

A Voice from the South,

DISCUSSING, AMONG OTHER SUBJECTS,

Slavery, and its Remedy,

RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED TO

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D.

OF KENTUCKY,

BY LENNOX BIRCKHEAD, M. D.

"And man, whose heaven erected face,
The smiles of love adorn.
Man's inhumanity to man,
Makes countless thousands mourn!"

BALTIMORE:

JOHN W. WOODS, PRINTER.

1861.

Spencer

REV. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,

Kentucky.

DEAR SIR,

The object in connecting your name with this little production is not merely to attract public interest nor to express the author's high regard; but to more particularly invite your earnest attention and aid in forwarding the great results it contemplates, particularly as regards slavery. Our revolutionary fathers, fresh from a bloody contest for the inalienable rights of man, spurning all outside influences, regarding African slavery in its simplicity and unsophisticated truth, under the prompting of an instinctive sense of justice, the spirit of christianity, the dictates of reason and humanity, naturally lamented the moral and political inconsistency of perpetuating the institution of slavery. Most of the wise and good men of that day, acknowledged slavery "a great moral, social and political evil." Whilst bearing their solemn testimony against it they felt constrained to leave the serious questions it involved to be solved by posterity and the sad consequences which loomed up so impressively before the imagination of Patrick Henry, to whose prophetic vision "coming events cast their shadows before," are now upon us in all their sad reality. According to men's locality and training, opposite views are taken of the morality and wisdom of the institution. No matter on which side the truth lies, all must agree that it is necessarily a great progressive national evil, which has already attained an appalling importance. Unhappily whenever man's feelings and interest must be affected by his avowed opinions human nature will create a difficulty in reaching the truth. If our people could be induced, under a due sense of responsibility to God, laying aside all anger, malice and evil speaking, honestly to examine this subject, this momentous question would be ration-

ally and amicably settled, for the decision rests upon propositions susceptible of settlement by the plainest understanding.

The North and the South are both right, yet they are decidedly both wrong. The North, regarding the subject in the abstract, is right; regarding it politically, wrong. The South, regarding it in the abstract, is wrong; but regarding it politically, in a certain sense, is right; and both are wrong, not having taken wise measures to palliate or remove so great an evil.

I have ventured to suggest a remedy both palliative and radical, but it will require far more force and influence than I possess even to initiate such a work. In looking through our broad land, I know of no one so peculiarly suited, practically, to patronize so patriotic and philanthropic an enterprise. A Southern gentleman by birth, feelings and habit, standing before the community a calm, upright, fearless, public spirited man, free from all unwily controlling, political or sectional, feeling, pledged to truth and virtue only; by your vocation a servant of Christ and a friend to mankind. Will you then hold in your strong hand the entering wedge? Depend upon it there will come many an unlooked for sturdy blow, now idle for want of an aim, to drive home the wedge. History assures us where a great political evil exists, mankind only want the proper leader to make the assault. When Luther stepped forth to war against Papist abuses, thousands were ready to respond. How many at this moment, North and South, only wait such another intrepid leader.

Respectfully,

LENNOX BIRCKHEAD.

TO THE READER.

I would fain pre-engage your candor, predispose your mind solemnly and earnestly, solely through the medium of reason and duty, and with reference to futurity, to regard the interesting matters here treated of. If you think the writer ultra, reflect that where there is any zeal there is liability to ultraism. He is willing to admit, that desiring a more equal division of the conveniences and comforts of life, without lessening the field for industry, alarmed at the rapid strides of luxurious living, the reckless hastening to grow rich, and the profligacy of the times, he may have exacted too rigid a simplicity of life; that his abhorrence of persecution may have led him to an extreme of toleration; his abhorrence of intemperance to an extreme advocacy of abstinence. But, upon the subject of slavery, he has no such admissions to make; his reprobation of slavery and abolitionism must go forth without any qualification, and he feels as a citizen of the Republic, and a member of the great family of man, that he has a right, without incurring censure, as it is his duty, to throw in his humble mite of influence to avert evil, when a matter encompassed with so much difficulty and serious threatening agitates the public mind.

There are many strange truths developed throughout the history of man. He is seen by familiarity to become utterly insensible to the grossest improprieties, scorning to surrender at the stake his own rights of conscience, he has unscrupulously violated those of others; men, from whose scabbards, swords would instinctively spring to maintain their own independence,

have wickedly, or inconsiderately, trampled under foot the liberty of others. But strange as all this is, not more remarkable than his self-delusion in matters of great individual and public interest, there are certain events and conditions obviously ruinous when ever occurring, and although to reason and experience, reading distant events in their causes, certainly approaching, yet as they require self-denial to prevent, we persuade ourselves never can arrive, and with fancied security deliriously indulge in golden dreams of uninterrupted prosperity. So, while righteous Noah toiled on his mysterious work, a rebel world dreamed and sneered, till the deluge taught that there could be an end of divine forbearance. So dreamed Charles and George of England, so dreamed Louis of France, till his brightest jewel fell from the crown of one, and the bloody axe revealed the awful realities of time and eternity to the others. May we not so dream till awoken by the measureless troubles of a union dissolved and a republic in ruins!

But, gentle reader, if you must smile at me as a timid alarmist, and cannot find your compensation in the perusal of these letters, I trust that you will find it in the consideration that the proceeds of the sale are pledged to assist in getting up a country church and school house, in a neighborhood greatly needing them. When the reader, the writer, and his little book shall have all long faded from the memory of man, should this humble effort to give a slight impulse to human progress succeed, with the blessing of heaven, your small contribution will be actively alive, temporarily and eternally benefiting your fellow-men throughout all successive ages. All this shall be no

LETTERS.

FROM LOVE MONEY TO MAMMON.

DEAR MAMMON:

Surprised you must be, but I am sure that you will excuse this communication. In fact whenever any one wakes up to his own guilt, feels the sweet consciousness of being forgiven, enjoys "that peace of mind which passeth all understanding" he has an insatiable craving for the pardon of others; so close is the alliance between piety and benevolence.

Aroused to a sense of the obligations imposed by omnipotence, to the awful consequences of their neglect and of my perilous position, a poor dependent probationist, destined to live or die eternally, yet a heaven-daring rebel, I have been to myself the greatest wonder upon earth. How marvelous! that a rational man, in view of death, judgment and eternity, inevitable and approaching with the velocity of flying time, can become so world-engrossed, as not to pause long enough in his headlong career to ponder the solemn questions: Why was I created, and am I to live or perish eternally?

Being much agitated of late, by very impressive dreams leading to the most solemn reflections, in consequence of which all my views of life and duty have been greatly changed, I cannot refrain from giving you some account of them.

I retired in usual health, and dreamed that I was seated in my office, on the Sabbath, preparing to overlook a huge pile of unrecorded bonds, mortgages and discounted paper, on my table, enjoying that composure which arises from the relief of business calls and the general quiet of the day, contemplating the great wisdom and blessing of a seventh day, for repose to the weary-driven, to gather the thoughts, recruit and arrange for the next week's toils, when suddenly my reverie was broken by the intrusion of a stranger. The hideous ugliness of the being, who seemed neither man nor beast, a monster of frightful aspect, chilled me with inexpressible fear. I could only look amazed. Besides his unearthly appearance there was such an expression! Care-worn and haggard, anguish and ferocity, misery and despair were all deeply traced. An unnatural smile, in which malice lay but illy ambushed, and like the sun let in upon some dark chamber of murderous crime, reveals its horrors, only gave force to the frightful expression. When he announced himself the great monarch of the human heart, the Prince of Devils, I stood horror stricken. With electric velocity my mind was filled

with childhood's fearful superstitions and natural terrors, as I thought of death and the terrible day of judgment ten times more awful, realizing before me the presence of that frightful being under whose tyrannous rod I might have to pass an eternity of woe. Conscience, wearied to rest by oft repeated useless remonstrance, awoke from her long years of slumber. Memory, seemingly acquiring supernatural vigor, brought up in crowds the follies and offences of long by-gone days in all their native freshness; I could individually and distinctly recollect the thousands of times I had not done to my neighbor as I would have him do unto me; times without number when I had not only not returned good for evil, but evil for good, how often under various delusive pretexts I had steeled my heart against the appeals of distress, of broken down merchants writhing in all the agony of impending bankruptcy, of creditors crushed by misfortune, not to *extort* upon their distress, how often I had indulged, at the expense of virtue and honor, a daring disregard to the promises and threatenings of Jehovah; till worked up by utter hopelessness to despair, I seized the papers before me, seeming the personification of that evil genius who had *seduced* me from allegiance to my God, to hurl them into the fire: thinking, alas, the insanity of man to exchange eternal peace for earth's best gifts, when I felt his fiendish grasp restraining me. With a forced expression of deceitful benignity, with

his world renowned address, seeming sincerely and deeply to sympathize, he exclaimed, hold my friend! forbear that rash act. Under some strange delusion you know not what you are doing. Wonderful power of infatuation! His revolting hediousness no more overwhelms me. But still conscious that all was not right, I felt the necessity for some strong counteracting power to rescue me from such strange delusive influence, and instinctively would have prayed to the God of my childhood. But prayer, so long a stranger to my heart, refused the call, and in despair and utter helplessness, I threw myself upon the mercy and guidance of hell's dread sovereign. Seeing his power over my prostrate mind, he spoke cheerfully of my youthful appearance, the promise of a long life of ease and enjoyment, the rich rewards of industry and frugality, with the fascinating prospect of vast expansion of fortune, till in spite of judgment I admitted this fiend to familiarity. Just as the faint suggestion of some foul deed shrunk from, but not resisted, steals stealthily into the mind, gets supreme control, and leads us darkly down to crime. See, sir, he seemed to say, what you would have lost by one rash act: Is it nothing to feel the potency of wealth? that so many court your favor, wait your nod, can you forget how the hot pursuit of wealth has kept your mind from brooding over the uncertainties and calamities of life, the certainty of death, and all those gloomy

apprehensions of futurity suggested by the frailty and weakness of your nature? How much pleasure you have had up to this very hour, from the command of money and the prospect of vast accumulation? How your soul has been filled with tranquil joy at the idea of one day to the envy of thousands, being called the rich millionaire? Familiar as you are with the value, and deeply imbued as you are with the love of money, even you can hardly conceive of the omnipotence of wealth. Sir, it is the most rational, the noblest object of man's pursuit; it is the wherewithal for every thing; no necessity, no pleasure worth enjoying, but its dependent. See at its bidding the strongest, richest intellect rush to sustain outrageous wrong; see its broad mantle thrown over vulgarity, meanness, immorality and every deformity of mind and body. See it giving prominence and exaggeration to the most diminutive virtue, till every vice is overshadowed. It holds the world in bondage. Can it extinguish justice; buy proud senates, even dictate peace or war. See beauty, intelligence, rank, elegance, needy genius, broken down fortune, vaulting ambition and even stern virtue, unconsciously compromising dignity, exalt this god and do him reverence. Will you in a moment of insane despair throw away so potent a good? Will you amaze and grieve your friends by a surrender of that proud attribute of man, your understanding, to the superstitions and

teachings of christianity, withdrawing man from his true sphere of action to waste his time and intellect in idle dreams of future happiness or misery? Sir, you are merely the result of accident, of certain laws inherent, and necessarily governing matter, dropped here by some freak of nature, and here you must live till a worn out frame returns you to the dust, and your true wisdom is, just to make the most of time and circumstances, only looking to the present, in accumulating to enjoy all earth can give. I faintly whispered, Revelation, Revelation. Revelation, screamed the horrid fiend, with hideous sarcastic smile, but evident discomposure. Have not Hume, Gibbon, Bolingbroke and my own peculiar friend Tom. Paine, long since given Revelation to the winds? What man of understanding, at this enlightened age will not resent the imputation of christianity? Do you not see the grossest absurdity of admitting the truths of Revelation? Do you not see the amazing inconsistency it involves in the conduct of intellectual men? Think you that if sane, they could possibly live in the habitual violation of a divine will, believing it must end in eternal woe? What! for the sake of transient pleasure, clogged with sorrow, see a yawning gulf and deliberately walk into it, prefer the wrath to the smiles of heaven. O no, the wise and great of the earth believe the promises and threatenings of Revelation, the fiction of cunning men designed for some sinis-

ter purpose, or they must be mad. I replied, no doubt his statements and argument would be forcible and comforting to many a poor deluded heaven-abandoned worldlying, but before I could be relieved, disembarassed from the irrefragable evidence of scripture truth, he must first totally nullify my understanding. That, to my mind, with the same certainty that a stone cast into the air falls again, the whole bible, which tells us of a Creator and a Redeemer sent to reveal his will, is an outrageous cheat, palmed upon the world by wicked or silly men, many of them poor ignorant fishermen, inconceivably capable of such a fraud, banded together for no motive ever known to influence mankind, but simply to deceive their fellow men, and bring upon themselves misery; or, we are destined to perish or live eternally. Is it all a cheat? Can a higher subject, claiming deeper inquiry, be presented to the human mind shrouded in darkness, yet susceptible of anxiety for the future? Must I believe this wonderful universe sustained by fixed laws, the result of accidentally congregated atoms? Can I behold the complicated, delicate and beautiful mechanism pervading animal and vegetable life, in the most diminutive insect up to intellectual man, in the smallest blade of grass up to the towering oak? Can I explore the wonders of the great deep, in earth or ocean, or raising my eye to the magnificent vault above, brilliant with unnumbered starry

worlds, all for ages moving regularly and harmoniously, and under a sense of my own insignificance and overwhelming impressions of power and wisdom, looking "up through nature up to nature's God" deny this magnificent universe an architect divine? Can I feel a consciousness of responsibility, a natural allegiance, a filial dependence upon this grand architect divine, feel the relationship sustained by prophecy fulfilled and daily fulfilling around me, confirmed by the clearly established visit of a super-human being clothed with miraculous power, and by his revelation, (the divine origin of which is attested by the sublime morality it teaches by its evidencing the deepest knowledge of the human heart, and its adaptation to all his moral wants,) to every fair mind fixed by the same amount of testimony which would establish any other truth, and deny the divine inspiration of Holy Writ? O no, the bible must be true, and what does it teach? Does it tell us, regardless of all we see around us, of all the remonstrance of reason and instinctive belief in immortality, stupidly to grovel in the earth for gold, or wrapped up in self, live only for our own sensual gratifications, and then sink forever in the dust? O no, it tells us we are probationists here, destined for an immortal existence, and by denying self, cultivating purity of thought, and active benevolence, walking obediently, to advance in holiness. It lifts us up from earth, cuts us loose from

the slavery of its engrossing anxieties, its pleasures, hopes and aspirations, opening to our view joys eternal. But, would you see the full value, the cheering, all sustaining power of that christianity you would have me to despise. Mark, I pray you, you pure timid spirit, who, unmurmuringly has struggled through a life of poverty and care, now ready to leave for another world. Ask her, whom the falling of a leaf would once have startled, whence all this perfect resignation, this calm composure, nay, more, this heroic, triumphant exultation in view of that solemn hour from which the most stout-hearted instinctively recoil? Animated with the christian's hopes, she will point you to the christian's faith. Take from poor frail dependent man, fortune, honors, even health, but leave him that only ray which can illumine and cheer the dark future, lighting our pathway through time, to a haven of eternal rest. O, without it, how dark, how cold, how dismal is the tomb! With feigned tenderness, the fiend rejoined, ah, my worthy friend, I see in all this but the infirmity of poor human nature; courage, my friend, these are but the phantoms of a disordered imagination, and to-morrow's early dawn will again call you to mingle in the business and excitement of the world, in the strife they will all disappear. But to my errand, I stand greatly in need of a cool, calculating, confidential counsellor, and I know of no one upon

whose friendship and aid I can rely with more confidence than upon those of a successful usurious money lender, systematically accustomed to view every subject in a business aspect, simply, irrespective of all influence from feeling, public sentiment, or the senseless laws of legislation.

I am much concerned at the active agency now at work to defeat the peopling of my vast domain. I am the most vilified of beings; whilst I acknowledge to that weakness of noble minds, ambition, I am unfairly charged with all the follies of man since the story of the fatal apple; I am the mark for every gown-clad divine, every moralist, every philanthropist who say and do not: but I care for none of them, but the indomitable captain of the temperance host, one little *Christian** David. Most strangely he has challenged to mortal combat, on the banks of the Severn, my great friend and ally Goliath, Prince of Alcohol, and unhappily I find him sadly depressed, reluctant for the encounter: he seems palsied by superstitious fears, growing out of an old family tradition, that his great ancestor, Gouath of Gath, having boastfully challenged to personal conflict the most daring Israelite, fell mortally wounded by an ancestor of like name to this *Christian*, Little David. I wish to know how I can best prevent this desperate battle, for when I compare

* Christian Keener, Esq.

the personal prowess of the Prince, with the insignificance of this little David, I feel assured that he never would risk so much upon the issue of this conflict, unless influenced by some secret, mysterious inspiration, some strange consciousness that supernatural strength will nerve his arm, unerring truth direct his missile. I fear that, like his great ancestor, he too will come "in the name of the Lord of Hosts." You will not wonder at my intense anxiety when you learn, that of all my numerous friends and allies, Prince Alcohol has done the most for me, millions has he gained me. Hitherto, there is no human excellency, the proudest genius, the most chivalrous, even beauty heightened to the highest degree of attractiveness by refinement and loveliness, which has not often graced his triumph—upon him too are dependent countless agencies: here determined to rid myself of a presence so hateful, I made a violent effort to denounce him, and awake. So exhausted was I by intense feeling, that I immediately swooned away in sleep, and again I dreamed. Before me was a heaven-clad messenger, seemingly purity itself, radiant with beauty, innocence and benignity of expression—so mild, so gentle, that as I gazed on this angel of light, I felt refreshed: at last with a melody of voice unknown to earthly ears, he softly said, poor mortal man, seeing you hard pressed by the great enemy of mankind, infinite goodness dispatched me on this errand of mercy.

Regard not the counsel of that evil one, he flatters but to deceive and ruin. Your own experience, as well as that of all that have gone before you, tells you, that there is nothing permanent nor satisfying in the boasted advantages so artfully portrayed; that whilst at best they afford but small satisfaction, they still leave the mind a prey to doubt and apprehension, cannot quiet conscience, nor conceal the certainty of death, and the possibility of an awful futurity. Can it be wise for all the unsatisfying advantages and fleeting pleasures of time, to lose the rich rewards, and feel the possible punishment of eternity? But yield not to despondency, "a bruised reed shall not be broken, smoking flax shall not be quenched;" there is a balm for every broken, contrite heart; I come to sustain and point you to the way of life, you will find it in divine revelation; I pray you never forsake it; believe one who has triumphed over sin and death, that by a constant exercise of piety to God and good will to man, you will enjoy existence here, and finally be received into the mansions of everlasting glory. So great was my joy to find myself within the bounds of hope, that I suddenly awoke from the emotion.

Now, dear Mammon, with a mind thus solemnized by these visions, called off from the pursuit of gain, for gain's sake, I have diligently searched in the inspired volume for the way of life. I find it to lie through devotion to God's will, kindness to my

fellow creatures, and extending the Redeemer's kingdom. Of course my whole life is changed, and I have a peace of mind never known before. I who only thought, and not too scrupulous as to the means, or who suffered, of accumulating wealth for wealth's sake; seeing the folly of living for this world; now consider wealth dearly bought at the expense of virtue, and as given to be held in trust for the high purposes of benevolence, and valuable only as a means of doing God's will by promoting human happiness. After much reflection, I am satisfied I can in no way, and in so short a time, make amends to mankind for my long neglect of the obligations to promote man's weal, as by concentrating the energies of mind and body, and the power of wealth, in the cause of temperance and African emancipation. Hoping to enlist you in the good work, I send you two lectures, one upon intemperance, and one on negro slavery. But, dear Mammon, I would not have you limit your agency to these objects, I would have you identified with all the great and good schemes of the day; for, from the necessity of your nature, the more usefully, benevolently, and actively you are engaged, the happier you will be. Wealth seems designed the natural ally of philanthropy, for it is essential to its great plans, and can no other way be innocently and safely used. I would have you, by careful reflection, by diligent, careful, prayerful reading of

Holy Writ, satisfy yourself that you are a probationist, and responsible, with the velocity of the lightning's vivid flash, traveling to utter ruin or eternal peace. That your large wealth is from the great Giver of all good gifts; that you are designed as his steward, that he will hold you responsible for the means placed in your hands. To reach these conclusions, you must come out from the world, but in becoming a practical christian, you will become spiritually minded, and delight in that which you now shun. In the exhibition of the strength and character of intemperance, the impolicy and iniquity of slavery, you will perceive a work worthy of the christian, the philanthropist, and the patriot. I do not approach you without a full appreciation of all your difficulties. I know that years of habit have worn a deep channel for your thoughts not easily left. But you are a reasonable being, and should not be the passive creature of habit, when a solemn responsibility attaches to all you think, say, or do. You have mapped out your large estate among your children or relatives, so that,

"Cursed with means
To dissipate their days in quest of joy,"

They may uselessly pass their lives feeding upon their father's toils. But you cannot be blind to the startling fact, that generally, to give fortune is only to ruin. Men, unless moved by some stimulus, will not work, and we all know the proverbial

evil of idleness. Wealth is only a relative term ; imagination, the hot bed of so much folly and sin, makes many poor who would be "passing rich with forty pounds a year." Experience teaches, very distinctly, that a good training in the principles and habits of virtue, industry and frugality is a boy's best inheritance. Indeed it would seem as if God never intended us to accumulate large wealth, because from the usual natural results from making children independent of exertion, that would have been to design ruin to our offspring. Moreover, has not God indicated this his sovereign will by the general decree that man shall eat his bread in the sweat of his brow, and appending suffering to the disobedience, by, in his dispensations, affording such ample objects for superfluous wealth, by leaving his poor always with us, enjoining their being cared for, by leaving so much to be done for the welfare of man in extending the Redeemer's kingdom? How, in fact, can we *individually* responsible, with the immense amount of good to be done, accumulate heaps of gold and obey the divine injunction, "give as God has prospered, and according to your *ability*. Will we, *individually*, obey the injunction, when we hoard up, from year to year, enjoying the possession of wealth as long as we can, and then leave others to dispense it?

"Riches, like insects, when concealed they lie,
Wait but for wings and in their season fly."

We do know, generally speaking, that if a man does not give away, as objects present, his superfluity, that his children will, by a law of nature, scatter them in luxurious living, dissipation or some injurious folly. If not so, in no great time the world would be divided into the enormously rich and the meanly poor. It would seem that accumulation carries within itself a principle of diffusion, since it cannot be dammed up interminably without mischief, being equally forbidden by our nature and God's command. If the wealthy neglect the high privilege of being God's stewards, and dispense, scripturally, nature's laws, by throwing wealth in more faithful hands, will indirectly effect the object, it will "wander, heaven-directed, to the poor." For the purposes of Omnipotence can never be defeated. If you think me too exacting, remember God, not I, is your task master. If I have asked more than the good book, heed me not. I once thought, when I handed over a bank note to some benevolent object, that I did a great deal, but reading of the privations and labors of an eminent heaven-sent missionary among the heathen, I was struck with the insignificance of all my charities. True, I had given liberally, but it involved no sacrifice except the pleasure of buying a few additional shares of bank stock, it cost me no labor, nor self-denial, no luxury was unindulged, the splendor of my equipage, nor my style of living in any way

reduced. I began to reflect that if the richness of charity consists in the amount of personal sacrifice it involves, as may be seen in the widow's mite, I must do more than give away a small superfluity, not that I would depreciate such benevolence one particle, but I must deny myself and work before I can feel my duty fully discharged, and you will see by my lectures that I have also commenced working.

Yours, truly,

LOVE MONEY.

The Promised Lecture on Intemperance.

It may surprise many, that so humble a citizen, I have placed myself so conspicuously, that I have assumed so much labor, encountered so much obloquy. To vindicate myself from the imputation of fanaticism so commonly used against every benevolent scheme, by the lukewarm and the indifferent. I will simply remark, that I believe in an allwise, omnipotent Ruler of the universe, who has made me a responsible probationist, revealed his will as my rule of life, given his commands, enjoined obedience by the promise of rich rewards and the threat of utter ruin. That he has commanded me to love and obey him, to do unto others as I would have others do unto me, and to love my neighbor as myself. With these convictions, and a full sense of my responsibility, and so plain a rule before me, ought it to be a matter of wonder, that I have engaged with some zeal in a cause, having for its object the rescue of thousands from vice and woe? Should it not be a matter of amazement rather that all christians do not make it the great concern of life to study how best to promote human weal and do their heavenly Father's will? The rock, then, upon which we hope to rear the altar of Tem-

perance, from which will ascend to heaven a grateful incense, the sacrifice of our inclination, our pride, ostentation and greedy lust of money to the good of mankind, is the revealed will and command of Jehovah. If any man will deny this rock, or that the divine will forbids, or does not command us to prevent his creature, man, from going to ruin, or to snatch his destined immortals from the dens of vice and misery, dry up the tears of broken hearted women; feed, clothe, and educate virtuously little children; with such, I have no argument to hold. But if the rule laid down, is admitted to be the indisputable requirement of christianity, our duty lies plainly before us, an unclouded sun has arisen upon our path. Unhappily, the mischiefs from intemperance have evidences too many, and too strong to require a detailed exhibition, you will find them in our domestic circles, in the streets, the highways, the lunatic asylum, the almshouse, the hospitals, the prison and ever pleading for your efforts from the very gallows. Where is the family which can proudly boast, no parent, no son, no wife, no daughter, none of our blood stands reproached with intemperance? Where is the square mile of our country without the marks of this demon? Unless long devotion to the world or the habitual practice of wrong have had their wonted effect, palsied your moral sense, rendered you insensible to the appeals of misery, realizing the wretched beings of every

hue of crime and shade of misery, crowding the avenues to ruin, my argument must be felt in every heart. Many a one will pass the poor inebriate, brooding over his misery and irresolution, (perhaps in despair, meditating some dark crime, the more speedily to hurry him on to perdition,) loathsome from filth or gross sensuality, give the passing sympathy with the self-gratulation, "Thank God I am not such as he." Or with a cruel harshness, spurn him, naked, cold and hungry from his door, loaded with reproach, then satisfied, his christian obligation discharged, complacently pass on to his warehouse, his shop, his club or may be his own splendid saloon, and there, by trade, by example, influence, promote the cause, directly or indirectly, which is preparing thousands upon thousands for the wretchedness of which this poor man is but the representative. To all such sober men I would hint, take heed lest you too fall, and I charge you in all your complacency, with this poor man's ruin, and before heaven's bar he will be a swift witness against you. He is only a poor frail being, the inheritor, perhaps of poverty, ignorance and vice, to your kindness; "in the helplessness of infancy and death, nature's first last lesson to mankind," more than a stranger. Have you not, for gain, selfish gratification, ostentation or indolence, knowing its constant results, sustained the cause of his ruin? Is a man not guilty as well for not preventing, as for the commis-

sion of crime? Are they not equally a violation of God's will? Will he, who has told you not to put a stumbling block in your neighbor's way, but to love him as yourself, to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, to extend the Redeemer's kingdom, hold you guiltless? I boldly contend there is no possibility of escaping the charge of glaring inconsistency, from insane trifling with the most solemn responsibility, but a downright denial of christianity. Ye intelligent, virtuous, sober men—ye amiable, tender, affectionate, pure women of our land, I charge *you* with all the variety of crime and misery, proceeding from intemperance. Are you alarmed, or indignant at so grave a charge? With you rests all the power of fashion, moral and political control. To deny your inability, will be the humiliating admission, that the majority of the nation is made up of men insensible or indifferent to human sorrows or religious obligations, of the sottish and vicious. Pray, who manufactures the poison; who sell it by hundreds of casks; who rent houses for its retail; hire ships and rail roads to diffuse it; who countenance it at the tavern, or in social life, who place it on the hospitable board and press reluctant guests; who provide and store up, as something precious for long years the endless varieties of alcohol; who support your club rooms; who, for hours, sit drinking and discussing the various ages and shades of wine; who send members to your legislature?

Are you prepared to admit that there is not virtue, intelligence, philanthropy, nor patriotism sufficient in our country, if concentrated, to strangle this monster? Strange, indeed, that the virtuous, the enlightened, the kind, the polished, who can have no sympathy with the revolting scenes of drunkenness, turning from its crimes and loathsome beastiality; who censure, with unmeasured abuse, its victims; even the humble grogger, from whence issue vulgarity and blasphemy, will directly and indirectly justify the use of alcohol, not only stand aloof from its suppression, with folded arms, as if they were irresponsible beings, but bring example, sarcasm, wit, all their influence, to thwart the friends of temperance. Surely, without slander, one might almost assert, that in the upper strata of society, religion and virtue are mere abstractions, carrying with them no practical obligations, imposing no duties of self-denial or benevolence—no obedience to Divine will; for nearly every genteel family, seeing all around them the steady, insensible, stealthy growth of intemperance, from the most moderate indulgence, will, in all its most attractive forms offer and press the fatal glass. When we hear all grades admit and lament the greatness of the evil, how can the fact that it has reached its frightful magnitude, be accounted for? Well, there is our natural indolence, and indisposition to think and act, not stimulated by a desire to be useful, an in-

clination to shift care and responsibility upon others, delusively persuading ourselves when done, that our responsibility ceases; a want of a just sense of our individual responsibility and of our own individual power and influence; the law of fashion, too strong for reason or virtue, self-gratification, imagined pecuniary interest, insensibility to the magnitude of the evil and a despairing hopelessness. I presume we will find some one of these considerations pressing us from the path of duty. But where do we find that indolence will be received as an apology for duty omitted. I would advise such as have not realized the value of individual exertions, that their strength lies in concentration. As the great ship, madly tossing and struggling to be free, is held to her moorings by the delicate hempen fibre. Upon the eve of a great battle, there floated from Nelson's mast head the animated appeal "England expects every man to do his duty." Only let every friend to our cause, no matter how narrow his sphere, do his duty and we are secure of a far more glorious triumph, because, over a far greater foe, and in its consequences more important and enduring, than the bloody victory of Trafalgar.

Where do we find that individual responsibility is transferable under any circumstances; that immunity from toil can be purchased by handing money from a full purse to a working philanthropist? No, we must give and work, too. To such as do

not distinctly see their individual responsibility, I would suggest that we are all required to do good according to our ability, to make the most of our talent, that each man's duty is necessarily distinct and irrespective of others, and his accountability also. Wherever there is a divine command, wherever there is a great blessing or privilege, wherever our example may effect good or evil, there stands, side by side, individual responsibility; it is omnipresent—in business, in pleasure, in religion. It is a strange delusion under which men merge their individual responsibility in their corporation, official relations, custom, or the duties of others. When a director of a rail road, from indolence or any other cause, allows his president to do an act of injustice, or the road to be used in a way injurious to public morals, surely he must be responsible as far as his authority and influence go. When the editor of a common newspaper, assuming the office of instructing the people, guarding their morals and interests, will allow scurrility and falsehood to stain his columns, when he will allow one impudent impostor selfishly to advertise his lottery prizes, and another to impose his poison and his quackery upon an ignorant confiding public, plundering the afflicted, under all the aggravation of wretched poverty, is the editor less liable to censure than the demoralizing vender of lottery tickets, or the unprincipled charlatan?

When an attorney, under an assumed professional obligation, in all the pride of legal acumen and learning, will descend to become the mercenary hireling of villainy; sustain, unblushingly, conduct before a jury which out of court, stripped of its legality, he would scorn to defend, or if imputed to him he would resent with blood, taking the bible standard of morality free from guilt; no one will say, every man is not entitled to a hearing, or that an attorney is not to sift every case presented. But, can justice be a maid so coy, cunning and agile, as entirely to elude the keen, quick sighted lucre-sharpened vision of a profound lawyer, yet be so easily recognized by a jury of plain, often ignorant men? Does no responsibility attach to the confounding of law and right? Can man's law make void the principles of eternal justice? Human law was designed mainly to substitute the sin-extinguished law of God, written in the heart of every man, a natural sense of justice; to protect the virtuous from the vile, not to sustain wrong, or by its defects justify outrage; surely not the foe but the guardian angel of justice. When, then, great men, their fame wider than their country's bounds, bring their giant intellect, rich in legal lore, all the weight of high character to defraud the philanthropist of his right, to dispose, as he may, of the earnings and savings of a life of toil and self-denial; wrench from the guardians of the orphan the means

of education, or before a jury, packed for his object, defend, vindicate and snatch from the craving jaws of justice, a wretch who has murderously stricken down an innocent, unarmed man, is there no humiliating descent from lofty position, no leveling to an equality of moral guilt with the man who would legally rob the orphan, or the foul assassin; is there no awful responsibility to divine justice, for such prostitution of heaven's great gifts? When an officer engages in an offensive war, believing it to be unjust—surely in the courts above, where no special pleading—only the merits will be considered, the plea of professional obligation must be idle. God has given to the individuals of an army a moral sense to discriminate right and wrong, and we might as reasonably expect the good deeds of an officer, vicariously rewarded in his government as his deeds of evil punished there. But, perhaps, no where is this attempt to merge individual responsibility in vocation, more striking or triumphant than among military men. They assume that their profession privileges them, actually imposes an obligation to fight any where and under all circumstances, that they are pledged to government, or to public sentiment. The heroic Decatur, remonstrated with, replied, fighting was his profession; and Barron, thinking both mortally wounded, offered his hand to the dying Decatur, saying, let us make up before we meet in heaven! Yes, their hands,

reeking with a brother's blood, fresh from open deliberate daring of the justice and wrath of God, hope to appear among the angelic choir!! But they were soldiers, that made murder a venial offence, cancelled the claims of divine obedience!!

To such as in humility plead their inability, I would say, that no man is so insignificant as not to have some influence, not to be entrusted with the one talent, and the solemn responsibility of using it rightly. To the wealthy, fashionable and great, I would suggest, that influence descends, that their combination will be overwhelming, and as their power—must be their responsibility. To such as are restrained by a lust for money or the world's loud laugh, only let them respectively weigh against their motives, offended Deity. The moral and religious principles of some men, it is true, do not seem to be so clearly defined as to give plain, comprehensive views of duty, or they are too vague and contracted, but still the ingenuity and facility of man in discovering pretexts for doing wrong are no where more remarkable than in the matter before us.

One will excuse himself, because he did not intend personally to do mischief, his object was simply to make a living with little labor, and if the object could have been effected without injury to others, he would have preferred it; and that, as such was not the necessary result of his act, he is not responsible. As if any instrumentality, thrown in between

him and the perpetrator using his agency could excuse it, knowing the probable result. Can any man be so simple as to think God's justice can be cheated by any human circumvention, or the interposition of other agency between him and crime, he knows likely to follow his act? Consequences have nothing to do with crime in the eye of heaven, man's law looks to them. God in his sovereignty has simply declared, thou shalt do so or so, and the guilt consists in violating his will. We are told that the guilt of murder lies in the mental conception. Is not a knowledge and conviction of probable results the same as a positive intention, directly and personally, to commit crime? I sell a highwayman a revolver, knowing that he designs it for murderous purposes, do I not virtually intend him to commit murder? Without my revolver he could not murder. I did not intend personally to murder, but I intended to qualify the murderer to do so. The only difference between us is in the degree of guilt, the highwayman murders that he may violently rob or gratify revenge. I sell him the instrument simply to make money, in a lawful way, but we have both violated God's will, neither has loved our neighbor as ourselves, nor done unto him as we would have had him do unto us.

I sell a grocer a pipe of brandy, knowing that he keeps a resort for the drunken and dissolute to assemble, and I know that he purchases to put men

in a condition leading to quarrel and murder. I certainly, knowing these consequences, intend to enable the grocer to qualify these men to quarrel and murder. Is my dollar any cleaner than his? He no more desires the evil effects than I do. All he wants, like myself, is the gain. Certainly the revolver and the brandy may be used in an hundred innocent ways, and we only can be guilty when we know that they are designed to be used viciously. Some men's sense of guilt seems in proportion to the number of links in the chain connecting them with the crime. They would be shocked if brought in immediate contact with murder, but feel no guilt in having, by a chain of agencies, knowingly placed another in the position to commit murder.

Thus, many a man, through a long life, has been the active agent for great mischief, through his talent, his energy or his capital, delusively quieting conscience by his never having desired nor personally actually committed crime. Some will start with the idea that a man is a free agent, and because intemperance is his own voluntary act, therefore, the guilt and responsibility is exclusively his own for abusing a thing in itself good. But we are as guilty when we aid a man to injure himself and family as when we aid him to injure others, for we are not manifesting our heaven-commanded love to him. Yet many a dramseller has, with complacency, counted over his day's iniquitous gains after his custom-

ers have gone home to mar the little remaining peace of hungry, suffering families, and retired to his rest fully justified by some such false views. As well may a man level his gun, then turning away his eyes, imagine himself guiltless of the consequences.

Many estimable people, from their minds not being drawn to the subject, do not connect acts with their responsibility and consequences. When an amiable, benevolent, christian lady is filling her beautiful crystal decanter, little is she conscious that she is indirectly encouraging and starting loathsome drunkenness, or she would, with horror, recoil from the task. Yet, many a splendid youth can trace his career up from the lowest degradation to the elegant luxurious entertainments of hospitable friends. There, countenanced by the presence and example of the intellectual, and refined, and virtuous, he first learned to drink brandy, and wine was only genteel, that no danger lurked in his first glasses, pledged, perhaps, to honor some great good man, or favored fair one, till, in the midst of flashes of wit, joy, mirth and the smiles of beauty, for the first time he retires, in polite phrase, to distinguish it from the vulgarity of pot-house vice, a little tight. A few repetitions always excused, the dreadful habit is stealthily fixed, and then "farewell, a long farewell, to honor, genius and glory."

Man, swayed by inclination or imagined self in-

terest, will delude himself into misconduct. A finds his justification in the certainty, that if he does not vend alcohol, that B will, and goes at the work of demoralization with a smothered conscience, as if the violation of God's will can be excused by another's evil intention, here, individual responsibility is lost sight of, and the effects confounded with the guilt. It is not the consequences to the inebriate, which constitute the guilt, it is simply because it is contrary to God's command to injure your neighbor?

I see a pirate about to capture a ship; well, the ship will be captured any how, I may as well drive off the pirate and take her myself; but am I any the less a pirate? B tells us the distillery will go on any how, and I may as well have the benefit of the wrong and slop my cows as others. Now the right or the wrong of the matter consists in its degree of conformity with the divine will: are you not, as an individual—and you cannot merge your responsibility in the crowd—encouraging the great source of crime, sorrow and ruin? Remember, when a man steals one dollar, he equally violates the command, thou shalt not steal, as when he steals a thousand. The amount of your encouragement of wrong has nothing to do with guilt in the eye of heaven, it lies simply in disobedience. Suppose the slop went to waste, would there be the same profits, would there be the same inducements to erect other distilleries? Could there be as much of the poison

to be used, or could it be as easily reached, can you with an honest face bear your testimony against groggeries? Can you say to your neighbor, you do wrong as a distiller, censure your son for drinking, will they not laugh in your face and ask who buys the distiller's slop? Were you to associate with all the purchasers of slop for cow and hog feeding, and refuse to buy the slop, what an amount of moral influence would you bring to bear upon intemperance. Pray are you not responsible for this influence? are you not encouraging the conversion of the poor man's staff of life into his poison? are you not countenancing your fellow man in doing wrong; therefore injuring him and aiding him to injure others. Then is not the purchase of distiller's slop forbidden from on high? Men, amused or gratified with the present, or compromising with conscience by a secret determination one day to retire from the business, will not allow themselves to look at the possible or even certain remote consequences. If they would only reflect that conscience slighted, lowers her tone of remonstrance, that avidity for gain gets strength from indulgence, and nothing morally wrong can ever in its remote consequences be policy; all the groggeries on earth would be closed. Every observing man has seen, and only because we cannot always see to the end, must ever see many instances where the misery which the grog vender visited upon others, has recoiled with terrible force

upon himself or family. Nor does it require any special providence. It is the necessary result of natural laws, indissolubly connecting wrong—doing and suffering from which there is no possibility ever to escape from familiar handling, or occasional drinking to encourage others, he becomes himself a drunkard, or from the consciousness of the folly and blasphemy of external religion, whilst deliberately, knowingly and habitually violating heaven's command, he becomes gradually wedded to the world, and at last an entirely alienated insensible reprobate. His wife and children, from his influence, bad company or bad example, also fall into folly, sin and intemperance.

One man will exclaim indignantly, shall I give up the pleasure of drinking, deny the social glass, submit to the privation of not prudently enjoying with friends, my old wine and brandy, because weak fools make beasts of themselves? To such, there is the simple reply: that is a question with which the moralist has nothing to do. You and your God, who in infinite wisdom has so constituted things, that you cannot thus prudently and innocently enjoy your wine and brandy without injury to your fellow creatures, forbidden positively by him, must settle that question. I would suggest, however, that possibly there may be sitting around that parental board, where the social glass is circulating, some weak one, in childish innocence, who

becoming a victim to prudent drinking may bring your gray hairs down with sorrow to the grave. St. Paul, submitting his own will and inclination to divine sovereignty, declares, "if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh whilst the world standeth." High souled, noble man! Contrast moderate drinker, such generous conduct with your own narrow souled course, with your selfish enjoyment of your social glass; contrast the feelings of the christian philanthropist, and blush for your opposition to our cause. This man will triumphantly assert: There was Mr. A never would allow his sons to drink at home; was ever censuring drunkenness. See how many of his sons became drunkards, whereas, there was B whose children had wine and brandy ever within their reach, are all now sober men. With regard to A, the argument might have force, if we are sure that this good rule was not counteracted by the bad example of offering to visitors, if we are sure that his sons in every other respect were trained in principles of virtue, were not elsewhere exposed to bad influences from neighbor B's sons and others. A's rule did not go to the bottom of the evil, his sons became drunkards, in spite of home influence. But, did A the less do his duty? Because my son in after life may become dishonest, am I the less bound to impress the principles of rigid uprightness? Here is individual duty and responsibility, irrespectively

of others, overlooked. With regard to B, we do know that there is a constitutional indisposition with some to get drunk; besides B's moral training may have been able to counteract the indiscretion of his system. To such, I would say, have you not encouraged the importer who supplies the dens of vice? Have you not, by example and influence, encouraged others who may not, from constitutional peculiarity cannot make the same discrete use of alcohol? Have you not at your own table, started and nourished the propensity again and again, which may end in blighted hopes? There is an argument against moderate drinking, which, unfortunately, derives great force from the frequency of the occurrence. How often have we seen men when the current of life flowed smoothly on, enjoying among their friend, without apprehension of coming trouble, the social glass. But soon, the daring profligate recklessness in making haste to get rich, occasions commercial shipwreck, then having no firmness of virtuous principle to fall back upon, having lain up above no treasures of comfort or consolation, in utter desperation and ruin, rush to the bottle, hoping delusively, "with the sweet oblivious antidote to purge the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff which weighs upon the heart," till, with fortune, has also been engulfed health, character and peace forever. But the cold flinty heart of trade, fashion or pleasure has no sympathy for such.

Is all this no offset to the social glass? But if not enough, I pray you look around, gather into one sad group the thousands upon thousands of miserable men and wretched families, the murders and other numberless crimes from alcohol, and then reflect, from prudent drinkers who wield the moral and political influence, all this mass of misery proceeds. Could all the wretched, broken-hearted women, ragged vicious children, all the murders, thefts, suicides, insanities, conflagrations, shipwrecks and sorrows it has caused for the last twenty years, be presented in one view, overwhelmed with emotion, you must exclaim, what a dreadful sacrifice to this Moloch! Can any man arise from such a reflection, pretending to one particle of kindness to man, patriotism, reverence and responsibility to God, and oppose the temperance cause, even to enjoy the social glass? Can any man duly feeling himself a probationist on earth, responsible hereafter, without anxiety, countenance or support, in any way, so fruitful a source of crime and misery?

Many selfish men, of hard natures, indifferent to public mischief, harshly judge the inebriate, refuse sympathy and a trifling sacrifice, from the consideration that the trouble is the result of willful individual folly at any time to be restrained. But they do a cruel injustice in making their own natural constitutional protection, unsubdued health, prosperity, happy training, strength of mind and free-

dom from habit's tyranny, a standard by which to judge the poor inebriate. But in truth there is no more common mistake among men in religion, and all matters, than to make their own views and feelings a standard by which to judge others. Many a poor man, abandoned by the support and sympathy of friends, uncared for by legislation, which should have taken him out of his own hands, has bitterly wept over his folly and helplessness, despairingly sunk into a drunkard's grave.

Many, with a hateful coldness, averting the eye from all its crime and misery, will oppose legislation, simply upon the ground of a political abstraction, for they cannot have the hardihood to assert that there would be really any danger to our political institutions from legislating upon the subject. They will tell you, that any law suppressing the trade would be an invasion of the citizen's inalienable rights. This may, perhaps, serve the purposes of the grog seller, or the demagogue, but how any thinking man, wishing to restrain this frightful evil, can see this invasion in suppression of grogeries, great and small, and not see it in a prohibition to carry fire arms, getting up a splendid saloon for smoking opium, or gambling, I cannot perceive. Surely upon the principle that society has an inherent right to self-protection and self-preservation, we have only to show any trade to be a nuisance, an injury to the public, threatening its

peace and safety, and we necessarily place it under the jurisdiction of law. We have rights as individuals, and rights as citizens, the good of mankind requires, when they conflict, for the former to be subordinate. If a man eats and drinks, or does any thing else exclusively to his own individual injury, so long as he is sane, we have no right to legislate for him, because he has not, so far, surrendered up his natural rights to society, nor, for the same reason, have we any right to interfere with his opinions and conscience, so long as he keeps them to himself, or their indulgence does not interfere with the inalienable rights of others, or the paramount rights and happiness of the community; without this concession, human society could not exist.

Well, then, does the unrestrained commerce in alcohol conflict with the good of society, or with its right to protect itself and preserve its existence? Let the crime and misery it produces answer. Can the community have a right to counteract and punish the consequences of intemperance and have no constitutional right to dry up its source? Shall people be taxed, Mr. Rumseller, for your benefit, to support a police, alms houses, &c. and have no right to control this tax? Is it not gross tyranny to tax a man's labor and allow him no right to restrain and regulate the tax? If a man has an inalienable right to get drunk, and place himself in a situation to commit murder, I contend, necessarily, he is,

when drunk, above all law, an irresponsible being, and in the sight of human law, guiltless of murder.

When the individual states, for mutual advantage, surrendered a part of their sovereignty to the union, the regulation of trade and national improvements, the free ingress and egress within their borders to every citizen of the republic, surely it never was designed to be construed into the surrender of the right to protect the morals, safety and happiness of the individual states from any commerce violating either. Our federal and state constitutions were designed as a wholesome check upon legislation, to define our rights and preserve them from tyranny, not by overstraining their authority to take from society the inherent right of self-protection. It is an outrage upon common sense to say, that a community may be exposed to crime, burthen, tax upon their labor, anxiety for their persons and property, to anguish of mind for husbands, wives and children made drunkards, and not have the moral and political right to legislate against the source of the evil. Although I would defend the constitutionality of a Maine liquor law, and at a proper time its wisdom, I would urge delay till a ripened public opinion shows that period arrived, for all legislation in advance of public sentiment is worse than idle. There will ever be unprincipled, selfish demagogues to avail of every exciting subject to inflame, pervert, and mislead the public

mind. Let men see that you are wise, kind, consistent, just, and really desiring their prosperity, and they will listen to reason. But the moment you make use of a small numerical power, undertake to force your views and measures, feeling their natural right to opinions, and to be controlled only by reason, viewing every attempt at coercion as republican tyranny, are easily aroused to resistance. Therefore, let your aim rather be to prepare the public mind for legislation by calmly convincing the understanding, of the wisdom of your course, making all men who have any conscience or self-respect, afraid or ashamed of further opposition.

The opposition upon commercial grounds, whether regarded in its plausibility, numerical or moral force, is a very serious matter, but if tested by the gospel rule of right and wrong, can never be justified. Does the traffic morally and physically promote the good of mankind? are its tendencies to impede the Redeemer's kingdom? The simple, truthful answer settles the matter.

Man, though the creature more or less of circumstances, is ever true to his nature, however his pride, his selfishness, his cupidity, his ambition, or his vanity may be concealed from himself, under a various disguise, to a close observer cannot be concealed, and to put him right, the disguise must be stripped. In the case before us, I would suggest to every honest minded, deluded opponent, to

examine if some improper feeling is not at the bottom under the guise of a sense of duty to family, public spirit, jealousy for human right, patriotism, or some other plausible motive.

When Liverpool and Bristol, so deeply stained with the shame of traffic in human blood, were aroused to protect the slave trade by the efforts for its suppression, blinded by the habitual practice of wrong and eagerness for gain, sustained by the crowd of example, strangely unconscious of shame, they poured into parliament remonstrance after remonstrance. The millions to be lost from the trade were coldly weighed against a most atrocious commerce, and we have now a similar case of men, in the commercial opposition to the temperance cause, blinded to what is palpably wrong by habit's law, cupidity or false views of expediency—as, if any trade so plainly fraught with evil, so clearly wrong and sinful, could be justifiable because gainful, as if the same argument would not justify privateering or any other mode of becoming rich.

That the temperance cause finds among its opponents many good and conscientious men, I freely admit, so did the slave trade find among its advocates a Newton and a Whitfield, but it only shows that good men cannot always see what is right, or it is among the anomalies which mark the frailty and inconsistency of our race.

Often, too, countenanced and supported in wrong

by others whose superior judgment we feel, our individuality merged in the crowd, we shamelessly do wrong. The fashion of the thing may sustain us in respectability, may lull conscience to sleep, but wrong is immutably wrong, and men, removed from the sustaining influence of the crowd, must be judged, stand or fall individually hereafter. The mind, however well disposed, cannot always perceive or receive truth. Why was it that the most powerful eloquence, the most melting strains of poetry, the strongest appeals to justice, humanity and religious principle, struggled in vain, so many years, with the nation most advanced in civilization against an egregiously wicked commerce? Why is it that in Bristol and Liverpool, among the sons of men engaged actively in the slave trade, no one valuing his standing can be found, now, to justify the trade? Are they intrinsically in other points better than their fathers? The fact is, the causes which secretly deluded and blinded the fathers, no longer operate upon the sons. Reasoning, correctly enough, from false assumptions, or through ignorance, or deceived by ambition, pride, lust for wealth, revenge or party spirit, we cannot see the right course. It would seem to be a law of our nature that truth wilfully rejected, the real motive perversely covered over by some secret feeling, gradually retiring out of sight, is only dimly seen, till at last judicial blindness takes possession. In such

cases the truth becomes as invisible as the sun from an intervening cloud.

Our own individual history, and the history of nations, furnishes abundant instances, illustrative of this position. In looking back upon the palpable inconsistencies and folly of others, as well as ourselves, we are amazed. We cannot, at first, see how a mind like Luther's, so honest, so avaricious for truth, was so long disabusing itself of popery. But Luther, reasoning from a false assumption and not thinking of looking back of it, could not at first see the falsity of popery. Who cannot now see the wickedness of the slave trade, the unwise course of England with her colonies, in not listening to reason and justice, her folly in plunging into the horrors of war, by meddling with the domestic concerns of France? The fact is to us, in all these cases, the intervening cloud has passed away. The men of those days were as honest as we and many far better and wiser men. No doubt many, now opposed to the cause of temperance, will condemn with unmeasured censure the slave trade, and as many engaged in the slave trade then, would have as zealously sustained our cause. At this moment, under some delusive unacknowledged influence, many good men *cannot* see the wrong of sustaining slavery, nor the general use of alcohol; but the time will come when the posterity of these opponents will look with the same amazement upon their conduct as

the people of Liverpool and Bristol now look upon the conduct of their fathers. Truth, however obscured from man's view by human passions or ignorance, with the subsidence, of the causes of its obscuration, must be seen, for unaffected by the fluctuations and infirmity of human opinions, it stands in the moral firmament the same forever. To enlighten men to what is duty, we must *kindly* disencumber and arouse the moral sense to discriminate right and wrong, we must gently lead them back to examine faithfully the foundations upon which they stand, we must remove the intervening cloud, whatever its nature.

There are men who would have you believe they see in a Maine liquor law a most dangerous precedent, the embryo of a gigantic tyranny; as if anything short of national viciousness could overturn our liberty, and what, let me ask, more conducive to that condition than the free use of alcohol? Pray, was it Cæsar's ambition, or Rome's corruption and sensuality, which caused the downfall of the temple of liberty? This argument is so superlatively ridiculous as hardly to require notice, but to be ridiculed and shamed out of the world. Hard pressed for arguments, we have been triumphantly told, that money promotes idleness and crime, as well as alcohol, and upon the same principle you should suppress both. But the cases surely are not parallel, the suppression of the one is an impractica-

bility; money is essential to man's happiness, to suppress its use would injure and break up society, defeat the very object in the other case. Society claims the right to suppress, upon the principle of self-protection, and self-preservation, because imperatively demanded by the public good, and in harmony with the divine injunction to spread the Redeemer's kingdom, and promote human happiness. Show us that a Maine liquor law will injure or ruin society, and we will admit the parallel. We are asked, will you make man moral by law? No more so than when we pass laws prohibiting Sabbath desecration, gambling, or for the suppression of crime.

Indolent or indisposed for personal sacrifice, men have an easy way of excusing their negligence of all effort. They at once, without trying, conclude that all systematic exertion is useless, that the evil must correct itself. But suppose its extermination impracticable, is there not a vast difference between restraining a wild horse and madly throwing the reins upon his neck? Neither do your laws prevent murder, will you then repeal your criminal law? The assertion that the evil cannot be materially reduced, involves the absurdity that an effect can exist without a cause. Surely, if men do not engage in the manufacture, it will in that proportion not be made; if the ship owners band together and say we will not import brandy, it cannot come; if the rail roads, canals and steamboats refuse to transport whiskey, the corn must remain to fatten hogs.

That there could be an end put to all manufacture or transportation I do not say; but I do assert, that if the sober capitalists of moral and political influence would combine in every way, not to encourage, but to impede the manufacture and circulation, and society would frown upon its common use, that the evil would be vastly reduced. We see whole nations indulging in opium, till it has reached an appalling extent, why so? Opium must have a powerful attraction for human nature, but if the cupidity of merchants did not transport it, how would remote people obtain it? Indulged in within the bounds of reason it might be as safely used as tobacco, but we know such is never the fact, and only because alcoholic drinks, by so vast a portion of the human family, cannot be reasonably used from their constitution, do we oppose its general use, as a duty? Why are we not a nation of opium chewers and smokers, are we not as men as much disposed for its use, by nature, as the Chinese? Simply, because the laws of habit and fashion have not made us so. Think you if the wealthy and fashionable were to introduce the opium pipe into their splendid entertainments, we would not soon have elegantly arranged saloons and subterranean dens for smoking and chewing opium all over our land? If the community can prevent the introduction of opium, as a national indulgence, why can it not suppress the use of alcohol? How soon would such an opium

establishment be pronounced a nuisance and put down by law, without our hearing the cry of tyranny and unconstitutional?

We are told that it is unfair to argue against the use, from the abuse of a good thing. Now it behoves our opponents to show that comparing its benefits with its injury, that alcohol as a beverage is a good thing.

Licensing groggeries by legalizing wrong is demoralising. Ignorant, thoughtless people, or those not having their principles very clearly defined, confound moral with legal right. They presume that whatever the law sanctions must be right and people will therefore shamelessly patronize groggeries, delusively calling themselves innocent.

It is not because mankind are inherently vicious, indifferent to human suffering, or willfully and maliciously allow a great moral evil to exist, because in other instances the very men opposing the temperance cause will do acts of benevolence and enjoy the consciousness of duty discharged. See, when the novelty and frightfully concentrated magnitude of any distress wakes up the public feeling, how the whole community is simultaneously moved with emotion, press forward to sympathise and benevolent effort. Why that general burst of indignation upon the head of a timid captain flying from the relief of his fellow men? Why all that distress at a late sea disaster, all that enthusiastic admiration for

the noble men, who, under every privation, forgetful of self, jeopardizing property and life, toiled night and day? Why all this? And men cannot equally see the imperative obligation to save others from the tenfold greater miseries of intemperance? The very men who lately, under a noble impulse, gave so generously to relieve distress, and reward philanthropy, enjoying the consciousness of a good deed, in self-gratulation have passed on, at home and abroad, by their capital, their enterprise, their trade and their habits, to facilitate the ruin of thousands.

Although the great revealed object of man's creation, is to prepare for an ever during existence hereafter; in kindness this residence has been made susceptible of enjoyment, but men stupidly or wickedly reckless, refusing to search for the divine will where alone it can be found, imagine that the great business of life is simply, selfishly and sensually to enjoy heaven's blessings; hence, so many thoughtless men, passing with a fearful velocity to that great and terrible day, make pleasure, or its tributaries, the great concern of life and at last by a constitutional necessity, acquire a lamentable insensibility and even deadness to heaven's will and the suffering of others.

When a man grossly violates prudence in ordinary matters, we indignantly call him a fool. What language can express his folly, who, when a rational,

but vain presumptuous man will level himself with the brute, over whom he lords it, disregard his high relation and responsibility to Jehovah, and neglect his creatures, whom he is commanded to care for? The truth seems to be, that man, more or less an impulsive, selfish being, delusively imagining himself, consequent upon prosperity, worldly absorption and neglect of Holy Writ, secure in some snug harbor of life, has his equanimity only slightly disturbed by the ordinary familiar troubles of others, but when aroused by some terrific, overwhelming calamity, the surges of strong emotion start his moorings. He feels himself a frail, dependent being, liable to affliction and punishment, wakes up to the vanity of his most ardent pursuits, to the sufferings of his fellow man, conscious responsibility and the immeasurable power of omnipotence. All selfish calculations are suspended in the horrors of the moment, irrepressible feelings of tenderness for man and reverence for the sovereignty of God, hurry him on to their strongest expression. But, ever and anon there comes floating by, a too familiar object, the loathsome body of some poor inebriate. There arises a gentle swell of feeling, but almost simultaneously repressed by the reflection—it is all his own folly; surely, neither I nor mine can ever sink so low, and the wreck of many a blighted hope; the occasion of many a deep sigh, with its cause sweeps by, to be thought of no

more. Not so with a rational, reflecting man, alive to all his christian sensibilities. He has learned the obligation to serve his fellow man under all circumstances of sorrow, irrespectively of the cause, that obedience simply has to do with our duty, and ultimate destiny, regardless of any man's folly or guilt, that feeling and sympathy with others, however grateful to ourselves, or esteemed by others, there, has nothing to do; that the performance of one duty does not relieve from the obligation of another, that the principle of obedience, as sternly and equally exacts kind consideration for one perishing by the slow progress of intemperance as for hundreds congregated in the misery of shipwreck; to neglect him for his sinful indulgence would be to punish and to usurp the prerogative of the eternal Judge.

Heaven's command is as much violated when we neglect the one guilty of his own misery as when we neglect the many for who, of the crowd, who go down in a ship as sinless in God's eye? We may bestow our generosity and sympathy upon shipwrecked hundreds, administer self-gratulation for meritorious conduct, but, there will still stand a steady, silent rebuke, our daily increasing undischarged debt to snatch God's creatures from the grasp of intemperance.

Surely this inconsistency must be referred to the fact, that men do not realize, in all its dimensions

and frightful features, this great national evil. Instead, then, of carelessly noticing or avoiding the subject, dismissing it as something painfully unpleasant and irremediable; let us rather wake up our feelings and energetic action, by dwelling upon the subject, viewing it and contemplating it in all its sad details and broad dimensions, and school our minds to concentrate in one great mass of misery, the consequences of intemperance. If the scene of one wretched inebriate home, a poor overtoiled broken hearted wife, pale, emaciated from labor, care, sorrow and want, weeping over little neglected suffering children and a bloated mind, wasted, raving, expiring victim of alcohol, cannot move you, I pray you, in imagination, gather into one great reservoir, all the tears it has shed—into one loud terrific wail of grief all the sighs of its broken hearted!

Whenever the intemperance and dissoluteness of the class of the community, as is undeniably the case with the elite youth of our country, becomes the subject of remark, it argues something wrong in the training. I presume the error will be found in the habits and misdirected influence of the parents in the upper walks of life. A gentleman, as opportunity serves, prompted perhaps by the paltry ambition to figure as a man of fashion, will accumulate a vast stock of wines and brandies, pride himself upon their age, variety and cost. The vintage, the

locality, the importer, the ship, the year are all most carefully registered. After long years of sacred repose they are carefully drawn off to grace the festive board, each with its biographic label. Then comes the very grave business of discussing for hours, not any great political measure involving the interests of thousands, no topic of science or literature, how best their individual happiness, or that of mankind may be promoted; but, shall I say it? to discuss simply, the quality of the wine. Under all the advantages which ice, the richest cut and highly polished glass can give, the wine comes forth, a solemn silence reigns, its pure transparency, its rich color are admired, then with a serious expression of the strongest concentration of mind and nervous sensibility, the glass is slowly passed under the judgment of the olfactories, then as cautiously tasted, this repeated a few times, the wine receives the vastly important decision, is tossed off to give way to another, and so on till bottle after bottle passes the solemn ordeal, and immortals made after the image of God, traveling with the fleetness of the lightning's flash, to give an account of the deeds of that day, arise from the prostitution of manhood, none the better and some far the worse for the old wine.

Parental example, coinciding with inclination, is a law with the young, and when this vast importance is attached to these liquors by a parent and

his gray-haired guests, can any thing be more natural than that the young should do the same? consider a connoisseurship in wine, as an evidence of genteel breeding, acquire for wine a high relish and value, an unconquerable desire to lose no opportunity to drink that which at the parental board, he has seen so important? Who cannot see from such a training an easy transition to irrecoverable vice?

We are positively commanded to study human happiness, to promote the Redeemer's kingdom. I assert that the encouragement of alcoholic drinks, whether in trade, at home, or abroad, clearly, decidedly, greatly tends to vice and misery, and therefore, violates, with all its sinful consequences, the will of Jehovah. If any parent denies these premises, to argue with him is folly, but I beseech him, as he cares for his children, his own peace on earth or Heaven's approbation, that he weigh well the decision. If he admits the premises, then I appeal to him as a solemnly responsible probationist, as a parent and as a citizen, not in any way to promote this frightful evil. If he does, he will be a traitor to his country, an enemy to his children and an offender to his God. Gentlemen may gratify inclination, delude themselves with the idea that if they will throw open their wine vaults to make home more attractive, that if they will countenance places of resort, where gentility and refinement exclude

vulgar men, that they will keep youth from low resorts; but a fearful responsibility rests upon them, if a man has to answer for all the mischief he encourages. They should rather have rooted out and trampled down the latter, and not have done evil, that good might come, not have extended the empire of vice. As regards ultimate effects and the offence to heaven, it is all a vain delusion. Pray, how have the thousands of promising youth, reared in gentility and refinement, now traveling to ruin, acquired their habits? Did they first acquire a taste for alcohol in some low filthy groggery, so revolting to their minds? or have they not, from childhood, been made familiar with it under the parental roof? Think you that it is possible to congregate in genteel resorts the old debauchee, the idle, the dissolute, the drunken of all ages and degree, and they by concentration will not throw off a fearfully contagious moral atmosphere, perilous to the inexperienced youth drawn thither by the gentility of the resort? Will a lad, purely raised, with the same pleasure and confidence, steal into some dark alley, to take his glass amidst coarseness and vulgarity, as he will walk up your marble steps, where membership is the badge of gentility? From the one, will he not recoil, to the other will he not be attracted; there, in the company of the elite, first take his glass to be genteel or fashionable, and then, alas! purely to get drunk? Ah! gentlemen, whether the darker

shades of intemperance are relieved by the refinements or elegancies of life, or are seen in all the revolting filth and vulgarity of the pot house, it equally leads to perdition, is equally offensive to heaven, and when you cover the nakedness of vice, when you make it genteel, you only polish the dart that it may more smoothly do its work of death. I pray you remember, in that book which cannot lie, we are told, "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, whatever a man soweth, that shall he reap." Will you then indulge pride, inclination for pomp and the world's fashion at so immense a cost? Will you shrink from ridicule, the world's scowl and daringly meet the wrath of heaven? Ah! ye tender mothers, when mourning over sons wandering from fair virtue's path, sinking deeper and deeper in the grossness of sensuality, you devoutly pray for heaven's blessing to make them pure and good, do you wonder to have no answer to your prayer? Remember, your prayers have been only solemn mockery, for you have often arisen from your knees, gone directly or indirectly, by example and influence, in the face of heaven's command, at your splendid entertainments, to prepare and start hundreds for perdition. Are we not told, no drunkard shall ever enter into the kingdom of heaven! If judged by the standard of Holy Writ, what becomes of those who make the drunkard? Alas! "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor strong drink,

that putteth the bottle to him and maketh him drunken?" and, again, "woe unto him by whom offences come." Ye men of business, who fatten on the miseries of your fellow men; ye polished gentlemen and refined ladies, who, with thoughtless or selfish indifference to the sorrows of others and daring disregard of heaven's will, countenance the use of alcoholic drinks, I pray you, on some stormy winter night, when the tempest, howling for admission around your own snug, comfortable dwelling, wakes up sympathy for all animated nature, with a grateful sense of your own blessings, that you will, in imagination, call up before you the destitute wretched home of the poor inebriate, himself, perhaps, from intemperance, "the dim-eyed tenant of the dungeon's gloom," there behold the mother and her naked little ones, cold, hungry and shivering over a few dying embers, the tears of suffering freezing on the cheek of tender innocents, and then reflect, ~~im~~ possibly the little one, prattling so sweetly and innocently on your knees, may become that inebriate or that sorrow stricken mother! Surely if the heart-hardening, soul-contracting pursuit of gain, or selfish devotion to the fashions of the world, has not palsied your moral sense, left any thing of nature in your hearts, you must at least cease opposition to the temperance cause.

LECTURE ON SLAVERY.

THE christian philanthropist, wont to study the book of Providence, under a strong sense of the infinite wisdom, power and goodness of God, in all the great calamitous events and revolutions of the world, will be strengthened in his faith, and comforted in the reflection, that a great overruling spirit is ever seen bringing good out of evil to man, in the darkest periods of his history, making, through the instrumentality of man, man's folly and wickedness, ever result in human advancement.

Have we not seen the sword sent forth by commercial cupidity, the pioneer for christianity in Mexico, India and China. Is not this overruling, guiding hand remarkably visible in the history of African slavery? Behold Africa, a dark spot upon the face of our globe; then see, strangely enough, the idea spring up in the mind of a benevolent priest, for its ultimate redemption from heathenish barbarity, in the suggestion of the slave trade. See the negro feloniously torn from his native land, ignorant and degraded; return a civilized, often a christian, man. See commercial avidity drive men, unconscious of guilt, into the slave traffic, the natural sense of the wrong, abated by the consideration

that they were making a better provision for the prisoner of war, and that the end justified the means. See great and good men, strangely struggling in vain for many years with a great enlightened, christian nation, in so obviously the cause of justice and humanity, till a number sufficient for ultimate objects is borne away. See a people pre-eminent for morality, and a sacred regard for the rights of man, smarting from the rod of tyranny, emerging from a bloody revolution, to secure the largest amount of human freedom, most inconsistently continue this trade, and (all accessory to the great ultimate object) incorporate African slavery as a domestic institution. See, when utter despair, with the most gloomy foreboding, oppressed many a patriot heart, a few benevolent, farseeing, noble men, with that confidence in a divine blessing upon every good enterprise, which marks the character, and gives energy to the enlightened philanthropist, full of love of country, under a proper sense of obligation to God and man, sublimely towering above the vulgar fears, prejudices and selfish indolence of the crowd, assemble in the face of abolition ridicule and abuse, to plant an African colony. See that little despised colony thus prayerfully planted by humanity, solely nourished by individual benevolence, in a few years grow up a prosperous republic, to its foes a standing rebuke, to its friends a strong assurance, that with God for his ally, how

ever dark and gloomy all is to human eyes, man must ever be triumphant. See further, abolitionism rear her hateful, insane, and for her pretended object, impotent head to excite the fears and resentment of the slave states, to enact stringent laws to drive off the free blacks, and simultaneously see the free states by legislation, or individual harshness, deny them a home, till invited by the better prospect of justice, equality and happiness, they go to christianize that darkest spot on earth's surface. But this overruling of Providence is no apology for it. God's fixed design was human progress, and his revealed will, carried out, would have produced the same result, but man neglecting it, his immutable laws do the work.

In truth, the constitutionally recognized institution of slavery, unblushingly supported and justified, under all circumstances, by distinguished citizens, stands out prominently before the world, as one of the most extraordinary examples of inconsistency, of the collision of practice with theory, the boastful profession of the great principles of christianity, benevolence and devotion to the rights of man. That ignorant, groveling men, whose views do not rise above the muck rake; that thoughtless, selfish men, merged in sensuality, should defend and countenance the institution, irrespectively of all necessity, as in itself right, is not a matter of wonder, but that enlightened statesmen, polished gentlemen,

more than all that, holy men, "giving scripture for the deed," should openly sustain and justify a great political evil at variance with every principle of christianity, is indeed amazing. That all the wickedness of men, which, as probationists, they are necessarily at liberty to commit, God will overrule for the furtherance of his object in creating man, that is to become a voluntary denizen of heaven; that, notwithstanding his wisdom and mercy, in the events and conditions of this world, may not always be comprehensible, I cannot allow myself to doubt that the tendency of all he allows, is for the ultimate good of mankind. May we not account for this moral phenomenon, the legally unlimited establishment of slavery in this free, christian, enlightened land, upon the principle that Jehovah, as in other cases of man's history, by a fixed law of progression, leading from bad to worse, for his own wise, inscrutable purposes, allows rebel man to be gradually given up to a delusion, by which he punishes himself and others, but which will ultimately be productive of some great good. When we reject God as our counsellor, will not that his teachings reign over us, he leaves us to go our own way, just as he allowed the foolish Israelites who rejected his paternal government to choose a king. As certainly as the grass grows whilst we are sleeping, I must believe, that the wrath of heaven is gathering for national punishment, which will be proportionate

to our slothfulness, whilst we are slumbering so inactively over a long, great neglected duty. This, to a patriot and philanthropist, is a gloomy view, but it should arouse us to more activity in our duty. Whoever approaches this subject calmly, rationally, without bias, simply conscientiously to estimate its true character, must view it in the injustice and cruelty of its practical details, or its political implications, a great evil, and be struck at the same time with the vast difference between the bible standard of morality, and that of man. The one, stern and uncompromising, knows no distinction among mankind, unswayed by individual feeling or advantage, unaffected by any human disguise, in the clear steady light of revelation, wrong stands ever immutably, eternally wrong; no coloring can shade—no sophistry can gild it. But man's standard, how uncertain and fluctuating! how influenced by selfishness, prejudice, fashion, opinion or human law! In one age and circumstances, one thing, and in others something else. Analyze negro slavery, present its various elements of wrong, one by one, entirely abstracted from its connection, present them simply in their elementary character, as injustice, tyranny, degrading selfishness, cruelty and offence to heaven—who so bold as to justify them? Where is there one among the many high minded gentlemanly slaveholders, who would be convicted of a much less offence, than gross injustice or mean

ungenerous selfishness, who would not hang his head in homage, before the presence of exalted virtue? Yet see how their embodiment, with other hateful principles in negro slavery, is not only tolerated as a necessary evil, but openly justified as a thing right in itself, and not to be touched. See how a distinction can be made between kidnapping a negro in Pennsylvania, and withholding liberty and justice by keeping him a slave in Maryland, robbing him on the highway, or retaining his earnings, as if human law can ever cancel heaven's eternal principles. But usage, public opinion, mutual countenance and the laws of the land, give the standard of morality, custom sanctions and habit blinds to reason and duty. Yes, men will outrage all of this combination, carry their heads erect, with not one blush for conscious wrong, by their last solemn act, it may be, too, sustained by the consolations of religion, pass immortal beings, keenly sensible to wrong and cruelty, over to the discretion, justice and mercy of a profligate son, and whilst he is gazetted as a great good man, gone to his reward, it may be, proud monuments will arise to perpetuate his memory.

If infinite wisdom could have left man to form his code of morals, what confusion, what an inextricable confounding of right and wrong. Acknowledging the institution as essentially wrong, and necessarily unwise, for nothing can be policy which

is moral wrong, how shall we work? It is indeed easy for the North, looking at the abstraction, unacquainted with, or insensible to all the modifying circumstances, far removed from consequences, necessarily to follow, recklessly to call upon the South, "let the slave go free, and cease from sinning." But, it is not so easy to see how a man calmly reflecting, can expect, without violence and ruin, coercively to extirpate an institution so incorporated in the whole social and political structure, so fixed in all the people's habits, physical and moral, so firmly believed by many to be necessary and irremediable, and habitually, too, regarded as not wrong. Could slavery, like intemperance, be at once abolished with unqualified good; could the abolitionist, waving his wand, enlighten and evangelize master and slave, we would all be abolitionists; such unfortunately is not the fact, yet aroused to a morbid sense of the negro's wrongs by the demagogue, (that rankest, most baneful weed of republican soil,) their sympathy excited by eloquent, exaggerated, affecting narrative of his abuse and sufferings, to a high pitch of enthusiasm which, with one generous bound, overleaps all difficulties and consequences, some at the North seem ready to rush madly to the rescue, to precipitate headlong in a crusade upon the South. But whenever any great and good end, involving possibly a vast amount of treasure, moral effort and misery is designed for the advancement of mankind, wisdom

will pause to inquire into the practicability of the scheme, and the best mode. In the case before us, seeing only great trouble, with little prospect or any good, wisdom will calmly, but impressively ask, has the great Redeemer lived a life of such high example, sublimely taught and died a cruel death in vain, that there can be found no better remedy for this evil in his great legacy to mankind? O, surely, the sword of the spirit must ever be preferable to the sword of war! Human feelings naturally run ahead of judgment, till lost in the distance, then too often lead to folly, and end in mischief. Is his scheme practicable, and is the abolitionist idly dreaming of a bloodless victory? Ah, he has but poorly learned human nature, or estimated the southern character, if he supposes that the southern man will quietly submit to dictation in so serious a matter, will suffer with impunity a stranger to intermeddle with his domestic concerns, turn loose upon him an ignorant, improvident, degraded, vengeance excited population; in fact, break down his country. No, the fiercest indignation will fire his soul, unmeasured vengeance do its cruel work. Stupidly infatuated and blinded by fanaticism, to the decided signs of the times, and to all consequences, or strangely, by party or ambition seduced from loyalty to his country, and his God, must be that man, who would, for the cause of abolition, plunge us into a civil war. The wildest imagination can-

not compass the horrors of such a war; horrors before the imagination of which abolition herself, may well turn pale. A savage spirit of cruelty and of extermination, in extent and duration such as has never marked war's progress before, will there be exhibited. Every southerner, smarting under a sense of individual wrong or injury to some inmate of his cherished home, will carry a personal bitterness into battle, individual hostility will mutually animate, having rancorously hated and abused each other, before they meet in mortal strife. Alas! too, on the last battle field, should victory perch upon abolition's banner, dripping heavily with American blood by Americans shed, when all that was fair and bright in freedom's glorious home is gone, will there be cause for triumphant exultation? True, brute force will have established the sway of abolitionism, but is the poor negro's condition bettered? The master and the slave have died in bloody embrace. The fairest, the purest, the loveliest daughters of the South have fled naked and frantic in the face of a brutal soldiery, from their burning homes, have perished from exposure, or wander, grief stricken and destitute, among their country's ruins. The abolition banner will have carried sorrow and wretchedness to many a once happy hearthstone; from victory to victory it will have floated over desolated fields, over villages and dwellings blackened by conflagration—famine and pestilence, outrage and

misery now reign where once prosperity cheered a smiling land.

But, is the man of the North quite sure that the South will furnish the only great battle fields, that the sacredness of his own hallowed temples, his own loved fireside, will be unpolluted by the ruffian hand of war, his own beautiful rivers untinged with New England's blood? Ah, he may find the fierce war hardened, southern man, desperate from ruin, frantic from rage, bearing with ruthless arm the torch of war into the very heart of New England. Where busy industry, now so securely plies her cheerful labors, where flourishing factories, and beautiful villages now grace a happy land, may be seen only the blackness of ruin.

When the long fearful contest is over, no matter who conquers, will the earth kindly open, and swallow up the brutalized army? Or rather, will it not turn and prey upon its country's liberties? Then farewell, a long farewell to all the world's bright hopes for political regeneration. Such is the truthful picture of woe, which I would hold up to the view of every patriot, till abolition insanity cease its perilous doings. Fellow countrymen of the North I fear you are but too carelessly treading the verge of an awful precipice: I pray you, seriously, solemnly contemplate this picture, as husbands, as fathers, as patriots, as christians. Remember "experience is the sure prophet of events." As certainly as man is still man, the reality cannot be exaggerated.

What considerate feeling man does not recoil from the horrors of any war; but a civil war in our country, when brother shall meet brother in arms, who, oh who shall depict its horrors! But, conceding the institution susceptible of removal without the dreadful consequences, are we quite sure that harshness is the remedy? No man was ever made honest by being called a villain. You may vent a generous indignation, cause others to shun and hate him, till in self contempt, and desperation, he sinks deeper and deeper, irrecoverably into infamy.

You may most unfairly, as a general truth, denounce the slaveholder as a hateful, selfish tyrant, excite his resentment, but you will not convince him, nor release the slave, but you will make both miserable.

Suppose, instead of calling a man a villain, I speak to him in a kind, friendly way, gain access through his heart and reason, to his understanding and his conscience, may I not plant a sound principle, and ultimately make him an honest man? Shall we then wield the arms of ridicule, abuse, crimination and threat, teach revenge and insubordination, rudely assail prejudices, feelings and opinions confirmed by long habit, and, by good citizens and most worthy men, honestly held as true? Christianity does not thus teach, wisdom founded on experience and knowledge of human nature does not thus counsel. There is but one wise, legitimate

mode of working, teach and practically apply the great heaven-given remedy for moral evil, the principles of christianity. Just as they prevail, vicious institutions must give way, as certainly as darkness before the rising sun.

True, you may pull down the pillars of the republic, like Sampson, bury all in one common ruin, and violently extinguish slavery. But all efforts to make the masses, North or South, act wisely and safely in this matter, without the aid of christianity, are vain and illusory.

Paul has most unfairly been lugged in as the justifier of slavery, because he did not make it his business to travel about, preaching a tirade against it, stirring up the bad passions of one against another; as well might he be quoted as the advocate for gladiating, or feeding fish on slaves. He understood his business better, he aimed to fit the master and the slave for the extinction of the evil. He knew, too, that men might have good eyes, be surrounded with objects, yet, without the medium of light, be unable to see. His commission was to give the gospel light, (which plainly discovered the follies and vices of the age,) and thus qualify to see the outrageous wrong, and we have only to follow his mild and wise example. No where in holy writ is coercion recognized as a principle of christianity, only let its spirit and teachings get possession, and they require no adventitious aid, they are of themselves omnipotent.

It is worse than a senseless waste of time and treasure for northern abolitionists to attempt forcing their views on the south, without a previous foundation in their hearts and understandings. As well might you expect a crazy mason to build a wall in the air.

Could they be induced to concentrate the same amount of treasure and zealous effort, simply to spread gospel principles, *kindly* point out through the press the wrong and impolicy, show a disposition for neighborly aid, promote mutual good feeling between the North and South, kindness and justice in the master, fidelity and subordination in the slave, you would soon see the foundation upon which slavery stands, crumbling away before the force of an improved public sentiment.

Should a man placing a board between our eyes and an object, denounce us for not seeing it, we would call him insane. Is there less insanity in placing a medium, impervious to the light of truth, between a man's understanding and conviction? But this you do, when by abuse you excite his pride, his selfishness, or vindictive feeling.

But there are fiery spirits who would take the bull by the horns; this is ever hazardous, and who ever attempts to take the slavery bull by the horns, may expect to be gored. These men, with more zeal than knowledge, contend that Jesus and his apostles called crime by hard names. The sophism

consists in making, under the circumstances, a venial and honestly doubted wrong, a clear universally acknowledged crime, and before we can take that precedent, we must lower slavery as it exists, in the *Southern* mind, down to the level of positive unquestioned crime.

But let us not for one moment, suffer our detestation for abolitionism to blind us to the folly and iniquity of slavery; the position taken by many who so flippantly talk as if a plain, clearly established fact, of the negro being of a distinct inferior race, intended for bondage, will require a brief inquiry into the origin and nature of the inalienable rights of man, and the negro's claim to humanity.

There is no foundation for our reasoning, unless in the presupposition of one great first cause, and man's common allegiance and universal equality at the origin of society. When we speak of natural inalienable rights, we mean certain natural prerogatives to do as we please, or freedom from obligation to others, coincident with our first breath, and coextensive with all human relations. These must come from God, and how do we arrive at a knowledge of their existence, but through a heaven-given natural sense of justice, and his revealed sovereign will. Admit this proposition, and we have a standard by which to test negro slavery, and every supposed infringement of human right in the heart of every christian, and, however men, writhing under the

source of conscience, or anxious to retain their consistency and respectability, with the enjoyment of its advantages, may defend the institution, there is no way to escape the charge of inconsistency, but by a repudiation of christianity; destroying the unity of the human family, or degrading the African from his supposed rank in the scale of creation. Take away revelation, and of course all sorts of responsibility go with it. Show that the negro does not belong to Adam's family, and as revelation only refers to his race, it has no authority in the premises. Degrade him to a soulless brute, and, under the primeval grant, he loses the rights of humanity, he may be treated as a dog or any other domestic animal.

But, have you done away with revelation? How do we know that the negro is not of the man family, that he is a soulless animal? Surely we can only arrive at the fact from revelation, or reason and science. The first does not tell us so, nor have the latter yet made it plain, and to rest a doctrine, involving the rights and happiness of so large a class of beings, and our own duty, upon anything short of a fixed fact, cannot be rational nor just. Would it not be fearfully hazardous to heaven's approbation, in view of the facts, that revelation recognizes but one race, and that in the daily concerns of life, in the walks of science, or the higher developments of benevolence, integrity, justice and piety, the

negro has proved his identity with the best specimens of white humanity.*

We will, therefore, assume, that the African is a human being, that the disadvantages under which he presents himself, are fairly referable to the universally acknowledged degrading influence of slavery, and his general neglect, and that he has necessarily the same inalienable rights, susceptible of the same wrongs, with the white man.

Some will argue, that slavery existed in all ages of the world, and therefore, is countenanced by heaven, but so has crime: some again, that it had God's sanction under the Mosaic economy. But, before we can make the Jewish institution our rule, we must make the circumstances of the Jewish, and our slavery alike. You must show that Christ authorized it. Slavery was an act of mercy to the heathen: he was incorporated into the family, taught his relation to God and man, was under the *sanctions* of Deity a slave, provision was made for his periodical emancipation, and could legally, whenever able, purchase his freedom. You must prove that the African among us, substitutes the stranger among the Israelites, that we substitute them as God's chosen people, that the Mosaic economy was designed for us, and if you will go back

*The learned Blumenback, who made it a subject of particular investigation, has boldly asserted, "that there is not a single department in taste or science, where the negro has not been distinguished."

to Noah's curse, you will be met by the questions, was not Noah's curse prophetic, did it not refer collectively to the nation, and not to individual slavery, and was it not already fulfilled in the subjection of the posterity of Ham, by that of his brethren?

When men draw arguments in favor of slavery, from its existence in ancient times, they should reflect, that in certain conditions of society, certain usages and restrictions are wise. From the attributes we assign to Jehovah, we may infer such was the institution of slavery among the Israelites. It saved prisoners of war from needless cruelty, the heathen had an opportunity of knowing the true God and his will, the favored people, by incorporating strangers, increased their strength, and the existence of that favored people was for the ultimate benefit of mankind.

The feudal system to us would be as irrational, as unjust, yet at the period of its origin, when human society was first emerging from barbarism, that simple form of government was proper as a first stage of rising civilization. In that stage of society when self government was impossible, the violent were to be restrained and governed differently than when a more matured state of society exists, a personal influence and power in the head of a tribe, unused to any other law but force, was the only government to restrain men. But as the human mind became

more enlightend, men reflected upon what was due to themselves and others, a more refined and complex form of government was demanded, an absolute prince to control feudal lords; as society progressed, a limited monarchy, and so on till self government becomes the only rational government, and the true measure of a people's fitness for a republic, is just exactly that amount of intelligence and virtue, which will enable them to appreciate and maintain it.

Would it be rational to draw arguments in favor of despotism, in our land, because it existed and suited in an early stage of society? Despotism, trampling upon human rights, is in itself unjust, and when avoidable, sinful. But does reason, or christianity (by the way christianity will ever be found on the side of reason) require the emperor of Russia to give the people a republic? All they require of him, is as speedily as possible to advance them to that state of virtue and intelligence necessary to self government.

Christ sanctioned obedience to Roman laws, but would that sanction justify the introduction of the Roman system amongst us? No more does the divine sanction of slavery among the Israelites justify negro slavery.

There are two sets of extreme men which do harm; for whilst the abolitionist, from his violence and impracticability of his plan, will do nothing but vituperate, slander and talk nonsense and make

mischief; the other, in hopeless inability and desperation, will sit sullenly down and leave the evil quietly and certainly travel on to its own cure, but dreadful catastrophe.

It is not enough that we sigh over the evil, we must buckle on our armor, look the monster in the face, measure his height and breadth, proportionate our efforts with a fixed resolution for his destruction as an offence to heaven. The South are to be commiserated for their curse, but justly obnoxious to censure, for not systematically going to work for its eradication, *there is their sin.*

The thundering denunciations of the abolitionist are equally unchristian and silly, they are like blank cartridges fired at a fort, they only make a noise, excite the gunner, and provoke the enemy. I would suggest the powder saved and a wise use made of the money, in circulating a mild persuasive argumentative christian literature, kindly pointing out the wrong, its impolicy, and the best mode of putting it down; defining the duties of master and slave, whilst the relation constitutionally exists, cherishing kindness and justice in the one, subordination and fidelity in the other; thus, relaxing severity, opening the heart of the master to justice, making the slave faithful and contented, both happier, better and more prepared for abolition; for submissive kindness and gentleness will melt the stony heart, and from fidelity and calm forbearance, will spring lenity and justice.

One ably edited journal, conducted upon these principles at the North, showing a just appreciation and christian charity for the difficulties of the southern man, would do a vast amount of good, substituting abolition writings, they only fire blank cartridges, throw no shot into the fort, explode at home, and there ends their mission.

However important an end may be, improper means can never be justified, for they imply sin, the violation of some command; nor will they ever effect what proper means cannot reach. Instead of sending silly, fanatical, low-minded, stooping men, in disguise, to whisper insubordination and revenge in the ear of the poor slave, I would send to the South the most gifted, amiable, frank, christian gentlemen, such as would be welcomed to the firesides of southern gentlemen, men who could never breathe emancipation out of their presence, and never coupled with reproach, over manifesting a liberal consideration for their views, feelings and circumstances.

My life upon it, such men, with powerful effect, might go to the South and express their views, with perfect freedom, not only unharmed, but with every mark of that homage which honorable, virtuous intelligence will ever command.

Such are the missionaries I would send to operate on the southern mind.

Man seems to be born with a reverence, if not with a love, for what is good and true; hence, any

important truth, presented under the guardship of kindness and respect, however unpalatable from variance with inclination, or from its silent rebuke, will, from a constitutional necessity, be respectfully received and make its impression.

Some thirty or more years since, a preacher of the Friends—Jesse Kersey, as eminent for intelligence and zeal, as for piety and simplicity of character, constrained by a sense of duty, visited Richmond during the session of the legislature, with the view of getting a law, making all children, born after a certain time, free at a certain age. He carried letters to the most prominent members of the legislature and to the first gentlemen of Richmond. He was not seen (for with such a man that was impossible) prowling in disguise among negro quarters, haranguing in swamps and retired places, midnight meetings, urging the slave to flight and redress of wrongs at any cost. No, like the wise and good Paul, he went directly and only to the master, reasoned and plead earnestly and frankly with him; was he insulted and warned to leave? No, but he was treated with marked respect and hospitality, honored for his wisdom, his intelligence and his virtue. Such was the effect of the efforts of this kind, good, plain, unpretending man, that sure of his law he would not remain till the bill came up, and it was lost by one vote only! When did a skulking abolition missionary on his unholy errand of mischief, ever make a like impression?

Whilst with unmeasured censure we may condemn the institution, we may, like honest men hold up our hands and aver that opposition to abolitionism, that is a forced general emancipation, is securely entrenched behind the principles of christianity.

Superficial, impulsive thinkers, unable to reconcile the countenancing of abstract wrong, no matter how modified and altered by circumstances, with divine teaching, say to us, will you make Holy Writ justify outrageous wrong? certainly not. But wrong, under certain circumstances, ceases to be wrong. An act is morally right or wrong, as it corresponds with the revealed divine will. That once found, and we need never hesitate. We can never err if we honestly apply the rule, do unto us, to others as we would have others do unto us.

Justice, mercy and human rights, are in themselves indestructible principles, yet their application may be so modified by circumstances, as to entirely reverse their natural dictates. I would be a violator of all, if I were to seize a traveler, take him home and cut off his legs, but, if I find him with mangled limbs, under his cart wheels, I may carry him home without consulting him, even cut off his mangled limbs, without immorality. Were I to kidnap a negro in Pennsylvania, force him into my service, I again would violate all. But to retain my slaves, when convinced emancipation would bring misery upon themselves and me, I would offend neither jus-

vice nor mercy, because, by manumission, I would not comply with the divine injunction, to love my neighbor as myself, and do unto others as I would have others do unto me, and extend the Redeemer's kingdom.

Upon the same principle, christianity allows us to confine the insane and lawless, to restrict the ignorant, and under certain circumstances advocate despotic government, to keep man from injuring himself and others.

The abolitionist may contest our position, that disastrous results would follow, but there we stand on equal grounds. It is a matter of opinion, where men may conscientiously differ, and are mutually entitled to courtesy and charity.

Taking "God's word as a lantern unto our feet and a light to our path," we can only be guided by reason and experience, and surely, are not responsible for results. I cannot conceive of a higher degree of political folly than to throw upon a community, a large mass of ignorant, degraded, improvident slaves, like liberty in France, which only from want of preparation, fell into anarchy and licentiousness; the emancipated negroes would only know freedom in idleness, poverty, vicious indulgence and abuse; the West India negro shows this to be no speculation.

The British shook off colonial slavery, pretty much as a man throws off his old coat when tired

of it, for the moths to feed on. As wisely would a showman, in an insane fit of humanity, give his wild exotic animals liberty. It was a paltry amende to the poor negro for years of oppression and unre- quited toil, to tura him loose under the influence of rum and freedom, to sink deeper and deeper into sensuality and degradation.

Governed by a high sense of justice and religious obligation, the aristocracy of England should have surrendered of their wealth the hierarchy of their unapostolic luxury, royalty of her jewels to pro- mote a well digested system to educate, evangelize and fit for good citizens, the rising generations. The old slaves should have been cared for, as slaves in every possible way; their earnings, deducting the expenses of government, should have been exclu- sively appropriated to them and their children's benefit, till a population sufficiently enlightened for self government should grow up.

If you would see under the existing state of pop- ular feeling and African depression, the result of abolitionism carried out in the South, look even now, when comparatively few, at the poor freed negro as generally found in your lanes and alleys, and on your farms. It is true, allowed to live protected by crim- inal law, but stupid from neglect and ignorance, denied political right, unsustained by self respect, unencouraged by any hope of rising; degraded, abused, unable to take his own part, yet unfriended,

chased by the needy emigrant from the lowest employments, till he almost doubts his right to eat his morsel in the sweat of his brow. See him, ragged and filthy, reeling from the vile groggery towards your alms house and jail. See him on your farms, huddle, patient, toiling, yet defrauded of his earnings, when standing up for his rights as a man, abused and clubbed by men infinitely his inferior in all which gives claim to respect, till he almost forgets he has a soul, and descends to the level of the brute. All this, too, the necessary result of his deplorable position, yet to justify his neglect and abuse, with a cruel severity, charged to a vicious nature, or a life of crime. Yes, as truthfully and as pathetically as it has been said of the poor despised Jew in his isolations and his wrongs, it may be said of the freed negro with us :

"The wild dove has her nest, the fox his cave,
Mankind their country—Israel, but his grave!"

Connected with this subject, have arisen two very delicate and embarrassing questions : Can a christian man consistently hold communion with a professor holding slaves, and can a christian purchase for a term of years or hire ? The negative decision of the first, involves certain assumptions, to say the least, very debateable. First, that a christian cannot, under any circumstances, hold slaves, and that christianity forbids communing with a conscientious

slaveholder; and, thirdly, that cutting loose from slaveholders, as christian men, would promote judicious emancipation. Can these assumptions stand? The first is directly in the face of the fact, that some of the most pious, godly men (Whitfield for example) have been slaveholders; with regard to the second assumption, we do know that St. Paul communed with Philemon as a brother in Christ, and as to the third assumption, no man can positively decide affirmatively. Will not the cause rather be injured by cutting off the influence of northern preachers on the South, and of southern preachers on the North? Is there as much hope of a change in southern sentiment, when the views of all are the same? Will you not strengthen and embolden the slaveholder by establishing a pro-slavery church, thus acknowledging the consistency of slavery with christianity? What good is effected? You do not convince your slaveholding brother, but by forcing a proslavery church, you ease the conscience and furnish an argument for many to cease from all effort.

The negative decision of the second question, involves the assumptions that the purchase is unkindness to the slave, or that we may sacrifice the poor slave, pass by an occasion for active benevolence, for the sake of a speculation, that the refusal to purchase for a term of years or hire, will necessarily reduce the sufferings of the slaves and hasten wise abolition. Now the truth of these assump-

tions is very doubtful; and is it not better, under the restrictions of divine teaching, steadily and zealously opposing the institution, to relieve, whenever presented, suffering humanity, and leave the final overthrow to the goodness and wisdom of Omnipotence? Indeed, reason, telling me no good is likely to result and much individual benefit lost by the refusal, it seems the question narrows down for the decision of the simple rule, "do unto others that you would have others do unto you." By the way, we must be careful not to construe this rule, so that it conflicts with any other great principle of duty. A murderer could not apply it in an appeal to a police officer, to let him run; for obviously he would not be doing as he would be done by in allowing a desperate murderer to escape and butcher his neighbor's family. Were you, a poor abused slave, to apply to me and were to say, I deeply commiserate you, but principle will not allow me to grant your request; would you not probably reply? Sir, was your brother a suffering slave among the Algerines, would you hesitate to redeem him, from the consideration that you would be encouraging the business of piracy? Would you let him suffer until civilized Europe would break up the nest of pirates? Or would you not rather redeem your brother, and at the same time make every exertion to root out the pirates?

But, under certain circumstances, may I not pos-

itively benefit the cause, bear my testimony, and exert my influence with more force, by hiring slaves, for it would necessarily bring the slaveholder more within the sphere of my argument and example.

God has planted in every human heart a natural sense of justice, a natural desire for goodness or what is right, for there is no sane man who would not do right, and have pleasure in doing so, (I mean no man would gratuitously do wrong for wrong's sake,) if some selfish aim or unchecked passion did not lead him off. The depravity must be extreme indeed, where no trace of this divine impression remains.

Now, assuming this to be a law of our nature, let us see if we cannot turn it to good account. Can we not by holding slaves under certain circumstances bring our influence more effectually, and with perfect consistency, to bear against the institution? I am born in Georgia, grow up, settle and acquire the responsibilities of the head of a family. Carefully reading my bible, reflecting upon my obligations to God and man, and seeing its impolicy, I perceive that negro slavery is a moral and political evil. I desire to act as an enlightened christian. What shall I do? Send my slaves to Liberia, remain in Georgia inactive, or ever snarling at slavery, making the negro more discontented, and the master more tyrannous, or shall I selfishly fly to the North,

leaving my neighbors to combat with the evil, and there cheaply, with kindred spirits, vent my indignation against the institution, merging the christian patriot in the fanatical abolitionist? Or, shall I, taking an enlarged rational view, determine to remain, and by a kind, judicious, honorable bearing, and consistent life, inspire my neighbors with that high respect and regard, which will give me great influence, settle down on my plantation and as needy masters, offer to hire the half clad, half fed negroes, kindly treat them, provide instruction in the elements of education and religion; try, in every way, physically and morally, to elevate and fit them for a higher station in society, and in the every day intercourse with my neighbors develop and strengthen their natural sense of justice, and their natural willingness to act harmoniously, judiciously and kindly; pointing out the wrong to the slave, the impolicy to the country, and the offence to heaven? Would I not be doing in this inoffensive, mild, kind way, far more than the most rabid abolitionist, no matter how potent from wealth or station, urging his country to disunion and servile war? Thousands of amiable good men act habitually wrong and inconsistently because they do not see the wrong, or how to get right, and how powerfully would such an example act upon that large class of citizens. Will I be told that I must not do evil, that good may come out of it? but the rebuke would be founded on

a false assumption. It is to be proved that I would be doing wrong. In short, in all such complicated cases, under enlightened views, we have simply to satisfy our minds in what way we will do the most good to our fellow-men, and pursue a conscientious course, regardless of results. With regard to abolitionism, since experience and our best reflections satisfy us, that neither the present state of the master, nor of the slave justify a reasonable hope that the slaves would be benefited by a general, immediate emancipation, God cannot, consistently with his attributes and teachings, require us to plunge up to the neck in the blood of the white and black man, to gratify northern speculation! We are afflicted, no doubt for some ultimate good, with a great national, moral, and political evil, severely trying to our principles; which, inasmuch as we cannot see how altogether immediately to remedy, we must leave to the great natural laws which govern the moral, as well as physical world, only steadily, cautiously working as enlightened christians.

The abolitionist will say, that is too slow a process. Slavery is sinful, and as a man should immediately cease from sin, let us have immediate, general emancipation, and leave results to God. But under present circumstances we believe the sin would be the other way.

We know that Jehovah, in his providence, makes no provision to counteract the folly of doing what

reason condemns, that his special providence may prevent natural consequences, as may be seen in the West India negro. Their unqualified emancipation was an unreasonable wicked act of recklessness. When the devil proposed to the Redeemer, to precipitate himself from the pinnacle, that the angels might bear him up, he was told, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." In other words, we are not to trifle with the overruling providence of God, by wantonly and willfully doing what is obviously wrong.

The question has been publicly proposed for solution, "What is New England's political remedy for negro slavery?" I reply, emphatically, none! So long as the confederacy lasts, based upon the original contract among the states, she has no remedy beyond instructing her members of Congress to aid colonization, by a donation of land, some pecuniary aid, and making a tender of the national vessels to transport emigrants. For a remedy which is worse than the disease, is no remedy, and legislative enactments dismembering the Union, bringing misery on master and slave, and ruin to the country is precisely that remedy.

But this question could only arise in a mind confused as to the exact, well defined political relations and rights of the states in their double character of sovereigns and members of a great confederacy. They have rights as individual states, and rights as

members of the Union, and it is only when these rights conflict, that one or any number of the states may politically interfere. So far, only as an individual state has clearly, by letter or implication, surrendered her sovereignty for the general good, have the other states to do with her institutions. The South actually stipulated to preserve her institution of slavery, and its control over it, was one of her reserved sovereign rights, and the North has no more to do with it politically, than with any institution of Russia. Massachusetts is no more to Georgia, no more implicated in her sin of slavery, than she is to Austria, or with any of her domestic institutions. As well might a citizen of the United States urge his government into hostile collision with England and Spain to correct what is respectively wrong in each, as for a citizen of New England to urge her political interference with southern slavery.

But we of the South, admit we have a solemn weighty duty to perform; we are not with a stupid, sinful inactivity to allow the evil to grow, we are bound in a christian manner to enlighten master and slave, by legislation and every other way to elevate the moral character of the slave, as well as that of the foreign heathen, protect him from tyranny, promote colonization and emigration, not teach him crime that he may steal, run away or revenge his wrongs, but teach him obedience and fidelity to

his master, resignation to his lot, trust in God, make him, in a word, a christian. Let the State of Maryland lead the van in this great work. Let her legislature solemnly, magnanimously, declare before the whole world, in the most impressive manner, the institution of negro slavery, wrong in the sight of man and God, only tolerated by a necessity to be removed as speedily as possible.

Let a period be fixed, when all slaves shall be free at the age of twenty-five, upon condition of emigration (in view of their own happiness, surely no hardship.) Let the state be regularly districted out into school districts, and teachers appointed where, till fifteen, the children are instructed in the elements of christianity and knowledge. Let there be an institution established at Monrovia, to receive the more talented boys, for higher branches. Let there be a state tax. Let the general government, for the whole republic is interested, be petitioned for aid, a portion of the national domain. Let northern abolitionists have a legitimate field for their zeal and money. Let the various christian denominations be requested, by legislative resolve, to detail men for the various necessary duties. Let the legislature prohibit the sale of slaves out of the state. This would at once mitigate some of the harsher features, considerably limit the odious traffic, prevent the separation of husbands and wives, parents and children. Let her repeal all unjust

laws, put the two races, so far as *consistent* with their mutual well being, on an equality of law and privilege.

Citizens of Maryland! Think you the scheme chimerical? Reflect what mighty results follow small beginnings. In such cases the first blow decides the victory. Bear in mind that you are individually responsible, that you cannot lose your responsibility in the crowd, nor merge it in the halls of your legislature, that individuals constitute nations, and when national judgments come, we must suffer individually.

I would not presume more, than to suggest a plan, only let an association be immediately formed to rid Maryland of the disgrace and sin of slavery, in a wise christian way, which will commend itself to the approbation of all good and wise citizens. Only let a few influential men seriously and boldly take hold, and the work will be done. See the great and prosperous republic in Africa, opening wide her benevolent arms to receive the emigrant flying from oppression; then look back upon the little company of big souled men, their hearts swelling with love of country and kindness to the oppressed, meet in solemn assembly and lay its corner stone, amidst sneers, ridicule and abolition denunciation.

As surely as you, in good earnest, put your shoulders to the wheel Hercules will assist. Yes! Om-

impotence will be your glorious ally, and to question success, will be impious!

When Maryland shall have placed herself on that lofty moral eminence, who can estimate the amount of her influence upon sister states? Will it require great effort, taxation and inconvenience? So will it to drive a foreign enemy from your shores. What foreign enemy so much to be dreaded? Whether the institution is morally right and politically wise, is a question deeply involving responsibility to God and the prosperity of the people. I pray you, as citizens, as candidates for futurity, weigh well the matter. Our fathers, spurning oppression, appealed to heaven, and then risked life and fortune in freedom's cause. When it is now proposed in a peaceful, benevolent, wise mode, to put down an institution, hateful in the sight of freemen and offensive to heaven, shall we hesitate, prove recreant to our country and our God? Surely a christian patriot will never descend to count the cost of any great national good, warding off the judgment of offended heaven.

TO THE REV. JOHN ORTHODOX.

DEAR UNCLE,

To acquire, with habits of method, activity and industry, a knowledge of business, you could not have placed me more judiciously, but, also for the religious principles, and rigid morality you teach. Indeed, in this great metropolis, I am amazed to see how few walk worthy of their high vocation, as professing christians, seem so little to understand what it calls for, to have any adequate idea of their great professed exemplar, who not only lived a life of blameless innocence, but went about doing good. In other words, how few carry religion, as a great governing principle, into the daily walks of life.

They seem to regard it, as something to be kept unallied by worldly intercourse, to be strictly confined within four consecrated walls, or at most a Sunday business, a sort of confidential, private matter with the great Governor of the universe, having no connection with their fellow men; that its fruits are never to be exhibited in weakness, gentleness, forbearance and kindness: but in a mere observance of church externals, sometimes an unseemly pharisaical fussing about church matters, sectarian denunciation, running night and day to church, mis-

asking it for religion. Hence, among professors, as much as among non-professors, we see the same un-subdued ugliness of temper, same devotion to self, want of charity, envyings, jealousy, bickerings and conformity to the spirit and fashions of the world.

I used to think, from your example, that a christian habitually carried his principles, every where, about him, as a carpenter carries his rule, ever ready to measure the fitness and propriety of his conduct.

When we go regularly to church, undeniably wise because our duty, listen to the prayers, music and sermon, then, as we pass on, deal out censure or commendation, are we done with religion? Did the great Jehovah mean us to stop there? Did he design religion a mere outward act of homage to him, without any view to perfection in personal holiness, by habitual self-denial, discipline and good deeds? I think, Uncle, you ought, every New Year's-day, to preach a sermon specially instructing in the design of going to church, the nature and ends of genuine religion, for it seems to me, the ideas of many church-going people upon these matters are very confused and cloudy.

Allow me to submit for your solution, a question not more philosophically curious, than practically important. How is it, that we can, sermon after sermon, hear our own faults and delinquencies clearly pointed out, and eloquently denounced, with so

much truth, and complacency make the application to others, and none to ourselves? Is it that we actually do not know ourselves, "having the understanding darkened, being past all feeling, because of the blindness of our hearts," having lost all sensibility to our own sinfulness, that nothing short of the sword of the spirit can rend the veil hiding us from ourselves, and pierce the sin-hardened heart? If so,

"O that some power, would the giftie gie us,
To see ourselves as others see us."

As to Mr. Churchman, he is a thorough business man of high commercial standing in his class, but he very unfairly calls himself a high Churchman. Taking even the low standard of the modestly self-called evangelical branch, he discredits the high church, for grasping as the low church does, all the piety, it generously concedes to us religious principle.

To become reconciled to Mr. Churchman's mode of doing business, will require me to lay aside certain nursery scruples and tenderness of conscience.

The other lads laughingly call me squeamish, say that a few weeks familiarity with the business world, will liberalize my views, initiate me into all the tricks and ways of trade.

My good mother, ever sacred and honored be her memory, in christian purity and simplicity, taught that a lie, whether of malice or expediency, was equally a violation of God's command; that we can

as well practice a sinful deception by a suppression of the truth, as by telling a falsehood.

I presume the guardian spirit of my gentle mother hovers over me when deceiving a customer, for my embarrassment *betrays* me. This destroys the confidence of purchasers, vexes Mr. C., and spoils every thing.

But who cannot see in such a business training, a mare for youthful innocence, the incipency of fixed dishonesty? Although custom, and the recognized policy of trade, sustain a man before the community, and reconcile him to fraud, our nature makes it impossible for any man to practice this kind of business morality, and not to lose his own self respect, not to depreciate morally, for a stain upon our honor, unwashed by the tear of repentance, soon becomes a corroding canker, assimilating to its own vicious nature the whole moral man.

Although infinite wisdom has given us certain instinctive feelings of what is right and wrong, he has given us reason as a surer guide, yet every reflecting man, who will examine the motive power of his conduct, will find it to be, not generally reason, but feeling, and that it has ever been making silly and evil suggestions.

There are in mathematics, certain self-evident propositions, so there are certain promptings of feeling, not to be reasoned upon, but, in the main, our feelings are a very unsafe counsellor; a man gov-

erned by them is the uncertain creature of impulse, never to be depended upon, like a ship without her helm, which may safely drift into port, or be dashed upon the rocks. Hence the importance of cherishing in youth, nice, correct feeling, and planting clear, decided, fixed, principles, not confusing the sense of right, by mixing up business morality with bible morality.

There are so many temptations through our indolence, pride, ambition, sensuality and devotion in fashion, way-laying our virtue in the journey of life, that we require all the stubbornness of rigid principle, and all the sensitiveness of a nice sense of honor to keep us erect.

Mr. C., as our true friend, should rather, in his training, have a fixed eye on this, should impress upon his youths, that character is capital, that there is something more precious than gold—our honor; sweeter than the triumphs of chicanery or cunning, conscious integrity.

The sentiment as strongly expressed by Burns, enforced by precept and example, should be written in letters of gold over the door of every counting room.

“The fear of hell’s a hangman’s whip,
To haul the wretch in order,
But when you feel your honor grip
Let that eye be your border.
Its slightest touches, instant pause,
Debar a side pretences,
And resolutely keep its laws,
Uncaring consequences.”

Mr. C. remarked to me kindly, Johnny, you must be more self-possessed when selling goods, rather show a determination to stick to your price, though allowed to fall; firmly, under all circumstances, insist upon the quality and cheapness of the goods.

You must know that a little fibbing is allowed in trade, understood to be necessary to all business, and therefore, no more wrong than when a lady sends word to the door that she is not at home.

It has become a settled, fixed principle, pervading all trade, that a little deception may be practiced, and like a custom-house oath, means no immorality.

I remarked, that fashion very much moulds opinion, and with people of the world gives the standard of right and wrong, but that religion taught differently, that it was the declaration of inspired wisdom, "riches obtained by a lying tongue are a vanity."

Then you should have seen the mingled expression of surprise, suppressed mirth at my rustic simplicity and contempt for my supposed prejudices and weakness. Why, Johnny Raw! he exclaimed, I am amazed and amused. You are indeed a simple Bumpkin! Next we shall hear of your having taken the pledge, or enlisted as a Sunday school teacher!

You seem utterly ignorant of the nature and objects of religion. In truth it is a mighty simple matter, consists in merely a strict observance of

all the forms and externals of religion, genteely dressed, going soberly to church, if the music is fine, the preacher eloquent, the church splendid and comfortable, luxuriously enjoying a mental feast, resting from the toils of business, reading *The True Churchman*, or some good practical book, then, as you retire, you are with your best coat, to fold up religion till the next Sabbath.

Pausing, like a good tactitian, to see the effect of his artillery upon the Bumpkin's outworks, seeing as he thought in my silence a breach, he vociferously exclaimed, sir, carry out your contracted views as a religionist, and the world will soon be upside down.

If religion is allowed to interfere with the great business concerns of life, farewell to the trade, general order and satisfaction of life. Where would be ample room in advancing our fortunes for the exercise of the ingenuity, energy, and enterprise? Stagnation, confusion and poverty would give the world a reign of terror.

Narrowing your mind and contracting your views and desires by habitually hanging over your Bible, you have at last deluded yourself that really, "man wants but little here below;" that wealth is only a relative term, that few and moderate wants will make small means great riches.

You, inexperienced in business, cannot conceive the vast amount of human machinery you would thus ungear.

Business men, of liberal conceptions and large views, when contemplating great interests, regard mankind in the aggregate; it does not do to look at man individually.

The great principle is, for the benefit of the many, like the forlorn hope of an army, the few must be sacrificed.

I would like to elevate and enlarge your views somewhat to the scale of Napoleon. Looking beyond war's carnage, conflagrated villages, famine and pestilence, his far-reaching, philosophic eye could calmly repose upon the ultimate greatness and glory of France.

Why, the teachings of Christ forbid war, but still, although frightfully demoralizing, and although from its grim battle fields, even the war-hardened soldier recoils, in its exhibition of genius, high qualities, its pomp and circumstance, it is still glorious war.

Great statesmen decide, that although a great, it is a necessary, evil, promoting and protecting commerce, warding off possible invasion, preserving the balance of power; useful to a nation as a great sewer, draining off its corrupted filth; humanely saving from ignominy, the fairest candidates for the gallows, baptizing them in human gore, the sainted heroes of history.

Again, opium is admitted to be a great soul and body-destroying drug; but as an offset, all sufficient, see the warehouses, the men, the ships it employs,

returning wealth and luxury, the only sources of human enjoyment.

I know, in religious cant, you will reply, we should do unto others as we would have others do unto us, undoubtedly a very good maxim, and designed to govern neighbors in the same trade. But is all this vast amount of business to be sacrificed, because Chinese fools (too thick any how) will destroy themselves? Suppose they do, is not the great commerce and luxury of the world advanced?

Again, christianity most decidedly teaches that negro slavery is a violation of justice, mercy and every human right. Well, but it is necessary to the convenience and luxury of a vast many very cultivated, refined people, to the profitable growth of the great staples, cotton, sugar and tobacco. If you allow the unreasonable interference of christianity, how can holy men, abandoning the ground of justification, that stern necessity, humanity and justice to the two races, at *present*, forbid general emancipation—the only ground, by the way, upon which the inconsistency of condemning slavery and using its products can be reconciled—defend the institution against the insane attacks of abolitionism, as a thing in itself right and proper? Yet there is no other principle to stand upon, if the world's great business and convenience is to enjoy permanently the benefits of the institution; for then, colonization, all efforts to enlighten and ameliorate the condition of

the blacks, looking to ultimate freedom, will be abandoned.

But, sir, admit once, with Thomas Jefferson, that God has not one attribute in sympathy with negro slavery, that it is only to be justified upon the ground of justice and humanity under existing circumstances, and you open the door for fanatical effort, you give a fulcrum for the lever of christianity, which must ultimately break down the institution.

Again, by such a standard, the huge alcoholic trade must fall, for none can deny, that it is proscribed by christianity as the great source of crime and misery; but will you sacrifice merely to reduce the amount of crime, the preservation of weak suicidal fools, their wives and children, this enormous interest?

If your mind can grasp the subject, I pray you see the vast amount of shipping, merchants, distillers, landlords and that legion of retail venders, now so prosperous, who would necessarily exclaim, "Othello's occupation's gone." Yes, a great important item in the business of the world blotted out! And pray, sir, for what proportionate good?

You, with your christianity, would soon destroy all the beauty and satisfaction of business, stab speculation to the very vitals. See, sir, where your principles carried out would land you.

I have discovered a valuable copper mine on your farm, or I have learned from my agent in New

York, that from some great political movement, flour has gone up two dollars a barrel; now Mr. R. would say, that I am morally bound to call on him, impart all my knowledge and then try to negotiate. Well, sir, were you to approach me in that way, irresistibly I should violate politeness, by laughing in your face.

I know you will argue, that all trade among honest men is based upon the principle of supposed mutual equivalents; each party, with the full knowledge of all the facts affecting the value of the property, making his own estimates. Then planting yourself upon your christianity, and averring that deception is a practical lie, as much so, when caused by the suppression of truth, as by a direct falsehood, and sinful in the sight of God, deny me the privilege of making a large fortune.

You will further argue, had I purchased in ignorance of the facts, the transaction would have been perfectly honorable, because I would have neither practiced deception nor given less than an equivalent according to the then general estimate, and because the transaction would have been in strict conformity with the recognized rules and fairness of business. But as the intrinsic value of the land and of the flour, simultaneously with the discovery of the mine and the political movement, had actually advanced to the estimate put upon them by the whole business community, by suppressing our information,

before making the purchase, we would violate two great principles governing honest men, not giving a fair equivalent and practicing a deception, in truth, virtually telling a lie.

O no, Mr. R., I will not trammel and perplex myself by such rules, in accumulating wealth, the law is my boundary, and I find my hands quite full enough watching others, taking care of my own interests, without enlightening others to my own prejudice. In fact, my simple rule is, "every man for himself, God for us all, and the devil take the hindmost."

Again, under the stern uncompromising requirements of christianity, how could the world of fashion, the source of so much hilarity and animation, and withal so good a customer of trade, hold up its gay head, quieting conscience, as if there was no better way of dispensing wealth, by the consideration of the hundred mouths it feeds, heedless how many a child of want, their mere health-destroying excess, their ostentatious waste would gladden, how many a dark chamber of sick poverty their needless illumination would cheer, how many poor children, simply, their waste would snatch from the dens of poverty and vice, roll on self-satisfied in sensual indulgence and wasteful extravagance, complacently reconciling God and mammon?

Indeed observation every where instructs, that the world is not governed by religious principle, but by a conventional morality.

Under the plea of professional obligation, they by pointing to *their higher law*, men of the highest order of intellect, keenly sensitive to dishonour and character, courteous and kind, commanding places of highest trust and distinction, openly and unblushingly justify the wicked for a reward. Yes, bring the richest resources of intellect, seize upon every legal flaw, every unguarded informality, indiscriminately advocate right and wrong, making the worst appear the better cause, to ward off the blow of justice, aid dark villainy in wrong, and then, glory in their shame!

No, Johnny, our daily wants and well adapted abilities to supply them, show that our great business on earth is simply to struggle for a good living, and when our present commission of accumulating money, in other words, the means of enjoying animal life, and of passing respectably, unscathed by human law, through the world, is over, all is over.

Truly, I replied, you make religion more than useless. No sir, he continued, religion still performs a good office, it is the great moral police of the world, by its terrors and superstitions it keeps the ignorant and weak minded among the lower orders in place, it serves to amuse and keep out of mischief speculating, literary idlers; prating, gossiping women; gives respectability and influence with the masses. Depend upon it, however men may speculate and preach, affect high church or low church, Presby-

terian atheism, or *Wolfe's* *Wolfe's*, I have given
the practical teaching of all those which by that re-
ligion has no more to do with the great business
concerns, than the devil has with holy water.

Struck perfectly dumb by this, to me, original view
of the subject, Mr. C., imagining the fort stormed
and the garrison put to the sword, triumphantly re-
tired from the contest. But, uncle, with your aid I
hope yet to show him,

That he who fights and runs away,
May live to fight another day.

It is lamentable to see the inevitable downward
progress of a prayerless, covetous, worldly man,
towards utter reprobacy. As surely as the culture
of our intellect and good feelings advance, intelli-
gence, virtue and happiness, as certainly, their ne-
glect deteriorates mind and heart, ending in ignor-
ance, sin and misery. This is a law of our nature
as fixed as the stars above, and should never be for-
gotten from the cradle to the tomb.

What a lesson does this Dives read to the avari-
cious worldling! Completely engrossed in business
and pleasure, only valuing religion as a mean of
worldly advancement, having had for many years
but one leading object in life, by a law of our nature
he can no longer feel an interest in any thing out
of its connection. The murmurings and admonitions
of conscience silenced, all his responsibilities as a
man, the appeals of humanity, the clear decided

truths, the solemn obligations of religion, all pass unheeded, and he madly, recklessly travels on to weakness and endless woe!

Pity, that in the dawn of active life, with our sensibility fresh and keen, our generous impulses unchilled, we cannot see that there is no tyranny so obdurate and engrossing, no habit of mind so withering to uprightness, so desolating upon every good and noble quality, as a greedy love of money.

Religion, this poor mind perverted, deluded man's scorn, with all its elevating, purifying, ennobling tendencies, which honesty cannot deny it, is the only principle to counteract this work of death upon the heart. It indeed could elevate his aims to higher objects, teach him the comparative insignificance of his soul-engrossing cares, that he will be awfully responsible for word, thought and deed, at the last great day, open to his imagination, and give to his heart the pure illimitable joys of kindness to man and devotion to God.

Invited by Mrs. C. to accompany her to her place of worship, I said I would see her to the door, and why not, she asked, go in? My uncle, madam, I replied, Dr. Orthodox, warmly pressing my hand, giving it the solemnity of a parting charge, and with his parting blessing laid the injunction never to enter a low church, Presbyterian nor Methodist meeting-house, for I might subject myself to the consequences of encouraging heresy, countenancing un-

authorized preaching, or even endanger my orthodox principles.

Curling her lip, with illy suppressed emotion, she said, I know not Mr. R. what you mean by heresy. Has inspiration specially endowed your teachers with infallibility and authority to pronounce what the will of God is to all the world beside? How are we to know the fact, are they more pure and enlightened? Where are their credentials? Have they more burning zeal? Do they win more souls for heaven? Where has the great founder of christianity plainly prescribed church machinery?

We claim, madam, I replied, for our clergy, a direct line of descent from the apostles, and if satan himself personated one of the Popes, previous to the reformation, it is enough for me if he transmitted the Holy Ghost and authority to his successors, for we simply regard the function.

Preposterous pretension, based upon the most unauthorized assumption! said Mrs. C., inconceivable, that since we are told, unless a man has the spirit of Christ he is none of his, that righteousness has no fellowship with unrighteousness, that we should withdraw ourselves from communion with wicked pretenders; that every rational man cannot see the chain of succession broken again and again in the persons of profligate Popes!

How could they transmit authority if christian men obeyed the injunction and held no communion with

such fiends incarnate? Pope Alexander and the indigence vending Leo the Tenth, viceregents of the pure and Holy Jesus! A medium to conduct the Holy Ghost! What folly too great for human credulity!

If the church of Rome and its nearest kin the church of England, judging from their fruits, had been the only instrumentalities for advancing christianity, what progress, pray sir, would vital religion have made in this nineteenth century? If you understand heresy in the scriptural sense, that it is simply doctrine, or usage not found in, or inconsistent with, the spirit and plain obvious sense of the inspired volume, causing disunion, I return the charge with scorn for your arrogance, and pity for your blind submission to authority.

Pray sir, where do you high churchmen find your doctrines of apostolical succession, original sin, baptismal regeneration, the practice of confirmation, the use of that popish rag, the surplice, the reading desk, that it would be high offence to heaven to unite in devotion with other christians unless upon your own prescribed terms, to cut your church off from sympathy with others, arrogantly refusing their clergy as uncalled men the use of your pulpit?

Sir, if all this is not heresy and will worship I know not the meaning of language.

A thunder-clap from a cloudless sky could not have more astounded the Bumpkin.

Man should be defined, not a rational, but an irrational rational being, so little use, comparatively, does he make of his reason. He will adopt the most important opinions, without due examination; will recklessly plunge himself headlong into error even though it involves sin and eternal death! Upon reflection, I find that I have taken, without looking into the matter, my religious opinions from my grandfather, and he most probably from his grandfather, and he again from his grandfather. We do not seem to realize that religion is not a mechanical but an intellectual principle, nor our own individual responsibility as probationists before God, endowed with a capacity, and required to work out our own salvation, as intellectual beings.

Suffering under Mrs. Churchman's withering rebuke, the perspiration streaming from every pore, I gladly accepted a sudden call from Mr. C. to accompany him. I soon found myself luxuriously seated in a magnificent dark gothic building, evidently constructed more in conformity with architectural rule and taste as a city ornament, than in reference to the great object of going to the house of God, so dark and illy contrived for hearing the preacher is it.

The beautiful structure, the softly mellowed light streaming through gorgeously rich colored glass, adorned with bible personage, the sweetly grand toned organ, enriched with the finest voices, a splen-

didly dressed assembly, all enrapturing my senses, I thought little of God and eternity, of my own insignificance and sinfulness, of the necessity of repentance and an atoning Saviour, or how I could best secure heaven's approbation.

But I thought much of the luxury and splendor around me, of my own dignity and importance, privileged to enjoy all this beauty and magnificence.

The silk robed preacher, well qualified to preach "to ears polite," deeming it wise ever to keep in view what he esteemed the essence of religion, the sermon was purely and peculiarly doctrinal, but it was rather too deep for my limited comprehension and too dull and unawakening to call off my feelings from luxurious indulgence.

No doubt many of his people think that there is in the simple act of going to church, some undefined virtue, something meritorious and atoning, a religious obligation discharged, irrespectively of edification, confession of sin, openly acknowledging Christ and fervent prayer to the King of kings, when, in going to go there with other feelings and views is all frivolity and awful blasphemy.

The preacher should rather have roused up his world-devoted people from their perfidious lethargy to a realizing sense of their imminent danger, their duty, their responsibility and their true happiness, from their devotion to vain pomp and empty formalisms, to true fervent piety and

good deeds, from their costly palace church, to the only wise use of riches, to the solemn truth, that a penalty attached to every violation of all God's appointments, by a fixed and unalterable law; that when he ordained man should eat his bread in the sweat of his brow, from that moment idleness, vice and misery became of one brotherhood, that a solemn obligation was placed upon man to be actively useful; that hence, in hoarding and bestowing wealth, man generally injured himself and gave his children sorrow.

Placing his beacon light upon the rock of greatest danger, he should have fearlessly denounced the world of fashion and pleasure, so full of dangers, so blinding to duty, sin and its consequences, leading the mind off from the true end of the life and the destiny of man, engendering a heartless indifference, to a niggardly grinding of the poor, a mean complaisant homage and wasteful liberality to the wealthy, a supercilious regard to narrow fortune, an engrossing selfishness, the sure harbingers of ultimate, lamentable reprobacy.

He should, instead of impressing idle dogmas, have taught that whilst by habitual deeds of mercy and goodness man is disciplining himself for higher attainments in holiness, avoiding the snare of riches, having the high enjoyment of doing good, knowing it to be God's will, laying up treasures for himself in heaven, he would have the conscious satisfaction of

knowing his children guarded from the perils of idle life; perils, which no human contrivance can avoid, because idleness and vice, vice and misery are bound together by a law as immovable as that which suspends the earth.

I walked home, well sustained by the thoughtless gaiety and religious indifference of all around me, in my want of religion and self-sufficiency, full of my own consequence, pleasurable sensations and admiration for the beauty and magnificence of the church.

In the afternoon, the music, for some cause deemed to be particularly fine, had invited all the amateurs of the city. The execution, so artistically fine, can it be so full of religious edification, so inspiring with fervid piety, seemed wholly to absorb parson, choir and people.

When the loud swelling organ, filling with its rich voice the immense church, announced the service over, all along the crowded isles, you heard the truthful commendation, "was not the music exquisite." Alas! thought I, are the people any nearer heaven?

To my views there is no where more call for church reformation, a stronger exhibition of will-worship and utter disregard of the object, than in our church music.

Thoughtless young people, uninfluenced by reverential feeling, often associate, form a choir. Then some one is chosen for leader, without reference to piety, generally hired for the business. Evening

After this, they meet for practice and amusement. This proceeds till practice has sufficiently perfected the music for a more public exhibition. Then the minister with great solemnity of manner, all in feverish anxiety for the fine performance, gives out, "let us sing to the praise and glory of God." Surely he would with more propriety give out, "let us sing to display the execution of the organist and choir, please the taste of the people and gratify Jehonadab's ear, for music."

The organ, after aiding in leading the mind off from appropriate thoughts, by a pompous display of its powers, dismisses the congregation, and

"With light quirks of music broken and uneven,
Makes the soul dance upon a jig to heaven."

If the legitimate object be to solemnize the mind, warm the fervor of devotional feeling, and express reverential homage for the Sovereign of the universe, the choir solely intent upon the accuracy of the music, the people enjoying it as amateurs; can there be a greater perversion of religious ceremony, a more solemn mockery?

Instead of pompous artistic music, delighting the ear, but never touching the heart, it seems to me, religion being an individual matter, the body of the church should be the choir, not persons hired, or mechanically trained, the music simply vocal, when the sentiment, not the execution, will engage the mind, then, I can understand devotional fervor ex-

cited and warmed, ascend to heaven, in acceptable homage.

Ye poor ignorant, idolatrous heathens; ye miserable poor of our lanes and alleys, steeped in poverty ignorance and vice, whom we are directed to look after; ye tenants of the western wilds, whose ears no church bell ever gladdens, all so much neglected by your fellow men, rejoicing in christian villages, if familiar with human conduct, how discordant will the annual sum of \$1,400 paid for hired, profane music by one church alone, sound in the ears of the heavenly choir piously singing with inexpressible emotions of love, joy and gratitude, voluntary hallelujahs to the great King of kings? Yes, men hired to praise God with their lips, when their hearts are far from him.

Christian friends, I ask, in all kindness and charity, is this the way to extend the Redeemer's kingdom? Will there be no responsibility for this abuse of wealth by God's stewards? For thus liberally rewarding blasphemous frivolity, what idea can they have of our heavenly Father, when they imagine such heartless hired homage can be acceptable? Does Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter or Paul furnish authority for such will-worship?

There are very many most excellent sensitive people, who carry reverence so far as to invest with sacredness, even religious folly; with such puerility from age, becomes venerable, even hallowed, and

they will deny the propriety of censuring any church external, and ridicule is an unlawful weapon.

But we should make a distinction between religion and its machinery; bear in mind that the more nearly connected with virtue or piety, the more serious in consequences, is any abuse, and the more reason for exposure, nay, though generally out of place, in such a case, may not an arrow from the quiver of ridicule be allowed, for surely the toleration of a religious abuse, impeding its progress, is no part of vital piety! Further, in connection with all church extravagances, allow me, without meaning offence, to ask, is it consistent with rigid christian principles, in any way to ever make a church, a luxury beyond the ability of an humble fortune? I ask again, in all charity, is that the way to advance the Redeemer's kingdom?

In the evening, Miss C. asked me to hear Dr. John Calvin—Dr. Calvin, awfully ominous thought I—one of our most eminent Presbyterian divines, sir. I exclaimed, surely Miss C. you are too correct a church woman to enter a Presbyterian meeting house;* clearly Dr. C. has no right to preach, has

* Fashionable church members, nay, even ministers at a watering place, have been known to "forsake assembling themselves together" when a Methodist or Presbyterian has officiated. Upon one occasion, two most excellent ladies finding themselves upon the threshold of heresy by mistake, were panic stricken; one remarked, O! what would Dr—say of us. Instantly the resolution was taken, they rushed from the door, were met almost breathless, hurrying

he ever been apostolically ordained to the work? Has the Holy Ghost from episcopal hands ever empowered him to explain the sacred word? What scriptural right has he to baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, or call sinners to repentance? Clearly he can only be a heaven-daring intruder.

Miss C. rolling her beautiful, benignant dark eyes upon me, said, I fear, Mr. R., that you have been even more unfortunately placed than myself. Reared in retirement beyond the mountains, under the patronising affection, undoubting simplicity and reverential awe of a patriarchal government, you have never heard from your uncle but one side of any question, have never ventured to think for yourself.

But sir, we are both young, may be placed in a responsible position, where our influence may be great, for good or for evil. Having understandings for the right use of which, we will be accountable to discriminate between truth and error, let us resolve, throwing off sectarian influence, keeping our minds honest, to let reason have fair play; exalting ourselves into the dignity of thinking beings, to judge for ourselves prayerfully, in so momentous a concern as religion, and be able to give others "reason for the hope which is in us."

away from the heretical minister, as if old Scratch, in full sulphurous perfume, was at their heels. This, too, in an age when Sumner and Chalmers were electrifying the christian world, to run from such heaven-inspired men!

I have observed in my father and others, that notions and prejudices, influencing seriously our conduct, are easily taken up, but confirmed by time, not so easily gotten rid of, and that these notions or decisions of the mind, arrived at without the superiority of reason, or personal knowledge, have the same force of influence as the greatest truth.

I think we cannot be too vigilant to avoid mischief, by misdirected energy in watching the soundness of all such decisions, assuring ourselves, that they conform to reason, justice, benevolence and gospel principles. Had Paul have observed this rule, would he have had to repent of persecuting christians?

We seem to be naturally prone to superstition and mystery, to transfer trouble and responsibility to others, to take up with any thing, which will save us the trouble of thinking. Hence we so readily persuade ourselves, passively to adopt the opinions of others. Hence too, a religion, ready cut and dry, wrapped in forms and pompous ceremony, easily complied with, and readily substituted for those good deeds—self-denials, self-abasing trust in redeeming grace, casting off all self-righteousness, required by gospel religion, suits so well the indolence of human nature.

In truth, I have been so wearied out, listening all my life, to the jarring between my parents, about high church and low church, finding in the one, too,

an unnatural, unscriptural want of sympathy with other christians, that its teachings, arrogant pretensions and usages, were no where sustained in the gospel, and that the other was an undecided, neither one thing nor another, I have found peace and quiet within the Presbyterian fold. Concluding, however, at the same time, that a holy life, conformable to the plain spirit and teaching of Holy Writ, under any church form is, after all, the only and all-sufficient requirement.

Now, Mr. R., preaching is simply spreading before the world, expounding and practically applying the gospel, urging men to repent and forsake sin.

In the absence of all positive divine command, to which I trust I shall ever submissively and reverently bow, that a particular set of men were exclusively authorized to preach and convey to the end of time to others, an exclusive right to carry the gospel to mankind and minister in sacred things, I must think it was designed, that as responsible probationists, placed here in reference to a future condition, that we should exercise our own discretion, individually, under gospel light, as to the best mode of serving God and advancing the Redeemer's kingdom.

Pray, sir, think you, Jehovah will be concerned by whom, or how, Christ's kingdom is extended under a sense of religious obligation? Think you, could a high churchman carry a complaint to the Re-

deemer, that he found Dr. C. (not one of us) preaching his word and doing good to men in his name, he would not say, forbid him not? Think you not, that such as Baxter, Summerfield and Chalmers had no divine unction, will not bear forever in the courts of heaven, the broad seal of God's approval, well done my good and faithful servant? When any zealous, godly men bring into his fold poor wandering sinners, think you, there is not joy in heaven with the angels?

Neither revelation, nor reason condemn Dr. Calvin. Moreover, I assert, that they authorize and command every competent, good man, either in the church or on the highways, to preach the gospel.

I exclaimed, what a latitudinarian! Allow me to ask a few overwhelming questions. Without a divinely instituted ministry, lifted above the grossness of the world, specially set apart to the solemn office, who could with efficacy baptize and purify poor little infants, steeped in original sin till there is not one fair spot of innocence? Who could with efficacy give thanks, break the bread and administer the Lord's Supper?

Moreover, allow every one to preach, and there is no corner of your broad land, that would not have some self-taught, self-deluded, unconsecrated layman, from ignorance, repudiating the great doctrinal dogmas and solemn forms, which give so imposing a dignity and authority to the church, keep up

religious interest by exciting sectarian strife and zeal, preaching faith in the Messiah, repentance and forsaking of sin, as alone essential to salvation.

Every fanatical, self-deluded, vulgar thinker, John Bunyan like, imagining himself divinely called, will be spreading the glad tidings of man's redemption. How soon would we be flooded with all sorts of fantastic notions, and isms? No, there must be some barrier to religious licentiousness, to that direct, familiar, personal approach of the laity, shocking reverential feeling, to divine majesty, so wisely provided against, in the Jewish priesthood, something to preserve the orthodoxy and dignity of the church, and there can be, from the necessity of the case, no other than the divinely instituted apostolic church.

I fear, said Miss C., I must shock your orthodox nerves still more, sir, I hold church and sect as distinct. Church, not to be the embodiment and exponent of peculiar opinions, but simply a society of good men, recognizing Christ as their head, and with such, holding Holy Writ for their guide, good sense and knowledge will ever prove an all-sufficient barrier against religious licentiousness.

I hold religion to be, not a mere assent of the mind to religious truth, nor cold conformity to externals, but a great active and vital governing principle, emanating from God, pervading, animating, guiding and restraining our thoughts and actions,

subduing all to obedience to the divine will, which requires all, individually, to draw nigh unto him, and to serve him in spirit and in truth.

Whilst I greatly value and sincerely honor the regular ministry, I do not hold them essential to the efficacy of religious ordinance. I would, when more convenient, or in the absence of a godly minister, have them administered by pious laymen, as must have been the case before there was an elaborated church organization.

In the absence of all positive command, I must appeal to common sense. If baptizing into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, means simply initiating christian professors, believing in the triune God, and if partaking of the Lord's supper, simply means, reverently and piously, as his command commemorating the Redeemer's love and death, then I can see no reason, thus stripped of all mystery, superstition and falsely imputed priestly consecration, both the one and the other may not be administered from the hands of any pious layman.

When your church receives into her fold, even the heresy infected Unitarian, without rebaptism, surely she either abandons apostolical succession, or admits the efficacy of lay baptism. Moreover, with very many enlightened, liberal churchmen, this doctrine of succession, is reduced to a mere matter of expediency, "not that episcopacy is essential to the being, but only to the well being of a church."

Now, in the face of common sense and all experience, for the sake of christian harmony, with the substance, you may as well abandon the shadow. But, alas! for the alliance of party feeling and pride of opinion, too stubborn for common sense or even for the spirit of christianity! any deluding subterfuge, rather than acknowledge error or defeat.

I make these remarks, not that I have the slightest objection to an episcopal form of government placed on its true ground of expediency merely, nor that I do not prefer leaving the function with the clergy, but simply to show the futility of your position.

I then said, I am amazed, Miss C., that your mother should have so boldly challenged me to prove the dogma of original sin. You seem very fond of appealing to that great umpire—common sense. Let us appeal to it. Can you not see original sin legibly written in infancy, in the very first dawning of reason? Do you not see it gradually develop with the child's growth, how, with the greatest vigilance and care only, children are raised to virtue?

Indeed, Mr. R., she said, so utterly unimportant to practical religion do I view this dogma, that if it was not the basis of other dogmas, complicating religion, perplexing the simple-minded, and feeding sectarianism, I should not think it worth the breath which discusses it. See for example, that gorgeous puerility, that paragon of folly, impudence and pro-

sanity, too nauseating to be tolerated by enlightened Romanists, although authorized by popish infallibility—"the late annunciation."

In short, sir, I hold original sin, preventing grace, infant baptism and baptismal regeneration, original sin the grand sire, a chain of unauthorized dogmas having no more to do with christianity, than light has with darkness. Where are they clearly taught in Holy Writ enjoined as essential matters of christian faith? True, theology may extort them, but theology is not christianity, and I apprehend all the difficulty which has forced theology to this dogma, is solved by the doctrine, so plainly taught, of man's probation; which necessarily presupposes imperfection, but there is no necessity for making this imperfectness, natural depravity, or a vitiated state of moral corruption, to account for man's aberration, much less, make it actual sin. The very fact of man's being an imperfect being, implies that he may sin. I know of no other definition of sin, than that it is simply a violation of God's revealed will.

The great source of error, seems to be confounding the power or liberty of doing wrong, which is essential to probationism, with the thing chosen, actual sin itself.

I admit we are all naturally, and if you prefer it, originally, from our want of perfection, liable to sin, but this liability, or even proneness, is not sin.

I have a strong inclination to drink brandy and

enjoy the excitement of intoxication, but, surely if I restrain the inclination and fly from opportunity and temptation, I have not committed the sin of drunkenness. As a probationist, I am necessarily born with certain passions and propensities, and ability to sinful indulgence, but can this liability to sinful indulgence be viewed as actual sin, requiring preventing grace and baptismal regeneration?

We are told that the forgiveness of sin depends upon repentance and forsaking of sin. How can any being, defiled with sin, be admitted into heaven, and if children are such, how can they get there? How can a little innocent, a few hours old, repent and forsake sin (if possible to sin) without divine grace? If this grace is coincident with the first breath to neutralize sin, what nonsense to make all this ado about original sin, as a foundation for other dogmas marring the simplicity of christianity.

Before we part, Mr. R., a few words upon another subject. You lament that so many wander off to popery. That these perverts are generally from your church, seems fairly to imply; that in certain doctrines and usages, you have left some plain stepping stones back, for timid, superstitious, weak minds, at the reformation in your doctrines of succession, and that regarding the Lord's Supper. Why not honestly and boldly cut entirely loose from both, as having no rational foundation in holy writ? Surely an honest, sound mind, must

see, that there is no reason to believe, that any sacredness, new mysterious character, was imparted to the bread and wine, used evidently symbolically. It is plain, that in using those familiar elements, the design was simply to institute a solemn commemorative ordinance, with a definite object, and that there was no other stated or implied than to do so "in remembrance of me." Any further complication is man's unwarranted addition. Why make a mystery of so plain a matter, by mixing up the symbols, with the purely intellectual ordinance? Where the necessity of saying, with the Bishop of Oxford, that the elements are not eaten as the body and blood of Christ, but only in a spiritual sense? Why not say the language is merely figurative, as when the Saviour says, "I am the door," or "I am the good shepherd," that with the injunction and efficacy of the ordinance, the material elements have nothing to do? Surely we should not wonder, when a plain, ardent churchman, fearfully working his way to heaven, perplexed by your nice distinctions, and subtle reasoning, seduced by the blandishments, easy ways and pompous ritual of popery, finding in his bible nothing said about eating and drinking the elements spiritually, and which he cannot comprehend, if he concludes, as I must regard the bread and wine, distinct from other bread and wine, as having acquired a new and exalted character, under the transforming influence

of priestly consecration, and as I cannot see the difference between eating and drinking spiritually, and doing so substantially, so far as the elements are concerned beyond emblems, let me regard the language as literal, either sense, is to me a mystery. Is it any wonder then, if he, ending all perplexity, with "a reverent fear of doing wrong," takes in the monstrous absurdity of the real presence, goes over to Rome, throwing all responsibility for religious truth, upon his pope and priest, no longer an intellectual christian, judging for himself?

But, Mr. R., I would not be misunderstood. It is not so much for the consequences to individual, earnest, but mistaken, christians, that we protest against dogmas, for we believe a man can go to heaven, if he does believe in transubstantiation. Aside from a vicious defective system, standing in the way of human progress, we care not for any honest christian man's personal faith, how he is baptized, how he interprets the bread and wine, how he views the origin of the ministry.

Wherever a system to experience, or to common sense, proves it, retards the Redeemer's kingdom, precisely in that proportion we hold it vicious. If any church will, as an established policy, keep the people in ignorance, not allow them to think for themselves, defer from Holy Writ, to her authority, discourage diligent search of the scriptures, lead them to believe, that the observance of certain ex-

ternals will substitute a holy life, that confession to man, will wipe off sin from the records of heaven ; if it teaches that prayers to saints will serve them, prayer and money release from purgatory, denounce, persecute and annihilate other christians, it must retard the Redeemer's kingdom.

We should ever keep in view, our intellectual and individual responsibility, and if we inquire honestly, is this or that dogma, this or that external tending to promote the Redeemer's kingdom : we will know without consulting pope, priest or parson, what to drop, and what to perpetuate.

Allow me, Mr. R., to suggest, with all respect, that preserving, slightly modified, your beautiful ritual, throwing off your time honored pomp and ceremony, bursting the bands of educational prejudice, you magnanimously proclaim apostolical succession, the unauthorized dogma of a dark age, the device of wicked, crafty men, repealing your unchristian canons, that you throw off the reproach to religion, and the sneer of infidelity, by extending the right hand of fellowship to every faithful follower of Christ. Then, sir, the incubus removed, your church would arise refreshed, pure and beautiful, illimitably widening its borders to the great joy of man, and the glory of God.

Well, uncle, a little influenced by female loveliness, boyish gallantry, and somewhat shaken by argument, I have passed the rubicon.

Dr. C. told us, religion did not consist in running night and day, and every day for weeks, to church, as a matter of prescribed form, in abstaining periodically, from one kind of food, in observing empty externals, nor yet in excitement, nor an abstraction for ingenious men to speculate upon, but that it was a great intellectual principle, the guide of life, connecting man with God and eternity. He brought religion down, not only to preside over the practical details of daily life, but, as "our thoughts are heard in heaven," to the purifying of the very thoughts and imaginations. He pictured the reasonableness, the beauty, and the rewards of holiness, the folly, hideousness, and the wages of sin, till the one seemed hateful, and the other lovely. Can I then have committed the unpardonable sin?

The next evening, seated by Miss C., nourishing every generous impulse, every good feeling of my nature, from the rich fountain of her goodness, as she sat knitting a pair of yarn stockings, for a poor old service-worn negro, when in walked Dr. C., his countenance bright, benignant and placid, because all was peace and sunshine within. With kind salutation, he exclaimed: Ah, Miss C., ever at something useful and benevolent, but such is the fruit of piety; your religious views of duty and responsibility which ever mould the character.

Her rich expression, heightened by the blush of maiden modesty, she replied: Certainly Dr., sen-

able, how much I owe to the mercy, goodness and grace of God, how much I fall short of duty, I only hold in trust as a responsible probationist, for the good of my fellow creatures, and the service of my Creator, whatever amount of mental or physical ability, wealth or moral influence I am blessed with.

A noble and ennobling sentiment, Miss C., was the prompt response, and if practiced by all professing christians only, would soon change the face of the moral world. But alas, self, all aggrandizing self, reigns supreme, without consciousness, the idol of every heart. It is ever crossing the path of duty, beckoning us away from all that is good and noble. How many delusive forms does it assume, how often are the suggestions of vanity, pride or avarice mistaken by others, and not unfrequently by ourselves, for the suggestions of benevolence or prudence, the mind cheated, the conscience quieted, and the man depreciated. By precept, example and discipline, it should be ground into the very heart of childhood, that the principle of gravitation is not more essential to preserve the order of the planetary system, than the practice of self denial, to keep man within the orbit of his duty.

I then remarked, Dr., judging from the extravagance, habits and manners of your young ladies, I should suppose, I must judge of the amiability, intelligence and moral worth of a lady in the first society, by the richness of her brocade, her use-

lessness in the community, or the haughtiness with which she repels a presumed interloper.

Spare us your sarcasm, Mr. R., replied Miss C., many of those ladies so richly dressed and so given up to etiquette and amusements, are truly lovely women, not to be so much censured, as the general state of manners and habits. You must make allowance for the potent law of fashion. Few of us, indeed, have the firmness of principle, the strength or independence of mind, to resist its sweeping influence. It is indeed a law of our members warring against all that is right. But if you would fully estimate its withering, chilling influence upon all that is lovely and excellent in woman, you must look deeper; see childhood's honest friendships, consecrated by many a sisterly kiss, many a confided secret of the girlish heart, exchanged for the cold passing nod, see kindness degenerate into formality and hollow profession, jealousy, pride, envy, ambition to be admired, all unite to make sad havoc of the better feelings in the woman of fashion.

Like every thing else which is morally wrong, it is at war with common sense. Now, no matter how intelligent, refined in feeling or manner, no matter how much sterling worth, only let it be whispered, that he or she are nobody, the children of some honest, unpretending citizen, and in vain will they try to shine in the first society, unless their pretensions are based upon a strong, broad metallic basis. But

let their parents, no matter how deficient in sense, refinement of sentiment or morals, impart to them their hereditary claims, and a thousand caresses welcome them to the world of fashion. See again, for moustached youth, fresh from debauch, with scarcely an attribute of humanity but his form, certainly none of the dignity of his nature, stupid from ignorance, or offensive from sensuality, indoctrinated in some genteel pandemonium, far worse in influence than kindred vulgar places of eating and drinking, but countenanced by parents, that their sons may genteely go to ruin; see him, his very breath exhaling sensuality, whirl through the waltz the young yet pure and innocent fair one, strange, with instinctive delicacy, she does not shrink from his contaminating touch! But such is the inexorable, senseless law of fashion. Far better for him, and the community, had the money hoarded for his ruin been given to redeem the poor heathen from darkness and cruelty. Is it any wonder that a lady of fashion becomes an offensive, heartless woman? Sad, indeed, said Dr. C., plainly there is no way of avoiding the result, but by keeping out of fashionable life and resolutely regulating your life by gospel principles, for only as they rule, are we pure, useful and happy. Truly the way of the worldling, like that of every other transgressor, is hard. Behold the devotee of fashion, her race of folly run, pleasure-worn, world-abandoned, soured by disappointment

and neglect, haunted by the ghost of murdered time, "no correspondence fixed in heaven," her soul adrift, and you have a wretched being over whom good men may sigh and angels weep.

There is, observed Miss O., a deep solemnity in the thought, a fearful responsibility in the truth, that from our complicated relations to time and to eternity no one knows, in all their nature and extent, the ultimate consequences for good, or for evil, of every serious act. A series of results is started *never to end*. A gentleman's lack of courtesy, a lady's thoughtless indiscretion, may induce a duel and death of the parties, broken hearts to others, involve estates, bring gray hairs down with sorrow to the grave, and a new series start from thence, and so on *forever*.

Should not the conception of never ending consequences solemnize every thoughtful mind, banish frivolous empty engrossing amusement, keep us vigilant, lead us to make our duties instead of our pleasures the common themes of thought? Yet in the whirl of fashionable life, we can only live for the moment; ball succeeds to ball, dinner to dinner, the interval filled up with the necessary appendages of etiquette, or associated amusements, till the whole business of a life, only given to fit for eternity, becomes the slavery of fashion.

Throughout animal and vegetable creation we see order and regularity preserved and continued by

fixed laws, and we will find certain laws at creation impressed on the mind, which act adversely, or happily, as we give the occasion. The philosophy of mind, as regards the intellectual powers, has been studiously investigated, perhaps that more important branch relating to moral character, not so much so.

Yet, under these laws, character is formed. If we act virtuously our disposition and ability to be virtuous will be proportionate. If we indulge in personal abuse and scandal we become hatefully unkind and censorious. If we yield to low and groveling thoughts we will become groveling sensualists. If we indulge an indolent disposition, we grow careless and finally irreclaimably neglectful. If we disregard the monitions of conscience, our sensibility to her rebuke fades away, till the still small voice is no longer audible, gloomy despair, or obdurate reprobacy, with the abandonment of all hope of reform and all that is good, completes our wretchedness. If the imagination is restrained by reason, we become practically useful, if we allow it to run riot, we idly dream life away. If we narrow down the sphere of mind by dwelling, mainly, upon how we shall get on in life, or most largely take in its pleasures, we become worldly-minded. If we school the mind to habitually contemplate our relative duties to God and man, the infinite wisdom, purity and mercy of omnipotence, we rise to a level with the great interests of eternity, proportionately become heavenly-minded.

Habit, too, plays a conspicuous part for good or for evil in the formation of character, too much to be disregarded, for, under the influence of this all pervading law, we perpetually advance or retrograde.

High authority tells us, "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart therefrom." Now, what is a well trained youth, but the creation of good habits? Without reference to this law of habit, what an inexplicable enigma is the miser? He starts with legitimate objects for industry and frugality, but enough for them obtained, mean to himself and others, he toils, denies and screws, simply for accumulation, only bringing with it care, odium and contempt. Poor insane man! little does his dark groveling, narrow soul know, that as far as a ray of light from a meridian sun exceeds in brilliancy one from the most dimly discerned star, the pleasure of the benevolent must exceed that of the covetous.

The truth is, in his anxiety for an over-estimated good, he has surrendered up all the energy of soul and body, stifled all kindly emotions interfering with it; and as every feeling, be it good or evil, grows by cultivation, or withers from neglect, his generous and kind impulses become feebler and feebler, whilst his avarice grows more vigorous, till at last, overshadowing all, becomes the sovereign passion, constituting that moral petrification, that wretched phenomenon, the miser.

Then, again, we oftener meet with a mixed character, equally with the other, no matter with what self-complacency he may despise the miser, a stranger to all generous impulse, and the product of the same modified law—the mean, proud man, profuse in his living, or ostentatious parade, yet otherwise miserly, unkind and mean. Let splendor of equipage, or entertainment, present a claim, avarice rears the grasp and delusively self-ignorant, he imagines himself very liberal; but let an occasion for wiseless, private generosity or benevolence, not to be gazetted, be the petitioner, and the call passes all unheeded.

In fact, we do not sufficiently advert to the fact, that every principled good man is the creature of culture, and if we would advance in purity and excellence, we must cultivate the heart by diligent self-examination, keeping it in subjection to the revealed standard of right and wrong, by our reading, our associations and our acts, in fact, by keeping all that is good in us actively exercised; and we will find, as we indulge the current of thought and feeling, we morally rise or depreciate. This truth must be familiar to most reflecting minds. That man is little to be envied, who, upon the retrospect of a long life, cannot find occasions, when indulging his better feelings and ennobling affections, he has not felt an exaltation of character, himself a better man; for next to communion with heaven, breathing prayer,

confession, or attrition, or gratitude, there is no exercise of mind so purifying and elevating as the habitual contemplation of departed excellence, more particularly, when connected with our warm affections and endeared associations; because, when thus engaged, exorcised by purity and tenderness, all that is gross, selfish, or mean flies away. How can it be otherwise, when a thousand hallowed tender recollections crowd the mind, when conscience enthroned in judgment, every neglect and every unkind act rises in stern rebuke, when we would rejoice to roll back the tide of time, and by ten thousand tender devotions repair the wrong, when though we feel, that the gentle, pure spirit which is gone, will forgive us, when we trust that God will forgive us, we still feel that our own hearts, never, never can forgive us. With the utter disregard of these mental laws, is it a matter of wonder that we grow up proud, despotic, careless, selfish, mean, or even vicious?

Wishing to hear the Dr. upon a subject frequently discussed among laymen, I remarked, Dr. is there not an apparent inconsistency in telling us that we are only saved by the grace of God, depreciating good works as a procuring cause of salvation, and in the next breath urging us to good works as if they would save us. If grace alone carries us to heaven, where the necessity for works, and where then is my responsibility? Yours, he replied, is

not an uncommon perplexity with those who are not bible students, who only read by snatches, and then, too, only with the same critical spirit that they would read a literary review. This embarrassment arises from confounding two distinct propositions, each an independent truth. The isolating of texts, the common trick of cavillers, no fair mind will ever resort to. You must never lose sight of the great leading truth, that Omnipotence has placed us here on probation, which necessarily presupposes a work for us to do.

I assert, upon the authority of holy writ, by grace, or independently of all human will or power, you are saved, and upon the same high authority, I assert, that without good works you will be condemned. Now, is it not by the grace of God, that you are born with the disposition, and the ability, under the use of instituted means, to be saved, and instructed in the way of life? In that sense is not grace primarily essential and antecedent of all good works? But when acts of obedience, which are good works, are enjoined, are they not also essential? Of course poor, frail, dependent creatures, without the privilege from the Creator could neither be, nor do any thing. Unless God opens the door you cannot enter his eternal kingdom; but he has not chosen forcibly to thrust you in; his sovereignty wills you voluntarily to enter by acts of obedience.

Surely it is entirely consistent to be entirely de-

pendent upon a privilege and at the same time be under the necessity of using available means to reach its object. In a shipwreck, unless you throw me the plank I must perish; but after the plank is thrown, I must seize it and exert my strength or I must still sink. I cannot be saved unless God so wills it, giving me the ability, nor can I be saved without good works, because that is made the condition.

I know that some will contend that the unlimited mercy and goodness of God, in his own good time, will save all, and that they have only to trust to his grace and supinely wait its coming; and many more will rest all hope upon their standard of good works, nay, in a life of negative virtue. But this is not bible teaching. We are plainly told that works cannot save us, and at the same time that we must work. In fact, that faith in the Saviour, confession and true repentance and prayer must be superadded. Otherwise a man, by giving largely to the poor, or the church, as some are taught and believe, would purchase the privilege of leading a life of sensuality.

There is a common source of error among men, making their own narrow, or clouded views of right and wrong, the standard of guilt, their own notions of what is amiable and good, the ground of divine acceptance. But do they not see, that they are thus presumptuously and self-righteously raising themselves to the platform of Deity? Human jus-

sice and human law, having no jurisdiction beyond the interests of society, have graded crime according to the injury sustained by society. With them, murder is a much greater offence than burglary, accordingly one is punished with the penitentiary, the other with death.

But in the all comprehensive eye of Omnipotence, who has made guilt consist in disobedience, may not burglary, being equally disobedient in his eye, be equal guilt?

When the decalogue was given, were we told that theft is a less offence than murder, in the view of heaven? But we are told that "without holiness no man will see the Lord." Drunkenness and other violations of the divine will, so venial among men, we are told, exclude from heaven. Where will man draw the true line of demarkation between such acts as will take him into, or exclude him from heaven? But Holy Writ has clearly drawn it for him, by declaring, "without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

How many will contend, that so long as they do not murder, break into houses, &c., heaven will receive them. But does the requirement, holiness, consist in restraining from crimes cognizable by human law, or offences to the code of human decorum? Or rather, is not a life holy exactly according to its degree of conformity to the teaching and spirit of christianity?

No reasonable man will despondingly give up to gloomy despair, supposing perfection essential to holiness; for that would be to exact an impossibility of imperfect beings. But let him, systematically using instituted means, strive to make the revealed will his rule of life, and when, through the infirmity of humanity surprised into sin, with deep humility and sincere repentance, breathe out prayer for pardon, and strength to walk erect. Surely we have only to settle in our minds the meaning of this holiness and we may cease to perplex ourselves with the question of grace or works, for we have the true standard of divine acceptance.

Mr. R. we should bare in mind that there is but one standard, and whenever we wander from it we are upon a wide sea of doubt, no better off than the heathen philosophers, and know not whither we are going. We are not rationally at liberty to regard one requirement of revelation reverently as authority, and another by the light of reason with indifference as unauthoritative, and if Holy Writ urges the necessity of good works, it as imperatively urges the necessity of a holy life.

But Mr. R., said the Dr., you need not have confined your censure to the gentler sex; see how folly, luxury and extravagance reign every where, in our dwellings, and strangely enough, in our very churches. Many seem to regard wealth, time and opportunity as dissociated from all obligation and

responsibility; that so long as one lives within the honest discharge of debt and negative innocence, that he may indulge in any amount of wasteful extravagance, or frivolous, selfish amusement. But since our Creator has given us a great work, requiring great diligence, steady advancement in holiness, to perform, and certain opportunities and in a certain allotted time, such must have very defective views of duty, their own temporal comfort, or the rewards and penalty of futurity.

I hold it as a principle, settled by divine teaching, that nothing which we do for pride, fashion, or ostentation, tending to injure or alienate from christianity ourselves or others, can be innocent.

Men, acknowledging the truths of Holy Writ, will neither study it for a rule of life, nor rigidly practice its principles. I often wonder why many attend church with so much regularity, seeing the only rational object, advancement in holiness, is so utterly disregarded. Can they delusively hope, that simply their bodily presence will be credited on the books of heaven?

Obviously the only corrective for all such defective views, is a diligent search of the inspired book, and when we know how few habitual students it has, we need not wonder at the lack of principle in the world. A man cannot innocently squander his means in ostentation, or sensual extravagance, because inspiration says, we must love our neighbor

as ourself, not put a stumbling block in his way; give as we have ability, and when we are told to advance in holiness, necessarily we are told to avoid whatever impedes that advancement.

Without stopping to inquire into the connection, observation sustains the declaration of Holy Writ, "we cannot serve God and mammon," and therefore as a general rule, and necessarily so, in proportion as we are devoted to worldliness, fashionable extravagance and luxury, we become alienated from piety.

The truth is, the spirit of christianity, and the spirit of the world are so opposite, that they can never, by any possibility, harmonize. To sustain which remark, I appeal to the personal experience of every christian lady in the sphere of fashion.

When I live in luxurious extravagance, vying to outdo my neighbor; am I not tempting some other weak brother, putting a stumbling block in his way? Is not this emulation among the wealthy, aped by others, the common cause of that disgraceful failure so familiar to our age.

Men, blind to the insufficiency of all the world calls pleasure, unmindful that contentment is wealth, strongly under the delusion that riches and happiness are synonymous, start on a scale of life corresponding, not with their means or prospects, but with their ambitious views, and unrestrained desires; to sustain which, they must be, out of the world's eye,

ever anxious and niggardly mean, and when difficulties come, pride, nor inclination will give way, and principle must; for to descend with honor and dignity from luxurious living, is among the severest trials of virtuous principle.

How many thus rob the mechanic, who makes their very ball room slippers? How many have been kept under the harrow of poverty and anxiety, struggling to keep up appearances, through the pride of an unprincipled, silly, worldly wife? How many a christian woman, anxiously seeking her heavenly inheritance, feels herself pulled back by a vain, thoughtless, ambitious husband? All this may seem strange and hard to the sensual mind, but, I can only answer, such is the sovereign will of Jehovah.

No, you cannot indulge thus, for you injure yourself, your neighbor, and your children. History refers the fall of nations to luxurious living, for in truth, it is never stationary, habit soon unconsciously converts luxuries into necessities, children start where parents stop, onward is the word; nations lose insensibly their virtue, and heaven's sure judgments overtakes them. Such is frail man.

Ah, Mr. R., there is no escaping the consequences of our frailty, but a rigid obedience to revelation.
My son,

“Ne'er with wits profane to range, be complaisance extended,
An atheist's laugh's a poor exchange for Deity offended.
When on life we are tempest driven, a conscience but a creaker,
A correspondence fixed in heaven, is sure a noble anchor.”

But, Dr., I remarked, do you not see in all this, how the poorer classes are employed, refinement and taste cultivated? It is only whilst ornamenting our globe, a judicious way of contributing to the poor, who must be supported.

Truly, replied the Dr., a pleasant salvo for the conscience of pride and ambition. Is it wise to cultivate refinement and taste at the expense of virtue? Pray, sir, will not the laboring poor be as judiciously and effectually supported, when Mr. B., instead of erecting a palace for himself, at the cost of \$100,000, builds with the same sum, ten houses? Then suppose he appropriates, to endure to the end of time, the rent of nine of the houses, to the comfort of poor widows and orphans, broken down and destitute by intemperate husbands. Mark the contrast: In the one case, an enormous sum sunk forever, with little gratification but to self, pride and vanity, not unmingled with injury to himself, his family and others, and whether he thinks so or not, the bible says so, offence to heaven: In the other case, extravagance discouraged, the individual advanced towards heaven, children reared in temperance, frugality, industry and benevolence; nine respectable citizens provided with dwellings, their own capital reserved to sustain trade, develop the resources of the country, improve it, and advance human happiness. Then extending your view down the long reach of time, see hundreds of the daugh-

ters of want and sorrow, relieved from pinching penury, their children reared in virtue. Then see this bright example, caught up by others through successive ages, till thousands upon thousands enjoy the blessing, and you have an achievement of benevolence, which may make the vaults of heaven itself reverberate with rejoicing.

In answer, I said, Dr., your scheme of benevolence must necessarily be short-lived, your principle is impoverished too, by its mischievous effects, for if all the rich were to appropriate their superfluous wealth in this way, your houses would soon be to let, and your principle extended will take away all motive to industry, enterprise and frugality; for if a man is not allowed to use in his own way, on his own pleasures, the earnings of his own toils, I wonder what he has to work for.

Ah Mr. R., replied the Dr., if you thus talk, people will soon take note that you live with Mr. Churchman.

The matter will regulate itself, any how it will be full time to meet the difficulty when it arrives, and the crisis, anticipated by your argument, is far off, and need in fact never arrive, for there will ever be endless modes of carrying out the principle, and only let it be carried out, till no more suffering poor remain, no more men to be evangelized, and we will relieve from the christian obligation imposed on wealth.

As to your Churchman argument, I will simply ask, is it possible for a poor frail mortal, enjoying his purest pleasure only when doing good, dependent for every breath he draws upon divine goodness, assured that he must be judged, and live or perish forever, according as he does his Maker's will, to have a higher, more powerful motive for industry, enterprize and frugality, than the privilege their exercise will confer of relieving distress, and pleasing his Creator? I remarked, Dr., surely you will not discountenance the homage of man erecting splendid temples in honor of the great Jehovah; and how shall we, without an appeal to pride, love of display, or ambition for city ornament, ever reach the flinty heart of proud and avaricious wealth, extort a contribution to christianity? Regarding me with solemn severity, he answered: Sir, I will never, I hope, compromise the christian, by descending to examine whether any end will justify the use of means in themselves wrong. But, sir, if we cannot extort money to advance human happiness, without encouraging what we condemn, we know that fine churches are not necessary, that we can do without them, and be free, consistently to preach down pride and luxury. The very fact that you cannot obtain the means without this improper appeal, is a strong argument against church extravagance. But, sir, can the hands of puny men exalt or glorify the Creator of the universe? Where is this mode of

paying homage revealed? Will not he whose throne is in the heavens, and the earth his footstool, say, "where is the house that ye build unto me? For all these things have my hands made, but to this man, will I look ever to him that is poor, of a contrite heart. You have chosen that in which I delight not."

Strange that men, forsaking reason and revelation, will hew out for themselves broken cisterns, which hold no water. Ambitious men have been flatteringly directed, as authority for this exhibition of pride and pomp, to Solomon's temple.

Jehovah did direct David to build a more durable tabernacle, but "a house of cedars he would not." Admitting there was a positive command, you must extend the analogy and perpetuate every Jewish right so instituted, to justify your argument. Where and when did the command issue to build the great St. Peter's of Rome?

God simply reveals his will to his intellectual creature, a probationist, then leaves him to his own course and its consequences. He told David to build a more durable tabernacle, and David would have a magnificent temple. He told David to be virtuous, and he was impure, and suffered; as well may you invoke inspiration in the one case as the other.

The model of the temple and David's impurity are equally his own work. Where is David direct-

give Solomon the medal or to prepare for the building? He was told that he should not build the house, and yet he commenced the work. God did not forbid any addition, and inasmuch as the essentials were there, his command was obeyed. But suppose it offensive as an act of negative disobedience, will you argue, strange, Jehovah's wrathful indignation did not prostrate the presumptuous temple? As well might you expect the lightning's flash called down by every high offence and heaven's artillery kept in one continuous roar! No, that is not God's way, he is long-suffering, allows rebel man to live and sin on, enjoying his blessings, and ultimately punishes by the silent, slow, but sure consequences indissolubly connected with every disobedience.

Jehovah no where tells us to withhold from his poor, leave waste places in his vineyard, bury millions forever, to rear great cathedrals in honor of him. He wants a broken and contrite heart, unspotted from the world; the fatherless and the widow visited in their affliction, not their substitute, a grand edifice with its unmeaning spire.

Yet how many will subscribe hundreds to build a palace church for the sensual gratification of their own eyes, sectarian pride, or a city ornament, then turning their backs upon the claims of the suffering, self-sacrificing missionary, or the down-trodden poor, delusively quiet conscience, under the idea that they

not only have discharged a debt, but have done an act entitling them to favor; as if a sinful creature could possibly oblige his Creator?

They should reflect that God is not to be cheated, "that he who killeth an ox (for sacrifice without piety) is in God's eye as he who slew a man."

Assuming that it is man's duty and wisdom to do his Creator's will; that will, once understood, and we surely have a plain, unerring rule, coextensive with all our relations to heaven and earth. If we are sure that a thoughtless life of pleasure, barren of piety, self-denials and good deeds is agreeable to this will, let us pursue it with appropriate energy.

If we are sure that God will be more pleased with a magnificent church edifice, than with having suffering humanity relieved, the Redeemer's kingdom extended, or ourselves, by good works, perfected in holiness, then forgetful of all else, let us concentrate genius, influence and means to such objects.

When there are no more of God's poor, no more requiring gospel light, then, and not till then, let wealth be diverted from its legitimate course, to pomp, pride and unauthorized expressions of homage.

It has been triumphantly asked "will you build palaces for your dwellings and stint the splendor of God's temple?" David lived in a house of cedars, yet God would not have one.

But such a question could only arise in a mind confused as to the object of a church. If it is designed

as a sacrament to honor Jehovah, a pious offering of reverence, then I leave you to search in the only rule of christian conduct for authority. If, as I assert, you find no such authority, and the object is simply in order to obey the injunction, that men forsake not assembling themselves together for public profession of the Redeemer, prayer and edification, then the object suggests the building to be substantial, commodious, with due regard to decency and propriety, excluding every thing which may interfere with its objects.

Your church, instead of following at the heels of pride, fashion, or extravagance, should, like your minister, stand in your midst, by its modesty, plainness and simplicity, a silent, steady rebuke to the surrounding folly, presumption and wastefulness.

When the sons of wealth and pleasure are called upon the last, great solemn day to man, horror stricken, under a sense of their short-comings, to give in an account of their stewardship, and point for justification to their magnificent churches, will not the Judge of all the earth, unrolling the scroll inscribed with the illy requited labors of his starving missionary and other faithful servants, pointing to the poor, once houseless, ragged and wretched under the shadow of yon proud steeple, and also pointing to the gospel-neglected heathen, will he not inquire, where did you find the command for such an expression of homage? All I asked was fidelity to

me and kindness to man. Depart! I never knew you!! With feelings of awe, which blanched our cheeks and sealed our lips, we for some moments, thought silently, reverently and profoundly upon death, judgment and eternity!!

At last, Miss C. asked the Dr. if he had read Dr. McCulloh's book on the credibility of the scriptures. Instantly the color returned to his face, with an air of consequence, self-sufficiency and professional pride, creditable to the Bishop of Canterbury, he tartly replied, no Miss, no, nor would I advise any of my people to read it. The Dr. has had no theological training. What would you think of my writing on law or medicine? I understand the author was educated a physician, but early entered a very arduous responsible office for twenty-five years, and upon resignation was immediately chosen to preside over one of our largest banks. How could such a man be qualified to write on so deep a subject as theology? Preposterous!

Her generous nature, aroused by a sense of wrong to the author, Miss C. urged, if learning, Dr., is essential to qualify for preaching the gospel, and I presume the same is required to instruct men from the pulpit, as the press, then, alas, for the hearers of many of your seminary-trained preachers! But christianity, the subject of the book, is not theology, comprehending opposite dogmas. You told us truly that religion was a great intellectual principle, not

an abstraction for ingenious men to speculate upon, a rule of life, something practical, to be found in the bible, connecting man, God and eternity.

From your own account, the author must be a sensible, intelligent, educated gentleman. I think such a man of a literary turn, and studious habits, may have found time thoroughly to study his bible, and all the lights upon the subject, and even dip a little into theology. Have a care, Dr., how you too exclusively claim for the clergy, unction and authority to expound the bible, or father will claim you as kin to the *true* church.

But, seriously, I cannot think it just to the author, nor to the community, thus to condemn as contraband in the mart of literature, not even to be fairly examined, a work of such a writer; a book, I am told, with the love of truth stamped upon its face, which, whilst it triumphantly vindicates christianity, places its truths beyond all cavil, striking boldly too, at the root of all sectarianism, inviting christians to unite harmoniously in one great fold of love, under the one Good Shepherd.

The worthy doctor soon took leave, when Miss C., her countenance glowing with generous indignation, not to be suppressed, observed, ah! Mr. R.,

“With mean complaisance ne'er betray your trust,
Nor ever be so civil as to be unjust.”

I could not help gently rebuking that truly estimable good man. Alas! we are indeed, the best of

at, but poor creatures. Now, there goes one of the most pious, zealous, enlightened servants in his master's vineyard, yet see, how pride of opinion and station, an aversion to acknowledge himself wrong, once committed to a certain set of opinions, can warp the judgment, chill the kindness and stultify the moral sense of even such a man!

True to its descent from infinite wisdom and goodness, commending itself to every fair understanding, there is not one impulse, one emotion in unison with what is good and noble, even among men, which holy writ does not sanction, not one avenue to the human heart it has left unguarded, yet see, in this good man, the most wakeful vigilance cannot always secure from surprisal.

I have received a general idea of the book, and respect (with all respect, for they are but frail men) the clergy, generally, without having read it, have an inkling of its character; are unwilling to countenance a book bearing a little too hard upon established opinions supported by authority they revere, yet too honest openly to censure the book without a careful reading, they superciliously give the go-by to a work, which I strongly suspect will mark an era in the history of theology, will become a classic and text book.

Vain and impotent attempt to suppress the truth! In this age and country, every book must soon find its level.

I understand it is a work calculated to do much good, liberalising the religious world, disencumbering religion of much worse than useless speculation, restoring its original purity and simplicity, that it indicates the author a learned, honest, strong minded, sound thinking, christian man, writing under a full sense of his responsibility; possessed of great analytic powers, which enable him, resolving on argument into its elementary principles, to go to the bottom of every subject, exposing the exact value of opinions. Surely, to discountenance such a book from such a writer, not because we can refute it, but because we do not like it, is neither philosophical, generous, nor honest. I hold the clergy as a body of intellectual good men, zealously laboring for the happiness of mankind; essential to spread christianity, and promote piety, entitled to all honor, confidence and affection; not that light, girlish adulation, the offering of a silly mind, but the honest esteem of a sound mind and upright heart. While I strongly contend for the legitimacy and value of lay preaching, I hold the clergy, elevated by their noble vocation, unsullied with worldly intercourse, most appropriately set apart to administer religious ordinances. Standing in our midst bright examples of holiness, a common centre, whither the sympathies, confidence and affection of all tend, an invaluable bond of union. But as divinely appointed, authoritatively to expound my bible, fetter my mind,

confuse my understanding—No, never. In
solemn sense of my obligation and responsibility, in
matters of conscience, to God alone, I shall read the
book, sir. Say, dear uncle, will you have me, whilst
tender, rupture the cords, drawing me towards other
sects, so carelessly thrown around me by the reason-
ing, gentleness and loveliness of Miss Churchman?

Affectionately,

JOHNNY RAW.

TO THE REV. MR. INTOLERANT.

DEAR NEPHEW,

A thoughtful man, familiar with care and sorrow, when calmly contemplating his mysterious existence, will ponder with solemnity these very serious truths, "there is but one step between me and death." "Man's days are as grass, as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth, for the wind passeth over it and it is gone, and the place thereof shall know it no more."

Surely to one thus gravely-reflecting, the thought of being forever in heaven, "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest," should soothe his sorrows, animate his hopes, and stimulate his efforts; and then the reflection, "to die and go one knows not where," should be full of inexpressible gloom and awe. But this rational man, with such eloquent persuasives to newness of life, will arise from such reflections, and under the scourge of conscience, too, blindly and recklessly pursue his headlong course of sensuality and disobedience: yet, this strangely impracticable being you propose to dedicate your life to turn from his folly and snatch from endless ruin! A mighty work! Demanding all your physical and moral energy, truly a noble vocation.

But, since we never more surely secure our own happiness, than when busy making others happy, allow me to congratulate you, upon having embarked in the great arduous cause of mankind. Every individual will have moments, when the reflection will be forced upon him, whence all this trouble and sorrow among men: and I have no doubt you have thus most naturally reasoned. The evidences of a great first cause from whom my existence came, and upon whom I am dependent, are too conclusive to be resisted; and instinctive consciousness, with divine revelation, too plain to be questioned, tell me I owe an allegiance to this great first cause, not with impunity to be violated. I feel that I have passions and propensities illicitly indulged, necessarily bringing trouble upon myself and others, I feel again that I have powers and propensities, wisely directed and encouraged, greatly controlling all this personal evil. I know, that I have never violated a divine precept, without some form of suffering. In fact, that in all ages, wrong appears to be indissolubly connected with suffering to individuals, and also to nations, for I see the folly and wickedness of one nation punished by carrying misery to others, and whilst we censure the folly of statesmen, the ambition of rulers, the brutality of the soldier; that they are only the instrumentalities of that great eternally fixed law—sin everywhere produces misery. Yes, with the same cer-

tainty that a stone cast into the air, falls again, because they are equally the inevitable result of an unalterable law of Omnipotence.

I see the friend of mankind mourning over the abuse of power, and the horrors of war; look with jealousy upon kingly power, and anxiously upon their support, the immense standing armies which, besides abstracting from the mass of productive labor, tax the industry of others, keep up national jealousy, open a field for ambition, and give occasion for bloody strife, and demoralize the world. But he has not probed deep enough.

The truth is, the moral condition of the world, or in other words, its sinful state, makes them both necessary evils. Remove them, you would soon have every where civil war, anarchy and the extreme of misery; for there must be a certain amount of intelligence and christianity to leaven the whole mass, before a nation is capable of self-government, and whether this requisite is possessed by any nation in Europe, is questionable.

Should our own country, under its present circumstances, with the antagonism of North and South, so recklessly fomented by fanatics and demagogues, be thrown back to the political condition at the close of our revolutionary war, by a dissolution of the Union, could we hope for anything better?

Under present circumstances, military despotism, hateful in itself, is a mercy, and the political phi-

lanthropist may cease to hope for any European government, better than a monarchy sustained by bayonets, till the purifying stream of christianity has cleansed the great augean stable of the moral world.

Seeing, then, that christianity, sternly rebuking all that men admit to be wrong, elevating and stimulating to all that is noble and good, is the only and great counteracting agent of sin and suffering, that of course the purest patriot, the best philanthropist is he who most zealously promotes its diffusion, therefore I will enter the christian ministry.

But, for the faithful and efficient discharge of duty, I would have you raise yourself, by solemn reflections, upon the sovereignty of Omnipotence, your individual insignificance and utter helplessness, the momentous interests of the unseen world, the weal or woe of never-dying souls; above the low considerations, frivolities, pleasures, honors or business, so unduly absorbing mankind, to a just appreciation of the importance, dignity and responsibility of your vocation, and till deeply impressed with the very serious truth, "He that winneth souls is wise."

I entreat you, never for one moment lose sight of the great objects of your mission. I would have you frown upon every thing in doctrine, polity and forms, no matter how strongly entrenched behind sectarian feeling, fashion, system or authority, tending to impede the Redeemer's kingdom.

Whenever your feelings as a churchman, prompt to jealousy, illiberality or unkindness, be assured, there is some unacknowledged fiendish feeling, wearing its garb, but not akin to christianity, secretly at work, therefore heed not its suggestions; especially guard against a sectarian spirit, which so easily personates religion; exact of no man's faith or pursuit, anything which is not clearly revealed, allowing the most ample, reasonable field in matters of doubt, to private interpretation.

Of course, you will have nothing to do with high church nor low; partizanship in religion has ever shown itself unchristian, and will only counteract your efforts to be useful. Party spirit, whether in the garb of politics or religion, is a malicious, unprincipled, fiendish spirit, blinding to truth, justice and duty, depressing the worthy, elevating the bad, giving consequence and dignity to men, who without it, would have little more moral existence than the ox that grazes, dragging down to the very dirt, the standard of official worthiness and dignity, till office ceases to be the legitimate badge of honor, or of moral worth. Yet, how strangely potent over gigantic and even virtuous minds: how often have we deplored a great man who

"Born for the universe, narrowed his mind,
And to party give up, what was meant for mankind."

But let us urge a choice of public men, based upon excellence and fitness of character, and you

will hear the cry, "principles and not men;" yes, and how much do we partizans know about political economy, or the complicated business of politics, or comprehend, in all their wide relations, matters of policy often inaccessible to the profoundest thinkers; we see the greatest minds marshalled on either side, and results constantly contradicting the boldest assertions of the most towering intellects.

In fact, however humbling the admission to republican pride, we, the people, are poor judges in all political matters beyond the jurisdiction of our moral sense; we can see whether legislation is morally right or wrong; we are capable of estimating individual character, beyond this we need not go, if we do, demagogues, in spite of us, will lead us by the nose; for, from the necessity of the case, we must confide in some one's better judgment, and in whom more safely than those we know to be good and wise.

That the virtuous and intelligent, spurning the senseless, slavish trammels of party, with a single eye to the elevation of good and intelligent men, wisely to govern the country, banded under the spirit of patriotism, would hold the balance of power, I cannot doubt.

But, this most reasonable, just, and material influence, seduced by our great domestic fiend, we merge in party; can any man doubt if our legislative bodies were selected simply upon excellence

of character, and fitness for office, unpledged absolutely to nothing but a conscientious discharge of trust, that the average of our legislation would be far better, than when placed in the hands of selfish, angry, vindictive party pledged legislators? Would we hear so much of that corruption, now gnawing at the very vitals of the republic? Would champagne, oyster suppers, or the more substantial bribe of gold, be our legislators; or would our halls of congress be perverted to an arena for political gladiators?

We see, constantly that religious feeling is but too easily merged in party, and surely the church is not the place for the hurrah, and the throwing up of caps.

It would be well for christians to reflect, in order to correct the evil, that human pride—yes, human pride, the most common, but least suspected spell which binds man in durance vile to sin—human pride is the element which holds the solution of the potency for evil of party spirit, and when fully developed in party rage, neither friendships, nor patriotism, nor religion's self too sacred for sacrifice. Beware of this insidious fiend urging to unholy alliances with the world, nay with the sword.

Considering the age when they were adopted, the spirit of compromise required the church, just emerging from the grossest religious abuses and corruptions, the general mind clogged with error and pre-

justice, if there was not occasion for reformation in your doctrine, polity and forms, would be strange indeed.

Acknowledging the expediency of system, we should not allow it to protect error, to enfeeble the sound by retaining the unsound, this is 'lopping through life instead of removing a diseased limb.

Many will adhere to a present known to prevent a possible greater evil, shrink from an obviously important change, lest they do worse. But under a determination to do what we believe is right, we must exercise a sound discretion in such cases, leaving events to God.

Whilst there is a latitudinarianism in politics, which admits of jacobinism, and in religion which embraces many extravagances not justified by any fair contribution of holy writ, there is, also, in both an unwise conservatism, which not discriminating between the true, the false, the innocent and the noxious, tends to mischief, to keep the world stationary, by perpetrating what human progress has long since repudiated.

It is no less true than strange, that such is the inveteracy of human pride and prejudice, that mankind have never been known to give up, without a struggle, even to the high behest of reason, doctrines and usages consecrated by long time's associations.

Only a few years since it was proposed by one of

England's purest men, and greatest lawyers, to abolish the punishment with death, for stealing a pocket handkerchief, when the house of commons was gravely told that such a measure would endanger the whole criminal law of England!! Punishment for treason required the criminal to be quartered, and his bowels to be thrown in his face. When the same great and good man proposed to abolish the peculiarly disgusting feature of the punishment, the attorney general of enlightened England, in an enthusiastic spirit of conservatism, exclaimed: Are the safeguards, the ancient landmarks, the bulwarks of the constitution to be thus hastily removed!!

Such is the effect of a dread of change and the law of habit in concealing the folly, and deformity of things; such is unwise conservatism, which often refuses to reform defects and abuses in government, till revolution, bloodshed and ruin do what justice and good sense should have done.

Religious principle, fixed by the clear, decided teaching of holy writ, cannot require, nor admit of any change; but in all its externals, all mere doctrines of inference, as the light of knowledge, or experience corrects mistakes, and suggests, with altered circumstances, better modes of advancing the Redeemer's kingdom, religion may legitimately be progressive, because such matters appertain to human reason, and are, therefore, necessarily subject to error, and the influence of clearer light.

If we only wisely discriminate between what is clearly revealed, and what is only inferred, between the vital substance and the externals, between the jewel and the casket, we may advance as boldly in religious improvement as in any branch of science.

In your efforts, have a care lest the ardor of youthful zeal, in a cause of such momentous interest, a too strong confidence that you *must* be right, may lead to rudeness, injustice and oppression. Manfully stand up in your place in convention with a meek and christian spirit, make suggestions, but wait patiently, kindly, with due respect to age, authority and the opinions of all, till by earnest, modest perseverance, you acquire an accession of strength equal to your objects.

Other denominations may well learn a lesson of wisdom, kindness and charity, from the amiable society of Friends, who, aware that the truth is often with the minority, govern not by majorities, but by unanimity.

Surely there must be something wrong in a system which would unchurch and silence such men as Bunyan, Summerfield and their like. Can we rationally suppose if fighting against the Redeemer, God's blessing would so signally have marked their labors? A system which would admit ignorant, worldly men to its offices, exclude others eminent for piety, knowledge and talent, must be defective.

If eminent good has been done without Episcopal

ordination, and there is no scriptural prohibition against good men without it doing good by preaching the gospel, what is the great value of Episcopacy as estimated in your church? Allow me to suggest in view of the fact, that ministers, not episcopally ordained, have, perhaps, done as much for religious advancement as the clergy of your apostolic church; whether, as they were chosen for a specific object, to be witnesses of Christ's sayings and doings, and impart them to the world; and especially as their distinctive feature, miraculous power, never was transmitted, it was not designed the apostles should have no successors, exclusively and successively appointed to instruct mankind; and whether, supposing it could be positively shown, that the present Episcopal ministers are in a direct line of descent from Peter, it can be of any value to the cause of religion, of any binding obligation.

Is mere apostolic usage, unbacked by divine precept, ever binding as a rule of faith or practice, throughout all ages and under all circumstances? Surely there must be room for reform in a church which will *impede* the Redeemer's kingdom by forbidding her clergy from preaching in other churches, unless encumbered with their own, including pious men of great power from her own, by forbidding their people from mingling in the devotions of others, and from an angel preaching to them.

I would advise you in your own ministrations, and freely mingling with all classes of christians, to evince the least possible value for the externals of every sect. The more exclusively intellectual and spiritual religion is made, the better, for men will delusively take shelter under its externals, and flatter themselves they are religious, and so long as religion is thus restricted, it will leave untouched that depravity of heart, whence issue all the folly and extreme worldliness, so often seen in men professing, by outward observance, christianity.

Strongly impressed with the importance of christian harmony, that the sense of the momentous interests of eternity, and a fraternal feeling, elevating the mind and heart above the small concerns of time and sect, should unite all into one harmonious body, concentrating talent, zeal, influence and money to promote the Redeemer's kingdom, I would raise you from the narrow sphere prescribed by church limits, and place you on the great broad common platform of christianity.

My remarks may be offensive to you, and some of your friends, for I am aware that so blended and identified are the decisions of our judgment and pride, with long cherished opinions, or long used practices, that when they are assailed, without the exercise of no inconsiderable degree of magnanimity, or self-denial, it is hard to keep the temper. But all truth-loving, liberal-minded men, should

adopt for their motto, "magna est veritas et prevalabit."

Does not the christian religion stand upon a broader, surer basis, since the attacks of Hume, Gibbon, Payne and others? Her friends rallied to her rescue, and most triumphant was the victory.

What there must be important doctrine and forms, acting antagonistically among christians, cannot be denied. Surely all cannot be right. Let all, then, with a proper spirit, come up to the great work of a general reformation among sects, that one great noble catholic spirit may prevail.

Let us reflect, that ignorance, prejudice, pride and sectarian feeling, constitute the great obstacles to the light of truth, struggling for admission into every mind; that they are to be removed only by knowledge, the force of reason, and kindness, and before such an alliance they must give way, that kindness must lead the van, for it is perhaps the most potent principle in controlling mankind. It is the great moral lever, with it, like the lever of Archimedes, you only want a fulcrum, and that the necessities of every man's nature constantly furnish to move at will, that little moral world, the human heart.

Obviously, mankind, neither individually nor as nations, have as yet fairly appreciated the power of this great law of kindness, or it would prevail.

were in the council chamber of state, as well as more extensively sweeten the intercourse of private life. How often would it prevent national collision, and even war, or soften its cruel severities. When Fabricius returned to King Pyrrhus, his treacherous physician, foul with treason and murderous intent, hostility ceased. When General Greene restored to the retreating enemy, their captured medical staff, there was an immediate response to the generous act, in a relaxation of British severity towards our prisoners in Charlestown. Who, that loves the memory of the good and great Washington, does not lament, in the case of Andre, that the kindness of his nature, did not overrule the stern requirements of military usage, that the soldier ruled the man? Had this chivalrous youth, by nature noble, by education refined, forced by the conventional morality of military men to identify himself with the baseness of treason, so revolting to his feelings, been condemned, and then sent home on parole to gladden the heart of a widowed mother, how would such an act, so little in unison with war's hellish spirit, have heightened the surpassing brilliancy of even Washington's great name! But who can measure its happy moral influence in all its wide extent? Could such an act of godlike mercy have made one traitor, or one spy more? No, but arousing every good and magnanimous feeling, astounding by its moral sublimity, it

would have demonstrated, to an ungenerous foe, a most depressing truth; that a lofty confidence in the virtue and patriotism of our army, and the justice of our cause, could allow a savage military usage to be dispensed with, a splendid example of magnanimity and mercy given, which would have shamed the enemy, to go and do likewise. How would such an act of generosity have called forth the admiration and sympathy of the world towards America, drawn to the cause of freedom, all the generous spirits of the age? How many more La Fayette and Pulaskis would it have called to our aid? Contrasted with England's cruelty to our people, wanton waste of private property, her foul imprisonments, Hessian and savage alliances, how would it have told on the feelings of the people at home and abroad?

Proud of a cause signalized by such a noble act, it would have done more to invigorate patriotism, than the fervid eloquence of Henry, to excite indignation than the withering denunciations of Chatham, to induce peace than the most brilliant victory.

But, what an illimitable range does this great law of kindness claim! If unrestrained by human passions, purifying, sanctifying, elevating, it would advance the soul of man, yet on earth, to the very confines of heaven itself. The fulfilment of prophecy, when "the spear is to be turned into the pruning-

hook, and nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," shall only be its limits, it shall only end in a millennial state of universal innocence, peace and happiness."

Perhaps, in the whole circle of duties enjoined by Holy Writ, there are none so hard to the natural man, as, to do good to all men, bless them which curse you, meekly submit to injury, recompense to no man evil for evil, overcome evil with good.

Well, but one will say, does christianity exact the universality of this law of kindness, to the putting an end to all kinds and degrees of resistance, to unyielding submission to all sorts of imposition? Am I to suffer unresistingly a ruffian to assail my life, or that of those still dearer to me than my own? This appeal to all our natural instincts, sense of justice and reason, the world has never learned to reject, or never will, so long as man continues M.S.D.

The duties of kindness, forbearance and submission to wrong, no man can deny, are enjoined by Holy Writ, but in what qualified sense they are to be taken, where to commence and when to cease, I leave for nicer casuists to decide. All I ask, is, their extension to the point, where men claim them in reason to end by their impracticability, or inconsistency with social existence, and even and then, what imagination can compass the blessing to mankind?

Controlled, then, by this potent principle, let us,

instead of exciting or offending sectarian pride or jealousy, by avoiding each other, because we hold different views, mingle freely and cordially to discuss without anger, simply seeking truth, all that relates to religion. Compare doctrines with Holy Writ, and where they will not bear that test, cast them away as so much trash, encumbering christian progress, foisted upon the world by men, frail as ourselves; and when conviction cannot be reached, leave man, till greater light will show the truth, to serve God in his own way, for the servant to his own master standeth or falleth, and to coerce, and punish such, in any way, is only to usurp the sceptre of heaven.

Religion, in its love and simplicity, as it came from the divine lips, breathing reverence to God, peace on earth, and good will to man, could never have raised the arm of persecution. No, theology, well called by Lord Bolingbroke, "Pandora's box" from whence have issued all these dogmas, so fatal to the world's peace, is fairly chargeable with all religious wars and divisions; and the sooner these dogmas are swept away, the better.

With merely inferred doctrines, as practical christians, we have little to do, and no matter with what an imposing air of authority, with what apparent sincerity of conviction, doctrines are announced, let us test them by the divine standard. Where then, will we find any of the artificially elaborated

church systems of our day? Could any individual man, left to himself, who has never heard of either the Roman Catholic, or the Protestant Episcopalian systems, or the creeds of other denominations, ever deduce, at this day, any one of them, in all their distinctive doctrines and rituals, from the Bible?

Then, they must be the work of man, and why so essential that they can never relax to accommodate the views of each other, and promote the Redeemer's kingdom? Could he find there, unaided by theological glasses, the various distinctive doctrines of popery and protestantism, apostolic succession, original sin, preventing grace, infant baptism, baptismal regeneration or even the doctrine of the trinity, as essential matters of faith, so plainly taught, as that he who runs may read, and many others which have mystified and complicated so simple a matter as christianity?

Apostolic succession was convenient as a basis, permanently to establish a privileged order in the church, original sin to account for moral evil, preventing grace to save man from predestined damnation, and infant baptism, by its regenerating power, to prevent infant ruin.

I assert, infant baptism was a human invention, because no where alluded to in Holy Writ, and where are we left to infer any other divinely instituted ordinance? Our opponents feel secure of vic-

tory when they only bring forward their imagined triumphantly sweeping argument, "The Apostles ought to have understood the Saviour's teaching and infants were baptized under their sanction." But I ask, where do they find the fact stated in Holy Writ?

Planting my foot upon scripture, I deny the apostolic sanction. It is only a doctrine of daring inference from the general directions, "go baptize all nations," &c.; "suffer little children to come unto me," &c., and from the statement that whole households were baptized. But was there ever a more forced interpretation?

With regard to the baptism of households. Suppose a physician was to direct a pupil to vaccinate a family, would he include those marked with the small pox, and those previously vaccinated, or only such as were suitable subjects? Why, more in the one case than the other, interpret the divine command against reason? Moreover, "the manifest inference is, that infant baptism was not a recognized institution of the christian church, down to the commencement of the fifth century."*

But in the absence of all positive command, let us again appeal to common sense.

In every case where baptism is mentioned, an open profession of Christ or repentance, preceded the ceremony. How could the apostles teach christ-

* See Credibility of the Scriptures, vol. 2, p. 136.

tianity to infants, how could they profess or repent, never having sinned? May we not infer adult baptism only designed from the generally recognized object of baptism? Only extreme men, and with no better foundation than their own conceit, view it as a regenerating rite. Others regard it as simply an initiating ordinance.

Can we suppose that Christ desired mere nominal members of his church, without any intellectual recognition of him and his church? If so, as well might brutes and stones be baptized.

Infant baptism has been compared to circumcision, and by many supposed to substitute that rite, but the one had no more to do with the other, than it has with the Eucharist. Circumcision was clearly a positive divine institution, and where we are not told to the contrary, may reasonably infer, was designed as a national mark.

Upon the subject of baptism, holy writ is entirely silent; one was exclusively confined to males, the other designed for both, one without any object designed, the other clearly designed as initiatory to the church, the one a political, (if religious females would not have been excluded,) the other a religious rite, the one implied an intellectual appreciation of the object, the other total unconsciousness. Reason tells us that baptism could only have been designed as an open confession of Christ before men, as the great head of the church and Redeemer of mankind, to which infancy was incompetent.

I contend, then, that infant baptism is purely a gratuitous doctrine of inference, yet we see even at this day, with no better foundation, with what hot haste the breathless messenger runs for the parson to baptize the dying infant, and see, alas! if the scene was not too affectingly solemn, how ridiculously venerable age, learning, genius, and even piety, descend, with solemn gravity, to sanction an idle ceremony and bring an infidel sneer upon christianity.

Nor is the doctrine free from a more serious charge. Who has not seen amiable, nay, promising individuals, strongly attached from birthright, early associations and ties of blood, to a particular church, driven away, and, perhaps, irreclaimably soured with religion, by a discipline based upon infant baptism? ~~The church, too, throwing itself into the embarrassing dilemma, of admitting, so far as the infant is concerned, the ceremony useless, or of denying to little innocences the benefit of the ordinance, on account of parental delinquency.~~

This is one of those remarkable cases, where bold assumption to sustain doctrine, has been recklessly forced upon the world by theology, through the submissive, unquestioning credulity of mankind, (so much advocated by some in religious matters,) firmly rooted in their faith, dividing the christian fold, and to be sustained by even fire and sword.

If men, with the lamp of revelation in their hand,

unaided by dogmatical teaching, would simply reflect and reason, how much embarrassing error would disappear! Where is the clear unclouded doctrine of apostolical succession revealed? Where is the evidence that the Holy Ghost has ever been imparted from any pretended apostolical successor? Has any bishop ever professed a consciousness of possessing this power? Think you that Paul, unconscious of professing it, would have ever dared to pretend imparting the Holy Ghost? or has any priest ever acknowledged its reception, in any renewal of his nature, or increase of power after the imposition of episcopal hands? Are they not all the same men, in every respect, as they were one hour before the ordination? When the bishop, at ordination, says, receive ye the Holy Ghost, in the language of the Bishop of Oxford, is it not, "the most blasphemous frivolity?" Will any one have the hardihood to assert that this language is only supplicatory? "With the Saviour, from whom it is borrowed, it was an authoritative communication of the spirit. If prayer, why does the bishop stand and the humble priest only kneel? Why has not a deacon as well as an ordained priest, authority to remit sins? Is it because the Holy Ghost has not been imparted?" No, the prelatie language is not prayer. Where then is the authority for a dogma which only complicates religion and divides christians, to the great prejudice of a common cause?

Perhaps, in our country, as far as discourtesy goes, no christian denomination feels, in concentrated force, to the same degree the spirit of intolerance, as the Unitarian. See him standing among us an isolated christian! What denomination sympathizes with him? So far is this silly, unchristian spirit carried, that he has not only been denied the privilege to stand up before members of other churches, convened for a benevolent object, and invoke a blessing upon charitable effort, but it has been extended to the very bricks and mortar? When kindly invited by a Unitarian minister to worship in his church, some censuring their pure and liberal minded minister who accepted the courtesy, have refused to worship within its walls.

But, fellow travellers to a great and awful day of account, where have you learned it to be your duty to resent indignity to heaven! Has not God told you, "withhold your wrath, vengeance is mine; to love the brethren, judge not lest you be judged." What right, in the name of reason, have you to proscribe the Unitarian, reverently praying for heaven's blessings? Who made you his judge, when to his own master he standeth or falleth? Do you not see that yours is the very spirit of the hateful inquisition, "fetching ladders from hell to scale heaven," honoring God at the burning stake?

Can there be any legitimate ground for exclusion from christian fraternity, but a denial in doctrine,

and practice of Christ, the Messiah? To our understanding, he is revealed the very God; and when a set of good men, acknowledging Christ as the great founder and head of the church on earth, heaven sent to reveal and instruct by precept and example in the divine will, acknowledging Holy Writ as their rule of faith and life, seeking to do God's will as they best understand it, because they cannot acknowledge the Trinity, are we to denounce them as enemies to man and God?

Admitting the Unitarian to be in error, I do aver, in the name of reason, justice and christianity, that he is entitled to all the sympathy and kind courtesy due to the credit of honest convictions, and a common interest in a common religion. We should reflect that the harshly judged Unitarian has not wickedly, perversely, or wilfully rejected conviction; he is Socinian under the sanction of great names from the accident of education, or unconscious misconstruction of Holy Writ, foreign to all irreverent feeling to our common Saviour. He prays to the world's great sovereign, with the same reverential awe and faith in his word, looks to the Redeemer, submitted in his own way, for his salvation, and manifests the same love to his neighbor.

Is there any argument in coercion? Will harsh denunciation convince of error, or reclaim men? I ask not for doctrinal fusion, for the sanction of doctrines disapproved of; nor will courteous and kindly

intermingling give it. I do not care for uniformity in externals, nor even modes of faith, but unity of spirit, the Saviour's badge of discipleship, love to all the brethren.

A Methodist, when most convenient, will unite in prayer with an Episcopal congregation. But does he thereby recognize apostolic succession or baptismal regeneration? Will any one contend that the kind and courteous conduct here urged will impede the progress of true religion? As well tell me, that to-morrow's glorious sun, rising in majestic brilliancy, will shroud the world in darkness!

One great cause of bigotry and intolerance is, that mankind have ever been, to a great degree, a priest-ridden race. We have been too indolent or timid, to read and think for ourselves, and being ignorant we have been prejudiced, bigoted and intolerant.

Imagination and credulity from early times have invested, without any scriptural authority, the clergy with a mysterious personal sacredness, a divine authority, ex-officio, to understand and expound the scriptures. This notion has had the effect of fixing the dogmas of men by authority, the query ever being have "any of the rulers believed?" At the same time it has not only in their own minds released them from the obligation of becoming enlightened christians, but from religious duty. Hence with so many the mode of religion is the mere pre-

judice of education. Hence the impression with many, that laymen cannot understand the plain essential teachings of Holy Writ, that there must be some priestly interpreter, some spiritual medium, who must rap for us before we can understand our bible.

But when called upon to answer for continuing in doctrines and usages hostile to the Redeemer's kingdom, think you, with the bible in your house, and the privilege of reading, it will be any justification to say, my bishop, my priest or parson taught me so?

There is no divinely constituted clergy to construe your bible; you must search the scriptures for your own faith. The world was ages getting rid of the divine right of profligate kings to trample on it, but it is now banished the world forever, and the same doom, at no distant day, awaits the divine right of theologians to dictate religion to mankind.

If any set of men will assert special qualification, by inspiration, or infallibility, to perpetuate or establish any system, arrogantly exacting unqualified assent to all its speculations, expoundings and externals, let them show their credentials; no inferred traditional dogma of apostolical succession will do, but immunity from human frailty, or miraculous power. The truth is, men generally choose their mode of religion under some early bias, before they are *really* christians, then viewing all others through

the medium of long cherished prejudice and bitter feeling, their pride, inclination, and all their associations identified with the church of their early adoption, instead of, like rational beings, reading and reflecting to find the wisest system, they use both their bible and their reason to fortify their position, right or wrong. Now, a man acting rationally, will, as regards all this, "put on the new man;" he will hold the church of his *mechanical* adoption in strict abeyance till he has honestly tested its claims on his preference; and surely an intellectual, honest man will take that system he finds most in accordance with the plain written truths and spirit of the bible, and which reason and experience show is best calculated to secure the great ends of religion—make men holy here, and happy hereafter, in other words, advance the Redeemer's kingdom.

Every honest minded man who will calmly look at the matter, must see that religious dissensions (not differences of opinion held in humility and charity) seduce the mind from the search of truth and true piety, confirming error; that bigotry, petty sectarian jealousy, intolerance and political persecution spring from them; that they engender a harsh, censorious spirit; lead off from self-examination, and that individual culture of the heart, which, lifting the curtain that hides our own frailty, suggests humility and kind forbearance, that in the rancorous zeal to promote sectarian views, genuine religion is

lost sight of, men, under the delusion that *it* is religion, substituting party zeal for holy living.

Instead of strengthening antagonistical principles, let us aim to draw christian men more together. As religion is an individual matter between them and their God, urge men to reflect upon the natural, reasonable right and duty to think for themselves. In short, let us labor to remove religion from speculations, sectarian expoundings and all externals, restoring it, where its great founder placed it, under the safe keeping of Holy Writ. Let us urge men before going to war, to examine well, whether certain doctrines and usages, stumbling blocks in the way of so many, have a decided scriptural authority, are really so vitally important, as to be relentlessly and recklessly adhered to, at the cost of christian disunion.

Perhaps there is no more palpable mischief from an unchristian, senseless, sectarian spirit, than is seen in most country neighborhoods. See it divide a community, hardly capable of supporting properly one church, into small religious companies, reciprocally jealous, harshly judging rivals, each niggardly supporting a poor starveling minister, who, in his turn, instead of triumphantly and joyously leading a happy flock through the green pastures of christianity to the way of life everlasting, leaves them to starve by the way. Surely the true christian course is, not to distract still more, but to harmonize the discordant

materials by the exercise of kind forbearance, mutual concessions and a generous spirit of charity, to some wisely concerted scheme to secure the services of a high-toned, gifted minister, according to the views of the *majority*, no matter whether Churchmen, Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist or what, so as a truly christian man, who, imparting his own spirit and character to the people, would elevate the neighborhood piety. See it thrusting its hateful head, a leaven of discord and mischief, in all our concerns, our elections, our courts, our schools, all our social relations.

You will see Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, &c., flying past each other's churches, as if so many pest houses, traveling miles out of their way, as if there was more than one saving faith, one Saviour, or one road to heaven.

Is it any wonder in the country, all the influence of example, means and energy thus frittered away, we so often find religion a feeble, sickly plant, struggling for existence? When we see in secular matters, the value of concentration, that talent, means, &c., combined, give weight and energy, can any one doubt that christian harmony would vastly promote the religion and comfort of a neighborhood?

This comes from placing religion so much in externals, in a certain set of dogmas or forms, instead of in a simple, reverential obedience to God's plainly (not inferred) revealed will.

With sound views, how indifferent would men become to abstractions, whether Christ was God himself, or in his inherent nature still to be revealed, so that secured to us as our Redeemer; whether predestined or not to heaven, so as assured of getting there; whether a born, or self-made, sinner, so as conscious of being purified by the blood of Christ; whether baptism in infancy, or adult age, with sprinkling, or immersion, was apostolical usage, so as initiated into Christ's church; whether the minister was episcopally or not ordained, so as he was pious, fervent and gifted.

After all, for every practical purpose, all the blessings of religion, what do all these denominational doctrines amount to? The bible resolving our whole duty, into a conscientious obedience to God's will—a holy life?

How any enlightened christian can be deeply impressed with the solemnity of death and judgment, the awfulness of eternity, be imbued with the great truths and spirit, receive into his heart and understanding, all the rich promises and dreadful threatenings of scripture, and still dwell on such unimportant matters of speculation and form, as to become severely sectarian, cut off from his sympathy, charity, social intercourse or religious communion, a christian brother merely because they cannot agree upon abstract dogmas, is among the wonders of earth.

The foundation of the practice of going to church,

must be the implied obligation, from the commands "go and teach all nations, perfect yourself in holiness, and the apostolic injunction, not to forsake assembling yourselves together," all of which require people to meet together. But we see nothing said about people having different opinions on debatable points, excusing them from these meetings, and we do know in the infancy of christianity there were considerable differences among christians. To whom did this obligation apply? Surely to all christians, and is not every man a christian who acknowledges Christ as the head of the church, and embraces his teachings? Under this definition, are not the members of all the various sects embraced in the obligation to attend church?

Now, if the object of going to church be to get clearer views, cherish feelings of piety to God, and charity to man; freshen up your principles, and gather strength to encounter the temptations of life, I see nothing in Holy Writ to inhibit any man from uniting with his neighbors, even if he cannot think with them upon abstract truths; but I see enough to require him to do so, rather than divide and distract a small community, enfeebling religion.

Without this liberality, in a sparsely settled neighborhood, it is impossible to erect, and sustain churches in healthful vigor; and I think a man must satisfy an enlightened conscience, that a union with his neighbors will actually impede

christianity, before he can stand aloof, guiltless in the eye of reason. Much less is it christian comeliness, when a zealous Methodist preacher builds up a prosperous bible class, where the members of the different churches assemble, for a zealous ——— to start an opposition class, and weaken the spirit which conducts it: or when a zealous churchman, with great labor, gets a respectable church erected, and a godly man is fast harmonizing the discordant materials into a zealous congregation, for a ———, because he does not fancy a form of prayer, or so unimportant a matter as a surplice, to exert himself to distract this little prosperous church, destroy harmony among neighbors, diffuse the small means of doing good, compel others to withhold their benevolence from other objects, from a necessity to sustain the tottering church, and open the floodgates of sectarian mischief. Truly we might think, that such believe the great object of a church is to teach dogmas; divide the christian fold, or that it is the theological Procrustean bed, to adjust the length and breadth of orthodoxy.

I will not say, what the great enemy has to do here, whether the motive power, be party feeling, some ignorant contracted view, or some debasing selfish end; but I dare aver, in such confounding of church and christianity, such neglect of the jewel for the casket, such impeding of his kingdom, the spirit of Christ has no agency.

To such, as of old, does he not say, "you know not of what manner of spirit ye are of?" It seems to me, having a rational well defined view of the object of going to church, would vastly counteract sectarian folly, in the country at least, and give vitality to religion. Now to suppose the object to be, merely to acknowledge the sovereignty of God, to inform him of our sinfulness, tell him all our wants, our penitence, or that we believe in certain dogmas, would be to question his Omniscience, and have a very low, unworthy estimate of our Heavenly Father. But, if by the very act of obedience, prayer and other religious exercises we cultivate piety to God, and good will to man, advance in personal holiness, qualify for a never-ending futurity, I can perceive a very intelligible, and awfully momentous object in going to church, one which will preclude all sectarian argument against country neighbors, when circumstances imperiously require it efficiently to carry out the injunction, "not to forsake assembling yourselves together," meeting under the same roof, harmoniously and reverently, followers of a common Redeemer.

Since we all feel a natural and reasonable right to our own opinions, that we can scarcely agree entirely upon the most trifling matters; adhere with such confident tenacity, and perfect honesty, to opinions upon the most flimsy foundations, because morally, as well as physically, we necessarily

see differently, according to the light we have, the folly and wickedness of hating and persecuting for opinion sake, must be obvious.

Yet, erroneous views of duty and doctrine, adopted on the faith of others, without examination—pride, arrogance, a determination that we *must* be right, and vindictive feelings are indulged, till unwittingly they get the mastery over reason, justice and benevolence, (men all the time thinking themselves good christians,) and then men are ripe for any folly.

See Paul, perhaps taught at the feet of Gamaliel, that christians were impious wretches, deserving of annihilation, never pausing to reflect whether he might not be in error, fly down to Damascus to persecute better men than himself.° As if the Omnipotent was incompetent to punish his own offenders, had not declared, "vengeance is mine." O no, Paul, must do the work for his God, and how many now are there, in this goodly land of light and liberty, ready, if they dared, to assume at the call of some religious demagogue, some Peter the hermit, the same presumptuous office?

This same miserable spirit has ever since divided Christ's fold, arraying in deadly hate those whom God has ordered to live in brotherly love.

We should discriminate, in our efforts to correct error, between erroneous opinions, innocently so, and such as tend to evil, or impinge upon our views of political right and duty: perhaps the former had

better be left entirely under kindness, and increasing light, to cure themselves, whilst liberal, merciful legislation only, should control the other.

Now, if the Romanist can believe, notwithstanding some of the infamous men history speaks of, profanely revered as vicegerents of Christ, and without one particle of authority from reason or revelation, that his pope, a poor, frail being like himself, is infallible as the expounder of Holy Writ, if he can believe that, reverently, turning his eye to an image, or a crucifix, the ardor of his devotion will be increased, that by mumbling over a succession of prayers, starvation, or any other penance, his God will be conciliated; if he can believe that every one of the thousands of wafers administered by priestly hands, often known to be impure, was each, in itself, a crucified Redeemer, perfect in every muscle, bone and nerve, and that, too, liable to be torn and lacerated under the sacrilegious teeth of the basest hypocrite; if he can believe that paying his priest a few dollars, will pray his old mother out of purgatory, so long as he believes in Jesus Christ as the Messiah; receives him as his atoning Saviour, prays through him for pardon and grace to do his Maker's will, and crowns all with a holy life, I do not see from reason or revelation, how his delusion, or works of supererogation, are going to keep him out of heaven, or ought to cut him off from christian charity.

But I do see how, by abuse and persecution, a cloud may be thrown over his mind, impenetrable to the light of reason ; so with all other denominations.

Although the Romanist and Church of England systems do not admit of mingling in devotion with other christians, and exclude the clergy of other denominations, as if desecration, from their pulpits, I would suggest, that an example of liberality and friendliness be set them, by going occasionally with them to their churches, courteously and kindly pressing them to do so likewise, and thus introduce an interchange of views, christian harmony and reform of error. This kind of antagonism is plainly wrong, yet whoever heard of a Baptist, Methodist or Presbyterian taking a Romanist or Unitarian clergyman kindly by the arm, saying, come, brother, join us in getting up a Bible society, or any other instrumentality of extending the Redeemer's kingdom? O no, they will pass them coldly on the way to church to acknowledge *their own* sins, and pray for forgiveness, and there, with zest, hear them denounced as idolaters and infidels!

I have been led into the train of thinking, which marks this letter, by the recent excitement from street preaching and the angry feeling manifested with regard to the public schools.

It is strange that the jealousy and sensitiveness of sectarian fears for its rights and securities, should have embarrassed such a matter ; that in this age,

men cannot see, the soener christians surrender up for the good of a common cause, all non-essentials, harmonize, form one solid, unbreken phalanx, against sin, the world and the devil, the better.

With this view, I strongly advocate the commingling of boys of parents holding different religious creeds, so as to break down all sectarian fences, to teach, by the interchange of friendly courtesy and kindness, that boys, educated under one faith, may be just as good as boys, educated under another; so that their minds, gradually freed from denominational prejudice, pride and bigotry, they may admire and love each other, and on the great theatre of life, hereafter, worship God each in charity towards the other in his own way.

Our Romanist brethren seem to think no one safe out of their church, and, therefore, oppose all intercourse, remotely even, hazarding other church influences.

Now, whilst I cannot see the reasonableness of this position, such is my detestation for even the semblance of tyranny and persecution, that I am disposed at least, to listen patiently to the Romanist, and reason with him as a rational being. If he honestly believes (and who has the right to challenge his honesty?) that sending his boys to school with Protestant boys, will hazard contamination and purgatory, argue kindly and dispassionately with him, do not reproach him with the sins of his forefathers,

presume that he is an honest man in error. Tell him that inasmuch as all men have an equal right to their opinions, it is not enough for reason and justice, that he *thinks* himself right. Call upon him to show, not because his priest tells him so, for to others *he* can be no authority, but because his bible and fair reasoning so teach, that the public system does endanger the souls of his boys.

But do not use your numerical force to compel the honest man; do not rob him by taxing his means to support schools, where he believes boys are trained for perdition. You may condemn his notions, but you are bound in kindness and justice to respect his feelings and natural rights.

Unless it would break up the whole system, by allowing one sect, and then another to file off, (I fear there may be a worse feeling at the bottom,) not to gratify this wish, is political tyranny, for civil and religious liberty must live and die together.

But, if yielding to the wishes of the Romanist will break up the system, then, as a sensible good citizen, viewing the subject politically, he should reflect that he is a member of a great republic, the very life-blood of which consists in the sovereignty of the majority. If it decides that intelligence and virtue are the only guarantee for the permanence of our institutions, and that the public system is best adapted to that end, he is bound, as a reasonable, just, good citizen, quietly to submit. He must see that

common sense and equity require that a minority should not govern, that he has no more right to arrogate to himself infallibility of judgment, than others, nor to expect of them, more willingness to surrender up their feelings and convictions.

Rather the fact that his religious creed thus brings him in collision with the common sense, common charity and common rights of others, should at least induce a modest, just, sensible man to question the soundness of such a creed, admit the possibility that he may be wrong. He should reflect that, again and again, his strongest convictions in other matters have been abandoned to greater light, and after all it is really but a small surrender to the public peace.

So far as keeping aloof from the public schools and giving them voluntary countenance is concerned, surely his conscience is inviolate, for this indirect support is forced upon him by political relations beyond his control. If he cannot conscientiously live peaceably with his fellow citizens in the mutual enjoyment of equal privileges, harmonizing with them in promoting the great objects of civil government, he should leave a community so little congenial, for the rights of conscience are equally stern and dear to both.

It is amazing that men can be so blinded by prejudice, pride of opinion, or passion, or love of sway, not to see that the folly and arrogance of a bigoted, intolerant spirit, consists in claiming that *they must*

be right, and all the world beside *must be* wrong, and when, too, their daily experience teaches that they are ever making false estimates, making the greatest mistakes in politics and business, and at best, but blundering through life.

We learn from history that this unreasonable assumption that we *must be* right, taken advantage of by a selfish, crafty, narrow-minded clergy, in combination with wicked, ambitious despots, has been the source of all that cruel bigotry and persecution, which has ever marred the world's peace.

Mankind, the rubbish of ignorance and prejudice tenderly removed, should be left to the natural force of truth, it will thus, slowly, perhaps, but surely win its way, certainly much sooner than if unnaturally harrassed with violence. It is amazing that all men cannot see from its spirit and its teaching, that christianity does not recognize coercion as a means of propagation, that it is folly to expect men to be forced from honest convictions confirmed by prejudice and long habit.

Yet I am sure there are, at this moment, in our midst, Roman and Protestant zealots, if uncaged from public opinion, unrestrained by law, ready for personal violence. Shame, shame, rational man, professing to be the follower of the meek and benvolent Jesus, to cherish such hellish feelings! O religion, the blessed heaven-sent boon, what follies, what cruelties, what crimes, have not been committed in thy sacred name?

Mankind, claiming Holy Writ as the source from whence they derive their rules of life, have ever, under a sectarian spirit, violated its teachings and its spirit. Indeed, unregenerate man, from long indulged ill-feeling and inclination, would seem to become demon-possessed, a bundle of folly, prejudice and inconsistency, bound up in an adamant band of self-will, only to be broken and dissipated by the Holy Ghost!

• The tendency of the human mind to will worship, the pride of human intellect to invent and desire to usurp power, are demonstrated in the steady, increasing departure from the simplicity and purity of religion, till it became at Rome, a cumbrous mass of truth, error and ceremony.

Having reached that consummation of folly, the tendency since the reformation has been reversed, but so hard is it to work back through the mire of error, that the great business of teachers is still, consistently with a wise appreciation of the difficulties and judicious use of means to bring the world back to the original purity, simplicity and power of religion.

There are some doctrines and usages in *our eyes*, so utterly irreconcilable with scripture, and common sense, yet so tenaciously contended for, that their opponents, conceiving honesty impossible, become impatient, intolerant and abusive, and there ends all hope of conviction. We should consider that not feeling another's difficulties, we cannot un-

derstand them, that a man may be as honest in maintaining falsehood, as truth; in fact, from the condition of his mind, he may not see the truth of your proposition, and moreover, that there is often "a reverent fear" of doing wrong, a dread of giving up doctrines which may be true, and which he has considered highly essential to salvation.

When opinions reach the mind through a consecutive chain of reasoning, their folly may be shown by pointing out the defective links, but when taken upon trust, through a blind faith, produced by prejudice, or an overwhelming imposture upon an ignorant, unreflecting, confiding mind, all argument is vain, and all harshness, senseless and cruel. Your premises cannot be received, there is no fulcrum in the mind, upon which to rest the lever of reason. A man will shock your understanding and feelings, by telling you, that every time he goes to mass, he chews his Redeemer. You will, in vain point him to the truth, that the language which instructs him is figurative, that with equal reason he will make the Saviour a door or a shepherd, that it is too great an outrage upon common sense, to tell us, when the Saviour instituted the Supper, that he broke up his own body, shed his own blood, then divided them among his apostles, who ate and drank of them in his presence. He will turn upon you, tell you his church so instructs him, and that nothing is impossible with God.

You still urge, that there is no evidence that a miracle was called for, or performed, that there was no occasion for one, that the object could have been effected, and the whole can now be understood, without suspending the laws of nature. But it will be all in vain; the same blind faith in man, which originated the error, will still resist your argument. You must wait patiently and kindly, till increasing light and reflection have disabused his mind of the fundamental error, church infallibility, before you can successfully discuss any other church doctrines.

In the mean time, friendly intercourse will liberalize his mind, subdue his heart, and prepare the way for truth. But, if any system, identifies itself with tyranny and oppression, as the church systems of England, Spain and Italy have done, it has traveled out of its sphere, has assumed a political character, and may be dealt with politically, and there I would politically unmitre and disrobe pope and bishop, as foes to human freedom.

In the present state of the world, there appears a necessity for church organization, for setting apart eminently pious, gifted men, to diffuse the gospel, and promote true religion. But, as the great founder of christianity has never plainly indicated a preference for any particular form of machinery, as binding upon his followers, I hold it to be a matter of utter indifference to man's salvation, whether a bishop in his mitre, or a congre-

gationalist in his black coat presides, so as it is done honestly, and reverently. To give vital importance to such a question is puerile in the extreme, trifling with the very serious matter of getting to heaven.

If any particular church machinery was essential, can any rational man think God would have left us in doubt? Such an idea would be blasphemous. Our benevolent God exact a duty without distinctly pointing it out!

In truth, religion is a very plain, simple matter, and as designed for plain, simple men, must necessarily be so. The pride, folly and selfishness of those who have gained the confidence of mankind, have complicated, mystified and crowded it with idle pomp and ceremony. As I read my bible it is simply prayerfully to study revelation for God's will, and do the same as well as we can, thanking him for his mercies, confessing our sins, and through the Mediator praying for forgiveness, and divine assistance, doing as little harm and all the good in our power, utterly irrespective of all peculiarity of form or merely inferred dogmas.

It is high time for laymen to take hold of this matter, as they must be depended upon to reform abuses, to think boldly and independently, spurning the trammels of educational prejudice. So long as they are not, allowing others to think for them, they will only be senseless blocks, subject to be

moved to and fro, to support this, or that assumption of presumptuous men. Can it be supposed that an all-wise, merciful God devised a religion for the daily use of man, containing his whole rule of life, whose essential truths, were only to be extracted within the walls of colleges and convents, through learned men, by the midnight lamp? No! laymen, no longer led blindfolded by sectarian leaders, with the Bible in your hand, and God above promising assistance to them that reverently ask, think prayerfully, but fearlessly, availing of all the light which learned and good men may give. Let us then away with all this trifling sectarian nonsense, impeding the Redeemer's kingdom. If men will only study Holy Writ, not hunting up authority to support this, or pull down that opinion, but simply to learn God's will, to do it, they will find a corrective for all denominational folly and bitterness, greatly advancing Christ's kingdom.

AUNT CHARITY.

APPENDIX.

So much perplexity clouds every aspect of American Slavery, it involves such serious questions affecting us in our moral, social and political relations, that there is naturally a morbid sensibility in the national mind which shrinks from all moral, philosophical or political examination; but as all the great and best men of the South unbiased by the lust for wealth, or the lust for power or pride of party, have ever united with the general sentiment of mankind in its condemnation as a "great moral, social and political evil," surely as patriots, as reasonable men responsible to a great future tribunal, we are called upon to honestly and bravely look the momentous question in the face. Indeed the question has become so mixed up with pecuniary, party, political, and religious considerations, so long viewed through a contracted theology, or an indiscriminating false philanthropy, that we should not wonder to find the public mind confused, disgusted and disinclined patiently, calmly, and candidly to examine the matter, neither in its abstract simplicity nor in the complications of its modified character as a political institution; yet, to reconcile difficulties, relieve conscience, reach just conclusions, a proper sense of duty and act wisely, this is essential, for there is all the difference of light and darkness between abstract slavery and slavery as a political institution. Injustice and oppression constitute the one, upon the other rests the protection and safety of the African; upon the one the gross assumption, teeming with injustice, abuses and immorality, that the slave is a mere transferable chattel and also the authority, irrespective of all social necessity, to perpetuate the institution; upon the other the only hope for a bettered condition of the negro.

If the abolitionist in his blind impulsive course, regardless of the spirit and scope of Holy Writ, or the suggestions of reason, has done mischief in their virtuous zeal to counteract the mad-

ness and wickedness of abolitionism, good men have been carried beyond the necessities of the case, beyond the legitimate grounds of defence, have passed through the enemy to a friendly province, have brought into conflict divine precepts and divine teachings, have boldly assailed the inalienable rights of man, fraternized with wrong and oppression, have overlooked the origin of human and confounded natural and political rights, given man a positive, absolute and inherent right of property in his fellow; thus, in their turn, have they become vulnerable to the shafts of truth and virtue, and call upon us to fall back upon first principles to counteract error.

The full, thorough examination of the question, in all its important bearings, requires it to be made primarily a question of morality, otherwise we will find great difficulty in arriving at our duty, in reaching or correcting abuses and applying radical remedies, for, entrenched behind even a false theology and an assumed or conventional morality, men will not care to change their long cherished opinions or habits, however questionable their character.

God in His precepts has given a standard of right and wrong, in our moral sense the ability to distinguish right from wrong, and in His teachings He has taught the application of His precepts under all the varying circumstances of life; man is a probationer personally responsible to his Creator, or he is not; he is a free agent, or he is not. Slavery is either morally wrong or it is not, the affirmative of these questions is declaratory of a distinction between right and wrong and of a divinely given standard to test the character of human conduct.

God is the original sole proprietor of man, and unless delegated by Him no human right can ever exist in one man over another without a voluntary surrender. A human right is the authority to act, directly or mediately coming from God, the only source, it is either natural or social; slavery is either practically the abnegation or abrogation of human rights, and is either personal or political. God, by the nature given to man, instituted society, which necessarily implies the authority to preserve and perpetuate. The worst bearable government is better than no government. No institution which is not in itself, or general consequences, in harmony with the spirit and teachings of the Saviour, can of itself be morally right or politically wise. Upon these assumptions we propose to construct our argument.

The vindication of slavery commences with the inference that it must have been divinely instituted, because coeval with the history of man, but as we can never know why, how, or when it originated, the original condition of society and its social needs, nor what scheme and purposes of Providence its sufferance may have been designed to answer, we cannot legitimately infer the divine approval of our institution from the fact of its existence in a remote age. Personal strife and offensive warfare have existed from the time of Cain, but we cannot infer divine approval. Whilst it is perfectly consistent with God's revealed design of human probation, that the evil which men do as free agents may be over-ruled for good, it is essential to the divine plan that man has the liberty to do wrong, and to infer from the existence of an institution or usage, the divine approval would be to deny man's probationary character, to make the slave trade, and the forcing of opium on the Chinese, virtuous acts.

God allowed the lust for power and wealth to take this particular direction, no doubt He will overrule them for the extension of christianity; but it is by no means a logical conclusion that He approved of the motive power, in itself wicked. Had the apostolic successors, instead of engaging men in angry controversy, or arraying them on the battle field with regard to idle dogmas, with which the happiness of mankind had absolutely no concern, simply obeyed the divine injunction "go and teach all nations," would not christianity have progressed as far under the mild influence of Missionary effort, as it has through the intermediate agency of the sword, the slave and opium trade? What virtue and reverence for God's commands refused to do, by His eternally fixed laws, he has made the evil passions of men effect. The prophetic curse of Noah has been strongly relied upon to justify the institution, but with as much propriety would the cruelties of the Roman army in fulfilling the predicted destruction of Jerusalem be justified, for they were equally a prophetic curse. Anyhow we think the curse of servitude was directed against the descendant *nations* of Ham and not to the personal bondage of his descendants, because if intended to apply to individual bondage, by far too few have been slaves to the posterity of the brothers to fulfill the prophecy, and in the present temper of the world it is not likely to be ever fulfilled. If designed as a special curse upon the posterity of Ham, as the argument supposes, the descend-

ants of the brothers must have been excluded, but the fact is more of their descendants have been in personal bondage, and therefore slavery could not have been designed as a special discriminative curse upon Ham, without which as well as a general fulfillment, the argument is worthless. Moreover, the prophecy has been fulfilled in the subjugation of Ham's posterity by that of his brothers; decide the matter as we may is unimportant, because we as christian moralists have no more concern in this prophetic curse than in the peculiar usages of the Jews under their institutions, unless you make christianity unnecessary and supererogatory, for it now is our rule of conduct. Polygamy was allowed, the Israelites were ordered to overrun idolatrous nations, where does christianity license abstract slavery? Where polygamy? Where to overrun the idolatrous nations of Africa with fire and sword? The biblical argument most triumphantly urged is the omission of St. Paul to condemn Roman and Grecian slavery, and it is attempted to draw odium upon the objection to this negative argument by charging that it casts an imputation of fear and dishonesty upon the virtuous and heroic Paul; but if we destroy the argument, this damaging charge is repelled.

In his probationary state man is at liberty to create the circumstances or conditions which suits particular forms of government, accordingly we find such to be the fact, and that the kind of government is ever the result of the intellectual and moral condition of the people. At the advent the Roman government was tyrannical and oppressive, but under existing circumstances it was the best to be had, as the most intolerable national calamity is no government, the Roman government, bad as it was, was allowed to stand unrebuked, though surely in itself disapproved by the Saviour. When Paul entered upon his mission he found Rome a nation of soldiers and slaves. Slavery an incorporated political institution, part and parcel of a vicious body politic, the result of war which created the necessity for agricultural labor and furnished in its prisoners, whom it saved from butchery on the battle field, the necessary subjects, and could not have been suddenly and coercively abolished without the worst political evil—anarchy; hence, Paul wisely meddled with neither, he was satisfied with planting such principles the adoption of which must make any form of government answer the ends of government, and take from slavery all the virulence of injustice and oppression.

We must keep in view that Paul was the apostle of him who declared that his "Kingdom was not of this world," that he came not a political but religious reformer to preach peace on earth and good will to men, to plant in christianity the great corrective of all moral evil; was another Paul to appear in the South now, a christian missionary as wise and good a man as he, can it be imagined that he would commence the work in criminating the masters, or preaching down an institution, greatly valued and cherished, in the *Southern mind* no wrong identified with their prosperity and essential to their habits of social life? No, he would perceive that it would be worse than useless, that he would not be listened to, that abolition would do incalculable mischief, derange the whole social structure, seriously injure masters and slaves. Why should Paul have meddled with a political institution which his precepts could not reach until the evil heart of Rome became subject to christianity? Why talk of honor and injustice to a man who has no sense of either? Why do that which must defeat the object of his high mission, and aggravate the evils of the time? Did Paul sympathize with Roman barbarity exhibited in the treatment of slaves, in gladiating, wild beast fights, or the triumphant processions in which the unhappy victims of war were exposed to the most unnecessary cruel distress? Was Nero's government to his taste? Yet he meddled not specifically with them. Because Paul did not condemn despotism, must we on such authority advocate tyranny? But was there not another cause for Paul's silence, in the truth, that there, as with us now, the sin of slavery was not in the fact of its existence, but in its abuses, and refraining from all effort to remove the condition the result of human conduct, which made the institution a social necessity? Paul displayed his political sagacity when he told his disciples to give their slaves "that which was just and equal," for without exciting political jealousy, or alarm for slave property, he aimed the deadliest blow at the institution, actually initiated its downfall, for the services of bondsmen have no advantages over freemen if there was a fair remuneration and no unreasonable exactions, this is the revelation of experience in our country. Let the principles of Christianity furnish the basis for a servile code and servile treatment, and slavery must die out for the simple reason that there would be no advantage in cheapness of labor nor any convenience to counterbalance the inherent evils,

anxieties and vexations of slavery. Like despotism, slavery was only tolerated because of the wickedness of men. Did christianity prevail universally, tyranny, war and slavery would be impossibilities. Now it is easy to perceive that the same reasons may have operated on Paul without his omission to denounce slavery, implicating in the slightest degree his wisdom, honesty or courage. Had he like some of our clergy turned aside from his true vocation, turned abolitionist, christianity would have been poorly advanced. But with his fearless nature, untiring zeal, simple but powerful eloquence, would have excited servile war, given to fanaticism a very carnival, opened the flood-gates of misery upon Rome. No, he knew the source of all moral evil and its remedy. Accordingly, before the sway of christianity, slavery disappeared without social disorganization.

The virtuous and wise course of Paul in the case of Onesimus has been pressed into the service to sustain a bad cause, when in truth it was impossible for a man of his high grade of virtue and wisdom, no matter how much he deprecated the Roman institution, to have acted differently. The highest duty of christian citizenship is to obey the laws of your country, for disobedience strikes directly at the heart of social organization, tends to anarchy, the most deplorable of all human conditions. Paul had nothing to do in instituting and had no controlling power over it, but by violating the laws in regard to it no one could estimate the damage he would do his high mission and to the community, his influence over Philemon and other slave owners must have gone. What would the enemies of christianity have desired more than to be enabled to cast the odium of a violator of the laws upon its great apostle? Bad laws must be endured till they can be removed without disorganizing society, the greatest of all possible evils, the laws must remain until they can safely be removed. Slavery was a legalized institution, slaves were private property held under the same title as Paul held his house, under the law of the land, and the same principle, breaking down the law, carried out, defrauding Philemon, would have taken away Paul's house. The individual benefit to Onesimus would have been far more than counterbalanced by the injury to his mission and to the community at large, showing that obedience to the law, even if founded in wrong, is virtuous and wise, and Paul will stand forever upon the sacred page the

brightest model of a consistent christian citizen. When a benevolent Pennsylvanian assists his Maryland neighbor in recovering his fugitive are we to infer his advocacy of slavery? Certainly not, only that he is a good citizen and obeys the laws of his country, not allowing his individual feelings to turn him from his sacred duty to his Government. Had Paul been instrumental in removing Onesimus beyond the reach of his master, in the sight of man and God, he would have been virtually a thief, false to his friend a social disorganizer, an enemy to mankind. Had Paul's example been followed, slavery would have been much nearer its end. Had benevolent men simply obeyed the laws and interceded for lenity, the kindest neighborly feelings would have been cultivated, a far greater influence exerted over Southern sentiment; silently, quietly, inoffensively doing its work. Such conduct would have exhibited the same results now seen in Maryland, once thoroughly a slave state, now probably verging to a free state. The subject, without gendering bitterness, would have been freely discussed, the master secure in his property would have had no occasion for severe stringency of discipline, the slave, unseduced, seeing no chance of escape, would have been cheerful and contented, far happier than now, a freezing outcast in Canada. Nor would we now have the sorrow and mortification to see demagoguism making slavery a pretext as the best cloak for ambition, preying upon the vitals of the Republic.

Can the advocate for abstract slavery consistently contend for the inalienable rights of man, for human freedom? Unless he can prove the negro alien from the human family, or can show some specific divine precept justifying African bondage, the conclusion is palpable that wherever a community, white or black, possessing the power, it may with equal authority morally reduce to personal bondage *white* or colored members of the human family. If the ground of social necessity is assumed, are we not bound to prove that we may rightfully create the circumstances which make the social necessity, or are not called upon to use every means for their correction? Do we not virtually create these circumstances when we perpetuate them by failing to use means for their removal?

If Paul's authority will justify abstract slavery, then it must apply throughout all mankind, for the Roman and Grecian slaves were white. It must be right and proper for Russia to reduce all her prisoners of war to personal bondage, sell them,

generals and all, with their children's children, to the highest bidder. Is South Carolina in her wildest ultraism prepared for such a doctrine?

We contend, therefore, that there is no scripture authority for abstract slavery. Let us test the validity of its claims by the light of reason, based on an instinctive sense of justice and of right and wrong. It is an incontrovertible proposition, a self-evident truth, that there can be but one source, the Almighty, of human rights, and that all men enjoy naturally an equality of right, and as justice is simply a due regard to the rights of others, we farther deduce the conclusion that abstract slavery is morally wrong. Much time and learned labor by the clergy have been devoted, occasioned by party objects, the perils of the country, or lust for gain, to establish for the institution the authority of Holy Writ, and men, anxious to escape from duties which result from an opposite view, have greedily availed of the effort. But whoever undertakes to prove a divine right for abstract slavery is involved in the hopeless task of proving that slavery, *per se*, is in its tendencies, influences and general consequences promotive of the peace, prosperity and happiness of mankind, for such is the plain design of Christianity. To assert that any institution at variance with this design, can be approved of by its great founder, implicates divine consistency. But undeniable facts, and the general sentiment of mankind, declare slavery evil and only evil, without one redeeming feature.

In discussing this subject, reason requires us to regard it not as slavery would be in rigid subjection to christian principle, but as it actually exists, an admitted wrong to the black, hurtful to the white man and to national prosperity. Christianity was designed to preside over all the practical details of life, to rule our natural propensities and sweeten human intercourse. Is it conceivable, by an unbiassed mind, that the benevolent Redeemer, or an inspired man of God, who taught so impressively the great lessons of justice and kindness, could approve of a Roman institution so teeming with injustice, abuse and cruelty? American slavery being an unnatural condition, grating to our natural feelings of benevolence, revolting to our moral sense of right and wrong, necessarily liable to the greatest abuse, involving the violation of human rights, only tolerated because a necessity presupposes something wrong in the social structure, vicious, damaging to individuals and society,

therefore the business of christianity to correct. We think the clergy would have been far more appropriately employed in pointing out this something wrong and its corrective, than in fortifying men in their assumed right to oppress their fellow-man and perpetuate a "great social, moral and political evil." For a christian to be conservative is well, but to be consistent is surely far better. With political institutions, conceding to them every privilege common to citizens, we contend that *professionally* the clergy have nothing to do, for their business is not to distract and embitter. But with the purity of public sentiment they have every thing to do. Yet where conventions, presbyteries and conferences yearly meet, we see, in the daily journals, notices shocking virtuous and noble sentiment. We see a noble state once renowned for good and great men, throughout whose every valley and from whose every hill-top freedom pitched her highest note of remonstrance, most earnestly plead for the inalienable rights of man, degenerate into a great slave mart. Slaves having become a regular staple, yielding millions to her people, who, reposing upon an assumed abstract right, pursue with marvelously unruffled equanimity the business of perpetuating their country's curse! In the bewilderment caused by contending minds, Pilate sarcastically asked the Saviour, "what is truth?" In the perplexity upon this subject, produced by contending divines, the gross perversion of christian precept, and the palpable inconsistency between profession and practice, some minion of despotism might well sneeringly ask a boastful American citizen, what are "the inalienable rights of man," what justice, what is duty? If in itself a wise and virtuous institution, why has every community where African slavery ever existed, opposing a resistless barrier to even wealth—wont to ride triumphantly over every other obstacle to social position—affixed an indelible stigma upon professional slave dealing? Why, in the convention called to frame the Constitution, did the southern orators, *to a man* exhaust opprobrious epithets in denouncing it a great moral and political wrong? Do moral principles, as eternal as God from whom they came, authoritative in one age, lose all authority in another? Why did Virginia, when deeding away her North-western territory stipulate that *there* slavery should never exist? Why did Kentucky's great statesman so vehemently oppose its territorial extension? Why did Presidents Washington, Jefferson and Madison so

strongly reprobate it? Madison, with a sensitiveness truly remarkable and expressive of his abhorrence, protesting against the term "slaves" being even named in the Constitution, substituting for slaves the words "held to bondage," because he would not have recognized in an instrument so sacred to freedom and designed to be as enduring as time, the right of property in man. Jefferson declaring that "there was not one attribute of God in sympathy with negro slavery." Why, throughout all mankind, save where king cotton sways, has it the unqualified reprobation of the wise and good? May human sentiment restrain and must God's eternal precepts truckle to mammon? Yet men, assuming to represent the great Redeemer, teach us from the pulpit, that African slavery is a heaven appointed institution, eternally basking in the ever vivifying smiles of christianity?

An essay purporting to develop the virtue and beauties of slavery would be an original idea, truly a curiosity, and we challenge its production. If the institution in itself is a good one, so promotive of mutual prosperity, upon the principle that we are bound to do good to all men, it is sinful to restrict slavery to the South. We should rivet the shackles upon the slave the world over, prohibit all emancipation, re-open the slave trade, and let all of our people, rich and poor, enjoy all the blessings of this universally beneficent institution!

But before coming to a practical decision, ask Maryland and Virginia why their fields are worn out, neglected wastes, the farms depreciated, and why it is reasonable to suppose—slavery extinct—that comparing with adjoining states, in a few years real estate would be quadrupled.

Although we deny abstract slavery all support from the light of reason and holy writ, we distinctly assert, apart from its abuses and neglect, to abate and remove it—in which the sin consists—American slavery is negatively a wise, benevolent institution, because it temporarily prevents incalculable greater mischief and misery.

The abolitionist who denies slavery justifiable under all circumstances, to be consistent, should clamor for the conversion of every Monarchy into a Republic, for as all human rights proceed from the one great source and are equally imperative, political can only differ from personal slavery in the degree of infringement, and if the one is morally wrong, under all circumstances, so must the other be. Surely he must be a

wild, fanatical republican who would make Russia a Republic! A conscientious man, unaccustomed to analyze the character of acts with regard to motives, circumstances and consequences, habituated implicitly to obey precept in the letter, regardless of its spirit, object, or practical bearings, may easily and innocently carry out his principles mischievously.

The character and extent of the authority of moral precepts to be justly estimated, must be viewed in reference to their object and reasonable limitation. Though moral principles are fixed in character, and absolute in authority, the character of the acts to which they apply, under circumstances, so change, as to entirely evade their jurisdiction. A lie is always an untruth, but an untruth is not always a lie. Stealing is taking the property of another, but taking the property of another is not always stealing, for both these acts may occur under circumstances where the criminal intent, essential to make the acts lying and stealing, were not present. We cannot conceive of God commanding the observance of truth, and also privileging falsehood; therefore, consistency must be a divine attribute. As all divine commands come from the same source, they must be equally imperative, of course no precept can take precedence of another, they mutually limit each other's range. Where the authority of one precept conflicts with the authority of another, there its power must end, for this is the requirement of divine consistency, otherwise, obedience to the one would be disobedience to the other, and there must be inextricable ethical confusion.

Parental obedience is exacted, but when a son is ordered to steal, the authority of the precept requiring parental obedience, must cease, because it conflicts with the command "Thou shalt not steal." An infuriated man pursues a parent with murderous intent to a son's house, who denies his presence, yet without the sin of a lie, for the son, if he betrayed his father's retreat to an assassin, would not obey the command to "honor his father," nor would he be loving his neighbor as himself if he facilitated an enraged man in becoming a murderer. By aiding the man, he would practically and virtually become, *particeps criminis*, a violator of the law. So, disregarding this principle, would lead to complicated disobedience. We are directed to honor the king, to obey rulers, but surely we are not required to obey the wicked laws of corrupt rulers, when avoidable, for that would be to violate other precepts, un-

resistingly to yield to the most grinding oppressor, and the object of the government, the benefited of the governed, be defeated.

We are told to give to him that asketh, but whenever an unworthy object, upon the plea of such precept, makes a demand, we may innocently refuse, otherwise, a man would be encouraging indolence and vice, reduce his family to extreme poverty, and become obnoxious to the charge of being "worse than an infidel." You may deceive, innocently, for their own good, a child, an insane, sick, or drunken man, which shows that the moral wrong of an untruth, is not in the act but in the criminal intent. Hence, God in giving a probationary existence, has given us a discretion and an understanding to discriminate circumstances, and determine the true character of acts. Now let us apply the principle here developed, to American slavery, imposed upon us by the reckless cupidity of a former generation, grown into a social necessity, existing under circumstances limiting the range of precepts which otherwise make slavery morally wrong. If abstract slavery is wrong simply because it violates certain moral precepts, then, if circumstances exist, suspending, through divine consistency, such precepts, their object is defeated, the sin of slavery is destroyed, and the condemnatory precepts cannot apply, because it is a condition removed beyond their jurisdiction by the conflicting range of other precepts equally authoritative. That American slavery does exist under circumstances which will not admit of the application of the precepts condemnatory of abstract slavery, is perfectly plain, for immediate general emancipation would ruin master and slave, disorganize society, embarrass the commercial prosperity of the world, and produce widespread misery. In fact, the abolitionist who has a correct view of this subject, and persists in his mad course from political or other motives, is guilty of divine disobedience and unmitigated cruelty.

But from false views of the true relations of master and slave, men have extended a right from its very nature, co-extensive only with necessity over the whole man, soul and body, made him personal property, well nigh practically confounded him with his brute. It would seem important then, that the conduct of masters be regulated by sound moral and political principles, there exist a clear, precise idea of the nature and full extent of the right, under which a man is held in bondage. Whence comes the right of human bondage? If not derived

from revelation, nor the light of nature; if it exists, it must come from social necessity. But the power to give, implies the actual possession of the gift. The law cannot impart that which it has not. Now has any community morally the right in possession, which it may impart to individuals of unlimited, unconditional bondage?

Unquestionably man was designed for social life, this necessarily implies the right to construct and perpetuate, from this inherent right is derived the discretionary power of communities to restrict privileges, control human conduct whenever required by human weal, hence the authority to punish crime, confine the lunatic, and hold man in personal or political bondage; whilst society holds this authority by divine right it is plainly a limited authority; divine consistency requires it to be exercised in subordination to the great moral precepts designed for the government of all mankind, and of course cannot be extended beyond the social necessity, can give no right of personal property, implying exclusive unlimited control, as a possessor's right in his horse. We can only know God's will through his absolute commands and the voice of his institutions. Having instituted society wherever its social needs make it necessary, he instituted political or social slavery, but no where has he commanded us, nor can the social exigency requiring it exist, to make chattels of our negroes, and we deny all right of such property in man as allowed a Roman irresponsibly to throw his living chattels into his fish pond.

Men should be made to realize by squaring the subject before the mind's eye, bringing it home to their sense of what is due between man and man, to their own hearts, and testing it by the divine standard of right and wrong, that an absolute unrestricted right of property in man as in a mule, can consistently, neither morally nor politically exist, because man has a far higher clearly discriminated rank in the divine economy, is divinely placed upon an equality of natural right with his fellow man—an equality which cannot be even disturbed but by a paramount social necessity, because man has rights to which the brute has no claim, and over which the law of necessity, subordinate to divine precept, the only authority abrogating human rights, can have, in its necessarily limited authority, no jurisdiction. God the creator, original and sole proprietor, has only given away man's natural rights as far as essential to satisfy the law of social necessity. Nor has the slave, like the

soldier or sailor, contracted to surrender his natural and legal rights. Therefore to take possession of his body and rights, beyond this law of necessity, is simply usurpation. So long as a slave continues in a country where the social necessity exists, the slave cannot rightfully complain of his position, and should he in personal difficulty kill his master, he may be rightfully hanged, because the good of the community as well as the happiness of the slave exacts it, but should it occur in a foreign country, the same man stands upon an equality of right, and the crime is precisely of the same grade as if occurring between two masters in Maryland, and social necessity does not require his execution. Every *citizen* is bound by an implied contract to obey the laws of his country, but the slave is no *citizen*, there was no implied contract between him and the government which required him to be hanged for the murder of his master in self defence; therefore, apart from social necessity, to hang him for manslaughter, would be simply murder. If this proposition is sound, there can be no *inherent natural* right of man in man; therefore it is purely the creature of circumstances, a political or social right for the mutual benefit of master and slave, coeval with, and limited by this law. In morality, the slave is entitled to every right and privilege of mankind—not rightfully restricted by this law of necessity. All the obligations which masters recognize as due to each other are, with this qualification, in full force as regards the slave, and the commands to do justly, show mercy, and others, with all their solemn sanctions, preside over the relations of master and slave.

Does this great imperious law of necessity in one greedy gulp swallow up all the divinely given natural rights of man? How much the responsibility of the master and the future ameliorated condition of the slaves are involved in the answer. Is not the slave's right to enjoy in his own private mode of life the earnings of his own toil, his natural authority over his domestic and religious relations, untouched by this law? If there is no special, directly nor mediately, revealed divine right to claim *unlimited* control over the person, time, will and earnings of a slave for his own exclusive benefit, responsibility to God and a due respect for the opinions of mankind require every man to show some rational foundation for the assumption, for it does seem perfectly plain that if abstract slavery has no rightful existence, that the right to hold man in personal bondage

springs solely from the ignorance and deteriorated condition of the black and the absence of a proper public sentiment making the social law of necessity with which the right must be coeval and coextensive, that whilst a certain degree of slavery under certain circumstances may virtuously exist, unless every right of manhood is swept away, there must be a limit beyond which, in morality, it cannot extend.

If the slave can be allowed a fair remuneration with the ordinary privileges of free labor, you are morally bound to yield them, for there the right of master ends, go beyond and the legitimate master is merged in the petty tyrant, or justice, mercy and human rights have no foundation either in nature, reason nor revelation. In truth the right to hold the negro in bondage has no other foundation than the right to confine the insane, and as we feel bound to confine and take care of the lunatic for his own comfort and safety, as well as for that of the community, and when the necessity for restraint ceases to restore him to all the rights of manhood, the same must be our duty to the negro.

In defence of the institution, an argument is drawn from the law of races, and it is decided that the African, though human, belongs to an inferior race, then the inference is very complacently drawn that he may rightfully become the slave of a superior race. That there are grades of intellect and peculiar adaptations to inhabit certain zones of the earth which distinctly mark a variety of races, and that certain races are less capable of self government is admitted, but it is not conceded in this admission that there exists any justification for personal slavery, because such a conclusion would be gratuitous, there not being the slightest divine authority, the sole foundation of human conduct, either in revelation or nature. We must assume that infinite wisdom ever adapts means to its end. When the horse was designed for the servitude of man, he was so constituted, there was perfect harmony between his nature and the end. Hence, under all circumstances, he is found in that natural relation; not so with the negro, because he is under the influence of laws common to human nature which makes the relation ever jarring.

Indolence and luxurious ease, throwing out of exercise those faculties essential to the supremacy of the more highly endowed race, emasculate man's vigor, unfit him for governing his inferior fellow-man, the last from his nature is constantly dis-

posed to rebel and throw off the yoke. For the fact of slavery does not reverse the laws of nature, a sense of wrong *must* ever excite discontent or resentment, the one will naturally seek its gratification in revenge, the other in some change of condition. Unless you can rescind or reverse the laws of human nature the oppressed will fly from bondage and human nature will sympathize with the wretched fugitive. Hence abolitionism, so long as the liberty of the press and freedom of speech are constitutional privileges, eternal discontent, wranglings and servile war, legislate as you may, are *inevitable*. Again, it is admitted that the white race cannot healthfully exist in climates where the negro flourishes. Here we have distinct natural laws antagonistic to the theory, surely defeating the assumed design of omnipotence, which the idea of infinite wisdom precludes. But when two races come in contact whose nature forbids political amalgamation, just as two families cannot live harmoniously under the same roof, one must govern, and nature and reason give supremacy to the superior race. Clearly then, from a variation in the human family there cannot be legitimately inferred the design that one race should appropriate the other for its own exclusive convenience, the design obviously was that each should occupy its appropriate zone. The cupidity of man having broken in upon the harmony of nature, I grant a justifying necessity for the political subjection of the inferior race is the result. But though rightfully kept in a subordinate station, the more gifted race is not released from the obligation to govern by the principles designed for the common advantage of mankind. The white race have all the power and can, in a corporate capacity, take as good care of the negro, keep him under as wholesome discipline, as if subject to irresponsible individual tyranny. Disfranchise him of every political privilege, every right he cannot be safely trusted with, but do not degrade his manhood to the level of a mule. It is common to justify negro slavery by the consideration that the slaves are far better off than their parents in Africa, but although this consideration may weigh with those disposed to vindicate the slave trade, it can have no bearing upon the question before us. If a man saves the life of a fellow-man he derives no right of property in him or his descendants.

If a man descended from Irish parentage is far better off in America than if he had been born in Ireland, does that give any right to an American community to make a slave of him?

Neither our responsibilities nor moral relations are an inheritance, but spring immediately from our individuality. A virtuous loyal citizen is never hanged for the treason of his father, nor does a murderer escape the gallows because his father was an eminently good man. It is said, to reconcile anti-slavery men, that the slave is far better off than the freed negro. As a general fact it may be true under existing circumstances, but a wise legislation is comprehensive in its views, and prospective in its policy. We expect existing circumstances will be altered and we look to the evils probable to result to both races from a continuance of the institution. Such are the instincts of our nature with which personal slavery conflicts that a man must be either brutally stultified or highly christianized for the perfection of the slave. One condition will prevent his feeling, and the other reconcile him to the hardships of his condition, but as the intermediate class will be ever far greater than the extreme, to expect a contented and passively submissive slave population is all in vain. An anxiety to put an end to a perilous political strife influencing some, and a lust for power and gold, over-riding reason, experience, and morality, controlling others, it has been boldly denied that the institution is "a great social political and moral evil." Such we will ask, what is American slavery? And leave the settlement of the question to the answer honestly given: American slavery, admitted to be a blight on the prosperity of every community where it has ever existed, holds forcible possession of man for man's convenience and pecuniary benefit, violates all the inalienable rights of man, subjects him to the universally admitted deteriorating effects of personal bondage, usurps entire control over his will, his person, his labor, his domestic relations, his conscience; presides over his whole existence, his irresponsible judge, jury and executioner; in fact, leaves him scarcely one vestige of humanity except his naked body; it demoralizes and deteriorates the white race, tending to the growth of indolence, and to destroy self dependence, producing a vicious pride, averse to corporal labor, violating most injuriously the divine law which decrees that "man shall eat his bread in the sweat of his brow;" it requires an increasingly severe servile code, practically abrogates the natural relations of husband and wife, parents and children, it gives increasing domestic anxiety and alarm, leads to the most frightful crimes, suspending the ordinary course of justice by lynch law, it allows the abscond-

ing slave to be hunted by blood hounds through swamps, and if found, in obedience to the most powerful instincts of his nature, a love of freedom and resistance to abuse, opposing arrest, to be legally shot down; it constantly gives rise to most bitter political strife, threatens the ruin of the Republic and by its inherent abuses cries to Heaven for vengeance. Is this fancy, or is it fact? All the great and good men of the early days of the Republic, North and South were deluded or gave a false testimony, if the observation and experience of impartial men since are deceptive, all the numerous statements and advertisements in the southern journals of the day, are false or the picture is true to life. Yet such is the institution which christian teachers will labor to show is authorised by christianity *irrespective* of necessity not to be meddled with. Circumstances having forced the South into a false position, certainly without a due regard to the master's rights and prosperity, to all circumstances and consequences to both races, coercively and suddenly to root out slavery would not be more unwise and cruel than repugnant to the teachings and spirit of christianity which we invoke for its removal. But whilst I defend the existing institution with its abuses as a necessary evil in preference to a general emancipation, involving far greater mischief, it cannot be fairly inferred that I advocate the institution as right in itself. It is only a choice of evils. As the circumstances which legitimate slavery are wrong and hurtful, its consequences hostile to individual and national prosperity, surely the obligation rests upon us as responsible beings, divinely ordered to do good to all men, to alter this unnatural condition. If our premises are just and our reasoning sound, slavery, in the abstract, is utterly unauthorised. American slavery a great moral, social and political evil, having no other foundation than sheer necessity, and our plain duty must be not to recognize it otherwise, still not to interfere with a legalized institution, unless with a right spirit, in a proper way to point out its true character, with its abuses, mitigate its hardships, change, as far as possible, the condition which makes it a necessity, and remove the negro beyond their reach, by encouraging colonization, emigration and a general diffusion through the world.

We cannot regard with indifference any legislation impeding diffusion, and must condemn the course which prohibits the poor freed negro a home in any state. You find a race of un-

fortunate men appealing from their degradation and oppression to your humanity and magnanimity, but you heed not their petitions. As benevolently would you refuse the shipwrecked mariner thrown upon your coast a home? Surely neither philanthropy nor patriotism are elements of such abolitionism. We believe an irresistible argument, based on the natural right of mankind, as the divinely appointed tenants in common of the earth, and a fair construction of the spirit of the constitution, can establish the freedman's natural and political right to emigrate into any part of his native land. If one state has the moral and political right to banish, and others in their sovereignty have the same to repel; banished from one state, repelled from another, the highway is the only resort for a living, at the same time the road to the gallows! Why not get rid of the trouble in a more summary humane way, decree that emancipation and decapitation go hand in hand! Abolitionism is wont to satisfy her shallow philanthropy with listening to exaggerated accounts of negro oppression, idle sympathy, and vindictive vituperation of the South. It offers no aid in counsel or money, and would, as in Jamaica, set free to bring greater ruin upon the slave; was it for such conduct that God gave an understanding to direct the feelings of the heart?

Obviously it is folly to point out an evil unless we can propose a remedy for the evil itself, or to counteract its tendencies. It is useless to attempt any social or political changes, unsupported by public sentiment. Let all the literary machinery of the country be put in requisition. Let our religious periodicals, our reviews, our newspapers, be thrown open for discussion in a *right* spirit, let a calm appeal be made to the understanding, patriotism and philanthropy of our people, thus create a favorable public sentiment and upon that erect your plans. We suggest diffusion by colonization and emigration, and also we urge an ameliorated slavery. That four millions of negroes by colonization, assisted by the wisest means of diffusion can be so reduced as to entirely do away with slavery in every form and degree, to human vision, seems impracticable, nor is it essential to consistency with moral and political principles; for man cannot exceed his ability, and to a certain degree we have an absolute necessity to deal with. But if the institution is restrained within manageable bounds, the slave fairly requited, protected from wrong, elevated by moral culture, his personal bondage converted into political control by

becoming the property of the state, the fullest claims of justice and humanity will be satisfied. The views presented suggest the immediate institution of a wise, benevolent, remedial code, as well to relieve present abuses as to co-operate with schemes for diffusion and removal by emigration and the great radical remedy of colonization, also that a society under its patronage be formed in each southern state which shall apply to the general government for a portion of territory on the South-West border of Texas, and at the same time for the proceeds of the sales from public lands so long as necessary, and that such colony shall be exclusively under the management of the state societies till territorial government becomes necessary. The present mode of colonizing contends with difficulties which the proposed plan will materially lessen.

The facilities of transporting, temporarily supporting, defending and managing emigrants, will be materially increased without the same jeopardy of life from climate, or demands for money. The necessity of crossing the ocean, of residing in a remote, unhealthy, savage country, will no longer exist, restraining emigration. Many conscientious men, seeing their slave's condition likely to be bettered, will no longer withhold emancipation. The plea so often opposed to manumission that the free black is a "nuisance" must cease, because a distant home is provided for him. The prospect of a successful result will animate zealous effort in many a desponding, inactive mind. Such a wide field for philanthropic effort thrown open, cannot fail, in this time of religious enterprise, unfurling as it is the banner of christianity before the most remote and inaccessible people, to invite labor to a field of benevolence worthy of the age. All reasonable, honest abolitionists, will divert their energies from the present mischievous channels to the promotion of such a scheme.

With such an enterprise fairly under way, all of that vast and influential class of timid, lukewarm, time-serving friends to emancipation must embrace this scheme. Such must be the progress of public sentiment, soon no respectable man, valuing public opinion, will have the hardihood to vindicate slavery upon its own merits. The impression seems general that to elevate the slave by education and christianity will unfit him for slavery, that he will acquire a knowledge of his rights, and aims above his condition, which will make him discontented and less controllable. Under the proposed plan this revolting

objection, springing from such a sad necessity, will no longer exist. Whenever a community leaves a class, distinct by its caste, in utter neglect, without elementary education and religious instruction, under a depressing sense of inferiority and degradation, exposed to all the unrestrained influences of ignorance, idleness and alcohol, and then complains of it as a nuisance, that community only writes its own sentence of condemnation, for that community has the power of legislation, with the moral influence to control the causes of negro worthlessness, and to make the result of their own neglect a reason for oppression and abuse, is unjust in the extreme. Let wise, benevolent restrictions be put on the domestic slave trade and all be removed from emancipation. Enact that all children born after a certain time shall be registered and serve for twenty years to compensate for raising, from that age let them be allowed fair wages, to be collected and invested by the state till forty years of age, then let them take their wage: and such of their family as they can buy and emigrate, or colonize, at their option. Will such a law do injustice to any man?

If there exists an objector who refuses to allow his slaves a fair remuneration, he may be great, powerful, accomplished and chivalrous, but he must stand before his God as neither patriotic, just, honest nor merciful. In furtherance of this plan, let it be enacted that the state issue bonds to a moderate amount, redeemable in thirty years. With these bonds, as far as they will go, let all slaves in the settlement of estates or otherwise for sale, the state being a preferred purchaser, be purchased at a fair valuation, becoming the property of the state, let them be hired out as agricultural laborers till they pay for themselves, then let them colonize, receiving from the society a cabin and twenty acres of land, or remain as the property of the state, hired out as before, but in the enjoyment of their own earnings, till it suits to colonize. Under this system the planter would save his capital to improve his estates, get rid of the unpleasantness and anxieties incident to slavery. The slave would be elevated in the scale of being, advanced to a state more favorable to emancipation. He would be relieved from the depression, ignominy and abuse of personal bondage. As his wages increased he would have an increasing self-respect and interest in good behavior, become actually a police to guard servile insurrection. In the meantime the state would be gradually releasing herself from an incubus, and a generous

sentiment, recognizing the African as entitled to all the privileges of mankind, would be cultivated, having a favorable effect upon the minds of the people towards emancipation. Upon the proposed plan of checking, reducing and ultimately removing, time, long time, will be required.

The change from slave to free labor will be so gradual as hardly to be felt. Social life will accommodate itself insensibly to the gradual change, there will be no interruption to the business of the country, and there will not be one pound less of cotton raised. Under the stimulating influence of labor remunerated, of prospective freedom and a high object to save his earnings, negro labor will be far more valuable, and as the gradual demand for labor calls, it will come. We have been gravely told that cotton cannot be cultivated by white labor, but in the face of the facts, that the European emigrant makes the public works at the South, is seen in all its large cities, doing all the laborious drudgery of common laborers; that the British and French soldiers and sailors are able to go through all the severest military duties in India and Africa, and from the fact that all over the world experience shows, that by observing a few simple sanitary rules, especially rigid abstinence from alcohol, that men are enabled, in the hottest and most sickly countries, to preserve their health under a reasonable exposure and moderate labor, we may fairly question the assertion. Can we doubt if black labor could not be had, that white labor, stimulated by high wages, would not come? We know that in the salt mines, coal mines, furnaces, glass works and other occupations, known to produce disease and abridge life, labor is abundant. But assuming black labor necessary, there is no necessity for its being slave labor. But we are told the free blacks will not work, yet the white man will have, if he chooses to make the necessary laws, the same power to make the free blacks work that he has to make the slave blacks labor. But conceding all which the force of the argument requires, where is the divine authority to justify one set of men to coerce others to work unrequited for them, where they cannot labor? Can expediency abrogate divine precept? Will such an argument weigh against a divine command? When the Almighty appointed the growth of cotton for the benefit of mankind, did he place its culture under such conditions as necessarily requires the violation of his distinct command to do justly and love mercy? Surely the Almighty will effect

all the purposes he has designed, and can supply all the wants he has created without abrogating or requiring any one to violate the great precepts or commands given to man, which would implicate his omniscience, omnipotence or wisdom.

Each state can, by legislation, secure any amount of black labor, only make his home comfortable and the manumitted will not care to emigrate, the only difference will be substituting a portion of free black labor, and with the law to control them they can be made to do their duty. Whilst the necessity for a long time to consummate the scheme must save all embarrassment from a sudden withdrawal of slave labor, allowing full time to substitute free labor, it will enable good and just men, conscientiously and consistently to make use of slave labor, and its products so long as the necessity lasts, and it would annihilate abolitionism. To trace results to their causes often requires patient, honest inquiry, and there are hasty, harsh-judging, superficial men, too indolent to think, or men whose limited reach of thought will not admit of easy access to truth, looking at the degraded result of slavery, who regard the negro as "sealed from his nativity the slave of nature and the son of hell," and defiantly asks "is there any hope for raising him above the level of the beast of burden?" But is it just or fair when he has been uncared for by the Legislature, only to punish his offences, neither encouraged nor aided to rise above the degradation where freedom found him, to make the wretched product of slavery justify the institution? That simple emancipation will not elevate the slave, and that the greatest advantage of the proposed plan is only to be found in coming generations, is the dictate of common sense. But then we will have started in the right line of duty, the first great, important step will have been taken in the right direction. There are many who deal in abstractions, and whose sense of right and wrong, and whose philanthropy are fully gratified with mere emancipation, leaving the poor slave to the sure consequences of a fixed law which connects such a condition with misery. But is there a christian obligation to send millions to redeem the foreign heathen and none to bestow thousands on our slavery degraded blacks? Is there patriotism in opposing foreign invasion and none in expelling the domestic enemy? Is there philanthropy in relieving human misery in Ireland and none in raising the black man from degradation and wretchedness?

I implore the good men of the country to make every effort to place the negro under circumstances of *personal* independence and equality, where the ordinary motives which stimulate and develop human excellence may have fair play. Surely human nature must be false to her own laws if we do not find that "as the slave departs the man returns." The same law rules in the brute and in the human family. The sheep, placed under a better climate, extra care and attention, will rise far above his family, but still retain all the distinctive features of the sheep. No doubt whole communities, under the influence of moral and physical causes, have degenerated in different degrees and given the variety to the human family, but man, under all circumstances, is still found to be man, and there is a susceptibility and a tendency under favorable circumstances to rise to his original. We see this law of human nature illustrated in the fact, that after a few generations with us the African becomes much improved, and when transported to Liberia rises still higher in the scale of character.

From all we know of the history of man, he must have been created, civilized, and we claim from revelation and the classification of naturalists a common origin. Whence then, all the variety of savage life? How can this result but from the steady operation for ages of deteriorating moral and physical causes? All the moral events and physical condition throughout creation, seem to result from fixed laws whether for evil or for good. Hence, certain consequences invariably follow a certain conduct. The suspension of certain moral and physical laws produces corresponding changes. Constitutional diseases, parental deficiencies, mental proclivities are transmitted, families morally and physically degenerate, showing that human procreation is in obedience to certain laws which mould the character, physically and morally. Just as the muscular system, within healthful limits, is exercised, is the muscular vigor, so with the nervous system, mental development corresponds with that of the brain. The arm which is tied up withers, the unpracticed brain falls off in vigorous manifestations, the good man by practicing virtue becomes better, the bad man habituated to evil becomes worse, so that it seems possible that man, made after the image of his Creator, may, in the course of ages, drift away from his high original, till the distinctive features of his race are nearly lost.

The colony in New South Wales, settled from the very

sweepings of the jails in England, under improving influences, has become a moral, industrious, prosperous community. Is not the inference legitimate that when removed from unfavorable circumstances and placed under others more favorable to the development of human excellence that the African will rise if not to the ancient standard attributed to his early history, at least to a degree that we may reasonably hope for success in colonizing? Anyhow, conceding his inferiority cannot furnish an argument for enslaving him, for if you admit the negro is a man, you must, if a christian, in his treatment, be governed by divine precepts given to regulate the intercourse among men. Of course if we find that the necessities of his nature make it absolutely necessary to disrobe him of his manhood, there is no alternative, he must be treated as a brute.

Some facts, superficially regarded, may discourage our scheme. The fugitives who have been concentrated in Canada have never advanced in respectability, the slaves freed by John Rãndolph settled in Ohio, are equally unpromising. We must reflect that these were ignorant slavery degraded men, left *entirely* to their own management, cut off from the improving, elevating influences of social intercourse with their betters. They carried with them all their slave habits, and as no pains were taken to improve them, they were under less favorable circumstances than when they had masters to keep them from drinking and idleness. Now take from any of our cities a colony of the lowest grade of society, leave them to self government, take no pains to improve them, will such a community present a more hopeful prospect? Suppose again three-fourths of the educated, religious, industrious and polished of London were suddenly to emigrate, how long before the condition of that great city would be most deplorable?

Some may object to planting a Colony of negroes in North America, but all future troubles from such a step is speculation, and altogether contingent upon the conduct of their more powerful white neighbors. If our people act wisely, virtuously, firmly and kindly, nothing need be feared, and if they do not the Republic will come to ruin whether or not we have a neighbor negro colony. Anyhow, we have only to follow the promptings of our enlightened conscience, leaving future events to Providence, for remote colonization is impracticable. We must either keep the blacks a debased race, a standing rebuke to our justice and wisdom, a conceded great social evil, an increasing cause of political anxiety, or adopt some practical plan for ultimate removal, or safe reduction at least.

So long as we are not led by a blind impulsive feeling, regardless of the light of reason and experience, as was the case in emancipating the West India slaves, guided by our understanding and an enlightened conscience, we cannot be held responsible for our well intended acts, and any question as to far distant results is a problem, the solution of which must be left to the good providence of God. To say nothing (though surely a most serious consideration) of the hazards to domestic security, peace and happiness, the concentration of a large slave population on our Southern border must be unwise. The strength of a country is its yeomanry, and surely no state will be willing to trust its defences to a yeomanry of slaves. In case of a foreign invasion a dense slave population must ever present a most inviting weak point, as we know it did in the late war with England, when it was contemplated to march black regiments into Georgia. On an estate remote from a large city, with five hundred negroes it would be only reasonable to suppose that there would be many ready to meet any overtures from a wicked fanatic or military spy. We should reflect that this is a *progressive* evil and that it is the tendency, by a universal law for every wrong unchecked by human wisdom, indirectly and violently to cure itself, as illustrated in the French revolution. In every well balanced community from the diversity and degree of talent, energy, form of character or other circumstances, there must naturally exist three strata or classes, the lower occupied by the indigent and laborious, the second by the more thrifty and better provided tradesmen and mechanics, the third by the more highly cultivated and opulent, placed above the drudgery of life. In the laws which thus regulate social life lies the foundation of a great self-adjusting conservative principle. When wealth and its concomitants, indolence and luxurious indulgence, long exist, the class deteriorates, individuals cannot hold their position from loss of power and aggressive competition from below, the middle class gradually works up, because its condition is more favorable to the development of moral and physical excellence, the more energetic from the class below them supplies their places. Without this law of class no prosperous community can last, because there will be no classes from below to refresh and invigorate the effete upper stratum, in which upper stratum, the governing power must reside, for "those who think must govern those who toil."

Now, under the institution of slavery this great law is broken up, there is a very meagre, inadequate middle stratum, and under the operation of natural causes, the upper stratum of

masters will lose its numerical force, its moral and physical ability to govern will cease to be in that healthy proportion to the lower stratum required by subordination and prosperity. Hence it would seem to be the true policy to cultivate a middle class, keep down all unsafe excess in the lower class or stratum. Colonization, aided by the wisest means of diffusion and the most decided prohibition of further importation, will naturally promote the one, introducing every variety of manufacture, worked by white operatives, and prohibiting by law negro mechanics, would advance the other.

Let the African be confined to agricultural labor, let him become the property of the state, introduce a species of serfdom, under which the negro will enjoy a comparatively healthful, safe freedom, an ameliorated slavery, consistent with justice, mercy and the prosperity of all. Surely no thoughtful man who has the courage to look the evil in the face, no man who will not wilfully reject conviction, can deny the dreadful tendency, nay, the inevitable result of slavery cherished as it is. In fifty years there will be sixteen millions of slaves in the South. Will not the anticipation of servile troubles cause men to emigrate, and the same cause prevent them from being replaced by new settlers? Will not an increasing difficulty to control, produce increased severity of police? Natural causes enfeebling the master's moral and physical power, till at last a point is reached beyond which endurance and the capacity to govern must cease? And what then? The South should be stimulated to move in this matter by every noble motive, as well as by the consideration established by statistical facts, daily observation and the opinions of some of her wisest men, that viewed in the double light or aspect of injustice and injury to the black race and of its deteriorating influences, morally and physically, on the masters and their descendants, with all its prospective perils, that slavery is no blessing. Indeed it cannot be too strongly impressed on the Southern mind, that to be politically wise, an institution must be morally right.

Fellow citizens of the South, I pray you listen to the voice of reason and experience, to all of your truly great and good men from the date of our Union. Facts may be carelessly blinked or recklessly disregarded, but their consequences must be met. Be not stupidly passive under the delusion that because great gains may be pouring into your laps, that you are growing rich and powerful in all the essential elements of political prosperity. Reflect that from vast unequal wealth and luxurious living in one class, ignorance, poverty and degradation in the other, for they are equally unfavorable to the growth of moral

worth, certain deplorable consequences are inseparable. True, scattered over wide districts, palatial residences, as in Cuba, may arise, looking with lordly pride over thousands of acres untenanted by a free, enlightened peasantry; true to your delighted eyes may wave rich luxuriance, but unless nature's laws cease from their usual results, your children's children, demoralized and enfeebled by inordinate wealth, extravagance and luxury must reap another harvest, a harvest of trouble and sorrow from the mad policy of cherishing within your bosom a great and growing domestic enemy. Alas,

"Ill fares the land to hast'ning ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and where men decay."

Your peculiar institution, to give security and peace of mind, will require an extensive standing army. It is the teachings of experience, that neighboring nations constantly find occasion for political broils. What is to give immunity to the two Confederacies from such evils? Will you not have also, exciting causes of bitter party strife? May not the people in the madness, recklessness and wickedness of party spirit, place in the seat of power some ambitious military man, some Julius Cæsar or some "Little Corporal." What then will save your free institutions? Will not the same causes which have produced the late unhappy division of our country exist so long as slavery exists as a cherished institution? Is it possible that in two nations so decidedly opposed upon the subject of slavery, that fanatics and demagogues will be idle? Will not fugitives from the South be still seduced away and protected in the North? Will not this cause the bitterest strife and inevitably lead to war? No man can doubt that widespread misery will result to both sections, but to reason's eye one result sooner or later, is inevitable; with such vast odds of numerical strength, force and wealth against her. A fearful, slumbering, domestic enemy, within her borders, the general sympathy of mankind against her, under a strong sense of the scowl of freedom, justice, mercy and divine displeasure, all the desperation and boasted chivalry of the South cannot save her. Like Napoleon's guard she may bravely resolve never to surrender, but like that gallant band, she must be overwhelmed. And truthful history will record her epitaph, died ingloriously, slain by freedom's sword, fighting against the inalienable rights of man.