the attention of our readers to the following passages of Scripture, not only as specifically setting forth the benevolent spirit and intention of the Mosaic law, (and also of the Abrahamic covenant,) in reference to the institution of slavery; but also as marking a distinction between the *hired servants* and the *bond servants*, which no sophistry can confound or pervert. Touching the Paschal Lamb, God says to Moses: Ex. xii: 44-45: "But every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. A foreigner and a hired servant shall not eat thereof."

Concerning eating of the Holy things in the Priest's house, God says to Moses: Leviticus xxii: 10-11: "There shall no stranger eat of the Holy things: a sojourner of the priest, or a hired servant, shall not eat of the Holy things. But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house; they shall eat of his meat."

We shall refer but to one other feature in the Mosaic law, concerning slavery, in illustration of the benevolence of its provisions, and then pass on. We mean that section of the law which provides for the enslaving of an Israelite. It is evident that the special benefit of the *poor Israelite* is the immediate object contemplated in this provision of the law. He that knows the hearts of all men, understood perfectly that there is such an utter deficiency of benevolence in the hearts of the rich, ordinarily, that the poor of his people would often suffer (as they do in this christian land) unless it was in some way made the interest of the rich to provide for them and to protect them against their oppressors. And hence he allowed the rich to buy the poor, that they might be provided for in a better way than they could do for themselves. An Israelite, however, if able to own it could hold estates in Canaan. There was no necessity of retaining

him in perpetual bondage in order to bring him under the influence of the true religion, on the one hand, or to prevent him from returning to Idolatry on the other. Hence God limited his service to seven years; at the end of which time he could claim his freedom in defiance of his master.

But mark, now, the peculiarities of the law. After the purchase has been made, nothing more is optional with the master. The slave can claim his freedom at the expiration of seven years, in defiance of the master. But if the slave at the expiration of the time should find himself unable, either from age, infirmities or anything else, to provide for himself, he has only to say: "I love my master," and am not willing to leave him; and the master has no choice left—he is *bound* to take him to the door-post, bore his ear with an awl and keep him, provide for him and protect him as his slave for life. All the provisions of this section of the Mosaic law, go to show that it was intended as a system of supply, comfort and protection to the poor in Israel by making it the *interest of the rich* to become their benefactors for the time being.

From what we have seen, we may fairly conclude that slavery, as a system of social and political relations between man and man, was intended for good, but like almost every other divine providence intended for the amelioration of the sin-ruined race of Adam, it is liable to be perverted, and often has been and still is made the occasion of most flagrant and appalling violations of the Divine Law. But the consideration of this department of our subject we must defer for our next.

---

#### NO. IV.

Having, as we think, clearly demonstrated, in our preceding article, that the relation between the master and the slave has received the Divine sanction and ratification, as a system of social benevolence, by which the master is secured in a reasonable reward for his trouble and outlay, and the slave delivered from abandonment and suffering—it may be proper for us to lay before the reader a few facts and reasons to show that such a system of slavery, as we have shown that to be which God has approved, is calculated to work out in society the beneficial results which we have assumed God intended it should.

We wish our readers distinctly to understand that we admit that the institution of slavery, through the cupidity and rapaciousness of wicked men, has been awfully perverted and abused. That it has been the occasion of enormous and crying sins by both master and slave; and that we do not appear as the apologist, much less as the defender of any perversion or abuse of the institution—we defend it no farther than we believe God has approved it. We are, however, far from admitting that slavery is sin in itself because wicked men have sinned, as masters and slaves. Subject any institution, even the most sacred, to such an ordeal, and it must inevitably fall. The institution of civil Government, of marriage, of the Gospel ministry must all be condemned and abandoned if such a process of trial and judgement are to be adopted; and anarchy, and barbarism, and infidelity must reign over those fair portions of our earth where civil order, domestic felicity and the christian's hope conspire to alleviate the sorrows of life, and light up the pilgrim's path to a better land. Sin has perverted every good, and it is not to be wondered at that the institution of slavery has shared with the rest. It is true that the imperfect annals of the times of Abraham and of the nation of Israel, from the death of Joshua to the time of Jereboam, afford us but imperfect data as to the practical operation of the system of slavery, as instituted among them. This we know, however—that no record of violence or of destitution is found in the history of Abrahams' family; nor have we ar

record of a poor-house, an alms-house, nor of a solitary beggar in the annals of Israel. Their poor were all provided for by the institution of domestic servitude.

Even in the present day, where slavery prevails among enlightened nations, notwithstanding the gross perversion and abuse of the institution, we shall find less destitution and suffering than in similar enlightened nations where slavery does not exist. As proof of this, let us, in the first place, compare the kingdom of Great Britain with the empire of Russia. Great Britain has the advantage of Russia in all the ordinary resources of human happiness. Her Government is more liberal, her climate and soil are superior, her religious and literary institutions are also superior to those of Russia, and yet it will not be denied that the poor of England are more numerous and more abject than those of Russia; and that the amount of human suffering from poverty and oppression in England is immeasurably greater than it is in Russia.

And if we take our own country as an example, and compare the proportionate number and the comparative destitution of the poor in the non-slaveholding States with those of the slaveholding States, it will be found that the proportion of poor, to the general population, is much larger in the free than in the slave States; and that there is a much greater amount of suffering from poverty and destitution in the former than in the latter States.

Now the reasons for these results are, to our mind, perfectly obvious. In all ages and countries, those who are in affluence and power have oppressed the helpless and poor, and will continue to do so, so long as the selfishness of depraved human nature remains what it is; *unless, by some benevolent arrangement, the interests of the poor and helpless are identified with the interests of the powerful and wealthy.* And such an institution is slavery, based upon the principles which we find it to be in the Scriptures. If we suppose the master to be governed by those ennobling and benevolent principles which the law of the Lord inspires, then does the slave find in him such a friend, guardian and defender as the poor and the destitute will find but seldom any where else. And if the slave is governed by the same law, the confidence of the parties will be mutual, and reciprocal benefits will result from the relation. Such we suppose to have been the moral character of slavery as ratified by the Abrahamic covenant, recognised in the Decalogue, and incorporated in the Law of Moses; and which, so far from being sinful, we can but regard as a wise provision of the Father of Mercies, to secure the poor against the rapacity and oppression of the rich.

Fallen as we are, and cursed as the earth is for our sakes, God has supplied every clime and country with abundant resources for the subsistence and happiness of its inhabitants. And the only reason why the poor in any country, are subjected to squalid wretchedness, misery and starvation, are the two following: First—the “chief commandment” of the second table of the Law has been so entirely effaced from our natures by the fall, that man has lost his sympathies for his fellow man, and instead of the law of love, all dominant selfishness rules in his heart. Hence, the rich are utterly incapable of sympathising with the poor. Secondly—no provisions are made in the civil institutions of those countries to reconcile and harmonize the interests of the rich with the safety and happiness of the poor: but on the contrary, their interests are made antagonistic to each other. The rich have not only all the civil power in the land, and therefore rule the poor, but they have also all the means of comfort in their possession; and being influenced by the law of selfishness, they oppress the poor, and grind them into the dust. The only means for subsistence which the poor have is their labor; but the rich have the control, not only of the amount of labor to be performed, but of the wages to be paid for it; and the result is, that such unreasonable exactions are made upon the time and energies of the poor, even in christian countries, that at the low wages afforded them, and the high prices which they are compelled to pay for food, thousands are starving for bread while there is an abundance around them; because, though they

labor sixteen hours out of the twenty-four, they are not able to supply themselves with bread. This is true, not only in those old countries where despôtisms reign, and the land seems to be overstocked with inhabitants but is true also in our own country, especially in the populous cities of the East.

Now we maintain that such a system of servitude as that which was established in Israel, by which the *health and happiness* of the servant was identified with the *interests* of the master, would obviate all this evil. Take Ireland for an example, and suppose the Government had so provided that, instead of an oppressed and impoverished tenantry, subjected to the rapacity and heartless exactions of overgrown landlords, the poor of the country could have sold themselves for a given period to the wealthy, so as to make it the duty and the interest of the wealthy to provide for the health and subsistence of the slave; who does not see that the immense stores of provisions in the possession of the rich would have been every where unlocked, and the oppressed millions of that devoted land have been delivered from a *slavery* infinitely more degrading, and from wretchedness, starvation and death? As a further illustration of what we mean, notwithstanding all that may be regarded as wrong in the slavery of this country, let us suppose that famine should visit any portion of the South, even beyond what it is in Ireland—is there any individual, even the most violent opposer of slavery, who believes that there is a master in the land, who would not only share with his servants the last bushel of meal in his possession, but would not sell every thing he owned, in order to buy food for them, rather than their little ones should cry for bread, much less that any should starve for the want of it?

Before we dismiss this part of our subject, we beg leave to introduce a case which occurred not long since in the city of New York, as a practical illustration of the views we have just given. The case is thus stated by Maj. Noah, in his *New York Sunday Messenger*:

“Here at the North the poor blacks are not permitted to work alongside the white man. Once they were permitted to follow the humble employment of carrying up bricks and mortar but they were kicked from the ladder by our white fellow-citizens. They clean boots, scour clothes, but are not permitted to sweep streets—and yet we, who persecute, neglect and repudiate the free black man here, are filled with holy zeal to make the slave free at the South, and deprive him of a home, of food and of clothing, and of a kind, considerate master; and we struggle for that freedom even at the expense of breaking down, dividing and destroying our glorious Republic! Suppose all the slave States were to say to their free blacks—“My friends, we have given to you employment, but your abolition friends are anxious that you should come forth from the iniquity that surrounds you—go to them, and see if they will do as much for you as we have done!” What is to become of more than half a million of freed blacks driven forth to seek the cold charity of the North? They will starve!

Wherever we turn, we see nothing in the agitation of the slave question but ruin and distress to the colored race!

A circumstance occurred here last week, which has led to the foregoing reflections. Passing down Nassau street, three or four persons were standing inside of a store talking to a black man, and they invited us to come in. “Here is a black man,” said one of the gentlemen, “who wishes to sell himself as a slave for \$150.”

We entered the store, and saw a short stout fellow in rags, with good countenance, and no indication of vice.

“Where do you belong?”

“To New York; I was born there.”

“Don’t you know that you can’t sell yourself as a slave in this State?”

“What am I to do? I can get no work. I have had no breakfast; I am almost naked; no one cares for me, and I have no friends. Is it not better to have a good master whom I can work for, and who will care for me?”

Here was an illustration of the practical benevolence of domestic African slavery, while it exhibited the rank hypocrisy of the Abolitionists. They would raise two

readers to a few prominent features in its history, in order to such an analysis of it as will enable us to compare and contrast it with the slavery of the Scriptures, that thereby we may be able to decide upon it as a question of causistry. In order to arrive at just conclusions in regard to the enslaved condition of Africans in this country, it is indispensibly necessary that we should ascertain what their condition was in Africa, before they were brought here. And as our object is simply to give our views, eschewing controversy, we shall state only facts, as generally admitted.

It is admitted on all hands, that Africa, from time immemorial, has been inhabited by a population the most degraded, ignorant, barbarous and cruel of any other quarter of the world. That they were pagan idolators, enveloped in the thickest moral darkness with which sin had cursed the earth, and which had effectually resisted all attempts to introduce the light of Truth into that benighted land; that they were cut up into clans, faction and petty nations, headen by chiefs, the most rapacious and cruel, whose chief business was war, and whose chief traffic consisted in their captives, who were destined for sale, for sacrifices to their idols, or to feast their own cannibal appetites upon. Such was the condition of Africa, before slavery was introduced into this country, and such is still the condition of those tribes, or clans, which supply the slave trade at present. No African is made a slave by coming to this country—they are slaves in their own country when purchased for market in twis; and it must not be overlooked that African slaves are made so by their own implied consent. For, according to the international laws by which those clans are governed, *every one who goes to war for reprisals, virtually consents to become a slave if conquered; so that they should not complain.*

While it is true that slavery, such as alluded to above, existed in Africa long before it was introduced into this country, yet it is due to truth to say, that in all probability, the extensive and ready sale for their captives to the traders from this country, has greatly increased bloody and brutal wars amongst them. But with this admission, it cannot be denied that the condition of the African slaves in this country, *both physically and morally*, is an infinitely better one than is the condition of the free population of their several tribes in Africa, to say nothing of the condition of their slaves. To say nothing of our hopes for them in the future, but considering them as they now are, and every enlightened and candid mind must perceive that they have been *greatly benefitted by the change*. If it be admitted, as we suppose it must be, that the African slaves in America, as a whole, are greatly better off than they could possibly be in their own degraded native State; then it must be admitted, also, that in one important feature, American slavery assimilates with what we have seen to be an important constituent of the slavery recognized in the scriptures—*effecting the good of the enslaved.*

Let it now be recollected what was said above of the several constituents of every moral action, and in view of the rules there laid down, let us inquire into the several motives which could possibly have influenced those who first purchased such an african slave, as we have found those to be in Africa, for service in this country; for the motive in the action, determines the moral quality of the act, so far as the actor is concerned. To state the question in as practical a shape as possible, we will suppose that there were three distinct classes of original purchasers, all influenced by different motives, and that these three classes of purchasers are *the representatives of three distinct classes of slaveholders in this country at this time*. These three classes of original purchasers, being in Africa, and beholding the physical, social and moral degradation of the native slaves, were all influenced, by what they saw, to purchase as many of these slavee as they possibly could, and transport them as slaves to this country for their own use. Though all were influenced by what they saw, to perform the same act, abstractly considered, yet each class was influenced by distinctly different motives. For example—

*The first class* are men wholly uninfluenced by moral or religious impulses, and measurably void of the ordinary sympathies of cultivated human nature, see nothing in the scenes around them to awaken either emotions of philanthropy or

thousand dollars to purchase the liberty of two mulatto girls, and yet allow a poor black to offer himself as a slave to save himself from starving in a free Northern State."

We have thus imperfectly sketched out what we conceive the slavery of the Bible to have been, morally and socially. We now propose to enquire into the constituent elements of the slavery of this country and to compare it and contrast with that system of slavery which we conceive the scriptures to tolerate and warrant. Before we proceed, however, we lay down the following brief rules, as our guide in determining the moral qualities of an action, and also in comparing one action with another:

1st. An act to be morally right must be in conformity to a Divine law, of either a general or special application. But that infinite wisdom never gave a special law to conflict with a general law, neither can a special law abrogate or in any way impair one of a general nature

2d. That all moral actions are constituted of three distinct, and, in some respects, separate specialities—the motive, the action itself, and the effect or tendency of the action. *The motive* determines the moral quality of the action so far as the actor is concerned; *the abstract moral quality of the action* is to be determined by specific moral law, or, in other words, the moral right of the actor to perform it, *the moral effect or tendency of the action* is to be judged of by its results, either as good or evil. The motive may be good and approvable, and the action itself *wrong*, as in the intention of Uzza to support the Ark; the motive may be wrong, and the action in itself a right one, as in Isaac's blessing Jacob instead of his favorite son Esau. The motive and the action may both be wrong, and it may result in the greatest imaginable good, as in the selling of Joseph into Egypt by his brethren.

3d. In comparing different *actions*, or the actions of different actors with each other, with a view to determine their comparative moral qualities, we apply the foregoing tests and decide accordingly. But where an action, in all its constituents, is evidently decided to be in conformity to the moral law, if another action be compared with it, with a view to ascertain its moral qualities, we will be justified in approving or disapproving the latter action to the extent that it may be found to agree or disagree with the approved action. In deciding, therefore, upon the relative moral qualities of the slavery in this country when compared with the slavery of the Scriptures, we shall proceed according to the foregoing rules.

There is one feature in the Mosaic law which authorizes the enslavement of the Gibeonites and its confederate cities, to which we have barely alluded; nor do we intend now to do much more. It is evident, from the facts in the case, that their enslavement was intended as punishment for their idolatries, God himself being the judge. The sentence of death had been pronounced upon them, but that sentence was commuted for slavery, in consequence of the oath of the Elders of Israel. We name this fact, not only as forming an exception to the general view which we have given of the slavery of the Scriptures, but also to call attention to the fact that, even under such circumstances, slavery was approved of God.

In regard to the slavery of the Scriptures, we think we have already shown that it was a *merciful and benevolent institution*, tolerated and sanctioned by God, for the amelioration of the condition of the poor and unprotected, by which the interests of the rich are secured in protecting and providing for the necessitous.

That where the consent of the enslaved has been, either directly or indirectly, given to his enslavement, he cannot complain of any injustice in his case; and that where his condition, physically and morally, are bettered by it, he is *the gainer* by his enslavement; so that the master is guilty of no moral wrong, who makes the condition of his slave better than it otherwise would have been. But, if he seeks to promote the happiness of his slave, and to advance him in moral and intellectual culture, he performs a charitable and benevolent act.

A brief inquiry into the history of American slavery is all we have room for; but it is not necessary to our object to do more than barely call the attention of our



christian benevolence towards the degraded and suffering human beings which they contemplate. They were not influenced in the least by any humane or christian feeling; but seeing an opportunity to enrich themselves by purchasing these slaves at a low price, and entirely without reference to the good of the slave, resolve to purchase all they can that by their labors they may enrich themselves. Now, admitting that the purchaser intended no injury to the slave, and that the act of purchasing a slave is, as an abstract act, allowable; and allowing also that the condition of the slave, by the force of surrounding circumstances, should be improved by the change; still as the act was superinduced by motives wholly selfish and sordid, in the absence of "the law of love"—love either to God or man, the actor is justly chargeable with *moral wrong*. Should however the condition of the slave not be improved by the purchase, and especially if it should be made worse, by the rapacity, injustice or cruelty of his master, then is the moral turpitude of his act increased, in the ratio of his disregard of the chief command of the second table of the decalogue.

Now we maintain that that class of slaveholders, who are represented by the above class of purchasers, and who are influenced by similar motives, whether they have purchased or inherited their slaves, are in a like condemnation. They cannot plead the examples in the Scriptures in justification of their *sordidness, selfishness, injustice, cruelty and utter disregard of humanity and the law of God*. God may, and we believe will, over-rule slavery, even in the hands of such moral monsters to his glory, in the social and moral elevation of the slaves, and the ultimate salvation of thousands, but his wrath is kindled against the wicked and cruel master; and he will be held strictly accountable for his disregard of his divine law.

The *second class of purchasers*, we will suppose, were affected at the degradation and suffering of the human beings before them, and believing that they could materially better their condition by bringing them to America and employing them as slaves, under their own watch, care and supervision, without loss to themselves, from mere impulses of humanity—*love to their neighbors*—resolved to purchase all they could; and, in pursuance of their original purpose, have continued to seek the improvement and well-being of their slaves. Here we suppose the motive to be such an one as the second table of the law warrants.—It was dictated by *love for man*, and, therefore, thus far, approved of God. This example we suppose to be strictly analogous to that system of slavery in the Mosaic Law, which tolerated the purchase of slaves from among the Gentiles; and which God intended to over-rule to the subversion of idolatry, and the extension of the knowledge of himself among the nations of the earth, preparatory to the coming of Messiah; but we have no room to enlarge.

There is, we think, a large class of slaveholders in this country fitly represented by the above example because similar motives influence them. It is not material how they come into possession of their slaves, whether by purchase or inheritance, if their conduct towards their slaves is dictated by a sense of *humanity*, kindness, and a desire to promote their social and moral improvement; though they may not be influenced by those higher motives which influence the Christian, still, so far from regarding them as sustaining a sinful relation to their slaves, we can but believe, and shall attempt to show, that God is using them as his instruments, to accomplish his gracious designs in regard to benighted Africa. The slaves of such owners will rapidly improve in civilization and the arts, and in despite of the opposing influences will soon acquire all the requisites for self-government; and the further important objects contemplated in the Divine mind concerning them, must ultimately follow, of which we shall say more in its place.

The *third class of purchasers* were Christians, who did not only feel all the sympathy and generous philanthropy which influenced the *second class*, but look-

ing beyond their temporal condition, miserable as that was, contemplated them as being without God and without hope in the world, and sinking down to the death that never dies; and in addition to, and above, the impulses of philanthropy, their spirits were stirred within them for the salvation of their souls as well as their bodies; they therefore resolved to buy to the uttermost of their means.— They aim now, not merely to promote their temporal happiness—their intellectual and moral improvement, but especially to instruct them into the knowledge of salvation by Christ Jesus. This is their chief concern, and for its accomplishment they are found daily at a throne of grace. But they do not stop here; they aim at more than the salvation of their slaves. The millions of their benighted kindred in Africa, press heavily upon their hearts, and they hope the day will come, when they can send their enlightened and christianized slaves, as Christ's freemen, to their Father Land, to teach their kindred the way of life and salvation; and to these great objects their energies and prayers are directed.

Now in our judgement such a case presents one of the highest exhibitions of pure Christian benevolence the world ever saw. Such a benevolence as we have no example of in either the Abrahamic or Mosaic history, and is only exemplified, in the scriptures, in Paul's letter to Philemon. Now we affirm from our personal knowledge, that there are many, and we believe many thousands, of slaveholders in the South, who, though they never purchased a slave in Africa, are affected precisely, in reference to their slaves, as in the example above given; and who hope for the time when the slaves in this country shall be so advanced in the arts, in science and religion, as to be perfectly capable of self-government—*assured that when that is the case they will be useless as slaves, that their owners will cheerfully surrender them to be transplanted by the Government to their fatherland, for membership in the great African Republic.*

---

#### NO. V.

We hope that the analysis of the slavery of this country, in our last number, was sufficiently explicit to be understood by our readers, and that so far as the effect of American slavery upon the relative condition of the slave, before and after his enslavement, is concerned, that it was quite apparent that, in that particular at least, there was nothing *necessarily* in American slavery to make it less moral than the slavery which we have shown to be recognized in the covenant with Abraham, in the Mosaic law, and in the second table of the Decalogue.

We moreover think that so far as the *motive* in the action is concerned, we made it appear that so far as that class of slave-holders are concerned, whose motives and conduct, in reference to their slaves, are assimilated to those in the first example which we gave, that they can in no sense whatever appeal to the example in the Scriptures for justification or defence. That they have contracted guilt by their relations as masters, and that their whole course of conduct, influenced by such motives, is perpetually aggravating the guilt contracted.

While we admit, however, that the above is too true of a large class of slaveholders in this country, we think that we have clearly shown that there is another class of slave-holders, as in the second example which we gave, whose motives seem to be as perfectly coincident with the requirements of the second table of the law, as we can possibly imagine the motives which actuated either Abraham or Moses to have been; and whom we claim to be as sinless in the relation they sustain to their slaves, as were those who held slaves, either under the Abrahamic covenant or the Mosaic law—except a *law* can be found *for those* which will not apply to *these*—which we shall show, in its place, cannot be done.

We have shown a third class, also, of modern slaveholders, who seem to be influenced by motives of still more elevated character than a mere negative conformity to the moral requirement of the law. They aim not merely to promote the temporal welfare of their slaves, but also their eternal salvation, and through them the salvation of their countrymen. These, therefore, we suppose, to be, not merely unoffending, as masters, but especially approved as christians, being influenced by the spirit of the Gospel, to make sacrifices and perform services which the second table of the law does not require.

We are inclined to think that there is an error somewhat prevalent, and not a little subversive of the truth, which we had just as well attempt to correct here as any where else. It consists in the assumption that the moral law requires all that the spirit of the Gospel can possibly incite to the performance of; and the deduction from this assumption is, that they who come short of performing all the services, and making all the sacrifices which the most ardent zeal, enlarged benevolence and elevated faith of the christian would prompt him to do, is a moral delinquent. Now although this is so evidently a mistake as that the bare statement of it would be sufficient for its refutation, still it may be necessary that we should do no more than merely pronounce it an error. A very few reasons and illustrations, however, will, we think, settle the question.

The erroneusness of the above assumption will appear, from contemplating the nature of the law itself; for the very nature and intention of the law, as a rule of moral action, is to require no more of the subject of it than is sufficient to avoid the penalty. It requires no acts of extra merit. Its entire requisitions are fulfilled, by merely avoiding the penalty. The law, in its restrictive requirements, did not, and could not contemplate that class of moral actions which are induced by a grateful sense of the unmerited pardon of sins. It is impossible to conceive how the law could require such acts of one who had violated its precepts, except in answer to the penalty incurred, and this would be to dispense with the necessity of the atonement of Christ. We have not room to enlarge here upon this momentarily interesting subject. Our object is to show that the love of Christ shed abroad in the heart of a renewed, repentant and pardoned sinner, prompts to deeds of benevolence, personal toils and sacrifices which the law as a rule of moral right and wrong does not require, and that while the performance of such acts, as christian duties and privileges, entitles the performer to no essential or saving merit, (which they would certainly do, if required by the law of transgressors,) still that they may be omitted without the contraction of guilt. A few examples, by way of illustration, will show more definitely our meaning, and we must there leave the subject for the present.

The law, for instance, does not require that a man should leave his father, mother, house and lands, &c., for the kingdom of God's sake, as a compliance with any of its precepts; but such an action, prompted by love and obedience to Christ, is an eminent trait in the christian, and is encouraged by special promises.

The law did not require that the poor widow should have thrown her whole living into the treasury, nor would she have incurred guilt if she had not done so; but having done so she gave evidence of her great devotion, and has secured the special approbation of Him who witnessed it.

The law did not require the woman to anoint the Saviour's head with the ointment of spikenard, nor to wash His feet with tears, and to wipe them with the hairs of her head; nor would she have contracted any more guilt by omitting it than John and others did; but the deed was prompted by that love for the Redeemer which is found only in a penitent sinner's heart—she did it against His burial—and her Lord bequeathed her the honor, not only of his approbation, but, that she should have her deed mentioned in honor of her wherever the Gospel should be preached, in all lands, through all time to come.

Multiplied other examples could be given, but these may suffice to show that a man may not incur moral guilt, even though he should come short of performing some of the higher and more distinguished acts of eminent christians. Hence we

have assumed that the christian master, whose love to God and the souls of men prompt him to a course of action in reference to his slaves, which taxes his time, his personal labor and his estate, for their earthly happiness and eternal salvation, as in the third example given above, does not only avoid the contraction of moral guilt, but performs a high and praiseworthy act of christian benevolence, of which we shall have more to say hereafter.

Having examined the *motive* of a moral action, we come now to enquire into the *act*. For whatever may be the character of the motive, if the act performed is in violation of law, or is not authorized by the law, then is the action morally wrong.

Those who maintain that the holding of a slave is, in itself, a sinful act, deny, not only that it is either authorised or tolerated by the moral law, but that it is, at least impliedly, forbidden. This objection, we think, we have fully met and refuted; and therefore submitting what we have said to the judgment and conscience of our readers, we pass on to examine the argument based upon the assumption that God may, and has, enacted *special laws*, in contravention of His universal moral code; and therefore; though a special law may be purely moral in its nature, it cannot be regarded as expository of the Decalogue, nor as authorising the act provided for in the special law, by any but those to whom that special law was given. We think that the nature of those special laws, referred to, is not generally understood, and that material and dangerous mistakes are made by many who undertake to show their incompatibility with the great moral code given for the universal government of men.

Those who affirm that slavery is *sin per se*, are driven to the necessity of assuming the ground that all special laws are *extra* of the Decalogue, not authorised by it, and in no way expound its import; because such are the clear and unequivocal proofs that the Mosaic law recognised and provided for the institution of slavery among the Israelites, that they would be compelled to abandon their ground, unless they could, in some way, invalidate this provision of the Mosaic law, as a Divine exposition of the Decalogue. To do this, they have assumed that, because some special enactments of God are *extra* of the Decalogue—that is, are not directly recognised by that code—that therefore all special laws are *extra* of the moral code, and in no way expound its import, or warrant the performance of the acts provided for by those special laws. Hence they deduce, that as some of the provisions of the Mosaic law were especially applicable to Israel, the whole law was of a special nature, and therefore none of its provisions are of a general application. Now we wish to show that this method of expounding moral law is essentially and dangerously erroneous.

In the first place, this mode of construing special laws, assumes that the Decalogue, as a universal code of morals, is *imperfect*, and does not provide for all the relations which subsist between God and His creatures, and between man and man; and that therefore God has found it necessary to provide special laws for special cases of moral necessity; which is an absurdity so manifest as to require no argument to prove it so.

In the second place, this mode of interpretation assumes, not only that the moral code is imperfect, but, that God can consistently with Himself and the code of His moral government, enact special laws, of a purely moral nature, not only *extra* of the moral code itself, *but in contravention of it*; and that therefore it would be sinful in any one beside those to whom the special law was given, to perform the moral action therein prescribed.

The idea that God can, consistently with Himself and the nature of His moral government, enact special laws of a *purely moral nature*, *extra* of and in opposition to His universal moral code, so directly impeaches the Divine purity and the perfection of His moral government, that we shall not waste time in attempting to show its falacy further than the mere statement of the hypothesis, as above made.

In order to lay before our readers, in as brief a manner as possible, the only just and consistent method of construing those special laws, referred to, we lay down the

following rules, for expounding them. In the first place, we maintain that the Decalogue contains a *perfect system of moral law*, to which nothing can be essentially added; and in opposition to which, God cannot, consistently with His moral government or His own nature, institute any law, either special or general.

*Secondly*, that all special laws must accord perfectly with the great universal moral code, because it is impossible for God to establish antagonistic principles in His system of moral government.

*Thirdly*, that that class of special laws which may be considered *extra* of the Decalogue, that is, not naturally proceeding from it or embraced in its provisions, such as the laws of the ceremonial service, of the Priesthood, of circumcision, &c., and those which relate specially to persons under divine appointment, as to Moses, the Prophets, &c., though either ceremonial or official and not strictly of a moral nature, are nevertheless in harmony with the Decalogue and not antagonistic to it. But that all special laws, *strictly of a moral nature*, are necessarily based upon the Decalogue, and are to be understood as expositions or elaborations of its precepts. An action, in itself, morally wrong, as defined by the Decalogue, cannot be made morally right by special law, and *vice versa*. All actions therefore of a purely moral nature, that is, such actions as are to be judged of by the moral law, which are authorised and sanctioned by special law, must of necessity be in conformity to the moral law, and therefore sanctioned by it. If a special law could be instituted, which would authorise a moral action in contravention of the moral law, then might the Infidel reason with propriety that the moral government of the world was founded on caprice and not on principle; and the strange and anomalous fact would be presented to the moral Universe, of Gods having by special law, authorised the violation of His moral government. Such a special law, therefore, never existed.

If the foregoing reasons be founded in truth and the moral fitness of things, it necessarily follows that while the moral law is the only rule by which a moral action is to be adjudicated upon and its merit or demerit determined, still that no action can be judicially tested by that law which is not recognised in its preceptive requirements.

If these conclusions be justly and fairly drawn from the premises laid down, then it will further follow; first, that if slaveholding be an action coming within the judicial cognisance of the moral law, it must be because it is recognised in its preceptive requirements. And, secondly, if it is admitted, as it must be, that the Mosaic law, as a special law, has authorised the relation of master and slave, it follows from what we have demonstrated to be the nature of special law, involving moral action, that slavery cannot be sin *per se*.

Thus have we shown, that slavery as a social, or civil institution was incorporated in the Abrahamic Covenant, recognised in the Decalogue, and established as a civil or social institution in Israel by the law of Moses. We have also further shown, that if it be admitted that slavery was sanctioned by the law of Moses, admitting it to be a special law, still as a law involving moral action, it is proven to be an *emanation* of the Decalogue, and therefore the act which is sanctioned by this special law is *of course sanctioned by the moral code itself*.

*Thus have we shown that the abstract act of either buying or holding a slave is authorised by moral law, and therefore cannot be sin.*

The next thing is for us to inquire into the effects of the slavery of this country, both present and prospective; and then we shall be able to decide with greater safety what its moral results will be to the several varieties, or class of persons and interests involved in it. And also what is the proper course to be pursued, under the circumstances, on the part of the Government, of christians and philanthropists, in reference to the African race in this country.

In order that we may arrive at just conclusions in regard to the effects of slavery in this country, we must consider its effects upon the two races, the white and the black, separate and apart from each other.

So far from considering African slavery as essential to the happiness and prosperity of the white population of this country, we have always regarded them as being

mainly the the injured party by its introduction and perpetuity. It may have contributed in settling and developing the productive capabilities of those portions of the South whose climate and local peculiarities rendered them less favorable to the health of whitethan to black emigrants; and the wealth of many individuals may have resulted from slave labor; but these and all other advantages, in our opinion, have been more than overbalanced, by the peculiar character of the system of slavery in this country, and the pernicious influence which it has exerted upon the moral and social interests of many in the country.

Slavery in this country, as defined by a certain class of laws, and as carried out in the practice of thousands of slaveholders, is not the slavery of the Bible and cannot be defended by an appeal to its laws or examples, as we have briefly stated in another place. That kind of slavery which makes no provision for the improvement and moral training of the slave, which disregards the marriage relation and the common laws of humanity and justice, *is a perversion of slavery*, and has no more affinity to the slavery of the Scriptures than socialism or concubinage has to the marriage relation as recognised by the law of God. Such a system of slavery may justly be denounced as *sinful and only sinful*; and we doubt not that thousands are heaping to themselves wrath against the day of wrath, by such a system of slaveholding. But we no more condemn slavery in the abstract, because wicked men have thus perverted and abused it than we condemn the marriage relation, because wicked men have contemned and violated its solemn and holy obligations.—As we have elsewhere said, we feel confident that there are multiplied thousands of slaveholders in this country, who hold their slaves in the fear of God, and whose conduct in relation to them is regulated by the law of Christ, remembering that they have a master in Heaven, to whom they must render an account. Thousands make sacrifices and sustain discomforts for the good of their slaves as purely disinterested as any act of Christian benevolence can be, and certainly to as great an amount as in any other department of benevolent effort. Hence the injustice and the impiety of the sweeping condemnation of Southern slaveholders by the Abolitionists of the North.

While therefore we are constrained, from the testimony of the Bible, to believe that slavery as therein warranted and provided for was benevolently provided for the benefit of the poor, still in consequence of the extensive perversion, of it in this country, and its consequent evil influences upon the moral and social interests of the white population, we can but regard it as, at this time, a social and political evil which calls for appropriate remedies and correctives, of which we shall speak hereafter.

We now pass on to enquire into its effects upon the African race, and in order to do this we must contrast the condition of the native Africans, both at the time that slavery was introduced into this country and at the present time, with the present and prospective condition of the African race in this country. Of their condition in Africa, socially, civilly and morally, we have heretofore spoken, and as we aim to be as concise as possible, we beg the reader to refer to what we there said and to contrast their condition, as there described, with what, from his own observation, he would esteem the condition of the blacks, as a whole, in this country, to be at the present time; and notwithstanding the cruelty and injustice which has been practised towards them, in too many instances, both in the slave and free States, still every honest and candid man must, unhesitatingly, admit, to say nothing of the future, that their condition has been vastly improved by being brought as slaves to this country. They are in a great measure civilized. They have acquired an extensive practical knowledge of agriculture and the mechanical arts; and many of them have made considerable advances in literary and scientific acquirements. Besides all this, and still better, many thousands of them have become joyfully and savingly interested in the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Compared with the natives of Africa, the Africans in this country are a civilised and christianised people; and are rapidly approaching that state of intellectual improvement and moral refinement which will fit them for *self-government and national independence*.

But we must not limit our estimates of the effects of American slavery to what has been developed in reference to the African race in this country, either in the past or the present. We have sufficient data, we think, upon which to found calculations for the future, and to hope for and expect results, in favor of that race, both to those in this country and in Africa, still more beneficial and universal than have as yet appeared. We hope—*ah, we believe*, that God is preparing, by means of African slavery in this country, *a nation of civilised and christianised men and women*, to be transplanted to Africa, by whom to redeem that land from barbarism, anarchy and blood, and to shed upon it the light and the blessedness of the glorious Gospel of Christ. To us this is a subject of so much interest that we are desirous to present our views upon it in as connected a form as possible, and as this number is already as long as it should be, we shall defer what we have to say further upon this subject to our next.

---

#### NO. VI.

We have assumed the position, as one of the benefits resulting to the African race from the institution of slavery in this country, *that God was thereby preparing a nation of enlightened and christianised Africans for independence and self-government in their own country.* Some of our reasons for entertaining this opinion we wish now to state.

However repugnant the opinion above expressed may be to those who entertain ultra abolition views, we doubt not there are thousands who accord in the sentiments, who nevertheless regard slavery as a moral evil; because they hold, as we do, that God overrules evil for good. But as we have, as we think, clearly shown that slavery in the abstract is not a moral evil, we can but think that it is perfectly compatible with the purity and benevolence of God that from the beginning he should have "*intended it for good,*" notwithstanding wicked men may have originated it and "*intended it for evil;*" and in support of this hypothesis, we might refer to a number of analogous cases in the scriptures, but we shall detain the reader to display the analogy in a single case only, and then pass on.

The case we allude to is the bondage of Israel in Egypt. Of this event God apprised Abraham long before it came to pass. That God *intended* it should be so for the special purpose of preserving the seed of Abraham from being destroyed by the Canaanites, while they were too few and feeble to defend themselves, no one who has read the scriptures with attention can possibly doubt; and yet mark the manner by which it is brought about. Joseph is taken by wicked hands and sold as a slave into Egypt. His brethren *intended it for evil* but GOD INTENDED IT FOR GOOD. Men may assume to be wise above what is written, and curl the lip and scowl contempt upon the idea that God can be the author of slavery; but his declaration of the fact to Abraham, his intimating to Joseph, in dreams, his future destiny, the special direction which he gave to all the events of his life, and his finally raising him to the highest honors in Egypt, furnish indubitable evidence that Joseph spoke by inspiration when he said to his brethren that though they intended the act of selling him into slavery for evil, GOD INTENDED *that very act for good.* See also what God said to Jacob, Gen. 46 ch: 3d and 4th verses.

The idea that all the terrible judgments which were inflicted upon Pharaoh and his people, were intended as chastisements for having kept Israel in bondage, we think is wholly erroneous. We doubt not that God intended these judgments, in part, as chastisements upon Egypt for "oppressing" his people; that is, making unreasonable exactions upon them and abusing their power over them; but the particular reason why God "raised up" Pharaoh to the throne of Egypt was, we apprehend, to show forth his power in him, and thereby to con-

firm the faith of Moses and the children of Israel in him as their God, and of his intention to deliver and protect them. Had Pharaoh let the children of Israel go upon the first application of Moses, we have no reason to believe that any punishment would have fallen upon him or his people for their past conduct to Israel: but God "hardened his heart" that he might show forth his power in him, that thereby his people might be assured that he intended to bless them.

Without stopping to defend the facts and inspired declarations, recorded in the history of the foregoing case, from the cavil of men who are determened not to believe what God has ordered to record concerning his own acts, we give it as our deliberate opinion that he who denies that the slavery of Joseph was by Divine appointment, because the act on the part of his brethren was a wicked one, cannot believe that *the Son of God died by Divine appointment*, because Judas, being "a devil" from the beginning, wickedly betrayed him; and the Jews with *wicked hands* took him and crucified him.

Now the points of analogy in the case above referred to, and the slavery of this country are these. Admitting that the slavery of this country was brought about by wicked men, influenced by wicked motives; even so was the slavery of Joseph, and the consequent slavery of the children of Israel in Egypt. But we have seen that God *intended* the slavery of Joseph and of the seed of Abraham for their special *good*; and if God could consistently appoint slavery in the one case for such purposes of good, so he could consistently appoint it in the other; as we believe he nas.

In the next place we find that the severity of the service of the children of Israel, was just as necessary to secure their consent to leave the land of Goshen for the promised land, as were the judgments which befell Pharaoh necessary to gain his consent to let them go: just so, we see, that if the blacks in this country had any hopes of being placed upon an equality with the whites, they never could be induced to go to Liberia, but as God intends them to return to their native country *for good*, he is providentially increasing the difficulties to their equality with the whites in this.

As the miracles which God wrought in Egypt were not only manifestative of the *good* he intended to the Israelites, by their slavery in Egypt, but also pledges of his intention to put them in possession of the promised inheritance; so we think that the remarkable providence by which the colony of Liberia has been founded and rapidly advanced to a Republic; and the rapid improvement of the African race in this country, and the increasing zeal of Southern Christians, notwithstanding the embarrassments thrown in their way by the abolitionists of the North, to instruct and enlighten the slaves of the country, are providential manifestations as distinctly indicating the Divine intention to restore them to Africa, *as soon as they are capable of self-government*, as did the wonders wrought in Egypt indicate his intention to put Israel in the possession of the land of promise.

As those who favored and labored to promote the Divine intention, with regard to Israel, were blessed and approved of God, and those who resisted his will, in this regard, were chastened with judgment, so, we have reason to apprehend, it will be in regard to the slavery of this country. If our deductions are logically drawn from the facts recorded in the Bible and the evident indications of God's providence, in regard to the slavery in this country, then should every one be interested to determine for himself what duty requires he should do in the present case, lest haply he should be found fighting against God.

Let our readers recur now to what we said upon the subject of civil Institutions and Governments, and their adaption to the various conditions and circumstances of human society, and they will perceive that we have there expressed it as our opinion that, while God has sanctioned and approved of different forms of Government, as best adapted, under the circumstances, to promote



the moral and social improvement and happiness of the people, that he has manifested a decided preference for a Democratic form of government—A GOVERNMENT OF FATHERS. And that God has indicated that it is his pleasure and purpose that there shall be a progressive tendency from the more imperfect to the more perfect forms of government, in the exact ratio that the mass of the people are advanced in intellectual and moral culture.

Let any man turn his attention to the study of this subject and he will find that in all ages and countries, there has been a tendency in governments to change from absolute despotisms to monarchies more or less limited and thence to Democracies, in the exact proportion to the moral and intellectual improvement of the people. If this fact be admitted, and it be admitted, as we have stated, that God approves of that form of government, and of that only, which under the circumstances is best calculated to promote the happiness and good of the people, then it will follow that the forms of government must so change in order to secure the Divine approbation, as to be most perfectly adapted to the intellectual and moral capabilities of the people. So irresistible is this principle in the moral constitution of human society that, as we stated in our second number, Kings and Rulers in all ages of the world have been compelled to conform to it, and to partition out the powers of government among the people in the exact proportion of their ability to exercise it.

Recognising slavery as a constituent of national organization, or a form of civil society, we hold that it is governed by the same law, to which we have referred above, as so effectually controlling and determining the modes of action in other forms of human government. Hence while it is true that the intellectual improvement of a slave improves his capabilities to be useful to his master, it is no less true that he deteriorates in *value*, just in the ratio that, beyond a certain point, he advances in *mental culture and moral worth*. The above assertion is proven to be true by the experience of all masters, and hence the origin of those laws which are intended to inhibit the teaching of slaves to read and write. But the reason of this fact is not confined to the mere circumstance that the educated slave knows better than the uneducated how to escape from servitude; this is true, but it is a truth of minor consequence. There is a principle in this law of human society, upon which we have been descanting, incomparably more powerful and operative than the sordid one recognised by the inhibitive laws referred to; and it is to this feature of that law that we wish to call the special attention of our readers. Solomon says: "He that delicately bringeth up his servant from a child shall have him become his son at the length." Now the foregoing declaration of the wise man involves the sentiment to which we refer. No man can treat his equal, much less his superior, in intellectual and moral endowments, as a mere *servitor*. As the slave, therefore, advances in mental and moral culture, he approaches to *equality* with his master, This claim the master, insensibly to himself and perforce of that principle in the laws of human society to which we refer, *is bound to recognise*, he cannot avoid it. He cannot resist the natural claims to respect which are set up in the behalf of a highly cultivated and enlightened mind; and he is a beast and no man, who could treat a slave thus mentally and morally elevated, as a mere menial. Hence slaves become less valuable, as they advance in mental improvement, beyond what is simply necessary to qualify them for the labor assigned them.

No observing individual can have overlooked the fact, that there has been a remarkable change wrought in the intellectual condition of the slaves of the South within the last thirty years, those inhibitive laws notwithstanding. We should, perhaps, be perfectly safe in saying that where there was one slave thirty years ago that could read there are scores; and it cannot be overlooked that in proportion as they have advanced in intellectual improvement, has society at

large accorded to them privileges and immunities, formerly unknown. The cause of this great change, in our opinion, is mainly to be ascribed to the increase of active christian benevolence, which has been in operation in this country since the rise of modern missions. But to whatever cause the prejudice of individuals may ascribe it, the fact cannot be denied. Now if our theory of human government and organized society be founded in true philosophy and is in accordance with revealed truth; and if the fact above stated, in regard to the improved and improving condition of the slaves and its consequent effects upon the whites, be admitted, then have we grounds to assume that the following positions have been clearly made out: *First*, that the facts referred to, concerning the improved and improving condition of the slaves, and the growing sympathy and increasing benevolent efforts of the whites in their behalf, are providential developments of the Divine will and pleasure concerning slavery in this country; indicating clearly that its removal is to be effected, not forcibly, as by military or statutory power, but, *by such benevolent or philanthropic appliances as are best calculated, not only to remove the causes which led to their enslavement, but which are also best calculated to elevate them in morals and intelligence, and fit them for self government.*

*Secondly*, that Mercy and Justice, alike remonstrate against any measures to emancipate that portion of the slave population who are disqualified to take care of and provide for themselves. But that the true policy to be pursued is, to follow the leadings of Divine Providence, by properly directing our philanthropic and benevolent efforts to the intellectual and moral improvement of the slaves, and thus to qualify them for self-government and the enjoyment of liberty, before they are thrown upon their own resources.

*Thirdly*, that, slavery being an organic constituent of the government, it is clearly understood, according to our view of the subject, that so soon as slaves are thus qualified for self-protection and self-control, it is INCUMBENT UPON THE GOVERNMENT, and not the individual owner, to provide for their liberation and settlement. The Government has authorized and established the relation between masters and slaves, and, therefore, we hold that it is bound in justice to the citizen slaveholders, if mercy or justice requires the liberation of the slaves, to recompense the owner for them; and if there is any constitutional impediment in the way of such provisions of Government, such impediments should be immediately removed; and measures adopted for the *gradual emancipation* of all such slaves as are prepared for freedom, by paying to the owner, in Government lands, or some other way, a reasonable compensation for his slave, to be suitably provided for and sent to LIBERIA. The landed resources of the Government are more than sufficient to accomplish all this, and then have more than enough left for all the emigrants which may land upon our shores for the next fifty years.

We have thus given, as briefly as we could to be intelligible, our views of slavery as a general question, and we now propose in a very brief way, to give our view of the subject as it is now presented and agitated in this State.

We are opposed to any interference with or alteration of the provisions of the present constitution upon that subject; because, it being a compromise measure, between the slavery and anti-slavery parties in this State at the time the constitution was adopted, when the subject was less imbittered by the influence of ultraism than it is now, we have no idea that it will be improved by any attempt to change it.

Besides we do not believe that it can be improved, because we do not only think its provisions perfectly *liberal* but perfectly *just*. It, in the first place, prohibits the Legislature from passing any law which shall in any way deprive a slaveholder of the right to emancipate his slave or slaves just when he pleases: so that no slaveholder is forced to retain his slaves, even for a day, in violation of his conscience.

In the second place, it empowers the Legislature, *at any time, to emancipate every slave in the State, by paying to the owner or owners a reasonable compensation for them.* And this provision we conceive to be just, and no more than just; for if slavery is a political evil, it is but just and fair that the political compact, and not the individual should bear the price of its removal. By this provision then, slavery may be removed from Kentucky at any time the people wish it, upon principles of equity and justice; and we therefore think that the constitution cannot be improved on the subject of slavery; but if the attempt is made it may be greatly impaired.

We are opposed to the present movement upon the subject of slavery, in this State, not merely because we think the present constitutional provision in regard to it the best that can be made; but because we have seen no plan of emancipation suggested, that is not in our judgement, fraught with manifest injustice both to the slaveholder and the slave; and our reasons for this opinion are the following:

*In regard to the slaveholder:* No plan has been, as yet, suggested, for remunerating the slaveholder for the loss of the estate which he holds in his slave property; but they all propose to take from him without recompense, all his estate in slaves by force of arbitrary law, which estate he has either acquired by his industry, under the encouragement and provisions of the laws of the land, or inherited, without his privity, by its operations. Now, we look upon this as so obviously unjust, that we cannot give it our sanction or co-operation. *We maintain that as slavery has been introduced and established by the authority of government, it should also sustain all the expense of its removal;* and upon the plan we have suggested above. Let this plan be adopted and nine-tenths of the South will concur in it.

*In regard to the slave:* We have shown above, that slavery has been less beneficial to the whites than to the blacks, in this country; and we are sustained in this opinion, by all the plans of emancipation hitherto suggested, and by all the reasons which have been offered in support of them. The plans for emancipation, now before the people of this State, are merely *measures of policy, to rid the State of slavery for the benefit of the whites;* and the poor blacks are left, whether freed or in bondage, to bear all the pernicious effects of such systems of emancipation.

We have not room here to enter extensively into an analytical investigation of the several plans suggested, and to expose to the full all the injustice and cruelty which would be inflicted upon the slaves, were they adopted; our readers must therefore put up with a mere reference to the more prominent absurdities in the plans referred to, hoping that they will thereby be induced to examine them themselves in detail.

Some of those plans are, intentionally, so constructed, that the slaveholder may have it in his power to remove his slaves out of the State before the law can possibly affect his ownership in them. Now, no one need be told that such a system of emancipation is a lie-bell upon the import of the term; and so far from being dictated by feelings of benevolence for the slave, it is a deliberate scheme of the most unhallowed selfishness, to secure the interest and profit of the whites, by an act as deliberately cruel to the blacks. The operation of such a system would be, to rid Kentucky of its slave population, by transplanting them to cotton and sugar farms in the South—owned by Kentucky masters and doomed to perpetual slavery. This would be emancipation with a vengeance. But we have seen no scheme as yet which provides against such a result. All of them seem to be studiously arranged so as to save the State from the expense of removing slavery, and yet, to gain the co-operation of slaveholders, they are so constructed, that the slaveholder may avoid a loss, by removing his slaves. All the facts and arguments in support of these plans, are intended to exhibit the

advantages which the whites are to derive from them; but no provision is made for the benefit of the blacks, and no impassioned speeches in their behalf. We can feel nothing less than sovereign contempt for such falsely styled benevolence.

The readers of the Banner all know that we have, from the beginning, been an advocate for the colonization scheme, and it might be supposed that we would of course approve of those schemes of gradual emancipation which contemplate the removal of the liberated slaves to Liberia; but we are under the necessity of saying that we do not, and for the following reasons:

*First*—Because in all of them, the slave is proposed to be liberated at the expense of the owner, alone; which we regard as most glaringly unjust.

*Secondly*—Because no provision is made by government to remove the liberated slaves from the country, but the country is to be infested with multitudes of lawless and irresponsible hirelings for a half a century to come. Besides all this the blacks are made *slaves to the State*, instead of individual owners, and required to labor for that which the government ought to supply; another act of injustice.

*Thirdly*—No provision is made to qualify these liberated slaves, either mentally or morally, to exercise the right of self-government. They are to be taken, promiscuously, with all their ignorance, improvidence and lawlessness, and shipped off with six months provisions to Liberia. Let any reflecting mind contemplate the scene which would be exhibited in Liberia after the landing of the first importation of our *thousands* of liberated, ignorant slaves, and it can no longer doubt of the cruelty and impolicy of such a measure. Even our own beloved and wisely founded Republic, with twenty millions of freemen to sustain it, a few years ago trembled to its very foundations at the tread of a few thousands of ignorant foreigners upon our shores; and who does not see that the very first importation of such a horde of lawless and ignorant creatures, as either of the proposed plans would send to Liberia, would at once crush the young Republic into ruin, blight all our cherished hopes of its successful agency in the enlightenment and salvation of Africa, and roll back upon it all its primitive anarchy, darkness and moral death? Verily, we are at war with all such heartless schemes. If we mean to benefit the slaves, let us do it *liberally and nobly*—fit them for liberty, and then place them where they can enjoy it. LET THE GOVERNMENT ADJUST ITSELF TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CASE AND PERFORM THE DEED, AND ALL WILL CONCUR.

While we recognise the right of the good people of this Commonwealth, to discuss the subject of slavery or any other subject that interests them, just when they please, still as a citizen, holding interest in common with others, we claim the privilege of expressing our opinion upon the policy of any measure affecting those common interests. We should rejoice if every son and daughter of Africa in the United States, being sufficiently enlightened for self-government, was amply provided for and removed to Liberia, and would cheerfully contribute, according to our ability, to bring about so desirable an end; yet we have been, and still are opposed to all this movement upon the subject of slavery, *at this time*, because it has not originated with the citizens of the State, but has been foisted upon us by the intermeddling of ultra abolitionists of the North, for the purpose of gaining strength against the South, by detaching Kentucky from it, and adding its influence to the North. But the mere fact of Kentucky's becoming a free State, is not the grounds of our objection to the present movement.—IT IS BECAUSE WE BELIEVE THAT THE MOVEMENT IS FRAUGHT WITH THE ELEMENTS OF DISUNION. The existence of this Government and the union of the States are in more danger from the slavery question at present than from any and all other opposing influences whatsoever. In our opinion, the salvation of the Union depends upon our preserving the present equally divided condition of the antagonistic elements, until the excitement subsides, and reason and brotherhood resume their wonted control over the public mind. Let Kentucky and Virginia

be taken from the South and added to the North, while the North are influenced by the spirit they seem to be at present, and, in our opinion, *civil war and disunion are inevitable*. To preserve the country from a catastrophe so inevitably destructive of our national existence, and the cause of civil and religious liberty throughout the world, we wish no changes to be made in the relative position of the States, North and South, until the present agitation subsides; then, when the national compact will not be endangered by it, if the people of the State desire it, we shall not object to the discussion of the subject to any extent.

Thus have we, in as brief a way as we possibly could, to be intelligible, given our views of the subject of slavery, in the several aspects in which we proposed to consider it. The articles have been written, as all our articles are, in the press and hurry of our multiplied labors, without even a clerk to help us. While, therefore, they express our views of the subject, we are aware that a judicious revision would improve them both in forcibleness and appearance—but we are quite willing to let them pass for what they are worth.

We may, in a subsequent number, give our views of the proper plan of emancipation, and of disposing of the Africans in this country.



## ERRATUM.

We sincerely regret that so many typographical errors appear in this pamphlet; it is to be accounted for from the fact that the Foreman of the office was attacked with Cholera before the proof was corrected. Many of these errors will suffer to pass uncorrected in this errata, because we think the intelligent reader will see the error and correct it as he reads. The following, however, we deem it necessary to correct:

- |               |                         |   |
|---------------|-------------------------|---|
| Introductory, | 12th line from the top. | read <i>equitable</i> for "equitabel."                    |
| 1st page,     | 23 lines from the top.  | read <i>preserve</i> , for "observe."                     |
| 6th " "       | 17 " "                  | " " " <i>merged</i> , for "urged."                        |
| " "           | 25 " "                  | " " " <i>stamped</i> , for "stapmed"                      |
| 7th " "       | 29 " "                  | " " " <i>legibly</i> , for "lgibly."                      |
| " "           | 30 " "                  | " " " <i>perceptions</i> , for "preceptions."             |
| 9th " "       | 18 " "                  | " " " <i>slave</i> , for "slaee."                         |
| 9th " "       | 41 " "                  | " " " <i>God</i> for "good."                              |
| 11th " "      | 12 " "                  | " " " <i>authorised</i> , for "authorizen."               |
| 14th " "      | 21 " "                  | " " " supply the word <i>who</i> after the word "but"     |
| 15th " "      | 6 " "                   | " " " supply the word <i>it</i> after the word "contrast" |
| 16th " "      | 31 " "                  | " " " read <i>several</i> , for "seveaal."                |



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 010 9