

E449
S627

56
2
5
E

SLAVERY,

E 449
.S627
Copy 1

CON. AND PRO.

OR,

A Sermon and its Answer.

BY

AMOR PATRIÆ.

☞ This publication is intended especially for the North.

WASHINGTON:
HENRY POLKINHORN, PRINTER.
1858.

11
12



9
16416



SLAVERY

Con. and Pro. :

OR,

A SERMON AND ITS ANSWER.

In the following pages the compiler has endeavored to show the arguments against and those for slavery; the former as exhibited in a sermon delivered by the REV. JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, of the Tabernacle Church, New York, and afterwards published as a pamphlet, entitled, "*Teachings of the New Testament on Slavery;*" and the latter in a pamphlet, by "AMOR PATRIÆ, entitled, "*The Blasphemy of Abolitionism Exposed. A Bible Argument.*" These two little works embody the whole subject of slavery, as treated in the Scriptures, and as it exists as the "peculiar institution" of the South. The pamphlet of Amor Patriæ was issued some six years before Mr. Thompson's, and they are now combined in order to show that Mr. Thompson is either mistaken in his Scriptural references, or has intentionally perverted the true construction of them, and purposely omitted many texts that make against the abolition and anti-slavery doctrine which he advocates. "Amor Patriæ" is a gentleman of the North, who formerly resided at the South, and is well acquainted with the popular feeling and the social condition of both sections of the country. The sermon of Mr. Thompson is given entire, subdivided under different heads as he published it, and the pamphlet of Amor Patriæ is dissected as, a running commentary to each part of the sermon, and in concluding general remarks on the whole. The combined works are submitted to the solemn consideration of every thinking reader. Both will be easily distinguished by their captions and the different type in which they are presented to the reader. Mr. Thompson commences as follows with the text quoted:

THE NEW TESTAMENT CODE ON SLAVERY.

EPHESIANS 6: 5-10.—"Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good-will doing ser-

‘ vice, as to the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free.

“ And ye, masters, do the same things to them, forbearing threatening; knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with Him.”

The epistle to the Ephesians contains the Christian code for domestic life. The same for substance is repeated in the epistle to the Colossians. Husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants, are severally instructed in their personal and relative duties. To study these duties, to preach upon them, to practice them, is as much a part of the gospel as to study, preach and practice the primary duties of repentance and faith. The first sermon of Christ at Nazareth was not a discourse on theology, but a plea for humanity, and a promise of blessings to society, especially to its inferior classes, through his mission of grace.

The law of Christianity in the relation of master and servant, the nature of that relation, and the reciprocal duties of master and servant under the gospel, are presented in the text as an essential point in the regimen of a church of Christ, and in the application of Christianity to human society.

It has been arbitrarily assumed, that because the relation of master and servant is treated of in the same connection with the marriage relation and the parental relation, it rests upon the same natural and moral grounds with these fundamental relations of human life. Hence it is argued that the abuses of slavery are no more valid as an objection against the system of slavery, than abuses of the marital and parental relations are valid against the institution of marriage. Since all have to do in some form with the relation of master and servant, and since the institution of slavery now demands the sanction and support of the Federal Government, and the suffrages of all the citizens of the United States, it behoves us carefully to examine the gospel code touching that relation. The question is not one of mere abstract morality, nor of political economy or expediency, but a question of practical Christianity.

What does the New Testament teach concerning the relation of master and servant?

That the New Testament recognizes the existence of slavery as a *fact*, is plain from various allusions to that institution, especially in the letters of Paul, and from the instructions given to both masters and slaves. Does, then, Christianity acknowledge the propriety of that institution, or in any wise give to slavery its sanction? Does slavery, as it existed in the Roman empire, find any warrant in the New Testament? Is it there recognized as a *rightful* institution, whose abuses only call for condemnation, in the same way that an abuse of power by the husband or the father is condemned without invalidating the institution of marriage? Is the essence of the relation of master and servant the same with that of husband and wife, and of parent and child?—and are the abuses of that relation to be treated as only upon a level with abuses of the tenderest relations of life?

In answer to these questions I shall show,

1. That in the apostolic age, slavery existed purely as a creature of the Roman law.
2. That in defining the duties of the respective parties in that relation, the apostles nowhere acknowledge the rightfulness of slavery under the law of God.
3. That by placing the parties in that relation under the higher law of Christian love and equality, the apostles decreed the virtual abolition of slavery, and did in time abolish it wherever Christianity gained the ascendancy in society or in the state.

These theses embody the code of the New Testament, and the practice of the apostles with respect to slavery in the Roman empire.

COMMENTS BY "AMOR PATRÆ."—Now, Mr. Thompson is egregiously mistaken in supposing that the code of slavery in the New Testament is entirely embodied in his text, and explained in his comments. He seems to have overlooked many passages which define the "code" much more clearly than that which is the basis of his remarks, and give the negative to the three positions he has assumed above; and we find even in his own text as copied, the *divine injunction* to the slave to serve faithfully, over and above the laws of the land, which our Savior commands *should be respected*. It may be proper here to remark, that in all the passages of Scripture I shall cite in the New Testament, the word *servant* means *slave*, DOULOS, in contradistinction to MISTHOTES, a *hireling*.

Luke, chap. xvii. ver. 7-9: "But which of you having a servant ploughing, or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he has come from the field, Go and sit down to meat? And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not."

Here the very first thing we find is our Savior, who condemned all sins, both great and small, at the risk of his life, justify the righteousness of his own conduct by an appeal to this slave institution! Now allow me to ask—would our abolition brethren, or any sane person, bring forward an institution *not approved of*, in justification of their own conduct? And then to say—"Does he thank that servant for doing his duty?" Duty! Why, our abolition brethren would rather consider it his duty to *kill* his master! then steal his horse, or some one's else, and flee for his life to Canada!

Verily, if this be a sample of New Testament teaching, our abolition brethren will have to appeal to some other book than it to justify them in their mad crusade against their southern brethren.

Colossians, chap. iii. ver. 22-24: "Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Jesus Christ." Here we find the divine injunction repeated still more emphatically.

1 Timothy, chap. vi. ver. 1-4: "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor,

that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings." Here we find nothing like disobedience to masters inculcated; but we do find something like a full length portrait of our abolition brethren!

Titus, chap. ii. ver. 9, 10: "Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again; not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things."

1 Peter, chap. ii. ver. 18: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." Here we find *no excuse* for disobedience. I presume we have now shown quite enough testimony to convince the *convincible*, that our brother abolitionists have as little to do, legitimately, with the *institution*, as they profess to have with the treatment.

(Although our brother abolitionists profess now to eschew treatment from the argument, still I must be permitted, by way of episode, here to remark, that it is well known to those acquainted with the subject, that it takes from two-thirds to three-fourths of the produce of the plantations, upon an average, throughout the Southern States, to feed and clothe the operatives; and they are the first served—the master or owner takes what remains: still we are told they get nothing for their labor! In the cold barren lands of New England, they give their operatives one-half only of the product! Now, let me ask, which is most in accordance with that passage of Scripture they love to quote so well—"Give to your servants that which is just and equal?" to say nothing of their favorite Golden Rule, alias Rule of Gold, which they will please bear in mind applies as much to *free servants*, as to those belonging to their masters?)

SLAVERY NOT NORMAL NOR DIVINE.

1. In the apostolic age slavery existed purely as a creature of the Roman law. It was not a normal condition of society, nor was it instituted by the command of God, or derived from his revealed Word; but it was an institution of Roman society created by the civil law.

The family institution exists everywhere as the normal condition of society.

It grows out of the very nature of things; the distinction of the sexes, with their correlative instincts and affections. Marriage is a law of nature which lies at the foundation of human society. From this institution arises, by the same law of nature, the relation of parents and children. All this is normal. It belongs to the rule or principle of man's existence. It is that without which mankind could not exist. All the rudiments of society are in the family; and the education and even the continuance of the race depends upon these fundamental relations of husband and wife, and parent and child.

But will any one presume to assert this of the relation of master and slave? Does this come into the same category with the relation of husband and wife, as a normal condition of society, a part of the natural law under which society itself exists? Then there has been no such thing as society in New York since July 4th, 1827, when domestic slavery was abolished by an act of the Legislature, passed ten years before. Then, in order to have a true normal condition of society here, we must reestablish slavery. Then, in order to the constitution of society in Kansas, slavery must be there established as its corner-stone. Then there is no true civilization in England, France, or Germany; but Russia and Turkey are the only civilized nations of Europe, these alone having the element of domestic slavery.

Will any sane man pretend that slavery is a normal state of society?—that the relation of master and slave belongs to a right and healthy constitution of society, just as the relations of husband and wife, and parent and child, are necessary to the existence of society? Marriage was the original basis of society in Eden, and is its normal condition everywhere; the relation of parent and child is a natural consequence of this; but the relation of master and slave is wholly artificial and arbitrary. It is set up by power and then constituted by law, but does not spring from nature. Even the code of Justinian declares that slavery is “contrary to natural right,” and that “all men by the law of nature are born in freedom.”

Moreover, as slavery in the apostolic age did not exist, as indeed it never can exist by natural law, so neither was it instituted by the command of God, or derived from his revealed Word. Marriage is not only an ordinance of nature, but was also a positive institution of the Creator in Paradise. Slavery, we have seen, is not, in any case, an ordinance of nature. Is it, then, a positive institution of the Creator? Did Jehovah ever ordain it, or give to it his sanction? And if so, was Roman slavery derived from any previous ordinance or sanction of the divine law?

Domestic servitude existed in the patriarchal age, and under the Hebrew commonwealth. But it did not originate in a command of God, nor is there any evidence that God approved of it as an institution of society, but much evidence to the contrary.

COM. BY A. P.—That the institution of slavery is of divine origin I think is fully proven by the foregoing extracts from the New Testament, which show that it attracted the attention of the apostles, who laid down laws defining the position of master and slave, the relation of one to the other, and rules for the conduct of each. That the institution was eminently normal, the following extracts from the Old Testament abundantly prove:

God, we are told, is yesterday, to-day, and forever, one and the same: that “he detests the unclean thing” SIN; hence, to call anything a sin he commands, or attempt to limit what he has established forever, is it not blasphemy? Moreover, is it reasonable to suppose the Deity expected other nations to be

better than he commanded his own chosen people to be, whom he intended as a light to the world? It will be well to remember, it was for the breach, not the observance of his laws, for which the Jews were so severely punished! And so it will be with all who refuse to go and buy, setting up their own righteousness superior to the God that made them! It is a trick of the evil one, and must be eschewed as a most deadly poison to the soul, or it will weigh it down to the *bottomless pit*.

Now for the Bible testimony. In Genesis xii. we find the first mention of Abraham in communication with the Deity. In verse 5, we find him a slaveholder, and got his slaves in Haran just as we get money or other property: "And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran; and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan: and into the land of Canaan they came."

Here it may be proper to remark, that EBED is the Hebrew for slave—SAUKEER for hired-servant. Hence there is no chance for the scholar to mistake.

In chapter xiv. verse 14: "And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan." Here we find Abraham had power over his slaves to expose their lives in battle. It is not so in the Southern States.

In chapter xvi, verses 6-9: "But Abram said unto Sarai, Behold, thy maid is in thy hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee. And when Sarai dealt hardly with her, she fled from her face. And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way to Shur. And he said, Hagar, Sarai's maid, whence camest thou? and whither wilt thou go? And she saith, I flee from the face of my mistress Sarai. And the angel of the Lord saith unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself unto her hands." Here we see how God through his angel dealt with a runaway slave—very unlike an abolitionist.

In chap. xvii. ver. 12, 13, we find God recognizing slavery: "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.

In chap. xx. ver. 14, we find them made presents of, the same as any other property [goods and chattels.] "And Abimelech

took sheep, and oxen, and men servants, and women servants, and gave them unto Abraham, and restored him Sarah his wife.

In chap. xxiv. ver. 35, 36, we find God blessing Abraham and his son Isaac with a curse! according to the abolition dictionary. "And the Lord hath blessed my master greatly, and he is become great: and he hath given him flocks, and herds, and silver and gold, and men-servants and maid-servants, and camels, and asses. And Sarah, my master's wife, bare a son to my master when she was old; and unto him hath he given all that he hath."

In chap. xxvi. ver. 14, we find the Philistines envied or hated Isaac. How is it in this our day?

In chap. xxx. ver. 43: "And the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maid servants, and men servants, and camels, and asses." Here appears to be proof that God did not disapprove of slavery; on the contrary, some hundreds of years afterwards, we find he permanently established it, through his law-giver Moses, and hence made it common to Christendom; and it is presumable he knew what he was doing, doubtless quite as well as our abolition brethren.

Exodus, chap. xii. ver. 43-45: "And the Lord saith unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover; there shall no stranger eat thereof: But every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. A foreigner and a hired-servant shall not eat thereof." Here we find the Israelites owners of slaves directly after they left Egypt! and their slaves were privileged characters, compared to hired-servants.

Chap. xxi. ver. 1-6: "Now, these are the judgments which thou shalt set before them. If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. 4. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servants shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post: and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever." Moreover, we have the fiat of God for holding the children, and consequently have no need of the old civil law maxim—"Partus sequitur ventrum." Let the 4th verse be particularly noticed by those who accuse the South of separating man and wife. This institution we never had in this coun-

try. It seems to be a kind of penitentiary, or state prison system—they were sold for debt and for crime. To allude to it, therefore, in argument against our slave institution, is only calculated to deceive, and hence fraudulent.

The 16th verse has ever been an universal text with our abolition brethren—“And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.” But it is more than probable, had father Abraham caught one of them stealing away his slaves, he would have made a very different application to what they are in the habit of making. In the 20th and 21st verses the Jewish laws are much more lenient to the master than southern laws or practice, as there is abundant proof extant to show, if cavillers will take the trouble to look after it. “And if a man strike his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two he shall not be punished, for he is his money.”

Leviticus, chap. xxii. ver. 10, 11: “There shall no stranger eat of the holy thing: a sojourner of the priest, or a hired servant, shall not eat of the holy thing. But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house, they shall eat of his meat.” Here we find the slave a privileged character again; especially the souls belonging to the priest!

In chap. xxv. ver. 30: “And if it be not redeemed within the space of a full year, then the house that is in the walled city shall be established for ever to him that bought it, throughout his generations; it shall not go out in the jubilee.” Here we find forever and jubilee are not synonymous—all that has been said to the contrary notwithstanding!

The following passage of Scripture is the FIAT OF OMNIPOTENCE for the AMERICAN institution of SERVITUDE—hence it is a divine institution. Let those who call it a SIN! or an evil! and quote the golden rule for its overthrow! remember that it was ordained by the God and father of us all, “who is yesterday, to-day, and forever, one and the same”—and “whose eyes are too pure to behold iniquity”—the father of the GOLDEN RULE, “and every good and perfect gift.” Heed it well! and forever bear in mind, that none oppose His commands, or set themselves up to be more holy than He, but the servants of the EVIL ONE—Infidels, Blasphemers! and whether they appear as “angels of light,” or in their own native deformity, “from such turn away!”

Now let us hear what chap. xxv. verses 44-46 Leviticus, says upon this subject: “Both thy bond-men and thy bond-maids,

which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen (foreigners) that are round about you: of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be your possession, [property—goods and chattels.] And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever: but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule over one another with rigor." Here we find the institution we have in this country. And here we find that never-changing God says—Ye shall buy! The command seems imperative. Not, if ye buy, as in the xxi. chapter Exodus. And forever too, not six years, nor even to jubilee! (There appears to be a vast difference between law-givers and law-expounders, nowadays!)

In examining the Old Testament, it struck me as a little singular, that not a word is said as to the treatment of the perpetual servant, when there is so much in regard to the limited. I can only account for this, that the Deity, knowing man, knew that he would be good to his own, in fee. For it is said proverbially—"The devil even is good to his own." Again, the limited servant had a property-interest in himself; hence, to put out an eye or break out a tooth, was a permanent injury, therefore it was commanded, as a remuneration, that he should be set free. But the Jews did not always do it, and hence were severely rebuked in the lviii. chapter Isaiah.

Deuteronomy, chap. xxiii. ver. 15: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee."

This passage of Scripture has recently been laid hold of by some Rev. expounder of Holy writ, who published several letters in the New York Observer, in the summer of '49, to prove it unlawful to send back runaway slaves to their masters in the Southern States!

It is well known to every intelligent reader of the Bible, that God commanded the Israelites to go up and exterminate every living thing found upon the promised land. Hence to have sent back those poor runaways, who sought protection from the pending destruction, and who were not parties to the quarrel, it would have been extreme cruelty and injustice—consequently this especial enactment in their favor. But instead of this special act proving, as a general thing, that runaway slaves were not to be sent back to their masters, even to foreigners, it proves the reverse; else the enactment would have been superfluous.

Lawyers well understand this ; and none but a knave or fool can misunderstand or pervert it. Were it not so, why was Hagar sent back by God's order, when found upon the borders of her native country? Can God do injustice, or violate his own laws? Again, the inspired apostle Paul sent back Onesimus to his master, and why? because he respected the master's rights of ownership; and, although a friend, and in great need, would not violate principle by retaining his servant without his permission. Moreover, how beautifully would such construction contrast with the abundance of scripture I shall immediately quote, where slaves are commanded to be obedient to their masters? Alas! What does D.D. mean? It appears to mean nothing but Deuced Dunce or Diabolical Deceiver!

But our abolition brethren don't seem to like the Old Testament—they call it the Jews' Bible! That it is an awkward book for them, no one can well question, especially since the people have taken the trouble to look for themselves instead of taking their statements. But for their accommodation, let us turn to the New Testament and see what it says, and whether they will recognize its authority.

THE "CURSE OF HAM."

Men who either do not read the Bible at all, or who read it very carelessly, are prone to speak of the posterity of Ham as doomed by Jehovah to perpetual slavery. What endless changes have been rung upon the "accursed seed of Ham." But there is no such curse in the Bible, nor has any such curse ever been fulfilled upon the children of Ham, as such. *Cush* was the oldest son of Ham, and his son was *Nimrod*, the mightiest name of that dim antiquity, and the founder of that Assyrian empire which for ages ruled all western Asia, and which once and again carried terror into Palestine and Egypt. The growth of all this grandeur and power from cities founded by a grandson of Ham, and peopled by his descendants—a power that shook the earth, and whose memorials outlast the ages—surely does not verify the curse of perpetual bondage *said* to have been pronounced upon the posterity of Ham. The fact is, that no such curse was ever pronounced.

Open the Bible at the 9th chapter of *Genesis*, and the 24th verse, and you there read that "Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done to him; and he said, cursed be *Canaan*; a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren."

Now *Canaan* was Ham's youngest son—as Ham himself was the youngest son of Noah—and the curse was pronounced upon *Canaan* by name, and is repeated three times. "You, my youngest son, have put me to shame before your brethren; you shall feel the punishment of this in the degradation of *your* youngest son; he shall be put to shame before his brethren, and his posterity shall feel in their bones the curse of their dishonored ancestor."

Turning now to the 10th chapter of *Genesis*, (vv. 15-21,) we find the boundaries of *Canaan's* settlement accurately defined. It was the land afterwards so well known as the land of Palestine, reaching along the coast of the Mediterranean, from Sidon to Gaza, and eastward to Sodom and Gomorrah. None of the posterity of *Canaan* settled in Ethiopia. When, 900 years after, the Israelites, the descendants of *Shem*, conquered the land of *Canaan*, and made hewers of wood and drawers of water of all who were not slain in battle, *then* was fulfilled that old prophetic denunciation: "Blessed be the Lord God of *Shem*, and *Canaan* shall be his servant." The

only curse ever pronounced upon any of the posterity of Ham was fulfilled in the subjugation of the Canaanites by the Israelites, about 1500 years before Christ. And this, like all slavery in the earliest times, was the enslavement of *whites*. The institution of slavery in the East was not based upon a distinction of color.

If ever you hear a man, even though he be styled a Doctor of Divinity, justifying African slavery from the curse denounced upon Ham, do you advise him to go to the nearest Sabbath-school, till he can read and understand the Bible.

COM. BY A. P.—The posterity of Ham were accursed by Noah, in the person of Ham's youngest son, Canaan, who is considered by many to be the progenitor of the African.

Much speculation has obtained first and last among learned philosophers as to the origin of the negro race. Some suppose them a race created especially for servants—to prevent a superior race reducing to servitude *their own brethren* by their cobweb laws, the most abject poverty-stricken servitude imaginable, as they do, for instance, all over Europe at the present day—and that there is no more reason in supposing that they sprang from the same pair with the white race, than to suppose the jackass and Arabian steed sprang from the same pair; for these are not more dissimilar. And that the passage of scripture which says, "All nations of the earth were created of one flesh and blood," proves nothing; as animals with equal propriety might have been added, for they are flesh and blood as well as other folks.

Others suppose them an *hybrid*, and that the old legend solves the problem, to wit: That a little daughter of Canaan, lost upon the Red sea, was found by an ourang-outang, who, fond of his *protege*, collected for her the various fruits of the forest, and in every way in his power administered to her comfort and happiness—this won her affections; and in process of time, their habits becoming greatly assimilated, the negro was the result; and as proof of this, that the uncultivated negro, taken from the wilds of Africa, approaches as near the ourang-outang as to our species. Moreover, that it is the only explanation that can be given to the 9th chap. Gen. 25th ver., which otherwise remains unexplained.

With all these speculations, however, I have nothing to do. My knowledge of the negro extends not beyond the limits of my own country. Here I find him in a comparatively highly cultivated and civilized state—a *good servant*—very unlike most white hirelings, compelled by their necessities to serve their affluent brother. If kindly treated, he is generally faithful and affectionate, and serves his white master with delight. And be his origin what it may, his introduction into the civilized and christian society of a superior race, has greatly improved his con-

dition ; and by the occasional admixture of a little white blood, has in many instances become almost as shrewd and cunning as his wooden-nutmeg brethren ; and in some few instances seems practically to understand the true intent and meaning of the old Latin proverb : “ *Rem facias rem, recte, si posses ; si non, quocunque modo rem,* ” as well as the best of them.

SERVITUDE UNDER THE PATRIARCHS.

As to the Patriarchs, the recorded fact that Abraham and Jacob had bond-servants is no more evidence that God approved of slavery, than the recorded fact that each of these patriarchs had two wives is proof that God approves of bigamy, or the record, twice made, and without censure, that Abraham equivocated about Sarah, is proof that the Bible sanctions lying.

When we shall see a modern slaveholder arm his 318 servants, and lead them hundreds of miles, over mountain, river, and desert, into a foreign and unsettled country, where no law or power can bind them to his service—when we shall see him thus heading his own trained and equipped household, for the rescue of an unfortunate kinsman, and dividing with them the spoils of war, we may begin to trace in that slaveholder some resemblance to the patriarch Abraham. Or when we shall see some modern planter commissioning his chief servant to go hundreds of miles beyond the reach of plantation laws, equipped with dromedaries and laden with jewels and gold—having every facility for escape—yet trusted to choose a wife for his master’s son, and to negotiate the marriage-contract, then again we may discern the features of patriarchal slavery in the slavery of modern times. How palpable it is that Abraham did not hold his servants as chattel-slaves. He was himself but a sojourner in the land of Canaan. No local law would guard his rights as a master.

But aside from the utter want of parallelism between domestic servitude under the patriarchs and modern chattel-slavery, shall we make no account of the greater light enjoyed in our times? It has been aptly said, that “if Abraham were now living among us, he would be put into the penitentiary for bigamy.” Shall we go back to study morality in the twilight of the patriarchal age? Those modern slaveholders who seek to cover themselves with the mantle of the patriarchs, remind one of the ignorant and superstitious peasantry of Italy, who, when their vines were blasted, offered a special prayer to the “most holy patriarch Noah,” invoking his intercession, on the ground that he was the special patron of the vine, and familiar with its qualities. If we are to copy the patriarchs in points where their example is not commended or enjoined in the Bible, then let us have the “patriarchal institutions” entire—inebriety, equivocation, deception, bigamy, polygamy, as well as slavery. Nay, nay. It is the glory of the Bible that it is so great, so good, so true in itself, so instinct with the sense of justice and of right, that it can afford to record, without comment, the failings of the best of men, and leave us to judge these by its own infallible standard.

COM. BY A. P.—I cannot perceive any difference between servitude under the Patriarchs and servitude at the present day, except such as may readily be accounted for by the progression of the human family to a higher and still higher state of improvement. *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis.* Slaves were bought, and sold, and given as presents by the patriarchs, just as they are in our day, as we have shown by some of the texts quoted.

A highly civilized, intelligent and refined society, cannot exist without servants of some kind—and the difference between

purchasing and hiring, is just about the difference between buying and hiring a horse ; the former is generally the best used. The Deity, knowing the nature of man, doubtless well understood this, or perhaps he would not have so unequivocally established the institution *forever*. And if our brethren of the free States would begin even *now* to keep God's commandments, and buy a number not to exceed the white members of their families, and at any age not above twenty years, then educate them—then the South could follow their example without the fear of incendiary pamphlets being sent among them—and I am sure no christian negro, if he read and understood the Bible, could disobey and run away, or in any way *unfaithfully* serve his master. How much more christian this course would be, than, while living in open violation of God's laws, trying to make a virtue for themselves by denouncing in the most savage manner their southern brethren who keep them, by buying as God has commanded.

THE MOSAIC CODE.

The laws of *Moses* did not introduce slavery among the Jews. The story of Joseph is evidence that slavery then existed throughout Arabia and Egypt. In making laws for a semi-barbarous and intractable people, *Moses* suffered many things because of the hardness of their hearts. A careful study of his code demonstrates that "the Mosaic statutes respecting the relation of master and slave are obviously modifications and amendments of a previously-existing common-law, and are designed to meliorate the condition of the slave, to protect him from oppression, and to promote the gradual disuse and abolition of slavery."

By that law, kidnapping, or the stealing of men to make them slaves, which was the origin of all the slavery in this country, was a capital crime. "He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, *he shall surely be put to death.*"

By that law a fugitive slave was not to be returned to his master. By that law a slave maimed by his master, a female slave violated by her master, were entitled to freedom, and the master was held responsible for any act of severity to a slave. By that law slaves were to have the same religious privileges with their masters. By that law the Hebrew slave was set free every seventh year, and there was an emancipation of all poor and oppressed Israelites every fiftieth year. The ranks of slaves were recruited from thieves, debtors, and captives in war; but the slave was always treated as a *person*; the laws were altogether in his favor; and perpetual, unmitigated chattelism, was a thing unknown among the Hebrews.

The enslaving of the heathen was permitted to the Israelites under certain regulations. By the law of nations in the earliest times, they had a right to enslave or to kill all captives taken in war. The laws of *Moses* modified and humanized this bloody common law. And if the Israelites were allowed to hold bondmen from among the heathen with somewhat more rigor than they could hold a Hebrew servant, this, like the conquest and subjugation of Canaan, was part of the special judgment decreed by *Jehovah* against idolaters, and inflicted through Israel as his chosen people. We laugh at the absurdity of those who would find in the command given to *Joshua* to exterminate the Canaanites, a divine warrant for the Puritans and their descendants to exterminate the aborigines from this continent. But is that any greater absurdity than the logic which finds, in a special and restricted permission given to the Hebrews to hold heathen bond-servants, a perpetual divine warrant for chattel-slavery?

COM. BY A. P.—If the foregoing be true, what means simply *Leviticus* 25, 44 to 46 inclusive? That slavery did exist under Moses (whether he instituted it or not) is evident from the laws he enacted to protect the slave and against kidnapping; and though in his individuality the slave was treated as a *person*, yet, as a *chattel*, he was liable to a change of ownership, and could be bought, sold, or given away, whether as a criminal, a debtor, or a captive in war.

LATER JEWISH LEGISLATION.

The regulations of the Mosaic Code had their natural and designed effect. They made the care of slaves so much a burden to the master, they made the rights of slaves so prominent and so valid, that even the mild and modified form of slavery tolerated by the Mosaic law, gradually died away. The fact that Solomon levied upon the remnant of the Canaanites for bond-service in building the Temple, shows that even his roll of "servants born in his house," could not have been great. There is no evidence that the Hebrews in Palestine ever engaged in the foreign slave-trade. The prophets denounced the abuses of slavery, and urged the abolition of the system.

The traditional Jewish laws upon this subject, codified by the pious and learned Maimonides, are instructive, as showing the increasing leniency of the system in the latter times of the Hebrew commonwealth. This code required that an adult slave, purchased by a Hebrew from an idolater, should be circumcised; but this must be done with the free consent of the slave himself; otherwise he must be returned to his heathen master. If voluntarily circumcised, he was entitled to the privileges of a proselyte in the house of Israel. The code required that the master should be kind to his slave, and not let his yoke weigh too heavy on him. "He must find him in sufficient meat and drink, and must not abuse him either by word or deed, nor rebuke him with rage; but must speak to him mildly, and must give him time to offer his defence in ease of culpability."

How manifest is it that the slave was a *person* owing service, and not a mere piece of property. The law favored manumission or emancipation upon the soil, in a variety of ways. A converted slave, that is, a circumcised Gentile, could claim his freedom of the magistrates if his master sold him to an idolater, or to a proselyte of the gate; or could assert his freedom by running away. Such a slave residing in Judea, recovered his freedom if his master sold him to any person whatever out of the land of Judea—even to a Jew in the adjacent parts of Syria. He could not be taken out of the land of Judea by his master without his free consent. The converted slave of a Hebrew residing in a foreign country, who escaped into Judea, must not be given up to his owner. Thus we see that the traditional laws of the Hebrews, carrying out the spirit of the Mosaic code, tended to ameliorate the condition of bondmen, and finally to abolish all involuntary servitude, except for crime.

COM. BY A. P.—Slavery existed under the "Later Jewish Legislation," according to heathen historians, in a more mitigated form than at any other epoch of ancient history. Yet it *did* exist, and it was not the institution that the prophets denounced, but the *abuse* of it; and they commanded, "Let the *oppressed* go free." This referred to their own brethren held in bondage.

SLAVERY IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.

It is a fact worthy of notice in this connection, that the four gospels contain scarce one allusion to slavery as yet in existence among the Hebrews.

In some of his parables our Lord draws his illustrations from servants, using the term *δουλος*, which in the Greek classics ordinarily denotes a slave. But in the New Testament usage that term of itself proves nothing as to the nature of the service; and some of these very illustrations seem to forbid the idea of a *bond-servant*. Only three cases are mentioned in the gospels of persons having servants who may be supposed to have been slaves; and but one of these is at all positive, namely: the Roman centurion, who held his servants by Roman law. The term *δουλος* is applied to the servants of the Capernaum nobleman, and the servant of the high-priest whose ear Peter cut off; but beyond this indeterminate word nothing is intimated of the condition of either.

Some have inferred from the silence of the gospels upon the subject, that slavery among the Hebrews had entirely ceased before the time of Christ. This is not quite correct; for an incident in the life of *Gamaliel*, the famous Rabbi of that day, shows that he had bond-servants; and sundry allusions in the Mishna and in Josephus, show that slavery did exist to a limited extent among the Jews in Palestine till their expulsion under Hadrian. But it is certain that in the time of Christ very few slaves were held in Judea by Hebrew masters. The Jews as a people were subjugated and impoverished; Hebrews were no longer made slaves, except as a punishment for theft; and only the wealthy families, who in that agricultural country were comparatively few, could afford to purchase slaves of the Gentiles. Our Lord and his disciples seldom came in contact with such families, and as his mission was distinctively to the house of Israel, the few proselyted bond-servants living in comparative freedom and ease in the houses of the great, would hardly come under his special notice. At the great marriage feast in Cana, where all were Jews, there were no slaves, but only *waiters*, (*ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟΙ*.) In the family of Lazarus, where Jesus was intimate, Martha did the house-work.

The Savior made his teachings *specific* only with reference to evils that came immediately under his eye, while he laid down principles that apply to every form of evil. To sum up all, then, on this point, slavery existed among the Hebrews in Judea, in the time of Christ, much as it exists in New Jersey at this day. We learn from the census that there yet remain in that State 236 slaves; but one is hardly every reminded that *slavery* exists in New Jersey. As to the Romans in Judea, Christ seldom addressed *specific* instructions to them upon any point whatever; but labored among his own nation. He is silent with respect to gladiatorial shows, to idolatrous rites, and the barbarities of war. Will any one infer that he approved of these? We may, therefore, dismiss Hebrew servitude and its code as having virtually passed away at the date of the New Testament. It had so much declined in Palestine, was so far inoperative, that it had ceased to be conspicuous as an element in the social state of the Jews.

COM. BY A. P.—Mr. Thompson thinks it worthy of notice that the four gospels contain scarcely an allusion to slavery. This is not at all surprising. The four gospels are but the same history of our Savior, written by four of his immediate disciples, and could not be expected to go into details of the laws and institutions of his time. The apostles, however, make frequent allusions to the institution, as I have quoted in Ephesians, Colossians, Timothy, Luke, &c., and the Savior in nowhere condemns it, but, through his disciples, gives some commands to both master and servant. (See texts before quoted.)

ROMAN SLAVERY.

That with which we have to do in the New Testament—that system with which the apostles came in contact, when they went forth from Judea to preach the gospel throughout the known world—was *Roman slavery*, which

existed neither by natural law, nor by any divine appointment or sanction whatever, not even as derived from the books of Moses—for the Romans did not go to these for their institutions—but was purely a creature of the *Roman law*.

What, then, was the origin of this slavery, and what were its essential features? Roman slavery was the fruit of military conquest. As the Romans extended their territory, they found it necessary, in order to retain their conquests, to reduce to slavery the captives taken in war. The very term *servus*, a slave, is said by the code of Justinian to be derived from the fact that captives were *preserved* alive and sold, instead of being put to death. The conquered were considered as booty; and persons, as well as cattle and things, were distributed among the conquerors, or were sold for the benefit of the state. Hence, slaves came to be treated as *cattle* or *chattels*—*capitalia*, goods movable or immovable, such as flocks, herds, and other possessions;—a thing unknown in Hebrew law. After the final defeat of the Samnites by the Romans, 36,000 prisoners of war were sold as slaves. In the first Punic war, 20,000 prisoners were taken and sold. The victory over the Cimbri yielded 60,000 captives. The Gallic wars of Cæsar are said to have furnished 400,000 prisoners for slaves. These were of various nations. Slavery was not then based upon distinction of color as marking an original inferiority of race, according to the doctrine of recent times; it did not claim a divine sanction in the curse on Ham—the Romans knew nothing of Noah or his posterity; it was based solely upon *power*—the power of lawless violence to subdue numerical or physical weakness.

The taste for idle luxury engendered by the sudden acquisition of large and fertile territories, and the creation of a servile class to cultivate without wages the immense estates of the wealthy citizens of Rome, encouraged also the foreign slave-trade as a branch of commerce. Not only was the interior of Africa ravaged to supply the market of Rome, but Asia Minor, Sardinia, Spain, and Britain, yielded cargoes of slaves to build the public works of the capital, to serve her wealthy citizens, and to gratify the brutal passions of the mob by fighting with wild beasts in the arena. The island of Delos was the great centre of this traffic; sometimes 10,000 slaves were transhipped there in one day.

Roman slavery made no distinction between the descendants of Ham and those of Shem and Japhet. It rested upon conquest. Slave merchants always accompanied the Roman armies. So many slaves were brought from Asia Minor as the spoils of war, that "*Phrygian*" became as common a name for slave as "*African*" is in our day. When Cæsar invaded Britain the taunt that the conquest was worthless was met by pointing to the slaves brought from that island—"Not a scruple of silver; but many slaves." Roman slavery made our ancestors its prey; though Cicero thought the Britons so inferior to the Asiatics, that they were not worth buying. I doubt not that in the monuments of ancient Rome that we now visit with curious eyes, in the ruins of temples, of aqueducts and basilica, and in the paved ways and arches of victory, are courses of brick and stone that were laid by the sweat and toil of *our* ancestors, during the four hundred years when British slaves were merchantable goods upon the Tiber.

The growth of this system in the Roman republic is admirably portrayed by Bancroft, in his essay on "*The Decline of the Roman People*." The institution of slavery, and the monopoly of land and labor, gradually deprived the country of that middling class between the extremes of wealth and poverty, which are the real strength of a nation. The Romans went to war, leaving slaves to till the fields. "Instead of little farms studding the country with their pleasant aspect, and nursing an independent race, nearly all the lands of Italy were engrossed by large proprietors, and the plow was in the hands of the slave." All trades were acquired by them, and they were hired out by their masters for gain.

Tiberius Gracchus, a pure-minded patriot, sought to remedy this evil by an Agrarian law. This much abused law was simply a homestead bill. "It was designed to create in Italy a yeomanry: instead of slaves, to substitute

free laborers; to plant liberty firmly in the land; to perpetuate the Roman Commonwealth, by identifying its principles with the culture of the soil." The wise law of Gracchus had met the approval of the people, and was to be decided by the senate. This body was made up of patrician slaveholders; yet some reasonable compromise was hoped for, even from them. But slavery, true to its instincts of violence, took up the bludgeon when argument failed. The reformer Gracchus, who had dared to assail the system, was beaten to death with clubs by its "gallant" defenders, upon the steps of the capitol, and his corpse was dragged through the streets and thrown into the Tiber. Modern chivalry has not even the poor merit of originality.

Such was the bloody triumph of slavery in Rome. All the evils that Gracchus had predicted ensued. The bone and sinew of the nation perished in foreign wars, and Rome counted only aristocratic idlers, free paupers, and innumerable slaves. The lands were impoverished; work and trade were considered ignoble; and nearly all the business of society—its commerce, its trades, its arts, its amusements—all were conducted by slaves for the profit of their masters. Thus free labor was rooted out by a ruinous competition. Then followed servile wars; and thus the way was paved for that despotism which renders the names of Tiberius and Nero forever execrable. Slavery sucked the life-blood of the Roman republic. Let not the history of her fate be the prophecy of ours.

Since Roman slavery originated in force, its radical idea was the right of the strong to oppress and degrade the weak. Hence, from the outset, it differed from slavery among the Hebrews in this—that while the Hebrew law of servitude regarded the slave as a *person* under limited obligations to his master, the Roman regarded him as a *thing*, a *chattel*, entirely at his master's disposal. Let this distinction be carefully noted. It is the radical distinction between the slavery which had obtained among the Hebrews, but had almost ceased to be in the time of Christ, and the Roman slavery which everywhere met the eye of the apostles in their missionary tours. Cicero and other Roman publicists of the first authority, in their definition of the term *servi*, include horses and mules as well as slaves; and by the Roman law slaves were taxed in the property of the master, along with houses, lands, beasts, and bronze money.

Liddell, one of the most careful writers upon Roman history, thus describes the condition of the Roman slaves: "They had no civil rights; they could not contract legal marriage; they had no power over their children; they could hold no property in their own name; their very savings were not their own, but held by consent of their masters; all law proceedings ran in the name of the master. For crimes committed they were tried by the public courts, and the masters were held liable for the damage done, but only to the extent of the slave's value. To kill, maim, or maltreat a slave, was considered as damage to his master, and could only be treated as such. No pain or suffering inflicted on a slave was punishable, unless loss had thereby accrued to the owner." Says Bancroft: "In the eye of the law, a slave was nobody. No protection was afforded his limb or his life, against the avarice or rage of his master; the female had no defence for her virtue and her honor; the ties of affection and blood were disregarded."

This is chattelism; these are laws not for *persons*, but for *chattels*; not for *men*, but for *things*. We have seen that the Hebrew law cared for the slave—protected his person, gave him redress against injuries inflicted by the master, and especially guarded the sanctity of marriage and of female virtue. The Roman law reversed all this. There was no legal marriage among slaves; the children of the mother were born to her condition; a slave could not testify in court; if a master was slain in his house, by an unknown hand, all his slaves were put to death without trial. Tacitus narrates an instance in which four hundred slaves were put to death, on the suspicion that one of them had murdered his master.

One could hardly believe the cruelties said to have been inflicted upon slaves, had not Roman slavery survived to our time, to witness against itself. The whip was always at hand. If a slave spoke or coughed without permis-

sion, he was flogged. If a maid committed the least blunder in the toilet of her mistress, her back must feel the thong or the heated iron. Scourges loaded with lead, or furnished with prongs, the yoke, the brand, the pincers, the rack, were common modes of torture. There were torturers by profession, to whom masters sometimes sent their slaves for the refinements of cruelty. Cato, the moralist of Rome, was accustomed to exercise himself, after supper, by flogging such of his slaves as had not waited properly upon the table. Worn-out slaves were turned out to die. Sometimes a slave was crucified or burnt alive, at the caprice of his master.

Such was Roman slavery, and this is the slavery which, in its essential feature of chattelism, and with many of its horrid incidents, has been transmitted to our times, and exists upon our soil. There was, however, one relief in the ancient system, which is wanting in its modern representative. In the earlier history of Rome the manumission of slaves upon the soil was frequent. Masters were accustomed to reward favorite slaves with their freedom, and these *freedmen* had civil rights; some of them even became eminent as poets, artisans, and statesmen. Even the barbarism of Rome did not make expatriation a condition of emancipation. About the year of Rome 430, personal slavery for debt was abolished by law.

Such was slavery as it existed in the time of Christ and his apostles; a creature of the Roman law, the offspring of force, and sustained by cruelty and terror.

COM. BY A. P.—The slavery among the Romans was characterized by the most extreme absolutism on the part of the master and the most debased and abject servitude on the part of the slave. It is not, by any means, to be compared with the slavery in our Southern States; for it is well known that at the South the master is liable to the death penalty for taking the life of his slave, and is severely punished for treating him with cruelty. Of course there are instances where, notwithstanding the law, great cruelty is practised; and so, also, as well at the North, as elsewhere, there occur instances of great cruelty in the relation of husband and wife and parent and child; but these cases are exceptions. The slaves of the Romans were captives in war, and often superior as soldiers, statesmen and philosophers, to those whom fortune made their masters, and they were generally of the same color; but the slaves of the South are an inferior and degraded race, and of a different color from their owners. In the course of their bondage they are in each generation improving, as if Providence designed, through the probation of their servitude, finally to christianize and civilize their race.

DID CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES SANCTION SLAVERY?

II. The question now arises, did Christ and the Apostles sanction this system? I might well leave it to your moral sense to answer that question. The Bible disciplines our moral sense to the intent that we may judge of right and wrong without the aid of specific precepts. Apply that moral sense to the case before us. You see what was Roman slavery. Do you believe—*can* you believe—dare you so much as harbor the thought that Christ and his Apostles ever *could* have sanctioned such a system? You know better. Every man who has a conscience knows better.

Yet it is argued that they did sanction this Slavery, because they are silent as to the system and its evils, and because they gave instructions to those

who were in the relation of master and slave, as constituted by the Roman law.

These arguments were urged upon the floor of the General Assembly, (New School,) at its session in New York, in May, 1856.

Said a Southern divine, and a Northern one echoed it: "I affirm that slavery is one of the social relations of men. It is like husband and wife, parent and child, older and younger, teacher and scholar, magistrate and citizen, merchant and clerk, captain and soldier, sovereign and people. These relations of life are expressly ordained of God; or they exist in that social economy which is the result of Divine Providence. In all these there is service. This service is found to be either voluntary or involuntary, and, as to duration, brief or protracted. There is either restraint or liberty in them all. In them all there is a liability to oppression. The common talk of oppression in the relation of master and slave is just as applicable to all these social relations."

Such was the language uttered by ministers of Christ in that Assembly. Is it true? Is this the Gospel of the grace of God?

In reply to this argument, I take the position that, in defining the duties of master and servant, the New Testament nowhere admits the rightfulness of Roman slavery under the law of God.

With respect to the alleged silence of Christ and his Apostles upon slavery and its evils, I remark first, that they were not wholly silent on that subject, and secondly, that their silence gives no sanction to the system.

We have already seen that Christ hardly came in contact with the institution of slavery—for it was no longer prominent among the Jews to whom his mission was mostly confined. He laid down general principles; but commented only on specific evils that existed around him. And yet Christ laid the axe at the root of slavery, as at the root of despotism, in his first sermon at Nazareth when he said: "I am come to preach glad tidings to the poor; to preach deliverance to the captives; to set at liberty them that are bound; to proclaim a jubilee from God."

Christ bore witness against Slavery when he denounced all pride and ambition, covetousness and oppression of the poor. Christ reasserted the unity of the race; the equality of all men before God. He re-enacted the law of Sinai, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and expounded this by the precept, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Who ever heard of an advocate of slavery so in love with the system, that he would have others do to him as he does to the helpless slave?

Was James silent when he said: "Go to, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, *crieth*; and the cries of them which have reaped, are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." Are these cries of the oppressed that pierce the heavens and reach the ear of God—*silence*? Was Paul silent when he said: "The law is made for murderers, for adulterers, for *men-stealers*, for liars, for perjurers, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine, according to the glorious Gospel of the blessed God?"

But he was silent, it is said, as to the abolition of slavery. "He did not denounce it as an evil or a sin." Did he therefore sanction the system? The argument proves too much. If silence as to slavery argues an approval of the system, then silence as to its enormities argues an approval of these as a part of the system; and silence as to other organic laws and evils in the Roman Empire argues that these also were sanctioned, or at least allowed. Here, then, let us consult facts in other relations.

COM. BY A. P.—If Christ did not sanction slavery, neither did he condemn it. As I have shown, through his disciples he gave laws for the conduct of both master and slave. His mission was to the *souls* of men; he did not meddle with their temporal government, or the "peculiar institutions" of their social life.

THE DOMESTIC CODE OF ROME.

In the Roman empire arbitrary power was not vested only in the holder of slaves. Every Roman *father* possessed that power equally with the master. When a child was born, it was left to the father to decide whether it should live or die. The infant was placed upon the ground. If the father took it up; he signified his intention to rear it; if he let it lie, it was exposed in the street or by the river to perish, or to be taken up by some stranger, who might then claim it as his slave. If the father claimed the child, his power over him was as absolute as that of the master over the slave; and it continued through life unless the son was formally emancipated, and made a citizen. The earnings of the son could be claimed by the father, who had also the right to scourge his son, to sell him into slavery, to imprison him, to banish him, to put him to death.

This was the relation of father and son by Roman law. Gibbon thus describes it: "In the forum, the senate, or the camp, the adult son of a Roman citizen enjoyed the public and private rights of a person; in his father's house he was a mere thing; confounded by the laws with the movables, the cattle and the slaves, whom the capricious master might alienate or destroy, without being responsible to any earthly tribunal. At the call of indigence or of avarice, the master of a family could dispose of his children or his slaves. According to his discretion, a father might chastise the real or imaginary faults of his children by stripes, by imprisonment, by exile, by sending them to the country to work in chains among the meanest of his servants. The majesty of a parent was armed with the power of life and death; and the example of such bloody executions, which were sometimes praised and never punished, may be traced in the annals of Rome beyond the times of Pompey and Augustus.

Nor was this all. The husband had much the same power over the wife, which the master had over the slave, and the father had over the son. In law the wife was nothing. The husband, if he fancied himself injured, could inflict corporeal punishment upon his wife, and if she was guilty of wine-drinking or infidelity, with certain formalities he could put her to death. Indeed, the authority of the husband over the wife in pagan Rome was quite up to the notions of some modern divines as to a husband's rights.

Such was the family despotism which existed in the Roman Empire in the time of Christ and his apostles. And yet the New Testament is entirely silent with respect to this bloody code of domestic law. Nowhere in that book can you find a command, "Husbands do not whip or kill your wives;" nowhere can you find a command, "Fathers, do not scourge your sons, nor sell or torture them, nor send them into exile, nor put them to death." Nowhere do you find a protest against this domestic tyranny of law and custom as contrary to the Gospel of Christ. Nowhere do you even find an allusion to it as an evil to be done away. What then? Did Paul sanction that horrible tyranny of the husband and the father? Does his silence respecting the Roman law of domestic life show that he either approved or tolerated that law? Is that your logic?

Remember that this tyranny of the husband over the wife, and of the father over the son, was just as much *established by law*, as was the power of the master over the slave. If, therefore, the silence of the Apostle as to slavery and its evils is an evidence that he sanctioned Roman Slavery, then his silence as to this household despotism is evidence that he sanctioned that. We are told, that "there were 60,000,000 slaves in the Roman Empire, and yet Paul says nothing against slavery." So were there millions of wives and sons in that empire, living under domestic tyranny, and yet he says nothing of their oppressions. And yet there was never a more flagrant violation of the law of God than the Roman law of the family. The defence of Roman Slavery from the alleged *silence* of the New Testament concerning it, proves too much, and falls to the ground.

In the time of Paul the brutal sports of the arena were common in the Roman empire. Trained gladiators, or captives and criminals, were set to fight wild beasts or to fight one another in the amphitheatre, for the amuse-

ment of the multitude. Paul was perfectly familiar with these gladiatorial shows; indeed, some suppose that he himself was once compelled to fight with beasts at Ephesus. He sometimes draws his illustrations of the Christian warfare from these contests of the gladiators. Yet he is *silent* as to the barbarous tendencies of such sports. Did he therefore sanction them? Is that your logic?

COM. BY A. P.—“The Domestic Code of Rome” has nothing whatever to do with the question of slavery among us. As Mr. Thompson speaks of it, he but conveys a little bit of historical information, familiar to every schoolboy. The social relations of the semi-barbaric ancients cannot be brought into parallel with modern civilization and christianity.

NO RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE IN ROME.

Slavery in the Roman Empire existed by virtue of the civil law. But in the time of the *Empire*, the people had no voice in making the laws, and could do nothing whatever to change or abolish them. This rested solely with the Emperor. And in the time of Paul, freedmen had come to be regarded by slaveholders as a nuisance, and restraints were imposed upon masters who might wish to emancipate their slaves. In the reign of Nero surely, the people had no sovereignty, no elective franchise, no legislative power. They were restrained in their personal liberties, so that there was almost nothing which they could do legally for the removal of slavery. In such circumstances silence does not imply assent. Besides, the epistles of the New Testament were not tracts published to act upon society at large, but manuscript letters sent to little companies of persons to instruct them in their duties. Hence we are not to look to them for a general discussion of public affairs.

This consideration has great significance. We are apt to conceive of the New Testament in primitive times, as being before the public much as it is in our day; forgetting not only that it was not then a printed book, but also that it was not even a *book* reduced to form by the final arrangement of the sacred Canon. The Apostles wrote letters to local assemblies of believers, which were composed generally of poor and uninfluential persons, and these letters were first read in these assemblies, and then copies were multiplied by hand. Keeping in view the persons whom they addressed and their object in writing, we cease to wonder at their omission of many topics relating to society at large.

COM. BY A. P.—The above has nothing to do with the question at issue.

INSTRUCTIONS TO SERVANTS.

But it is said that the apostles give instructions to parties in the relation of master and slave, and thereby give an implied sanction to slavery itself. Precisely the opposite of this is true. Whatever instructions they give to parties implicated in the system, they nowhere admit the rightfulness of slavery under the law of God, but often imply the contrary.

In prescribing the relative duties of husbands and wives, and of parents and children, the New Testament distinctly sets forth the divine authority of marriage and the parental relation. In giving instructions to rulers and subjects, the New Testament teaches the divine authority of civil government, though it does not give a divine right to particular rulers or to particular forms of government.

But in giving instructions to masters and servants the New Testament does *not* speak of slavery as existing by the appointment or authority of God; you cannot find in these instructions one word in vindication of slavery, or one word in approval of the relation of master and slave as a desirable rela-

tion for either party. They are simply told how to conduct themselves in a relation established by laws above their control. This omission is significant.

Let us see now, how far these apostolic precepts look toward an approval of slavery. "Art thou called being a servant?" Does the grace of God come to you in the lowly condition of a bondman? "Care not for that." Do not fret and chafe that you, who are called to be a son of God and an heir of heaven, called to sit with Christ and to judge angels, are here held in bondage by a fellow-man; abide patiently in your lot. "But if thou mayest be free"—if you have the opportunity to gain your freedom—"USE IT RATHER." Does that look like a sanction of slavery?

Paul had no such opinion of the happy lot of a slave as to advise him to continue thankfully in that condition, if he could change it. Peter says: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, (that is, the fear of God;) not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience' sake toward God, endure grief, *suffering wrongfully*." Does that look like an approval of the system? Then did the apostle approve of the conduct of Pilate and the Jews towards Christ, whom he holds up to those abused slaves as an example of patience in suffering. His argument to the servant is not based at all upon the lawfulness or desirableness of his lot, but upon the example of Christ. "Because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye follow in his steps."

There is a tone of compassion in all the instructions of the apostles to servants, which is far from indicating an approval of slavery. They did not meet in ecclesiastical assemblies to argue the advantages of a state of servitude; how good a thing it is that such poor, ignorant creatures have masters to care for them; how superior their lot is to that of the freemen around them; no, when the apostles speak of servants, there is a tone of humanity toward such as are in bonds; they address them as in a condition hard to be borne; but since the providence of God—mark, not the moral preference but the providential will of God, which suffers so much evil in the world—since this suffers them to be in that condition, they should be meek, and patient, and faithful, "that by well doing they may put to silence the scandal of foolish men" about the licentiousness of the gospel. They were not to lie or steal, or be idle, because they felt themselves to be oppressed; they were to obey even hard masters, not because the law of God had set these masters over them, not because God had instituted slavery and put them in bondage as the best possible condition for them and their children; not because God approved of that condition; but because as Christians they were bound, in whatsoever state they were, to honor Christ and his cause. If a christian was a prisoner, he must honor Christ as Paul did in his bonds; and if he were a slave, he must do the same. John Bunyan must not lie or kill his keeper because he is cast into Bedford jail; he must be a well-behaved prisoner. Was his imprisonment therefore just?

Did Christ indorse the administration of Herod and Pilate by paying tribute money? Did Paul indorse the bloody reign of Nero, by exhorting christians to be peaceable, law-abiding citizens? No more does he indorse Roman slavery by the instructions he gives to servants. On the contrary he condemns that system in the very tone of these instructions: "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh." Why? Because they have bought you and have a right to your services? Because they have reared you and taken care of you? Because the law requires this of you? Because you have no rights as men? Because God has set up slavery for your good? No, but "as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service to the Lord—AND NOT TO MEN." They are to ennoble the lowly condition in which they are placed, with the dignity of the christian doing in all things the will of God. Where is slavery approved, where is the Roman law of slavery admitted to be right by the law of God in any counsel or instruction given to those in that relation? Nay, the foundation of that whole system, which was CHATTELISM, is knocked away by every precept that addresses the slave as a MAN, bought with the blood of Christ and accountable to God. The servant is brought under moral responsibility, which a chattel cannot feel.

INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS.

III. But there are instructions to masters as well as to slaves, and these lead me to my last position; namely, that by ignoring the Roman law of slavery, and placing both master and servant under the higher law of Christian love and equality, the Apostles decreed the virtual abolition of slavery, and did in time subdue it, wherever Christianity gained the ascendancy in society or in the state.

Christianity was a kingdom within a kingdom. Penetrating through all forms of government and of society, it gave its law directly to the soul; and then, working from the individual outward, it leavened and renovated society and its institutions. It did not work by social revolution as a means to an end, but produced social revolution as a necessary consequence of its transformation of the individual. But it is a great fallacy to suppose that because the result to be effected by Christianity was gradual and remote, therefore the principle tending to that result was left to a gradual development. The principle which should regulate society, and which in time would reform society in the mass, was laid down at the outset as the supreme law for the individual.

Because the process of social transformation must needs be slow, the necessity for that transformation, and the principles by which it must be effected, were not left to be gradually discovered in the future. No individual was suffered to hide himself under the shadow of society; to plead that an evil or abuse with which he was implicated was a social evil that time must cure, and to take advantage of the delay in reforming society, to indulge a little longer his own complicity with the wrong. No; the law that was to permeate and revolutionize society was given *as a law* to the individual believer, the moment he entered the kingdom of God. He could not cross the threshold of that kingdom until he bowed his will to the supremacy of that law.

THE LAW OF CHRIST.

The Apostles have nothing to say specifically against the abuse of wives by their husbands, or of children by their parents; they do not legislate against specific evils of slavery, or against the system as a whole. Why? Because they and their Master have given to every christian a law which renders all such acts incompatible with fellowship in the kingdom of God. Paul does not assail the Roman code; he does not blindly butt against what he could not move; but he gives to Christians a law that lifts them out of the pale of that code in all their intercourse with one another. They must still live under Roman law, and make the best of it; but that is not to be their shield. "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, to go to law before the unjust and not before the saints?" How could a Christian take advantage of the Roman law to enslave another, or to exact of him unrequited labor? The rights of master and servant must be adjusted, not before the heathen, but before the saints; not by the Roman slave code, but by the law of Christ. And what was that law? "ONE is your Master, even Christ, and ALL YE ARE BRETHREN." "A new commandment I give to you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

Christians were a peculiar people. They formed a spiritual society apart from the world—fellow-citizens of the commonwealth of Israel. In this relation they ceased to be under the Roman law as their source of right or rule of action. Hence the relation of master and servant was at once lifted out of the plane of the civil law into the higher plane of christian love. The outward relation constituted by law might not cease, it might not be possible legally to terminate this, but the essence of slavery was abolished by the fundamental law of christianity.

See how the Gospel transforms this Roman chattel into a christian man: "Masters, render to your servants that which is just and equal." Treat them as your equals in all the essential rights of men—as husbands, as fathers, as laborers worthy of their hire, as rational and immortal souls, give to them EQUALITY. These words are the death-blow of Roman chattel-

slavery. They are good where slavery does not exist—for every relation of master and servant; but they abolish slavery at a stroke. And these words are enforced by a solemn reference to the judgment—"knowing that both your and their Master is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with Him." And then, on the other hand, the servant made free by the Gospel is not to plume himself on that, nor to set himself on his dignity; but to be voluntarily humble and faithful in his position, not quitting a master because that master is declared to be his equal. "They that have believing masters, let them not *despise* them because they are brethren." How could a chattel despise its owner? How would that caution sound in the ears of modern slaveholders? What Southern church would tolerate such an exhortation to its slaves?

Hear now the decree of the Apostle Paul for the abolition of slavery: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. You are all alike covered with Christ's righteousness and radiant with his glory. Each and every one of you is Christ. And now shall the Christ *here* oppress and injure the Christ there? Shall one soul, made bright with the glory of Christ, soil and trample under foot that glory in another? Nay, ye have each and all put off self and put on Christ; there is neither Jew nor Greek—there are no favorites in this spiritual commonwealth; there is neither bond nor free—no distinctions of caste are here allowed; there is neither male nor female—no tyranny of the stronger sex over the weaker, no special privileges whatever in this kingdom; for ye are all ONE in Christ Jesus." Truly has it been said that "this law of Christ was the law of laws. Its authority was imperial. Its decision was ultimate. Where the law of the empire was at variance with the law of Christ, who can doubt to which Christians would yield the supremacy?"

RESULTS AND DUTIES.

The principle of equality which the New Testament lays down for the government of its disciples, wrought out the abolition of slavery first in the Roman church, and by the church throughout the Roman Empire. According to Neander: "Christian masters looked upon their servants no longer as slaves; but as their beloved brethren. They prayed and sang in company; they could sit at each other's side at the feast of brotherly love, and receive together the body of our Lord." Church laws were made in favor of slaves. Even the sacred vessels of the church were sold for their redemption; and in the reign of Constantine the emancipation of slaves was performed as a religious act in the churches and on the Sabbath. Guizot testifies that "the spirit and genius of Christianity abolished slavery throughout the world," and even Gibbon admits the facts, though he withholds from Christianity its meed of praise. The law of Christ is a law of emancipation.

What, then, is the application of this law to our circumstances and times? The system of slavery which exists in this country is the Roman system of chattelism. It does not descend from the patriarchs or the Israelites. It originated in lawless violence; it is upheld by force and terror. This system is as incompatible with Christianity as was the slavery that existed in Apostolic times. It is radically hostile to the Gospel of Christ. What then is the *duty* of Christians toward it? Those who live where the system exists, are bound to free themselves and their churches from all connection with the system of *chattelism* and *forced service*. They may not be able at once to do away with the law of slavery in the State; but they should practically abolish in the church the distinction of bond and free, and give to the slave his equal rights as a man. Till Christians at the South do this, are they not responsible for the sin of the system of slavery?

We ask this in all Christian candor and charity; and we ask them to do no more than Christians at the North have done. When Newport, R. I., was a centre of slavery and the slave trade, and the wealth of its citizens came mainly from that source, the church of Dr. Samuel Hopkins passed this resolve. "That the slave trade and the slavery of the Africans as it has taken place among us, is a gross violation of the righteousness and benevolence

which are so much inculcated in the Gospel; and therefore we will not tolerate it in this church." And the church, in face of society, carried out that resolution in its discipline. When Southern churches practically come up to that standard, slavery will speedily cease.

But WE also have a duty in this matter. Except so far as by political or ecclesiastical action we have sanctioned it, we are not indeed responsible for slavery where it is; we cannot intermeddle with it by positive legislation; we must have large charity for those who are in it; we must not judge them by our light. We must speak to them always in Christian love.

But whatever allowance we make for those who are involved in the system by law, custom or inheritance, we can make none for those who would carry it to curse a soil now free; and we can make no excuse for ourselves if we do not our utmost to hinder that. Excuse! Suppose you were asked to join in a foray to capture slaves in Africa, could you find an excuse for that? Suppose a party who had done this should ask you to participate in the spoils, and to give your influence to keep in slavery those whom they had seized. Could you find an excuse for that? Never could you excuse yourself if you did not repudiate and oppose the outrage. Just such an outrage you, as a citizen of the United States, are asked to sanction. Can you excuse yourself if you do not your utmost to hinder it?

No question of practical Christianity is so imperative upon us to-day as this. Christianity and slavery cannot live together. They have now met face to face upon a virgin soil. We know that in the end Christianity must triumph. We know that slavery must go down; but this nation, like Rome, may first go down in the struggle. The prayers and efforts of Christians alone can avert a catastrophe which the madness of rulers is hastening on. You cannot make this a question of party measures or of political expediency. It is a question of vital, practical Christianity between your soul and God. If you thrust it aside, it will haunt you in night dreams; and it will face you in "That Day." The day shall come when all party platforms, measures and resolutions shall be burnt with fire, and all human work and institutions shall be dissolved. Then shall you stand face to face with the slave before Him who is no respecter of persons. The question then will be: "What did you do to secure for this man the blessings of freedom and of the Gospel? When the destiny of millions trembled on the slip of paper you cast into the ballot-box, how did you decide that destiny?" Beware lest the sentence come: "Inasmuch as ye did it *not* to the least of these my brethren, ye did it *not* to me. Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity."

COM. BY A. P., AND REFLECTIONS ON SLAVERY, &c.—I have before shown the instructions of Christ to masters and servants and the laws he promulgated for their government. As to the *equality* which he asserted, it was *the equality of souls* in the sight of heaven, not the equality of men upon earth, for—

"Order is heaven's first law, and that confess'd,
Some are, and must be, greater than the rest."

The laws of Christ are divine laws for the government of the souls of men, and not for the control of their bodies. When he said "one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," he spoke in a spiritual sense and had no reference to physical relationship.

I have cited, I believe, all the passages of scripture in the Old and New Testaments, of any importance, that touch directly upon the subject under consideration—enough, at any rate, one would think, to satisfy the most skeptical, that slavery is a DIVINE INSTITUTION recognized and established by God's own or-

der. He says, ye shall buy—our brother abolitionists say, ye shall not ! He commands slaves to be obedient to their masters ; to serve with fear and trembling ; not to purloin ; and to serve the froward as well as the good. But our abolition brethren teach us to disobey—steal their master's horses and run to Canada ! and to aid them in disobeying God's laws, they raise large sums of money, and then boast through the newspapers of the amount of theft they have practised upon their southern brethren in the course of a year !!

Now allow me to ask, which is the best of the two authorities I have cited ? “Ye cannot serve two masters ;” therefore, “Choose you this day whom ye shall serve !” “He that is not for me is against me !” “Bitter and sweet water cannot run from the same fountain !”

After all this, does it not appear strange that these same counter-teachers to God, to Christ, and the Apostles, still claim to be christians ? nay, the very *ne plus ultra* of christians !! and turn up their nose with as much *nonsavory* against the venerable clergy of the South, whose shoe latchet they are not worthy to unloose, and to those of the North, who will not “follow the multitude to do evil,” as the Scribes, Pharisees, Chief Priest, &c. did against our Saviour and his disciples, and prate as loudly of the *golden rule* as though they alone understood it and kept it perfectly ! Doubtless they think it a great pity that some one of the fraternity had not been present when the Supreme covenanted with that chief of sinners, old Father Abraham, to have given the true interpretation thereof ! and so on down to Moses and the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles. “Oh ! that my eyes were a fountain of tears.” Had it so happened, what a world of grunting and groaning, self-glorification, hallucination, it would have saved !

I will mention one or two passages of scripture, which I would most affectionately commend to their especial attention, and ardently hope they may profit by their careful contemplation, to wit :

II Corinthians, chap. xi. ver 13-15 : “For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel ; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works.”

II Timothy, chap. iii. ver. 8-9 : “Now as Jaanes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth ; men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further : for their folly shall be manifest unto all

men, as theirs also was." These will prove the balm of Gilead to them if they be wise.

Were there other passages of scripture sufficiently strong to overturn the multitude I have cited, what would the Bible be good for? It would be fit for neither Church or State! and believe me, if our clergymen teach the people that it can be made to blow hot or cold at the pleasure of the piper, the day is not far distant when the people will reject it as of no authority on any subject, and clergymen will soon follow as equally useless. One run-mad leader has already rejected it, if I am correctly informed, and now calls for the abolition of the Sabbath; There is but one more step to Fanny Wrightism.

Had it not been for the institution of slavery, all the negroes in this country, both bond and free, civilized and christianized, if alive, would this day be slaves in their own native country, their bodies to black tyrannical masters, and their souls to the devil, through the worship of cats and aligators; and the colony of Liberia, which is destined, in the providence of God, to civilize and christianize all Africa, never heard of.

Now allow me to ask, who have been the means of conferring this great blessing upon the African race—the northern abolitionist or the southern planter? And if it be a christian act to better the condition of another, who are the best christians as far as this act is concerned? Moreover, who has acted most in accordance with the spirit and meaning of the golden rule, and the commandments of that benevolent and never-changing God, who says, "Ye shall buy."

Knowing what they do now, and were they thus situated, would they not wish, nay, would they not give worlds, that some one would come and buy them and their families out of the horrid condition and transfer them and their posterity to plantations in America? Let them answer upon their oaths! It is no light matter to thwart the plans of God, simply because we don't understand them. "God's ways are not man's ways neither his thoughts their thoughts." But if slavery be an evil, as they allege, and the South have had it thrust upon them by Old England and New England, are they now to be told they are pirates, thieves, and robbers! and too, by those who have enriched themselves by their own defined, nefarious trade? Who are the veritable pirates, thieves, and robbers, if any there be? If wrong has been done, who ought to right it? Heaven doubtless would decide. Old England and New England, if it take every dollar and everything they possess on God's earth! and until prepared for this, discretion, it seems to me, would require they should not be quite so brazen-faced with their denuncia-

tions, for God has said, "Out of your own mouths ye shall be condemned."

Be this as it may, are they not to be content to scatter this their peculiar moral suasion, alias immoral blackguardry—I speak of fanatics—far and wide through the States; or must they carry it into Congress, where it has no more business than the spawn of Pandemonium has in Paradise? It has already found its way in thither, and shown its cloven foot, manifesting significantly what it would do if it had the power—oaths and Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

If the brand of discord ignite there, and blood be shed upon that floor, the flame will spread like wildfire through the length and breadth of the land; and what the consequences will be, all can imagine, but none predict!

The great South calmly and coolly look on at the elementary movement, but are silent; yet the fires of indignation are at work internally, and when the day comes for action, the people will rise *en masse*, resolved upon a redress of grievances or death! Their members of Congress will be required to prepare and demand an amendment of the Constitution. 1st. That there shall be a full representation of both bond and free in the South as there are of women and children at the North. (Just look at the relative importance of the two States of Louisiana and Maine to this Union. Still Louisiana has but four representatives in Congress, and Maine seven! Had Louisiana a full representation for her colored population, instead of three-fifths, she would then have but six—still one less than Maine! Is this fair?) 2d. That it shall be treason for the people of the said States to meddle with the domestic concerns of any other State, and especially with the institution of slavery, in word or deed, calculated to disturb the peace and quietness thereof, and punished accordingly. And 3d. The government of the United States shall guarantee to the South the peaceable possession of their property; and in the event any of their negroes are stolen, or run away to the free States and not sent immediately back, or secured and due notice to the owner within ninety days, on certificate and appraisement being made by the proper authorities, the treasurer of the United States shall be authorized and required to pay the owner thereof the full value of his property. If these amendments be refused, the next thing will be to demand a peaceable division of the paternal estate. The only question remaining, where shall the line of demarkation be? The Middle and Western States will evidently go with the South. 1st. Because their interest leads, being within the line of Tariff. And, 2d. Because they like

the Southern people better than their arrogant and meddling brethren of the North.

[It would be far more to the advantage of the South, that Mason and Dixon's should be the dividing line. Then the Southern States proper would become great manufacturing and provision-growing states, and the southwestern, relieved from their competition in the great staple, would obtain far better prices, and hence become prosperous and rich much beyond their present condition.]

Then left alone in their glory, what a pretty little kingdom of "prerogatives" New England would make! And cut off from the monopoly of the great southern and southwestern markets, that old England would give from fifteen to twenty millions per annum for, would she not most likely go down as fast as she has gone up for the last twenty years? Her millionaires become bankrupts, and the general prosperity of the country mildewed and blasted forever. Is this state of things desirable? If not, wherefore make such a tremendous hazard for a contemptible ism! that is at war with common sense, the common laws of the country, and above all, the clearly expressed laws of God? Arrest then the mad career of your fanatics—peaceably if you can, forcibly if you must; for what right have they to judge their fellow servant? "to his own master he standeth or falleth!"

And can they be so stupid as to suppose that through their abusive vituperation, and the misrepresentations of the Holy Scripture I have cited, "which is so plain, that a wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein," that they will ever induce the South to give away their property and reduce their delicately raised families to poverty? Why, such an idea is as absurd as a moon hoax! and it seems to me, none but a moon-struck ninny could entertain such a sheer piece of nonsense for a moment.

They may continue to boast through the newspapers of the number of slaves they aid in disobeying and running away from their masters every year; but they should remember, whether they do this directly, or indirectly by their money and advice, it is a violation of all laws, human and divine, hence theft, and as deserving the penitentiary as it would be had they aided in dispossessing the owner of any other property. Why God so ordained I know not, but since it is found so plainly written in the Satute Book of Heaven, it cannot be expected that such a palpable violation is to be winked at in these days of gospel light. "*What God has sanctified, let no man call common or unclean.*" "God's ways are not men's ways, neither his thoughts their thoughts." He stays not to reveal His entire

government to man, nor to account for His acts. His servants will hear His voice and obey, believing it will all result for the best in the end.

I once asked one of our most intelligent abolition brethren, why it was that his society were so anxious to detain the free negroes in this country, where their very color enslaved them? why not send them to Liberia, where they might, if they have talent and virtue requisite, in time, build up a great and flourishing country, like the United States—and where their example might ultimately civilize and christianize the whole African race?—that this would be an object worthy the philanthropic and philosophic christain.

He replied: They wished to keep them here till all their “brethren in bonds” in the South were emancipated!

I asked him how he expected to effect this—that the simple detention of the free negroes here was not sufficient?

He replied: If moral suasion in addition to this proves unavailing, they would raise an army of free negroes—I beg pardon—“our free colored brethren,” who would be joined by their white brethren of the North, and that they would march an army of five hundred thousand strong on to Mason and Dixon’s line, with banners emblazoned in golden capitals—**FREEDOM TO THE SLAVE!**

I asked him—From his knowledge of the Southern character, if he supposed he would find them sucking their fingers on his arrival upon Mason and Dixon’s line?—or whether it was not more probable he would find himself confronted with another pepper and salt army in point of numbers equal to his own?—say two hundred thousand picked negro fellows, armed to the teeth, officered by white men, flanked on either side with a hundred thousand mounted riflemen, and in the rear supported by a hundred thousand infantry and artillery, with banners emblazoned with golden capitals—**FREEDOM** to the penitentiary convicts, Irish catholics, foreigners in general, and all poor white operatives—these fine houses and lots, bank stock and money, and every thing you can lay your hands upon, are yours—we want nothing ourselves but the extermination of our enemies, and that we will have, or die in the ditch!

Now the war begins! The commanding general orders his black troops to open the ball: There is the enemy—slaughter every devil of them, or by the gods, we will put every one of you to death upon the spot! The negro slave is in the habit of obeying the white man’s voice, and that he would do up the matter *secundum artem* we have no reason to doubt; especially, after the illustrious example we have in old father Abraham’s slaves in the xiv. chap. Gen. 14 verse.

Now fire and faggot devastate the land: every principal city and town sacked and burned: every free negro put to death, sold to the highest bidder, or expelled the country: and every demagogue abolitionist, whether of Church or State, hung up between heaven and earth by the heels!

With such an army, which would be daily increasing, any General, that could not cut a double swath through to Canada and back, ought to share the same fate.

Here ends your abolition my friend; do you like it? I have since learned, my venerable friend has joined the peace society, and lectures as stoutly as he ever did on abolition. May God grant him a happy deliverance from his former great error, for he is a great and good man, with the exception of this *monomania*.

But to return. After the experience the South has had, they would be stupid indeed, if they do not lay aside all party divisions, unite as one man, and never allow themselves to rest for a moment till they achieve every amendment to the constitution proposed in this little book—here lays their only security. And, indeed, I may add, the only security of the North. For if these amendments, which justice and safety demand, are cheerfully conceded, brotherly friendship will be restored; prosperity will continue its rapid strides in every direction; the oppressed of all countries will find a home and plenty here, under the shadow of this first God-like form of government ever established on the face of this globe, “where all can eat of the fruits of their own fields,” “and worship under their own vine and fig tree, none to molest or make afraid.” And this great country will soon become not only the greatest, but the most powerful known—the wonder and admiration of both God and man. But if folly and madness prevail, division will ensue, then collision, bloodshed, devastation and destitution, till the country is torn into fragments, and each ruled by some military despot “with a rod of iron!”

God ordained and established the Church as a light to the world—made it subject to the civil authority to keep it at its legitimate business; and hence, intended it as a blessing to mankind. But what has been its course? Alas! what? Why, through the agency of ambitious priests, with Rev’d. at the head, and D. D., at the tail of their cognomen—which I look upon as a little short of blasphemy, and especially the prefix; and the latter should never be granted to a person short of sixty years of age, if at all. Whoever heard of the Rev. Jesus Christ, D. D. or Peter, or Paul? none at all! They needed no such artificial aids to give force and effect to their preaching! “Woe be to those who seek honor one of another, and seeketh not alone that honor which cometh from God.” This passage is especially addressed to clergymen, and if they be

wise, they will heed its admonition—I say through the agency of ambitious priests, leagued with unprincipled or crazy-headed demagogues, leaving their legitimate business, or rather making it subservient to their nefarious ends and aims—the honor, glory, and power of this world! and hence what has been called THE CHURCH OF GOD, has been marked with fraternal blood! from the earliest periods to the present day, till it would be difficult for the philosopher, were it not for the few “who have not bowed the knee to Belial,” “keeping their garments unspotted from the world”—to decide whether it has indeed been a curse or a blessing to mankind! And if ever this great and happy country is torn into fragments and deluged in fraternal blood, the cause will readily be traced to this same source!

For a few centuries past, God in his mercy has divided and subdivided the church into a great number of sects, and this has made its power direct for evil comparatively small, and hence, the people have had an opportunity to breathe free air!—but indirectly, its power is still very great; especially, when it can conjure up some fanatical idol to gull the people with, so as to draw largely upon their devoted purse and adulation.

“As face in water answers to face, so does the heart of man to man”—hence, I would no sooner trust the Protestants, were they all united under one head, than I would the Catholics—for they are men of like passions, and apparently have no more the fear of God before their eyes. Indeed, they are less to be trusted—for they have children to follow them and to share their ill-gotten honor, power and glory. No, “keep them divided, and you will keep them comparatively pure.”

Our clergymen should “know nothing save Christ and him crucified;” leaving politics and all secular matters to the PEOPLE: not even vote; for they cannot vote without taking sides; and when this is once known, their preaching will do but little good to those of opposite opinions. “Christ’s kingdom is not of this world!”

Preach nothing but the pure, unadulterated GOSPEL—nothing more nor less—and, like leaven, it will have its proper influence on government, laws, and every institution: this, and nothing short of this, will satisfy God at the Bar of Judgment!

Now one word to that portion of our clergymen, of all denominations, who disclaim all connection with the abolitionists, and who, whether called or volunteered, having enlisted under the banner of the Saviour, and publicly professed to take the word of God for their guide, and, consequently, solemnly bound themselves to preach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, “keeping nothing back,” are they not aware that the sins of omission as well as commission applies to themselves as well as other people, and to be punished accordingly?

And are they not sensible that had they "cried aloud and spared not," and kept nothing back of what God has said upon this subject, abolitionism, with all its evil consequences, would have been sent back to the Gulf from whence it emanated, long ago? And would it not be well, even at this late period, to begin "to do works meet for repentance," before it is forever too late? If they will but show half the zeal in the service of Christ and the Holy Book that the abolitionists show in opposition, or in another service, they may yet prevent the direful consequences I have taken the trouble to set in order before them, and which are as sure to occur as effect to follow cause, if they neglect their duty, while "watchmen upon the wall-towers of Zion."

It is fair to infer that society was similarly infested in the days of the Apostles—but did they hesitate to proclaim the truth and rebuke sharply? Regardless of the "loaves and fishes," and honors of office, they had respect to the "recompense of reward," reserved for the faithful hereafter. The fear of God rather than man influenced them, and "while preaching to others, they were careful not to become castaways themselves" through neglect of duty.

Again, is it not likely when these sad reverses begin to be realized, the people will begin to look for the "whys and wherefores?" And when they shall have discovered the Institution of Slavery was established and made common to Christendom by the Fiat of Omnipotence, and not a solitary word is said against it, fairly and properly construed, from Genesis to Revelations, will they not be disposed, in their grief and vexation, to hold their unfaithful teachers accountable, and give them a foretaste of that punishment reserved for "blind leaders of the blind?" It will hardly avail to tell them, you are the direct descendants of Apostles through the Puritans, the Popes, or Purgatory; if they manifest their usual good sense in their private matters, they will be very apt to look and see if you have followed in the footsteps of your illustrious predecessors, and "judge the tree by its fruit." "Judgment must begin at the House of God"—the Church.

"As you sow, so shall you reap! If ye do well ye shall receive well; if evil, evil!" "*Verbum sat sapienti.*"

REFLECTIONS.

It seems to me, there never were a people more mistaken as it regards results, could they have their way, than the people of the North, both as to their own best interests, those of the South, and indeed those of the negro slave.

Let us suppose the Southern States had been settled by free white inhabitants, as they most ardently desired, instead of slaves for operatives. Is it not morally certain, had it so re-

sulted, they would have grown their own provisions, manufactured their own clothing, &c., instead of purchasing almost their entire supplies from their eastern and western neighbors? Unquestionably.

Now had this been the case, what would have been the condition of the North, compared to what it is under a more advantageous state of things? Would it not approach nearer that of the Canadas than its present wealthy and prosperous condition? I think so.

Both east and west have enjoyed for a very long time almost a complete monopoly of supplying the South and southwest, *free of duties*, with their provisions, clothing, carriages, furniture and agricultural implements, to say nothing of the thousand and one non-enumerated articles, including wooden clocks, wooden nutmegs, &c., almost at their own prices! nor of the *unrestricted* carrying trade by their ships and steamers. All these advantages they have enjoyed and to which they are indebted for their present prosperity, and for their future prosperity, if they don't "pull the house down over their own heads," or allow their fanatics and aspiring demagogues to do it for them. But where is their gratitude for these great and especial privileges? and how do they treat the South? "*They have got fat and now they kick.*"

Notwithstanding the sedition in New England and that which they have sown in the middle and western States, it is not disputable, however much they may dispute it, for their present prosperity over and above the Canadas, they are much more indebted to the existence and extension of slave labor in the South than to any and *all other causes*. Still they abuse and grossly insult the very hand that feeds them!

Now suppose the South should adopt their very sage (!) advice, and emancipate all their slaves, what would in all probability be the consequence! Why, from the experience we have had before our eyes in St. Domingo and Jamaica, the negroes would perform just labor enough, in addition to what they could rob from the whites, to live a lazy, dancing, dissolute, savage life, till the whites, finding it impossible to live among them, would abandon everything and fly with their families to the free States; then the negroes would fall upon and butcher one another! "What a pretty spectacle this would be to set before the King." And would their abolition advisers be found ready with open arms to give their *white colored* brethren *aid and comfort* in the shape of house-room, food and raiment? Perhaps they might allow them the *crumbs* that fall from master's table! and perhaps now and then some good, nice, young, old, fat, lean sheep (!) "killed to save its life," and furnished by the lowest bidder to feed the poor old public poor upon—

Wilmot proviso—that they would black their master's boots, and "do other works meet for repentance" for not obeying their mandate before! Perhaps they might say grace over the crumbs and the fragrant viands, and tell them that "*God is merciful to the penitent!*"

It may be said a standing army might be established to compel the negroes to work. But this could not be done over such an expansive country. And if possible, the expense would be *impossible*, unless the North would bear it. But if possible, would this kind of slavery be more tolerable than the present?

What a pity it is that the South are so ignorant and besotted that they cannot see their own best interest, and turn themselves out of doors for the benefit of their wise, loving, Northern brethren's self-righteousness and their idol, Abolitionism! which was set up by the church for them to worship, as the golden calf was set up for the worship of the Israelites. But if they keep on with their "*moral suasion*" there is no knowing what wonders they may work yet!

Suppose Kentucky should take the advice of her great philosopher, Cassius M., and abolish slavery, would this clear the ground of them, and fill their places with white, industrious inhabitants, like those of Ohio? Hardly, I think. In the first place, neither the free nor the slave States would permit such a multitude to come among them; and if they could be sent to Liberia, or elsewhere, their places would not be filled with white servants. First, because the people of the North don't like the manners, customs, *pistols and dirks*, of the Kentuckians. And secondly, would the people go from the North to purchase second-handed lands at from ten to twenty dollars per acre, when, in any of the western States or Territories, they can get any quantity of the very best *new* lands at Congressional price? Before the Kentuckians make the move they had better sit down and count the cost.

Fanatics, both foreign and domestic, when put *hors du combat* by those who understand the Bible, sacrilegiously appeal to the Declaration of Independence, as though it was paramount to God's word and *fiat!* and argue as lustily as though they had the bull by the horns!

Our Declaration of Independence is a pretty piece of poetry, and answered admirably well the object of its generation: That the people of this country were born *free and equal*, and entitled to all the rights and privileges of those left behind on the little island, neither law nor equity can deny—and it was for these, and only these, that our fathers contended; but being denied, no alternative remained but, *vi et armis*, to divide the *paternal estate*; which, after a long and bloody struggle, through the providence of God, *our FATHER!* they not only achieved,

but made permanent, and handed down to their children *a glorious inheritance!*

It will be well here to notice, that there were a plenty of dough-faced wiseacres in Britain in those days, like the present here, who, while goading the colonies to distraction, exclaimed—*O, they dare not dissolve!* If they do, we will set their negroes upon them and cut their throats! or as the devil told Eve, if she ate the forbidden fruit, *she should not surely die!* But Burke had the sagacity to inform them, if they proceeded on that supposition, they would find in the end, they had reckoned without their host! *Let our Solomons learn wisdom!*

But to return. From the Declaration of Independence to pretend that all men, in the universal sense, slaves and all, are born free and equal, is not only an absurd inference, but an assertion contradicted by all history, sacred and profane, from the remotest ages to the present day. For example—Will any one pretend to say, that the slaves, born in Abraham's house and bought with his money, were free and equal with Isaac, the heir apparent? Every person is born as free and equal as the *mother* that bore him; this is all that history asserts; consequently, all that *truth* can allege. If any one enjoys privileges above this, they are acquired or bestowed, not an inherent right! Anything beyond this may do to *sing*, but not to preach! God has said in the 21st Exodus, 4th ver.: The children shall be his master's. Why? because the *mother* belonged to the master, *in fee*.

God's *fiat* is another thing, altogether, to the dictum of men, however high their pretensions. He did not spare the violators of his laws in ancient times, under any pretext, much less will he in these days of gospel light. Let the people, therefore, beware, *before mischief be done!*

The South have emancipated more than a hundred millions worth of negro property—many of whom have gone to Africa to civilize and christianize their colored brethren. All these could have been sold for money; and had these Southern masters had a little wooden nutmeg spice in their composition, doubtless they would have availed themselves of the *lucre*, and then perhaps come North and turned Abolitionists, and after a few lusty grunts and groans, would have been deemed by their brethren entitled to the chief seats in the "*Synagogue of Satan.*"

But what have Abolitionists done but distract the peace and quiet of this country? and now by their emissaries in Congress, endangering the very existence of this Union! *Echo asks, WHAT?*

If government should so order, negro servants might be directly imported from Africa, in our national ships in time of

peace—a *christian service*—in a far more comfortable condition than any European emigrants come here, and delivered to the purchaser at cost and charges—provided the purchaser would agree to re-deliver them to government to be sent back: the men at fifty years of age, their wives, if any, at whatever age, when, in their highly cultivated state, their influence would be felt. Perhaps the South would come into the arrangement for *peace' sake*—if so, it would be but a short time before as many would be going back as coming forward, and then, with what gigantic strides would civilization and christianity walk over that benighted region! What a glorious object for America; and she alone should have the glory of doing it—God has most bountifully blessed her; let her show her gratitude by being a blessing to Africa.

Negroes brought from Africa, it is true, would not be worth one-fourth of one raised in this country; but then again, they would not cost one-fourth as much. But away with such mercenary calculations. Any man that has no other standard to measure his actions than dollars and cents, is a worshipper of the Golden Calf—*an idolater!*

Let it not be forgotten, that the free States were all once slave States; but the knowing ones, supposing it would be much more easy to establish peculiar privileges for themselves and their children, in the absence of wealthy, intelligent, and independent farmers, who might veto their usurpations—made a virtue of FRAUD, and “*prospectively*” robbed them of their property! Monarchy, or high usurping aristocracy, cannot live alongside of the independent farmer or planter, *who own their own servants.*

Suppose Fanny Wright had persuaded the South to abolish matrimony, and her societies had opened their batteries of “*Moral Suasion*” (!) her fanatics no doubt, would have found it quite easy, simply by consulting the records of divorcees, even in the little State of Connecticut, for the last thirty years, to have found abundance of material, of abominable abuses of husbands to their wives, to have made a volume quite equal to that put forth by the American Anti-slavery Society of New York, 1839—and made it appear as the general character of the Northern, or free States; and raised all the ignorant fanatics of the South against “*the awful tyrants of the North!*” But enough of this humbug! Let the people be enlightened.

God never would have authorized slavery, had it not been intended as a blessing to mankind. And if it does not so result, it is the fault of man, not the institution. I think I have already shown this, as it regards the slaves, and the people of the North; and I think I shall show, if the people of the South

do not participate in the blessing, it is their own fault, not the institution, and they need blame no one but themselves.

If Southern gentlemen would be more enterprising, look after their business themselves, introduce *science* into everything, feed, clothe and house their people *superbly*, then make them work fifty per cent. more, which they would do cheerfully—and then not do near so much as a Northern white laborer—then divide their labor into scientific farming, manufacturing, and planting on their rich bottom lands; then they would make within themselves their own provisions and clothing, and the large amount of cotton, sugar, rice, tobacco and hemp they would have annually to sell, would bring in large quantities of money from all quarters, which would give impetus to every enterprise, and with their own operatives, they could beat the world in every department of industry and improvement, and would soon be quite as prosperous as their Northern neighbor, which are this day the most flourishing part of the world. But if they sit down, talk politics, drink mint juleps, and leave the negroes to bask under the shady trees, and what little they make, let it be taken away for Yankee notions, they will turn the blessing of God into a curse, will be a mock and a by-word to all christendom, and will have more reason to curse their own “masterly inactivity,” than the *hardness* of the times. “*As you sow, so shall you reap.*”

With due deference to the opinions of all honest and good men, however much they may differ with me in opinion, and utter contempt for those of the self-righteous, selfish, unprincipled demagogue, whether of Church or State, who hesitates not to pervert God’s Word, however plain, under the guise of mock-heroic philanthropy, misleading the people to their destruction for their own selfish aggrandizement! and after the deed is done, then crying aloud, “O, the people are not fit for self-government!” I hesitate not to say, maugre the opinions of all these, God grant the institution of slavery, regulated by the principles of the gospel, may ever exist in at least half of the United States. For I feel well assured, after the study I have given this subject, that if ever anything could be considered as demonstrated without a practical test, it has been demonstrated that had it not been for Southern slaveholding States, even had we started with a republican form of government, the people would have been cheated out of their *liberty* at last! without being bought or selling themselves to their masters.

The privileged orders having the making and administration of the laws, it is perfectly in accordance with human nature and all experience, to weave them over the people, as the spider weaves his web, taxing and voting themselves and their sons after them, high salaries, special privileges, and perpetual

offices, till the poor farmers and mechanics, and all other laboring people, entangled in their meshes, would not know which way to turn! and if they became restive under the oppression, the cry would be, law and order! law and order!! law and order!!! "*Frequent rotation in office is the salvation of the Republic.*"

Thank God that there was such a place as the South, where the sages maintained and enforced liberal principles, while the Northern laboring men, encouraged by such powerful aid, selected their own leaders, hurled back the aspiring demagogues and political fanatical priests, and achieved for themselves a glorious victory. This glorious position they may ever maintain, if they continue to go shoulder to shoulder with their Southern brethren.

It is amusing to see these fanatical priests and Wilmot Proviso fraternity, attempting to gull the South with their moral suasion! "*O for a thousand pair of asses' ears to deck our sage men's heads with!*"

They will assume any guise, or disguise, even that of an angel of light, like the parent of the society, to curtail the power of the South, so that they may get both Houses of Congress into their own hands, then all the offices of government, then the privilege of taxing the South *ad libitum*, and then, perhaps, they would consent to live in peace, provided always, that they can have these privileges secured to them and their posterity by *law and order*. As to the *Jure Divino*, they can find or make passages of Scripture enough to establish that, by the grace of God, at the shortest possible notice. They can just as easily find—"Topnot come down," as "Let those upon the house-top not come down."

"When crazy theorists, their addled schemes,
Unseemly product of dyspeptic dreams,
Impute to *Thee!* as courtesans of yore,
Their spurious bantlings laid at Mars' door."

But enough.

"Their lust is murder! and their infernal joy
Is to tear their country, and their kind destroy."

Deus vobis bene faxit.

By way of retaliation for attacks made on the South by Northern fanatics, it is often said by Southern men that the Yankee planters are the hardest masters. This simply means, the Yankees feed and clothe well, and then make their negroes work as white men work at the North, and consequently these Yankee planters always get rich.

The writer could mention hundreds of instances that have come within his knowledge, but will name but three. Dr. Rogers, of Georgia, went from Connecticut, and when he ar-

rived in Savannah, had but three dollars in his pocket—he is now supposed to be worth half a million. He is pointed out as a hard master, but the writer has been present when neighboring negroes have begged him to buy them, and has heard the Doctor say—“But you know I am called a hard master!” The negroes replied—“We know you make your people work, Sir, but you feed and clothe them.”

Mr. Tillotson also went from Connecticut, and with little means, and now makes four hundred hogsheads of sugar per annum, in Louisiana.

Judge Morgan went from Boston, began cotton planting in Upper Louisiana, with but very little means, and is now worth more than half a million of dollars. In a word, the negroes prefer these hard masters for their masters, and the Southern girls prefer them for their lords and masters; and I commend the good judgment of both, and shall continue to do so, till my Southern brethren learn to manage their affairs likewise. I introduce these gentlemen, simply to show, that it is not the institution, but the sad management of the institution that does the mischief. Had my Southern brother bestowed the same attention as his Northern brother, the South would be the richest and most prosperous part of the country.

The above gentlemen, had they remained at the North, instead of being rich planters, would doubtless be poor men, if not poor free laborers for others, at this very time. But now they are all highly respectable and intelligent gentlemen, have greatly improved the condition of the negro, and all in consequence “of the accursed, blighting effects of slavery.”

The truth is, the Southern planter is the only true keeper of God’s commands in this particular—the only true friend to Africa and the African race; and it is the North, and not the South, that lies under the condemnation, and must so remain, till they “*do works meet for repentance.*” “*Thief crying thief,*” won’t do—that trick is too old.

The writer wishes it to be distinctly understood, that he has no feelings of revenge to gratify, against any class of his fellow-citizens. It is an ISM, and an ism alone, which if allowed to go on unarrested, is sure to deluge this our beloved country in suicidal and fraternal blood, that he wishes to rebuke, and that sharply too; because it is his right and his duty to himself, his posterity, and his country, to do so. But against his abolition brethren, and especially those who have been—through a perversion of God’s Word, and the abominable falsehood repeated over and over against the South, and passed from mouth to mouth, by designing, unprincipled demagogues—misled into this blasphemous error, he has not the least unkind feeling.

May God grant, they may be delivered from this fatal blindness, before it is forever too late.

I use here, in the conclusion, the word servant in place of slave, for, on reflection, it is the most, if not the only proper term. It is derived from the Latin word *Servus*, which purely means a servant belonging to his master—in contradistinction to minister, mercenary, hireling and domestic—each of which terms, having its peculiar application. Moreover, in the word slave, there is something odious; and as many persons are influenced by sounds, it should be stricken from our language, or at least from common use. The term slave, owes its origin to the Slavonians, who were seized and sold throughout Europe, and reduced to the vilest, most vindictive, cruel servitude and oppression imaginable. But that state of things long ago ceased to exist; let the term therefore, by which it was known, cease also.

I have now, gentlemen, finished my task, after a patient investigation of this great subject, for more than ten years, during which time, I have read and listened to much, if not all that has been said and written, pro and con, in the course of my summer tours through every State in this Union, which would amount to more than fifty thousand miles; and not feeling satisfied with the treatment of this most fatal disease upon the body politic, I took the Bible in hand, and with the patience and perseverance of a lawyer, critically examined every page from Genesis to Revelations; and I must confess, if I ever was astonished at any thing, I certainly was at the blasphemous use that men, professing better things, had made of this Holy Book!

There is an old proverb, that—"There cannot be much smoke without some fire,"—or in other words—"Truth enough to make a lie out of!" But in this case I have found an exception to these rules. After the atmosphere of this happy country has been made foul by the pestiferous, pestilential breath of crazy-headed or knavish abolition fanatics, "with tongues set on fire of hell!" not a spark of the fire of the truth has been found, or can be found, authorizing their nefarious proceedings, in the Bible!

I here present you with the result of my labors—A LITTLE PAMPHLET, divested of all the chaff of verbiage, covering the whole subject in a condensed form, so that all can find time to read it; and still, so lucid and conclusive, "That a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein."

I feel that I have now done my duty as a citizen; and if you will take the necessary steps to place a copy of this little pamphlet in every family of these still United States, come what may, you will at least have the consolation of knowing that you have done yours.

As under our much loved and admirable form of government all power rests with the PEOPLE, it is above all things of the utmost importance, that the people should be enlightened, and kept enlightened, especially upon all great national subjects.

As it is, this unique subject, although the greatest in importance and consequences that ever agitated the country, is not allowed, in the free States, to be spread before the people, by the press or by the pulpit, although the latter are most solemnly bound to God and their country to proclaim to the people the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. "No while Belial has his thousands, not one true prophet is to be found in all Israel!" And hence it is, after the people have had their pure minds perverted by the foul-mouthed, "*fiery flying*" fanatics through the land, brazen-faced demagogue upon the floor of Congress rise and assert, that a majority of the people of the North are with them in their depredation upon the rights and interests of the South! But enough.

I am willing to superintend the printing, and will furnish, to any government agent, a million, or any number of copies they may think proper to order, at a price per copy too insignificant to mention here. Or if this proposition does not suit, I will make a present of it to the government, if they will obligate themselves to put it into every house; for I am sure it will never find its way there, unless by their authority—notwithstanding it is of far more import to the free States than to the Southern—and even if it could, it would not have a tenth part of the force and effect it would have with it. YOU ARE THE GUARDIANS:—Preserve this land of Washington from discord and destruction, or its blood may be required at your hands.

AMOR PATRIÆ.

P. S. As it was in the contest between the Colonies and Great Britain, it should ever be remembered—it is not those who demand their rights, but those that withhold them who are the disunionists. Never allow a Territory or State south of 36 30 ever to come into this Union denying to its citizens the right of owning their own servants, as long as this privilege exists in any portion of these States. Any Southern man that will not be firm in this to the very letter, regardless of party, deserves to be sent to purgatory in irons, without grace. You have God and his Bible with you; hence if you are firm, courageous, united, and persevering, you have nothing to fear. If the tug of war must come, it better come now, when the South is less prepared for it—and she is growing comparatively weaker every day.

Doubtless every "done brown" trick imaginable will be attempted in the introduction of new states south of 36 30. Constitutions not objectionable may be presented, and the next year after admission, changed by a called convention! Therefore let it be understood, whenever this takes place, such State forfeits her right to send Senators and Representatives to Congress, and reverts to a territory. If the squatters don't like the conditions, let them re-squat upon their own side of the line. The South must manage to keep up a positive equilibrium in the Senate, even if they have to divide some of their largest States. The little States of Delaware and Rhode Island should be annexed to Maryland and Connecticut. There is no justice in these more counties having as much influence upon the Senate floor as New York and Virginia. "The North are resolved upon humbling the South!" But I am inclined to think, when they get through with their humbling process, there will be but little left north of Mason and Dixon's line, worth the humbling.

NOTE.—The South need never give themselves any uneasiness in consequence of being in the minority in both Houses of Congress, for they will always hold the balance of power, and hence, will share more largely in all the measures and offices of Government than they could if equal in numbers with the North, viz: The North will always be divided, and the South, if they act as one body, can always put into power either party as they please, hence their power will always be courted by both the Northern parties.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 748 7

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 748 7

