

## CASTE.

[Compiled, chiefly, from recent publications.]

This is an East India word, and means *tribe*. The Hindoos are divided into four castes or tribes, each of which is again subdivided into a large number of branches. "Every individual remains invariably in the caste in which he was born, practises its duties, and is debarred from ever aspiring to a higher, whatever may be his merit or his genius." In consequence of this unnatural distinction of caste, all motives to exertion are extinguished.

"The Chitties live by trade, and the Vellallas by cultivating the land. The smiths and carpenters' caste is inferior to the Vellallas. Washermen, shoemakers, and barbers, are still inferior. The Toddy-man, Paraya, &c., are still lower. The Tooroompen (which signifies a man that is not worth more than a rush), is the lowest. This last is so low a caste, that people of the high castes often strike them, if they come in contact with them. None of the high castes will eat with any of the low castes."

"The most numerous caste are the Sudras or Sooders. Their business is *servile labor*;" and their degradation is generally inhuman. They are compelled to work for the Brahmins, being

considered as created solely for their use. They are not allowed to collect property, "because such a spectacle would give pain to the Brahmins." To them "the Vedas, or sacred books, must never be read." How striking the resemblance between this and *American slavery*! Who does not recognise the same feeling and principle which creates the barrier between the whites and blacks in this country? Even here, white people generally feel a sort of Hindoo horror at the thought of sitting and eating with the blacks; and the black man, whatever be his talents or moral worth, can seldom rise.

An interesting colored man completed a thorough education at one of our colleges. The learned professions were shut against him. Not having religion to sustain him, he sank under the weight of prejudice, and fell a victim to intemperance. The writer knows of but two colleges in the land which announce that blacks will be admitted on the same footing with whites. Whole towns have been thrown into confusion by the attempt to establish colored schools. In Connecticut, Miss Crandall was thrown into prison for such an attempt, and in New Hampshire an academy was drawn into a swamp because colored youth were admitted. The colored American's money will hardly secure him a seat in a stage-coach, or a berth on board a steamboat. Even a missionary of the American Board, whose face was slightly tinged, was

dragged from the table by the captain of a Providence steamboat, because he was a "nigger."

In *religious worship* the effect of caste is similar in Hindoostan and republican America. Tissera says the low castes are kept out of the temples. They have temples exclusively for themselves, or stand outside the temples of higher castes. How much does this fact, relating to heathen customs, remind us of those of this Christian country! "Nigger seats" are found in most of our churches; and colored people, in most of our towns and villages, must sit in them, or not hear the gospel preached; and in larger towns and cities they have their temples by themselves. Whole congregations have been thrown into excitement because colored men have purchased pews, or been seated with white people; and in one instance, a colored man was excommunicated, in consequence of his son's purchasing a seat for his family. (See Mrs. Child's Oasis.)

The first missionaries in southern India undertook, like many Christian D. D's in this land, to accommodate Christianity to the prejudices of the people. Protestant missionaries, who have under their care many thousands of Hindoo converts, have allowed caste, *the most exceptionable feature of Hindooism*, to appear in full vigor at the communion table! (See Christian Brahmin, vol. 2, p. 138.)

Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, has recently re-

quired the missionaries of his church not to tolerate the distinction of caste in the native churches. And he says, "the heathen usages of caste, in the Christian churches, is the main barrier to all permanent improvement."

Bishop Corrie says, that in India, "the different castes sat on different mats, on *different sides of the church*; they *approached the Lord's table at different times*, and had once different cups, or changed them before the lower classes began to communicate; and they had *separate divisions in the burial grounds*." Where is the difference in principle, between seating different castes on different mats, on different sides of the church, and seating whites in the centre of our churches, and the blacks on the "nigger seats?"

A Brahmin asked an Englishman if, in his country, they ate and drank together; to which the latter replied, "We deem it an honor to demean ourselves as brethren in the participation of food at one table." The Brahmin replied, "That appears to be an offence against good morals and good conduct." The gentleman replied, "Do you not, in the field of Juggernaut, eat with the lowest caste? *There you have no distinction of caste, but all feed at one board*." The Brahmin tried to screen himself by saying, "There we are in the presence of our god, and there we can feast together." "Ah!" said the Englishman, "I can justify our practice on your own principles, *for we are everywhere in the presence of our God*."

“They had separate divisions in the burial grounds.” In the account given of the burial of a large number of persons who perished in the recent shipwreck near New York, it is stated, “The bodies having been decently enwrapped in shrouds, and laid in separate coffins, were, *with the exception of three colored bodies*, interred in one grave, the coffins being placed side by side, in one continuous row. The colored bodies were committed to the care of the colored people, and interred at the same time, and within the same enclosure.” Here we see the same heathenish spirit which will not suffer the bodies of different castes to lie side by side in the same grave, lest they should *pollute each other!*

In New Haven, many years since, when the new and elegant burying ground was laid out, the “nigger’s” part was fenced off at the western end of the lot. In lapse of time, it became necessary to enlarge the burying-ground, and they were obliged to enclose some acres near the western side. This brought the “niggers’ graves” in the centre of this far-famed burying place! And there they are, at the present time, a practical illustration of the power and the punishment of prejudice against color, in that beautiful city. No wonder the people there opposed the establishment of a college for colored youth, and that a judge was found in that city who charged the jury that colored men are not citizens!

Wherever the distinctions of caste exist, in heathen lands, the missionaries find them the greatest obstacle in the way of converting the heathen. Christianity makes slow progress in India, of course. The same principle obstructs its progress in this country, especially in the improvement and conversion of people of color. "The colored man," says Rev. Theo. S. Wright, "is excluded from the house of God. Even at the communion table he can only partake the crumbs offered to him after others have been served. *This prejudice drives the colored man from religion.* I have often heard my brethren say they would have nothing to do with such a religion. They are driven away, and go to infidelity; for even the infidels at Tammany Hall make no distinctions on account of color."

Will this unhallowed distinction have no effect on the white man's piety? Can his soul thrive while he harbors an unjust and cruel prejudice? Has it not prevented the descent of the Holy Spirit upon congregations? If missionaries have found it necessary to set their faces against caste, in heathen lands, ought not ministers to do the same in this Christian land? Bishop Wilson well remarked, "The existence of caste, as it respects religion, must cease, or we had better abandon our missions at once."

So common a thing is it to maltreat persons of a certain color, that some who in their hearts profess to abhor it, feel compelled, as they love

their daily bread, to do it; and those who, following their hearts, refuse to follow custom, are accused of injuring, by their *ultraism*, the very cause they love. Even some abolitionists, and professing Christians, speak thus! Females feel it towards the deserving and pious of their own sex! Yes, let a white man invite a colored one to sit with him in his pew, or eat in his parlor, and what an outcry is made! Pray, what is the matter? The reply is, *would you have your daughter marry a negro?* Surely this spirit of caste, lurking among our free institutions, like the devil in paradise, is the offspring of slavery, and lives in no country apart from its parent abominations.

Is it said, prejudice against color is the result of "a principle of instinct," implanted by the Creator? Why, then, does it not exist in other countries besides this? Why, then, does not the white child recoil from its black nurse? and the parent refuse to let his offspring draw sustenance from the breast of a negro? Why do slaveholders ride, walk, nay, even sleep in the same apartments with their slaves? Why, then, do ladies and gentlemen in New York ride in their coaches with black servants, and often on the same seats? But there is no natural prejudice against color. Where the colored race has not been enslaved, this prejudice is wholly unknown.

The president of one of our literary institu-

tions, in conversation with another minister, who was trying to show that he was an enemy to slavery, and above prejudice against color, although he was in favor of separating white and colored Christians in the house of God, said, *there is no prejudice against color.*


“What is that you say?” replied the defender of caste. “I say what I mean,” observed the president. “It is not prejudice against color merely that seeks to separate people in the house of God or elsewhere; but it is prejudice against condition, associated with the color of those who have been so long degraded. The slaveholder has no objection to riding with his black slave, nor walking with him, nor sleeping in the room with him; nor have northern people an absolute abhorrence to being near the blacks, provided it is manifest that they are in a degraded condition. They will permit colored people to come near them in the capacity of slaves or servants, but revolt at their taking the attitude of equals. The prejudice is against equality, and not against color.”

“It never appeared to me before in this light,” said the other, “but I now see that you are right, and that the separation that is made does not arise from instinctive aversion, but from pride. It must, therefore, be offensive to God, and every Christian should say, away with it!”

In proof of what has been said, we will refer to a recent fact in New York. There is, at the



present time, a Zoological Institute at No. 37 Bowery, where "birds, beasts, and reptiles are exhibited," and which attracts large crowds of visitors. In a pamphlet describing the *inmates*, the proprietors have the following announcement:

"A whimsical illustration of the fact that it is caste and not color, and that Americans have no objection to seeing colored people in their places of resort,  IF THEY WILL KEEP THEIR PLACE, is found in a late publication of the New-York Zoological Institute. After setting forth their claims and eulogizing their attractions, the proprietors say, in a note,

"*The proprietors wish it to be understood, that PEOPLE OF COLOR are not permitted to enter, EXCEPT WHEN IN ATTENDANCE UPON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.*"

"It is saying, 'We and our patrons, the American public, care not how many colored people come, *if they will come as servants.* But COME AS MEN they shall not.'"

"The manner in which this rule is carried out may be seen in the following letter to Rev. H. C. Wright, from a citizen of the city of New York, whose worth is well known:

"I was very desirous of taking my family to the Zoological Institute in the Bowery, to see the specimens of wild animals. So I hired a carriage, took my family, and went up to the place. When we drove up in front of the door, I got out and went to get a ticket. When I got to the door a well dressed man gave me a very

hard punch in the breast with his cane, which knocked me very nearly flat upon the steps. Said I, 'What did you do that for?'

"'Clear the door,' said he.

"'I want to go in, sir,' said I.

"'You cannot go in.'

"'I am ready to pay,' said I.

"'We don't admit *niggers*.'

"'Why did you not tell me that colored people were not admitted before you punched me so?'

"'If you don't clear out, I will put you in the watch-house.'

"'Do you suppose, sir,' said I, 'that I am to be treated in this manner, and not be permitted to speak about it?'

"'He then called for two officers to take me to the watch-house. I replied, 'I think one will be enough, as I shall offer no resistance.' The officers came—laid hold of me with great violence, and walked off with me about a hundred yards; leaving my wife and family in the carriage in front of the door. The officers now said to me, 'If we will let you go, will you say no more about it?' 'Gentlemen, do your duty, for I will come to no such terms.'

"'They then whispered to each other a moment, and let me go. They returned to their employer, I suppose. I got into my carriage and came home, thankful for having escaped from the jaws of such savage beasts.

"'Yours, in the bonds of the gospel,

"'THOMAS VAN RENNSLAER.'"

Some persons are so ignorant of history, or the usages of other nations, that they do not know that prejudice against color, as it is called, is peculiar to the United States; and that the fashionable in foreign countries laugh at our absurd pride, while the pious grieve over it. The negro, it is said, is of a degraded race. But who are *you*? asks William Goodell. An American.—A descendant of the Europeans. And the Europeans, who are *they*? *Who*? The noble ones of the earth. And from whence did they derive their literature, their civilization, and their religion! Europeans were naked barbarians a few centuries ago. Yes: but they drew wisdom from the Greeks—the Romans—the Hebrews. But whence did they derive their cultivation and their letters? The Greeks and Romans were once savages.

No mention is made of the literature of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. “Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the *Egyptians*!” To whom did the Greeks and Romans look up for instruction in letters and the arts? To the *Egyptians*. They sent their sons to be educated in *Egypt*—in *Ethiopia*. But who were the Egyptians and Ethiopians? *Negroes*! Yes, negroes; with woolly hair, flat noses, and black skins; for thus they are described by Herodotus. The Greeks imagined their deities resided among the Ethiopians, and Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, was supposed to have been an African princess.

Euclid, the father of mathematical science, was a *negro*. Cypria, Cyril, and Augustin, were pious and learned Bishops and Theologians, Fathers of the Christian Church; and they were negroes! Niger, (a negro,) a Roman general, wanted but one vote in the Senate, to be elected emperor of Rome.

Mr. Birney states that the slaveholders will ever believe northern abolitionists are hypocrites until they treat free people of color *irrespective of color*. The South tauntingly asks if we would have slavery abolished, while prejudice against color remains at the North? God will not crown our efforts for emancipation with success, till we first pull out the beam that is in our own eye. The very quintessence of slavery is embodied in this prejudice. It is the keenest edge of the iron that enters into the colored man's soul. It is the main pillar of the slave system.

In a letter just received from Rev. James A. Thome of Kentucky, now on a visit to the West Indies, with Mr. Joseph Horace Kimball of New Hampshire, he says, "with respect to *prejudice*, Antigua is a *new world* to us. We see none of it, excepting among the blue aristocrats, and there it is greatly modified, and is, indeed, nothing more than the feeling which they always have toward peasantry, white or colored. The *prejudices* of our countrymen never appeared so odious and abominable before. All classes here sneer at them."

“In church, the colored people and white sit together in the same pews. I saw this in two different churches at St. Thomas. When I told some persons there, that in the churches in America, the whites make the colored people sit in one corner of the church by themselves, they were very much surprised at it. They thought it was both foolish and wicked. Indeed, I was ashamed to tell them that such a thing was done in enlightened and Christian America.”

Mr. Kimball also writes from St. Thomas, “the prejudices which are so rampant against color in the United States, are hardly known here. The only expression of them which I have yet seen, is *among Americans*. People here, through all the grades of color, sit promiscuously together at church, unite in social visits and public balls, and stand side by side at the counting-house desk . . . . Colored men are also members, with whites, of military corps.”

“A. de Castro, a colored man, is aid-de-camp to the Governor General of the Danish West Indies; and his son, who is said to be worth a million, is aid-de-camp to the governor of this island, and is also co-member, with white clergymen and others, of the committee of the Lancasterian school. They are both on terms of intimacy with the first white families in the island, receiving visits from the most eminent merchants, and on all occasions, being honored as much as though their skins were of Yankee whiteness.”

Does the reader ask, *What shall we do?* In the first place read and commit to memory the tenth chapter of Acts and the second chapter of James. Next, remember the remarks of a Turkish chargé d'affaires to E. S. Abdy, "no Turk ever despises any one on account of his skin. I have African slaves,—when they behave ill, I do not sell them,—I dismiss them from my service. It would be against the Mahometan religion to treat any human being with disdain." Among Turks and Persians, negroes rise to the highest offices in the state. Ought not professing Christians in America to blush at the contrast?

*What shall we do?* Every individual is bound to do that which will convince others of the folly and wickedness of caste. He has duties as a reformer. What is it that keeps up caste? Example. And what else can throw it down? Precept without practice is notoriously powerless. It is even worse. No man's *practice* is so successfully quoted to support any sin, as his who acts contrary to, or not in accordance with, his right principle in regard to that sin. Now, whatever may be the clamor, wrath, and reviling, of any, or any number of individuals against abolitionists, for their intercourse with the colored people, I cannot but believe that to this, more than any other cause, we owe the firm hold which our doctrines have taken of the public conscience.

We may have been occasionally indiscreet in the *manner*, but when we give up the *matter*, I shall despair of our cause—and not till then. I must, therefore, believe it peculiarly the duty of every abolitionist, as such, to take special pains to honor, by frank, open, unconstrained courtesy, merit, whenever it appears beneath a colored skin. He should not forsake the society of whites, but he should meet the deserving colored man with the hand and heart of a *brother*. Such conduct cannot fail to be appreciated by the objects of our regard, and to have the happiest effect. It will convince all candid men, that to make the abolition of slavery successful and happy, it is only necessary to prostrate caste. I believe the conduct of Christ, in eating with publicans and sinners, conversing with the Samaritan woman, &c., illustrates both these views.

*What else shall we do?* Abolish invidious distinctions in the house of God. If the minister and the church will not consent to their brethren and sisters of color purchasing pews in any part of the church, or selecting their own seats and partaking *with them* at the communion of the Lord's Supper, let consistent abolitionists sit with their colored brethren in the "nigger's seat." The Apostle James says, with reference to such distinctions as are usually made, "If ye have respect to persons, YE COMMIT SIN."

It is plainly a respect of persons, says Joshua Leavitt, when churches say that the black man,

solely on account of his color, shall not sit in the house of God, unless he will occupy the negro pew; nor, though acknowledged as a Christian brother, be allowed to take the symbols of a common Saviour's death, except on a bench in the aisle, or after the rest are all served. The truth is, the churches are but just beginning to open their eyes to this ENORMOUS SIN—this outrage upon the body of Christ, in the person of his members.

“Every article of splendor in dress, every dainty viand, every delicacy of drink, passes through the hands of blacks; but when we come to the Lord's entertainment, when we all meet on the common level, as redeemed sinners, bought with the same blood, our delicacy is shocked, and our pious reception of the body of Christ is turned into loathing, if those black fingers are allowed to take a piece of bread from the plate, or those black lips to touch the consecrated cup, before our own. Is that *color*, or is it *caste*?”

Does any one suppose that if our blessed Saviour were now on earth, in this country, he would countenance the treatment colored Americans receive from their white fellow citizens, and fellow christians? Would he refuse to eat with them? Would he decline to ride with them in the stage-coach? Would he object to walk with them in the streets? Would he revolt at sitting with them in the house of God? Would



he oblige them to wait, at his table, until all the white members of the church had partaken of the emblems of his broken body and shed blood? Every truly Christian heart will immediately exclaim, **CERTAINLY NOT.** Would Jesus have done so? **NO.** Hear him say then, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, **YE HAVE DONE IT UNTO ME.**"

We have mentioned the language of the Apostle James as condemning, in a pointed manner, the spirit of caste, so rampant in this country. The attention of the reader will be directed more particularly to this "abolition" passage of holy writ. It is the second chapter of James.

"My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, [or with a white skin,] and there come in also a poor man, in vile raiment, [or a man with a black or colored skin,] and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, [or is of a white complexion,] and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place, [in a pew in the broad aisle, or in the body of the church,] and say to the poor, [or man of color,] Stand thou there, [by the door,] or sit here under my footstool, [or in the "nigger's seat,"] are ye not partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts? Harken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the

poor of this world, [many of the colored people,] rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?

“But ye have despised the poor [the people of color]. Do not rich men [the white people] oppress you, [treat you with neglect, contempt, or scorn,] and draw you to the judgment-seats? Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called? If ye fulfil the royal law, according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor [thy colored brother] as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in ONE POINT, HE IS GUILTY OF ALL.”

Abolitionists profess to believe the doctrine, that “people should be treated according to their intrinsic worth, *irrespective of color*,” but even some of them decline acting out this principle. Many are the excuses. One says, “we must not brave public sentiment.” Did not Jesus Christ brave public sentiment? “He made himself of no reputation,” says the apostle, and he incurred the hatred of men by acting in opposition to their prejudices. Another says, “if sinners see that colored people sit with white people in the house of God, they will be driven away, and lose their souls.” Indeed!

An officer in one of the churches in the city of New York—a professed abolitionist—engaged

with apparent warmth as a teacher in a colored school. He was willing to have "treatment irrespective of color" inscribed upon the banner, and was determined to break down, he said, the anti-Christian prejudices of men against colored people. In a short time, a prayer meeting of the teachers and scholars was appointed. A colored man (very black, it must be acknowledged) came in, and sat upon the seat with the deacon. It was perceived that the white man looked worried and displeased.

After the meeting had closed, he was asked, "what made you so uneasy in meeting?" That black man, he observed, had no right to take that seat; he might have sat on the other side. "But you hold to the principle of treating people *irrespective of color*, do you not?" Oh, yes, replied he, but perhaps I do not understand that expression as you do. "Ah, and how do you interpret it?" Why, he remarked, it means treating them so in my heart!!

For one, I am for treating our colored brethren thus—try to forget that they are *colored*, and act accordingly. This seems to be imitating Christ, of whom it was said, "Thou regardest not the persons of men." Never shall I forget the impressive remarks made by *George Thompson* on this subject, in one of his eloquent lectures in this city. "Try to banish from your mind that there is any difference in complexion. In your thoughts, in your prayers, in all your speech and

conduct, think of your colored brother as a MAN."

This advice has been of great use to me. I pray God it may be to others. Let it be engraven on the tablet of the memory, and written as with the point of a diamond on the heart, and we shall not hear abolitionists use such expressions as the following—"have mercy upon the colored people," "we feel for the poor degraded in the midst of us," "these people," "that black man," "what colored man is that?" &c., &c.

Let us say that *man*, that *woman*, that *child*; pray for the slaves as *our brethren and sisters in bondage*; and for the free people of color as *our brethren and sisters suffering under cruel prejudice*. In this way we shall lose the idea of a distinction founded upon complexion in our own minds, and be more sensitive to evidences of it in the conduct of others. Thus our respect for colored Americans will be increased, our abhorrence of prejudice strengthened, and we shall have more sympathy for those who are treated with contumely because God has, in them, "set his image in ebony."

Abolitionists owe it to the free people of color, and to themselves, to treat them thus kindly and respectfully. Thus our theory will be reduced to practice, and we shall gain the confidence and love of those who are weighed down by oppression in the free states. Their drooping spi-

rits will be revived, their hearts will be gladdened, and they will hold up their heads as freemen. To the touching appeal, "Am I not a man and a brother?" every consistent abolitionist will promptly reply, in language and conduct, YES.

One of the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society came to a village in Ohio where there was but one colored family. The head of it was a member of the church, a sensible, pious, and highly respected woman. The agent visited her, and was much pleased with the neat and respectable appearance of the dwelling and the children, and especially with the intelligence and piety of the mother. They knelt down, and prayed together for the poor slaves, for slaveholders, the despised people of color, the land of their birth, the church of Christ, the anti-slavery cause. During one part of the interview, the woman burst into tears. The agent inquired the reason. The answer was, "you are the only white person that ever called me sister!" Yet this woman was a sister in the Church, and both the minister and members spoke of her as an exemplary Christian.

It is the spirit of caste that helps to keep alive the expatriation-scheme. Nothing will tend more to cover it with universal opprobrium, than for abolitionists to treat the people of color as they treat other persons, and to speak of them as they do of other countrymen. Even the *title* of

Mrs. Child's "Appeal in favor of *that class of Americans called Africans,*" did much to conciliate the hearts of men to the people of color, and to open their eyes to the wickedness of that prejudice that seeks to remove them to a far distant land. We conclude this tract by an extract from the "Appeal" of the consistent and uncompromising writer alluded to.

"Our prejudice against the blacks is founded in sheer pride; and it originates in the circumstance that people of color only, are universally allowed to be slaves. We made slavery, and slavery makes the prejudice. No christian, who questions his own conscience, can justify himself in indulging the feeling. The removal of this prejudice is not a matter of opinion—it is a matter of *duty*. We have no right to palliate a feeling, sinful in itself, and highly injurious to a large number of our fellow-beings.

"Let us no longer act upon the narrow-minded idea, that we must always continue to do wrong, because we have so long been in the habit of doing it. That there is no *necessity* for the prejudice is shown by facts. In England, it exists to a much less degree than it does here. If a respectable colored person enters a church there, the pews are readily opened to him; if he appears at an inn, room is made for him at the table, and no laughter or winking, reminds him that he belongs to an outcast race.

"A highly respectable English gentleman re-

siding in this country has often remarked, that nothing filled him with such utter astonishment as our prejudice with regard to color. There is now in old England a negro, with whose name, parentage, and history, I am well acquainted, who was sold into West Indian slavery by his New-England master; (I know *his* name.) The unfortunate negro became free by the kindness of an individual, and has now a handsome little property and the command of a vessel. He must take care not to come into the ports of our Southern republics!—The anecdote of Prince Saunders is well known; but it will bear repeating. He called upon an American family, then residing in London. The fashionable breakfast hour was very late, and the family were still seated at the table. The lady fidgeted between the contending claims of politeness and prejudice. At last, when all but herself had risen from the table, she said, as if struck by a sudden thought, ‘Mr. Saunders, I forgot to ask if you had breakfasted.’ ‘I thank you, madam,’ replied the colored gentleman; ‘but I have engaged to breakfast with the Prince Regent this morning.’

“Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. Brougham have often been seen in the streets of London, walking arm in arm with people of color. The same thing is true of Brissot, Lafayette, and several other distinguished Frenchmen. In this city, I never but once saw such an instance: When the Philadelphia company were here last sum-

mer, I met one of the officers walking arm in arm with a fine-looking black musician. The circumstance gave me a good deal of respect for the white man; for I thought he must have kind feelings and correct principles, thus fearlessly to throw off a worse than idle prejudice.

“In Brazil, people of color are lawyers, clergymen, merchants and military officers; and in the Portuguese, as well as the Spanish settlements, intermarriages bring no degradation. On the shores of the Levant, some of the wealthiest merchants are black. If we were accustomed to see intelligent and polished negroes, the prejudice would soon disappear. There is certainly no law of our nature which makes a *dark color* repugnant to our feelings. We admire the swarthy beauties of Spain; and the finest forms of statuary are often preferred in bronze. If the whole world were allowed to vote on the question, there would probably be a plurality in favor of complexions decidedly dark. Every body knows how much the Africans were amused at the sight of Mungo Park, and what an ugly misfortune they considered his pale color, prominent nose, and thin lips.”

---

Published by R. G. Williams, 143 Nassau street, New York, for the American Anti-Slavery Society.