

11



TWO DISCOURSES

ON THE

BIBLE AND SLAVERY.

By Rev. B. F. TAYLOR,

OF THE UPPER IOWA CONFERENCE.

THOU SHALT PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND
TO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF." LEV. XXV. 10.

WATERLOO :

PRINTED AT THE "COURIER" OFFICE BY W. H. HARTMAN.

1862



Errata.

Not having been situated so that I could read the proof sheets, the following errors have occurred, with a few others, such as mite, for might; heard, for hard; wives, for wives; &c.

- Page 6, 11 lines from top read Justinian Code.
" " 14 " " " " " three in number.
" " bottom line read mental.
" 10 6 lines from top read robbery.
" " 29 " " " " these were persons.
" " 39 " " " " 318.
" 16 13 " " bottom " some may.
" 17 16 " " top, after elevate, supply him
" " 5 " " bottom read Jer. 23, 13.
" 32 4 " " top read Bengelius.
" 34 21 " " " " children cry.
" 37 4 " " " " heart.
" 38 1 " " " " firmly.

TWO DISCOURSES

ON THE

BIBLE AND SLAVERY.

By **Rev. B. F. TAYLOR,**

OF THE UPPER IOWA CONFERENCE.

“THOU SHALT PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL
THE LAND TO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF.” Lev. 25, 10.

WATERLOO :

PRINTED AT THE "COURIER" OFFICE BY W. H. HARTMAN

1862.

Grout Historical Museum
Park Ave. at South St.
Waterloo, Iowa

0011.1955.010

TWO DISCOURSES

ON THE

BIBLE AND SLAVERY

To the cause of Human Liberty, is this my first effort in the Literary world,

DEDICATED,

B. F. T.

By Rev. B. F. TAYLOR

OF THE UPPER IOWA CONFERENCE

TO PROMOTE LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LANDS TO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF

WATERLOO:

Great Historical Museum
Park Ave. at South St.
Waterloo, Iowa

P R E F A C E .

When a writer comes before the public it is always expected that he should give a reason for so doing. In compliance with this general practice I must say that a few weeks ago, I had no intention of entering the field of authorship, and especially as a writer on the "Irrepressible Conflict;" a subject on which I have generally been silent in my pulpit labors, to which those who have heard me most will bear testimony. On my present charge I found quite a pro-slavery element, against which I was requested to preach. Having never preached on the subject I was not in any hurry, until after my second quarterly meeting, at which time my Presiding Elder made a strong Union prayer, with which there was considerable fault found by persons of certain political complexion. This coming to my knowledge I concluded it was about time to speak out boldly on this subject, which I did, in my first discourse, preached at the two prominent places on my charge.

From the first place at which it was preached, there came up a protest signed by self-constituted guardians of the pulpit, some of whom heard the discourse, and others did not, under the plea that it was political preaching, and that they would withdraw their support. This protest I would gladly lay before my readers as a moral curiosity could I get possession of it, but as it went back into the hands of those who presented it, I cannot get it, and those who have it refuse to give it up. At my other preaching place the kind friends good naturedly remained at home while I preached my first discourse. In some cases the very dear Sisters have been my strongest opposers, one of whom thought her patriotic hens might do me some good, which I assured her would be the case, provided they were made into a pot-pie.

When I preached the second discourse at S. B., persons outside of my Society made me a present of \$18, which I cannot in justice pass without mentioning. I would be happy to say that everything in connection with these discourses passed off pleasantly, but out of their delivery has arisen many things that to me are disagreeable. The report has been circulated that in my first discourse I said that the signers of the Constitution of the United States were "thieves and robbers, with Washington at their head." Although I never had mentioned slavery in the pulpit since coming to this charge until I announced and preached my first discourse as herein contained, and have not since only in announcing and preaching my second, yet it has been cast into my face by persons who knew better. "That we have an example here in town of a person who preaches the ne-

gro more than he does Jesus Christ." Such is slavery, North and South ; low, vulgar, base, domineering. By request of my friends I publish these discourses. They were preached from notes, and although it is impossible to give the same language in the written, as in the delivered discourses, yet the points are the same. Some of the language is much stronger than that used in the pulpit, and if any think it too strong, my only apology is, that this is no time for the honeyed expression "My dear brother slaveholder," or for "wish-a-washy" resolutions. Gun powder, fire, thunder, and metallic hail, are the last refuge. Could I concentrate all the power of invective in one sentence and then as the Irish orator said, "I would place one foot upon the ocean and the other upon the georgiumsidus, dip my tongue in the livid lightning, throw my voice into the bellowing thunder," I would hurl it against slavery until traitors North and South would quake like the frail skiff lashed by Atlantic's billows.

B. F. TAYLOR.

NOTE.—I do not wish the public generally to know where this proslavery element exists, for I think it a disgrace that it should be found in the North at the present time ; hence I have avoided names of places.

When a writer comes before the public it is always expected that he should give a reason for so doing. In compliance with this general principle I must say that a few weeks ago I had an intention of entering the lists of authorship and especially as a writer on the "Irrepressible Conflict"; a subject on which I have generally been silent in my private letters. On my way to which those who have heard me must well bear testimony. On my present charge I found quite a proslavery element, against which I was prepared to speak. Having never preached on the subject I was not in any hurry, until after my second quarterly meeting, at which time my preaching made a strong Union party, with which there was considerable friction found by means of certain political complications. This conflict in my knowledge I mentioned it was about time to speak out boldly on this subject, which I did, in my last discourse, preached at the two meetings placed on my charge. Even the first place at which it was preached, there came up a proslavery party, who, in the first place, were of the opinion, some of whom were opposed by the speaker, and others not, under the plea that it was not a proper subject, and that they would withdraw their support. This position I would gladly, for before my readers as a moral curiosity could I not have seen it, but as it went back into the hands of those who presented it, I cannot get it, and thus who have it takes it up. At my other meetings the kind friends good remained at home while I preached my first discourse. In some cases the very dear friends have seen my strongest opponents, one of whom thought her partner's name might be the same good, which I mentioned her name to be the case, provided they were made into a party.

When I preached the second discourse at S. D. persons outside of my Society made me a present of \$10, which I cannot in justice pass without mentioning. I would be happy to say that everything in connection with these discourses passed off pleasantly, but out of their delivery has arisen many things that to me are deplorable. The report has been circulated that in my last discourse I said that the signs of the Constitution of the United States were "blatant and robbery with Washington at their head." Although I never had mentioned slavery in the paper since coming to the country, and I mentioned and preached my first discourse as usual, and have not since only in substance and preaching, but it has been cast into my face by persons who know better. There were no examples in town of a person who preaches the

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

First Discourse.

Strange as it may appear, things diametrically opposite in many respects, yet coincide in others; such is the fact in regard to the subject under consideration. There are two classes of persons whose opinions on many subjects are as opposite as the two poles of the magnet, and yet they both agree that the Bible sanctions slavery. 1st. Those of the Dr. Smith type, who feign to believe that slavery is not only a harmless thing, but that God has ordained it as the highest social position the African can occupy, and professing firm faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures they appeal to their authority.

The second class is found among those who at heart are Deistical, and yet with the majority of genuine christians they believe slavery to be morally and socially opposed to the principles of natural religion; generally acknowledged to be binding upon every human being, and yet—whether they are honest in their convictions or not, I am unable to say—they contend that the Bible upholds the curse of human bondage, and find in that a reason for its rejection.

In argument with such they will paint slavery in its blackest character, and then tell you that the Book you say came from a God of love and mercy, sanctions it; and if the humble believer in Christ denies the assertion, he is pointed to those learned D D's, and professors of religion, who contend that slavery is a Divine institution, with the taunting remark, "Those who have studied the Bible, say it does." Thus the professed friends of the Scriptures are arrayed against them, and is it to be wondered at that Infidels are successful in undermining the foundations of the faith of many.

Persons who contend that the word of God favors an evil as dire as that of American Slavery are furnishing the fuel with which to feed the flames of infidelity that will enwrap the souls of many in the habiliments of eternal destruction. Pause, my brother, and reflect. Will you turn the fountain of life, whose streams are for the healing of the nations, into a fetid pool of abominations. By your course the Bible suffers more from its professed friends than it does from its open enemies.

We will now proceed to an investigation of the subject. And to as-

certain whether the Bible sanctions Slavery or not, we must know what Slavery is.

But prior to doing this there is one principle we wish to establish; namely, that by the laws of nature all men are entitled to liberty until by crime they have forfeited that right. Or in other words that the Divine Being never created a slave such by nature.

We all descended from one common parent. "God made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth,"—Acts 17, 26. God has frequently declared that He is no respecter of persons. The same principle has been recognized in nearly all human laws. In the first Book of the *Justinian Code*, which is part of the Roman law, it is asserted that, "By the law of nature all men are free." Blackstone, the English jurist, in his commentary on law says: "The absolute natural rights of men are those in number, 1. The right of personal security. 2. The right of personal liberty. 3. The right of private property." Our own great statesman, Thomas Jefferson, when speaking from the out-gushings of the human heart, as in the Declaration of Independence, says, "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created free and equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Mark you, these truths were self-evident. They needed no proof to establish the fact, that ALL MEN were created equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among these the right of liberty. Now, if as many contend the Constitution dooms a part of mankind to hopeless bondage, it is in direct violation of the Declaration of Independence; but we leave that to the statesman. Our own Book of Discipline asserts the same truth. "We believe that the buying, selling, or holding of human beings to be used as chattels, is contrary to the laws of God and nature, and inconsistent with the Golden Rule." The man who in the light of such evidence will deny this point must be blinded by prejudice, or incapable of comprehending testimony; and in either case is not a subject with whom to reason. No longer assert that God has doomed any class of human beings to bondage from their birth, or that even before their eyes saw the golden light of heaven, the fetters were forged with which to bind them to a life of degradation.

It is evident that any system calculated to deprive men of their natural rights, given by the Creator, is intrinsically wrong; for these first principles being not only found in the very constitution of our being, but also in the revealed Will of God, are paramount to all others. That Slavery, which is the absolute subjection of one person to the will of another, is at war with these principles none dare deny. Without any crime upon their part, or that of their ancestors, the Africans have been stolen from their native country, and against their will reduced to a state of servitude.—From whom did any human being obtain a right to do this? Where in His Word has God chartered any man, or any company of men, to commit an act so flagitious? It is an outrage upon the law of nature, as well as upon every principle of justice, and although it is looked upon by our national government as piracy, that has not suppressed the traffic, nor made an atonement for the past

2. Slaves in this country are held as chattels, personal, bought, sold, mortgaged, taken under execution, and without any crime lodged in jail. The master may determine the quality and quantity of food the slave shall eat, and the amount of labor performed.
3. They are deprived of all the rights of education; there are no schools for their instruction; no teachers employed to impart to them the rudiments of science; no ray of light is permitted to dispel the mortal

See errors

darkness that surrounds them. But on the contrary severe penalties are inflicted on any person who should attempt to instruct them. 4th. They must bear the grossest insults and the severest punishment, without the possibility of redress. Parents must quietly submit to see their children abused by the fiendish task-master. Manhood must stand and behold the blood trickle down the lacerated back of that mother who bore him; as stroke after stroke in quick succession, the sound of the thong falls upon his ear; he must hear her groans, and cries for mercy, but has no power to relieve her distress. To resist by physical force would be death. Legal redress is beyond his power; for the law is such that no Slave can bring a suit against a white man, or be a witness in a case where one is a party. 5th. The Slave has no right which the white man is bound to respect. He is not secure in his person—property he can have none. The marriage relation is hardly a name. Its sanctity may be violated by any one. The tenderest ties may be sundered by the will of the master. Look at it a moment; does not the heart sicken. Nearly four millions of human beings doomed to the most abject bondage; robbed of manhood,—chattelized, degraded. No legal redress—no right of petition; from among them no orator can arise to plead their cause. No tribunal but that of heaven accessible. Is it any wonder that God should arise and with one tremendous galvanic shock, shake this nation to its foundation. Such is only a part of Slavery. Glorious institution, indeed! Well worthy of those who plead for it. Every principle of the system is opposed to natural right, and God cannot establish one law in nature, and give us another in Revelation directly the opposite.

2. WE WILL EXAMINE SOME OF THOSE PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE ADDUCED IN FAVOR OF THE SYSTEM.

1. *Can one man have property in another? We deny the right*, but let us hear the affirmative. The following is adduced as proof: "And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money." When we take into consideration the simplicity of the ancient forms of government, the absence of strictly legislative enactments against minor delinquencies; and that every house-holder was in some respects a chief, and a Judge in such matters, we might grant the right of punishment. But that this passage grants any such right we deny. A similar expression occurs in 1st John, 2, 1. "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father." None dare say that this is a permission to sin. And yet the expressions are tantamount, and if the one does not prove the right neither does the other. It is a regulation made in anticipation of such an event. If the servant died at the time the punishment was inflicted it was presumptive evidence at least, if not positive, that the master intended murder; in which case the punishment was death. Gen. 9, 5, 6. If the servant continued a day or two before death occurred, it was considered sufficient evidence that it was not the master's intention to kill him; he had not premeditated murder in his heart. The servant may have been guilty of crime, and worthy of punishment, but he has exceeded the bounds of propriety, as well as of his own design; and as all law in meting out punishment does, or should look at the design the criminal had in view, he having no intention of committing a great criminal offence, death was considered too severe a punishment. The servant continuing a few days, death might have occurred from some other cause. At the present age a competent jury under such circumstances would be unwilling to sentence a man to death without

medical testimony, given by those who had made a careful post-mortem examination, which would have been difficult to obtain at that age of the world.

But it is said, "He is his money." This is the main point under consideration, and doubtless the language is figurative. I know it is easy for a person when he finds a Scriptural text that will not bend to his theory to say, "it is figurative," and so let it pass. But this expression is so purely such, that no sane person will understand it otherwise. Flesh and blood are not money, as all must admit. The master had a claim on his servant for a certain period of time, and the amount of labor that servant could perform in that time was as good to him as so much money; consequently it is the labor that is the money, or the representative of the money, and not the person. Such expressions by a figure of rhetoric are of frequent occurrence. If the servant were a Hebrew, he might be indebted to his master to the amount of six years' labor, but no longer without a new contract. If a stranger, forty-nine years; but no more, as we will hereafter prove. The master by his rashness loses this labor, which amounts to a fine. Although at the present age of the world imprisonment would be added.

2. It is contended that because servants are enumerated with property they are such. Gen. 12, 16. We reply that because men and women are classified, or more properly mentioned in connection with property, for it is not a classification; it does not prove similarity any more than it proves them to be sheep and oxen, or some other four-footed beast, because they are mentioned in the same chapter or verse with such. If it proves that servants were property, it also proves that men's wives were the same, for they are similarly classified. Ex. 20, 17. Illustrate this point. Suppose that I in writing to a friend back East should inform him that I met Mr. Jones on his way to Nebraska, and he had his mules, cows, sheep, swine, wife and children, along with him, would you not think that friend of mine addled, if he should afterwards write a book, and endeavor to prove that out West women and children were some kind of four-footed beasts, held as property, and refer to my letter as proof. The argument is as good in the one case as in the other.

3. Servants were anciently bought and sold, hence it is concluded that they were held as property. The Hebrews bought servants, but you look in vain for any example of their selling any under the sanctions of the law, except in criminal cases. The idea has generally prevailed that whatever is bought is property, and in the main it is correct, yet it will not always hold good. God is represented as having purchased his people. Ex. 15, 16, and Deut. 32, 6. "Is not he thy Father that has bought thee?"—These people were not property; the Divine Being was not a slave-holder.

Anciently men frequently bought their wives, paying their father a dowry—that is now reversed, and the father pays the dowry. Jacob gave seven years' labor for Rachel, and then got cheated, and was obliged to give seven more, which must have been an enormous price, or she must have been a superior woman. But men did not hold their wives as property.—We never hear of men selling them to get their money back. Even white men have frequently been placed in circumstances where they were obliged to buy their liberty, but that did not make them a mere article of merchandize. The term bought does not determine the condition, without a previous knowledge of the thing bought, and as men are not recognized as property without a special law to that effect; and the Jews had no such law, consequently they did not hold human beings as chattels. Fr

the case of servants it was labor that was purchased, and they were held until that labor was performed, when they, and their children, were set at liberty.

The Jewish law was founded on the principles of justice; they were required to be honest in all their dealings, assisting each other whenever it was in their power. If any one found any lost property, or saw anything going astray, he was required to return it. Deut. 22, 1. In Ex. he was required to do the same thing for his enemy. Persons held in bondage are more liable to go astray or run away, than anything else, and yet they are not mentioned in this enumeration, but the law in regard to them is directly the opposite. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." Deut. 23, 15. If the Bible recognizes the right of property in servants this text is contrary to every principle of justice, and is not only a license to commit fraud, but a positive command to do so, which never could come from the God of Revelation. From this it is evident that men were not held as property.

God having created of one blood all nations; he being no respecter of persons; all men being equal, and liberty an inalienable right, upon what principle can one portion of the human family chattelize the other? In this act there is a distinction as great as there is between man and the brute creation. Will you say upon mere physical force, embracing the atheistical theory "that might constitutes right." Then probably the African would have the right to enslave the Anglo-Saxon, for physically he is his equal, if not his superior. Will you say superiority of intellect constitutes a right? We reply that similar advantages possessed by us, it remains to be proven that the African would not equal us in intellect, although it might require centuries. Dr. Livingstone, than whom few are better prepared to judge, he having spent seventeen years on that Continent, asserts that many of the Natives evidence more natural shrewdness than the uneducated men of England. In this country where the opportunity has been presented they have generally been eager to acquire knowledge. Few white men who have lived to the age of thirty or forty years in ignorance, ever think of acquiring an education, and yet slaves at that age who have escaped from bondage set about it immediately. There appears to be some latent native intellectual energy about the African that causes him to rise, notwithstanding his condition, for while those in this country are approaching civilization, the white population of the Slave States are sinking to barbarism. But granting that intellectually we are vastly their superiors, it gives us no right of property in them. In this respect we may find many who are our superiors, but we would be unwilling they should make merchandize of us.

If you say the difference in color gives a right you make an assertion without the least shadow of proof, for neither God's Word, or the laws of nature make any such distinction. Suppose that God should raise up a nation of Albinoes as much whiter than we are as we are whiter than the mulattoes, would that give them the right of property in us? Few would be willing to make such an admission.

Others contend that the Africans are the descendants of Canaan, the grand son of Noah, and that they are doomed to Slavery on account of the sin of their father. This is a point that never has been proven, for it is not historically true that Canaan settled in Africa, but that he settled in the land of Canaan, and from him it received its name. The Canaanites have been tributary to other nations in a manner which fulfills the prophecy much better than it can be done by applying it to the Africans.

Having shown that there is no argument either from Scripture or reason for reducing any portion of the human family to the condition of mere things as chattels; the only principle upon which this can be done is by brute force, an arbitrary enactment. I do not say law as that is founded upon justice; this is an outrage upon human rights, upon justice, and upon every other Divine principle. It is ~~robbing~~ depriving men of their dearest rights, and upon the same principle we might be reduced to the most abject bondage by a nation superior to us.

WE WILL NOW CONSIDER PATRIARCHAL SERVITUDE, AS SET FORTH IN THE HISTORY OF THE THREE MOST PROMINENT PATRIARCHS.

Let it be remembered that each of these under the direction of the Divine Being was a kind of absolute monarch, and those forming his household were properly his subjects, for whom he made laws and regulations. There is no word in the Hebrew language that necessarily means a Slave. "*Abed*" denotes any kind of a servant. This is not the case in those countries where Slavery existed. The Greeks have two words, "*doulos*," a servant, which may also denote a slave; and "*andropodon*," a down-trodden man, a slave. So with the Latins, "*servus*," a servant, "*mancipium*," a slave. (ELLIOTT.) In the English language we find the word servant, slave, &c.

ABRAHAM.

The first intimation we have of this Patriarch having anything like servants, is when he was summoned by the Divine Being to leave Ur, a city of Chaldea, his native land, and go to the land of Canaan. Gen. 12, 1. In the 5th verse of this chapter the historian informs us that Abraham took "Sarah, his wife, and Lot, his brother's son, and the souls they had gotten in Hara." Now, it is contended that these souls were slaves; but where is the evidence? Certainly not in the text, for that says nothing about slaves. Abraham was a worshiper of the true God. He left his country on account of the idolatry which prevailed, and is it not equally probable that there were persons who left for the same cause? The Chaldea Paraphrast understood it in this sense, hence it reads, "The souls of those whom they proselyted in Hara." This leaves no room for Slavery, but in the imagination of those who would steal the livery of heaven with which to serve Satan. This Patriarch was chosen of God to occupy a prominent place in the world's history; he had piety, wealth, and influence; and it is probable that those who accompanied him in his peripatations ultimately became his subjects or servants. After dwelling in the land of Canaan for some time, Chedorlaomer and his confederates, made war with the Sodomites, and carried off Lot and his Goods; Abraham having heard of this armed eight hundred and eighteen of his trained servants, born in his own house, and went in pursuit of the enemy, and rescued Lot. GEN. 14, 14. It is contended that these eight hundred and eighteen were slaves. We deny it, and demand the proof. In due time we will show the difference between a slave and a servant; they may have been the latter, but the text does not prove it. The word servant is supplied by our translators, and might with equal propriety have been rendered, "trained warriors," born under his Patriarchal government, as the text must be understood, for Abraham never dwelt in a house, but in tents, and we are not to presume that they all lived in one department. That this Patriarch had servants none will deny, but let us inquire into the manner by which he procured them. 1st. It has been intimated that those who came with him from Chaldea became his servants, or more properly his subjects. 2nd. Although he is not commanded to buy servants, yet

in GEN. 17, 13, there appears to be a tacit admission that he might do so, and as all those who were bought were proselytes to his religion, and as that covenant relation was a voluntary act, he must have bought them with their own consent, and that probably from themselves, and for limited time. 3d. Abimilech, King of Gerar, a city of Arabia, made presents to Abraham, of sheep, and oxen, and men servants, and women servants.— GEN. 20, 14. They may have been slaves while in the possession of Abimilech, but it does not follow that they remained such after coming into the hands of the Patriarch. Abraham was not the man to traffic in human flesh and blood. In return for Abimilech's kindness he presented him sheep and oxen, (GEN. 21, 17,) but no servants. These were now a sacred trust committed to his care; he is their Priest and King; they are part of his family, participants in the same heavenly grace which he enjoys; he cannot dispose of them. No scenes like those which occur in the Southern States disgraced the Patriarchal circle.

ISAAC.

A few remarks in regard to the long anticipated heir must suffice. He inherited the possessions of his father, and as head of the government, those under the former became subject to him. He was wealthy, and had possession of flocks and herds, and great store of servants; or as the margin reads, husbandry. GEN. 26, 14. These servants were employed as herdsmen. Now this is just what we would expect. A person having flocks and herds would have men to attend them. But it is evident that they were not slaves for this is the last we hear of them.

JACOB.

The successor of Isaac in the Patriarchal line, left Canaan and went to Padan Aram. He took no servants with him, but for fourteen years he labored as one himself, (GEN. 29, 27,) to pay for his wives. This would be a strange freak for the hereditary possessor of a number of slaves. Such a person would have sent one of his chattels, or if his passion for his lady love had been very strong, and he could not get her until she was paid for, he would have sent a score or more to do the work while he acted the beau in whispering soft things into her ear.

One year after the expiration of the time for which he contracted to labor for his wives, and he began to have flocks and herds of his own we find he had servants. GEN. 30, 40. From whom or how he procured these we are not informed. Six years after this he returned to his native land, and his servants accompanied him as herdsmen. GEN. 32, 16. But there is strong presumption that all the servants Jacob ever had were only hired men, and that after he arrived at Canaan they either returned home again, or settled in the land of Canaan, for in a short time we are informed that Jacob's sons are feeding their flocks in Shechem. GEN. 37, 11. The father wishing to ascertain their condition had no servant to send, but was obliged to send Joseph his beloved son. Upon Joseph's arrival at Dothan, the place to which his brethren had removed, the same diabolical spirit entered into them which influences the lords of the lash in the South, and they sold him into bondage, and then concocted an infamous lie with which to deceive their father. Here is Bible Slavery, and pro-slaveryites are welcome to all the advantages they can derive from it. That Jacob's sons were alone on this occasion is quite evident as there is no threats, bribes, or charges given to servants to keep the secret.

During the famine which prevailed in Canaan Jacob was obliged to

send to Egypt to purchase food for his family; he did not send servants, but his own sons, which would hardly have been the case had he possessed any. Slave-holders are not likely to go on such an expedition as that was while their slaves remain at home in idleness. Upon their second trip to Egypt they found that he who had acted so strangely towards them on the former occasion was their brother whom they sold to the Ishmaelites, and who was now under Pharaoh, ruler of the entire kingdom. When Jacob received this welcome news, he and his entire family departed from Canaan and went to Egypt. GEN. 46, 6. The whole number of persons comprising the family of Jacob were sixty-six. Joseph and his family were already in Egypt. Here we find neither slave or servant. It is true that two of Jacob's wives had been given to him as handmaids, but now they are joined in wedlock, the children are legitimate and share equally with those of Rachel and Leah. This is over two hundred years since Abraham left Ur, and upon the supposition that he held slaves, and that they were inherited as they are in this country, and that they increased in the same ratio as the balance of the population, they would have amounted to many thousands. To say that the Patriarchs sold any is an infamous assumption with which to fasten crime upon those men of God, and the man who does it should be looked upon as an enemy of the truth. There is nothing in the history of these men to favor in the remotest degree the vile system of bondage found in this country.

Having done with Patriarchal servitude as far as our time will permit, we will now EXAMINE THE MOSAIC CODE ON THIS SUBJECT, and as pro-slavery men generally appeal to this in support of their system we will be a little more explicit. If the law condemns Slavery even could it be proven that the Israelites held men in bondage that would be nothing in its favor, for they as well as other nations, frequently engaged in things contrary to law. But suppose upon the other hand God gave them the privilege to hold those in bondage whose cup of iniquity was full, and whom he had doomed to destruction, but afterwards mitigated their punishment to a state of servitude, it proves nothing in favor of Slavery in the United States, or in any other country.

That the Hebrews had servants none will deny; but there is quite a difference between a servant and a slave. The latter is held in perpetual bondage—the former looks forward to a period when he shall enjoy his freedom. Slaves have no choice of masters—servants generally have.—Slaves are liable any moment to be sold, and the strongest ties sundered by the will of their masters—servants are not. Slavery abrogates the duties of parents and children, husbands and wives; although servitude may render their duties inconvenient, yet it respects them. In a word Slavery robs a person of all rights, and subjects him to the will of the master, and in a measure to that of every white man. We defy any person to prove that such a system is sanctioned by the Sacred Writings.—Your attention is invited to the several different classes of servants.

1. From DEUT. 15, 18, we infer that there were hired servants who were employed three years. In speaking of those who served six years it is said, "for he hath been worth a double hired servant unto thee, in serving thee six years." 2. The Hebrew who was held to service for six years, EX. 21, 2, 3, DEUT. 15, 12. 3. The Hebrew who upon the expiration of the six years made a new contract by which he served his master forever, DEUT. 15, 17. By forever we understand until the year of Jubilee, as we shall see hereafter. The 4th and last class to be noticed is the

stranger or heathen, and if Slavery existed any place in the Jewish economy we will find it in LEV. 25, 44, 46.

We will now inquire into the manner by which these persons became servants, and in doing so we will find nothing analagous to our vile system of kidnapping, but on the contrary in almost every case we will discover the principles of mercy and justice.

1. Persons who committed theft and had nothing with which to make restitution were sold for their crimes. Ex 22, 3. There was nothing wrong in this case for the criminal could only be held in bondage for six years. Our laws are more severe as they in most cases make no provision for restitution, by which the transgressor can escape the State's prison.

2. Persons who had become extremely poor and unable to support themselves might be sold. LEV. 25, 39. The question arises were they sold by their creditors against their wills, or did they sell themselves. This is not easily determined. In verse 47, we find that a Hebrew might sell himself to a stranger, while in 2nd Kgs., 4, 1, we have an example of a creditor coming to take away the sons of a certain poor widow, and when she cried unto Elisha, the prophet, he performed a miracle by which the debt was paid, and her children saved from going into bondage. Creditors may have usurped such authority, but I see nothing in the law of God to warrant it.

But if such a privilege was granted it would teach men not to contract debts which they were unable to pay, and yet it would not sanction Slavery for they could not be held to service longer than six years, and when they were granted their freedom their masters were obliged to supply them liberally out of such things as he possessed. DEUT. 15, 14.

3. Under certain circumstances, parents during the minority of their daughters, might sell them with the understanding that when they arrived at the proper age they were to become the wives of those who purchased them. Ex. 21, 7, 11. This as the Jews say, was only admissible when the parents had come to a state of the most abject poverty, utterly unable to support their families. This amounted to nothing more than a system of apprenticeship, during which time the parent received the wages of the child, or had received them at the commencement of the term. If at the expiration of the term the man did not see fit to marry her, he was obliged to let her return home. This is the only way by which the Hebrews became servants to each other. They had no power to sell one of their countrymen to a foreigner, and except for the violation of some law, or in the case of the parent and his daughter, they had no right to sell one at all.—Every Hebrew stood on an equality with his fellow Hebrew. One could not make a thing of merchandize of his brother. It was death to steal a man and sell him, or to have such stolen man in one's possession. In all those instances it was more properly the sale of services to be rendered by the person than the sale of the person himself, and amounted to little more than hiring or binding out for a number of years.

There was no equivocation upon the length of time; the law was emphatic. "Then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee." DEUT. 15, 12. See also, Ex. 21, 2. Here was liberty for every Hebrew who desired it; beyond this no one belonging to the Jewish nation could be held as a servant without his own consent, and that upon the merits of a new contract.

This brings us to the case of the *Lar bord servant*. This was a Hebrew, who while in his master's employ, married a heathen woman, an act contrary to law, and the children of such were counted heathen or strangers,

and were not entitled to their freedom at the end of six years. The law is found in Ex 21, 5, 6. "And if the servant 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, &c., and he shall serve him forever." In this case the master has given him one of his servants for a wife. She must have been a heathen woman or she would have been free at the same time her husband was, *i. e.*, at the end of the sixth year, as that set all Hebrews free. Although this marriage was contrary to law, and consequently void, yet the servant leaving his master does not necessarily imply a separation of his connubial bonds, as he could settle down and find employment contiguous to his former master, and still enjoy the company of his wife and children. But he says, "I love my master," &c.; he does not say, I love my wife and children, and will submit to a cruel bondage on their account, but that "I love my master." How different this system from that in this country which drives men to forsake their nearest friends to escape the brutal tyranny of their masters. The servant now by a new contract which the master was bound to make binds himself "forever," or until the year of Jubilee, when all were set at liberty.—It is unnecessary to pursue this part of the subject farther, as there is nothing in it to favor perpetual involuntary servitude; but we will invite your attention to another class of persons who were held as bondmen. Namely, *The Heathen*. "Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are around about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. 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, &c." LEV. 25, 44 and 46 verses. Verse 45 not quoted.

These were heathen whose cup of iniquity was full, and God had commanded their utter extermination. DEUT. 7, 2. This commandment the Israelites failed to carry out, and God foreseeing that this would be the case granted them the privilege of making bondmen of them. Although this course was detrimental to the spiritual interest of the Jewish nation as they had been warned by the Divine Being, yet it was not so severe upon the heathen as the original commandment. It was a change from capital punishment to a state of bondage, and as such was an act of mercy. This is no proof in favor of African Slavery, for God has never commanded their extermination. Having ascertained the condition of the persons mentioned, we wish briefly to analyze the passage quoted above. "Of them," *i. e.* "of the heathen shall ye buy," &c. Now, there is a shade of difference between "of" and "from;" to buy of a thing frequently means to buy that thing, so to buy of the heathen simply means to buy the heathen without denoting a third party, but to buy from, denotes a third party, or one who had power to sell. We have seen from LEV. 25, 47, that a person might sell himself, but where has God granted another the right to sell his fellow being unto bondage except for some crime. Granting that the heathen were guilty yet they were all equally so, and one had no right to enrich himself by selling his fellow criminal, which must have been the case had the Jews bought their servants from the heathen.—Where would have been the justice in making slaves of some, while that act was enriching and encouraging others, probably the most guilty. The heathen could not get possession of each other but by the more powerful oppressing the weak, or by kidnapping as we have done. Now, it was impossible for God to encourage that among other nations which he had made a capital offence among his own people. Ex. 21, 16. To receive

stolen property, or to hold a man in bondage who has been stolen is as bad as the original crime. We lay down this proposition and challenge any one to disprove it. *These persons were bought from themselves; they sold their services, or if it suits the fastidious ear of our pro-slavery friends any better, we will say they sold themselves, paid a tribute of service to their conquerors for sparing their lives and permitting them to remain in their native land.* Thus whole tribes became tributary, while as individuals they were employed to perform the more rigorous labor. We have an example of this in the case of the Gibeonites who by craft imposed upon Joshua.— In Jos. 9, 8, they offer to become servants, and in consequence of their deception they were made hewers of wood, and drawers of water. This service was not bought with money but with something much more priceless,—their lives. The same may have been the case with other nations. We want it distinctly understood that these nations remained tributary to the Israelites, and that they obtained their servants among them, yet under such regulations as precluded the possibility of any regular system of slavery, as we will show hereafter.

Those nations remaining in the land of Canaan became not only tributary to the Israelites who first entered the land under Joshua, but also to succeeding generations, and the term of service of those actually employed being longer than that of the Hebrew servants, descended by inheritance as a possession to the children of those who first bought them.

There is great stress laid upon the term “forever,” in the text, and yet those who so frequently use it with so much gusto do not appear to have any definite idea of its meaning. To hear them talk one would suppose that in the eternal world poor souls would toil on in a state of bondage.— I fear this will be the case, but the scale will be turned. Those who are now the masters and those who plead for the perpetuation of this system which is the quintessence of the scum of hell, will be the slaves, and the great arch traitor who rebelled in heaven will be their master, and with his trident he will urge them to gather the apples of Sodom in the sulphurous fields of damnation. That the term “forever” generally has an unlimited meaning is admitted, but when it is applied to things that have already ended it must be limited. For the last thousand years the Jews have not held the Canaanites in bondage. To say that in the text it means a life time is to assume the point without proof.

The Scripture limits its meaning when applied to servants, and yet pro-slavery men are so blinded by prejudice that they cannot see it. If in the passage under consideration it is used to denote the length of time these persons were to serve it cannot exceed forty-nine years, for at that period all were set at liberty.

“Forever” frequently has the sense of always; the text then might read the heathen shall always be your bondmen, *i. e.*, servants, but over your brethren, &c., ye shall not rule with rigor. Understood in this sense it points out the class of persons who were to be their servants, and not the length of time they were to serve.

THE JUBILEE.

This was one of the most singular, and in some respects one of the most beneficial regulations in the whole Jewish economy, and must have been suggested by the Divine Mind, for while it was a perpetual evidence of an overruling Providence, it preserved an equality of property, and prevented the possibility of perpetual involuntary servitude being introduced into the land. We find the law on this subject in the 25th chapter of Lev. Every seventh year was a Sabbatical year, at which time all Hebrew ser-

vants who desired it were liberated. The Jews were to number seven of these Sabbatical years, making forty-nine years, and then on the tenth day of the seventh month, which answers to our September, and which was the first month of the Jewish civil year, the trumpet was to sound throughout all the land, (verse 10,) "and ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and shall proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." This proclamation is as comprehensive as language can make it. Mark you, *throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.* The servant is to demand freedom; the master is to grant it. Will some of our pro-slavery friends who are good at splitting hairs please give us an arithmetical calculation of the number held in bondage after ALL were set at liberty. This to my mind looks very much like abolitionism, and I presume if such a proclamation was made in the Slave-holding States it would be treated as such, and not even a Divine commission would exempt the one who made it from insult and death.

But as this text is an eternal veto upon the slave system it is to be expected that the whole pro-slavery fraternity, North and South, will come down upon it in a perfect avalanche of hail, snow, thunder, mud and dirt; hence we find them applying some of the workings of their own beautiful system, and contending that because the permission to buy servants is given after the Jubilee is mentioned, that those heathen servants are not comprehended among those who were to be liberated. Dr. Ellott in speaking on this point, says: "As well might we contend that the Babylonish captivity took place after the latter day glory, for in the Book of Micha it is mentioned subsequent to that event." That the Jubilee was instituted for the benefit of the heathen stranger is evident from the fact that the year immediately preceeding it was a Sabbatical year, at which time all Hebrew servants who desired it, obtained liberty. We cannot suppose that such a grand proclamation would be made for the benefit of those who voluntarily remained in bondage at the end of the seventh, or previous year. Instead of this being joyful news to them it would have caused sorrow, because now they must go out from that master whom they love, and leave their wives and children. The language is too comprehensive to be thus limited; all are included; those who had married heathen women held to service now are permitted to leave their masters, and take their families along with them. Every heathen who had sold himself as a servant, or been sold as such, if any such cases occurred, now regains his freedom as an individual, while as tribes they still remained tributary to the Jews. Under this regulation it was impossible for any one to be held in bondage more than forty-nine years, and as during almost every year between the Jubilees so many have become servants, many would be free in a few years. Such a system prevented parents from dooming their children to perpetual bondage, even were they disposed to such an unnatural act.

If these regulations had been strictly observed it would have been impossible for any regular system of hereditary involuntary servitude to become engrafted upon the Jewish economy. As the gray light of morn streaked the east on the day of atonement, the trumpet sounded throughout all the land, and every man was free. Had the Fourth of July, 1776, been a grand Jubilee to all the inhabitants of this country, and if the framers of our Constitution had inserted a clause making the year 1826 another, with a prospective one every fifty years, Slavery would not to-day be shedding the best blood in our country.

Having seen that the Jubilee prevented any regular system of Slavery,

even among those who by transgression had forfeited their natural right, we will now examine some of the moral precepts of the Old Testament, and in so doing we will find an effectual barrier against the whole slave system, as it exists in this country.

1. *Respect of persons forbidden.* "With God there is no respect of persons" 2nd CHRON. 19, 7. "To have respect of persons is not good : for a piece of bread that man will transgress." PROV. 24, 23.

With the Divine Being, the rich, and the poor, the high, and the low, are on an equality ; moral worth constituting the only difference. Slavery originated in violation of this principle. The argument of the pro-slavery men is, "that the negro belongs to an inferior race, consequently we have a right to enslave him." The idea of the right to enslave our inferiors must have originated in the infernal regions, for it finds no place in heaven, or in God's Word. Granting that the African is inferior to us, he is still a human being, and should be an object of our compassion ; and by kindness we should try to elevate to a proper standard ; and not by brute force make him an object of merchandize. The latter clause of the last quotation is very expressive. It is the love of sordid gain that leads slave-holders to transgress, and even in the ministry it is to be feared that there may be found those who for the sake of a few dollars, respect the persons of the wealthy, and fail to speak out on some of the great questions of the day.

2. *Oppression forbidden.* "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him." The same expression is found in quite a number of passages of Holy Writ. A stranger, in a Scriptural sense, is one belonging to another nation. Slavery in its mildest forms, is a system of oppression.—Dare you deny it? The African is not only oppressed in the South, but if he escapes, and comes to a free State, he is still a slave, and finds laws to rob him of manhood, and grind him to the earth. Is it any wonder he is degraded, when he finds such a combination against his elevation. The African has not intruded himself upon us; he was brought here against his will, and Christianity should try to elevate him; but under the garb of Christianity he has been deprived of his natural rights; doomed to ignorance, chattelized, degraded, oppressed. Shame on such Christianity!—Shame on the boasted philanthropy of the American people! While we are spending thousands of dollars to educate the African in his own country, we suffer laws to exist in this country that doom him to ignorance and oppression.

3. The Israelites were commanded to love the stranger. LEV. 19, 34. "But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." This principle, although more fully recognized in the New Testament dispensation than in the Old, yet it occupied a prominent place in both, and as slavery is incompatible with every principle of love, it could never exist under a dispensation where this was enforced, as we will see in our next discourse.

4. There is a woe pronounced upon those who receive labor without wages. "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbors' services without wages, and giveth him not for his work." JER. 22, 13.

Slavery is a system of unrighteousness and wrong. Those engaged in it build their houses, clear their farms, cultivate their fields, &c., by labor for which they render no equivalent, to those who perform the labor. Let us make a calculation. Suppose the average life of a slave to be thirty

years. Ten years of this is childhood, during which time he cannot do a great amount of labor, and it costs but little to clothe him. Then allowing two years for sickness, there are eighteen years of actual service.— Sometimes slaves can be hired for twelve or fifteen dollars per month; but as a boy ten years old could not get that, suppose we average the wages at ten dollars per month, or one hundred and twenty dollars per year. In eighteen years, that would amount to two thousand one hundred and sixty dollars. Now, let us ascertain as near as possible, the cost of keeping him. We will give him a peck of corn, a peck of potatoes, and two pounds of meat per week, for the whole thirty years; and also two shirts, and two pair of pants, and after he is ten years of age, he shall have a new pair of shoes, a coat, vest, and hat, every year. The account will stand thus:

12 bu. of corn a year, at 25 cts. per bu.,	\$3,25	And for thirty years,	\$97,00
18 " potatoes " 20 " "	2,60	" " "	78,00
104 lbs. of meat " 4 cts. per lb.,	4,16	" " "	124,80
2 shirts at 75 cts each,	1,50	" " "	45,00
2 pair of pants, \$1,00 each,	2,00	" " "	60,00
1 " shoes, \$1,50,	1,50	And for twenty years,	30,00
1 coat, worth \$4,00,	4,00	" " "	80,00
1 vest, " \$1,50,	1,50	" " "	30,00
1 hat, " 25 cts.,	25	" " "	5,00
2 pair of socks, 25 cts. each,	50	" " "	10,00
			\$560,30

This amounts to \$560,30, but for salt and condiment, we will make it \$600. Now, take this from the \$2160, the wages of the slave for eighteen years, and it leaves \$1560.

One thousand five hundred and sixty dollars, is the amount out of which the master cheats his servant. But as in the South, coats, vests, shoes, and hats, are dispensed with, the sum may be increased. To say that the master will be obliged to keep the slave, and provide for him after he is too old to work, does not better the matter, for in that case he will probably get twenty years more labor out of him; which would increase the theft to more than two thousand dollars. Neither does it alter the case to say that the master bought the slave, for he did not pay the price to the one who performed the labor. View it as you may, it is down-right villainy, and the fearful woe of Jehovah rests upon those who engage in it.

THE DECALOGUE IS OPPOSED TO SLAVERY. This is not only the Revealed Will of God, but it is based upon the eternal fitness of things. To violate this, we sin against nature, and nature's God, for had we received no written Revelation from Deity, it is presumable that reason alone would have taught us to obey some of the precepts contained in this epitome of morality.

The system under consideration violates the fifth commandment. "Honor thy father and thy mother," &c. Even heathen morality went so far as to teach children to respect their parents, but in the noon-day of the nineteenth century, there exists a system, in Christian America, directly the opposite. Involuntary servitude ignores the reciprocal duties of the parents and children. The will of the drunken master, or negro driver, intervenes between that of the parent and the child; the latter is under no obligation to obey the former, but must disobey, dishonor, and abuse, according to the desire of the master. It is a matter of record, that children have been compelled to use the lash upon the back of their mother, and for refusing to commit so fiendish an act, were severely punished. "But don't say anything about it; Slavery is a Bible institution, and you might hurt some poor tender soul." Indeed! Well, we won't now, but will pass to the seventh commandment. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." The marriage relation is a sacred institution, ordained by God as consti-

tuting the highest earthly happiness of his rational creatures. The husband is bound to love and protect the wife, while she is to reciprocate that love, and render due honor and obedience to her husband. For trifling causes this relation cannot be suspended, and either party marry again without violating this commandment. In the Slave States the marriage relation is hardly a name, and can be suspended at the master's pleasure, or whenever his interest demands a separation; and the husband and wife parted, or sold to other masters, who may oblige them to marry others; thus compelling them to transgress this Divine precept.

But this most diabolical of all abominations puts the virtue of every slave woman at the mercy of every reckless, drunken, libertine, in the land. The piety of the victim is no safeguard; she is obliged to violate God's law to gratify the brutal lust of those inhuman monsters, who are now thirsting for the heart-blood of your sons and brothers. Is it any wonder that the slaves are degraded? What have we done to elevate them? Rather let it be asked, what have we *not* done to degrade them? The violation of this commandment called the fiery vengeance of God from heaven, upon the cities of the plains, and yet persons in this country, who esteem virtue a jewel, plead for a system that degrades their sex to the lowest depths of infamy. Pro-slavery men are horrified lest the abolition of slavery would lead to amalgamation, and yet the poor blind hypocrites are lending their aid in support of an institution of that character. Every year adds to the quantity of the Anglo-Saxon blood that runs in negro veins. In the South the races are rapidly assimilating; many who to-day are held in bondage, have as fair complexions as their masters.— Silence thou, pro-slavery traitor, and thou wilt hide thy perfidy.

Slavery is a violation of the *Eighth Commandment*. "Thou shalt not steal." Theft is the unjust taking or keeping that which belongs to another person, and may be done either by force or fraud. If there is anything under the sun to which a man is entitled, it is himself, or the liberty to employ his time, strength, and talents, so as to contribute to his highest joy, for without this he can have nothing else. The idea of one absolutely under the control of another, possessing property, is simply absurd; all he has is at the disposal of the person who holds him as a slave. The rights of the slave have been stolen. He was stolen from his native country; he is not his own; his master claims his blood, bones, and sinews.— Is not this theft? Slavery leads to kidnapping in this country. States enact laws reducing free persons, who have no where else to go, to a state of bondage, thus committing wholesale theft. Freedom being the natural right of all, children are born free; but this nefarious system seizes them at birth, and binds them with fetters. But says one, "the master has paid his money for the parents, and he has a right to the increase."— Yes, we know that that is pro-slavery logic, and certainly it is beautiful.— Well worthy the low principled things in human shape, who use it. All right for men to keep human beings, and sell their offspring as we do that of our horses, and cows. All right that children should be stolen from their parents, and sold into bondage. All right that the cries and tears of that poor mother, should go unheeded. One would think that even the adamantine rocks would weep tears of blood over poor fallen humanity, when those who profess to be the followers of Christ, contend that the Word of God sanctions a system that leads to such wickedness. Suppose that in crossing the ocean, you and your family were cast upon the coast of Africa, and the Arabs should seize you, and sell you to a caravan going into the interior, would that make you and your wife, mere things of mer-

chandise, and your children mules? Would the simple fact that they had bought you, give them the right to rob you of your manhood? Dare you admit it? Whether you do or not, it is evident that they would have just as much moral right to hold you, as those in the South have to hold their fellow beings in bondage. They took advantage of your helpless condition, just as we have of the Africans, going upon the atheistical principle that might makes right. I would not condemn every person who holds slaves as being guilty of violating this commandment, for there may be those upon whose hands slaves had been thrown, who have no sympathy with the institution, and the laws of the State in which they reside make emancipation impossible. In such cases, those who enacted the laws, have the greater sin to answer for, and if such persons aided in the passage of such unholy laws, they are criminal in the sight of heaven. But all persons who, of their own accord, engage either in the domestic or foreign traffic, are guilty of the violation of this precept, and come under the condemnation pronounced in Ex. 21, 16. "He that stealeth a man and sell-eth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death."

Our whole slave system being one of theft—and we defy any person to prove that it is not—this passage alone puts the eternal veto of Jehovah upon it. We are now done with the Decalogue for the present, and will turn our attention to the law in regard to servants who escape from their masters. Those servants were probably slaves, held by surrounding nations, who escaped and came to Palestine, or they may have been held by some recreant Jew, contrary to the laws of God, and in either case they were not to be returned. There are some examples on record, of persons going in pursuit of their servants, but they are without the Divine sanction. Take the case of Shimei, 1st Kgs. 2, 39, 46, as an illustration. He was a bad man, and went to a foreign nation for his servants. Those who endeavor to prove from his example, that it is right to return fugitives, must be hard pressed for argument. The law is what we want on this subject, and here we have it. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." DEUT. 23, 15. Thus spake the Divine Oracle, and so long as God's will was obeyed, the panting fugitive was never returned, and Canaan became the asylum for the oppressed of all nations. The deep baying of the blood hounds, and the clarion notes of the bugle, sounded by armed men in pursuit of human chattels, never disturbed the tranquility of its ancient mountains. No Marshals with their posse, were ever seen in pursuit of the half-famished mother, as she flies with her tender infant in her arms, from her fiendish masters. People were not then sufficiently enlightened to transact scenes that would disgrace even Pandemonium.

We should not be hasty to set up our judgment in opposition to those who profess to be our rulers; yet God's law is paramount to all human codes, and where those would compel us to violate a Divine precept, plainly revealed, we are bound to give preference to the law of God. To deny this is Atheism.

The present "Fugitive Slave Law," as it exists in this country, is not only a violation of the commandment above quoted, but is in opposition to the whole moral teachings of the Gospel, and is well worthy of Mason, its traitorous father, who is now, in this the time of our nation's trouble, using every artifice which satanic influence can suggest, to involve us in a war with the powers of Europe. It will go down as a foul blot upon our Statute Books, and when succeeding generations read it, the cheek will mantle with blushes, and the excuse will be made, "it was enacted in the

dark ages of barbarism." Even admitting that the Constitution demands the return of fugitives, there was no necessity for passing a law with so many inhuman concomitants. See that young female; her complexion is as fair, and her form as beautiful as that of many ladies whose presence grace the drawing room. The love of Jesus is in her soul, but she finds it impossible to live a christian, and remain under the control of her brutal master. She escapes, and without food, or any one to protect her, flies to the dreary swamp, panting for the pure air of liberty. She is followed by armed men, whose profane oaths and obscene threats fall upon her ears, but with all their vigilance, they do not find her, and after weeks of wandering, and almost starvation, with nothing but the canopy of heaven for shelter, half-famished and nearly naked, she arrives at a free State, and crawls to the door of a christian brother's house, probably a member of the same church to which she belongs, and begs for protection. Is she now free, and dare he grant her request? No, high-minded men of the North, christian men, men whose fathers fought for liberty, have suffered themselves to be bound by a law that forbids it. See them, at the bidding of Southern aristocrats, crouch like a menial slave, and turn *slave catcher*. They seize her, and despite her groans, her tears, and her entreaties, they bind the fetters upon her bleeding limbs, and with all due formality of law, deliver her up to be dragged back to the hell of Southern bondage, while they exultingly exclaim, "Ha! Ha! She didn't escape, did she? Wasn't that done fine? That Abolitionist thought he had her safe. I can find a nigar every time." Yes, man, your deed was a noble one; you by force, have succeeded in dooming a virtuous female to a life of infamy, where her children must be held in perpetual bondage; you have outraged humanity, and in the glorious light of the nineteenth century, in christian America, you have committed an act that would have disgraced Rome in the dark ages. I hope as a reward for your labor, the King of Dahomy will send you a medal dyed in the blood of his bosom companion.

Catching slaves!! Yes, *for traitors*, who have been plotting the destruction of our government; this noble fabric, which was cemented by the blood of our fathers. We have disgraced ourselves in the eyes of the world, and now, as a reward for our humility, slave-holders are murdering our sons and brothers upon the battle field.

Let an indignant, an outraged, and insulted people, arise and demand the repeal of that law. Say to the slave-holder, "If you want your slave you must catch him yourself, but expect no aid from me."

From what has been said, we come to the conclusion that the Mosaic Code lends no countenance to slavery, as it exists in the United States, or to any other system of perpetual bondage.

But the question may be asked, "Did the Jews live up to the requirements of their law in this respect?" We reply, it would be strange if they did, for they transgressed nearly every other. By turning to the Prophets, we have reason to believe they did not, for in the fifty-eighth chapter of ISAIAH, we find the people had called a national fast, but God rebuked them, and in the sixth verse he tells them the kind of fast he had chosen, saying, "Is not this the fast I have chosen? To loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke." ISA. 5, 8, 6. That this was not spoken of man's moral condition is evident from the fact that God alone can undo the burdens of sin, and let the oppressed spirit go free. It has reference to the natural condition of those held in bondage, and the Israelites are commanded to break every yoke. This is as good abolitionism as I want, and

if those who are opposed to slavery must be defamed by foul-mouthed politicians, and their hunker constituents, they have the consolation to know that the Evangelical Prophet, and the spirit of the eternal God are along with them in their labor of love.

Dr. A. Clarke, in commenting on this verse, says: "How can any nation pretend to fast or worship God at all, or dare to profess they believe in the existence of such a Being, while they carry on the slave trade, and traffic in the souls and bodies of men! O, ye most flagitious of knaves, and worst of hypocrites, cast off at once the mask of religion; deepen not your endless perdition, by professing the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, while you continue in this traffic." Not only the foreign but the domestic traffic is here condemned, and we fear our national fasts fall under the same condemnation.

In the days of Zedekiah, King of Judah, they had a great anti-slavery meeting, and agreed upon a general emancipation of all their brethren, but failing to carry out the contract, God, by the mouth of the Prophet Jeremiah, says: "Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor; behold I proclaim liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and the famine." We have failed to proclaim liberty to the captive; God has proclaimed liberty to the sword, and its fearful ravages are falling upon this once happy land. Our brave countrymen lie weltering in their blood upon the Southern battle field; almost every mail brings us a wail of woe to some poor mother's heart; a loved one has gone, died far from home in the heat of deadly conflict; without a friend to catch the last farewell to bear to dear ones at home. And yet men will use all their powers to prop up an institution that has caused this. Take warning, God's energies are not exhausted; the famine and the pestilence, are yet in store, which may be avert for his name-sake.

Second Discourse.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I had not expected my former discourse to cause so much excitement, as it was expressly prepared against the prince of darkness, and his nefarious business. I am sorry that any should stand between him and the pulpit, and feel themselves hurt. I have no desire to have any personal discussion on this matter, but when the truth and ministerial liberty are attacked; when persons try to enforce the gag law on some of the great questions of the day, I am here to defend that truth, and by my example vindicate that liberty.

When a minister preaches against a sin, and especially one as great as that under consideration; one that is drawing the heart blood from our nation, it is exceedingly unpleasant for him to find the members of his charge, and especially some of his official board, throwing their influence against him, and in favor of that sin. The minister of Christ needs the influence of the whole Church with him; but when he cannot have that, it is his duty to stand so much the firmer, and if his remarks expose the imperfections, or sins of professors of religion, he is not to blame. But why persons here in the North, who never owned a slave, and who never will own one, should become so offended as to leave the congregation, or absent themselves from the place of worship, because the minister mentions slavery, is more than I can tell. Are their sympathies with the traitors of the South?

It has become a trite remark, that persons may live, and always learn. I have learned that after all, there is something in a name. Although there were over twenty texts of Scripture quoted in the former discourse, but none announced as a formal text, the speaker has been accused for not taking one. Well, presuming that other people know a preacher's duty much better than he does himself, and as he should always be accommodating, we will acknowledge the fault, and make atonement by quoting two. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that has escaped from his master unto thee." DEUT. 23, 15. "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto

all the inhabitants thereof." LEV. 25, 10. Now, I think that should satisfy the most fastidious, but if it does not, we have more of the same character.

Since the former discourse, some have said that they were more than ever convinced that slavery is right. That might appear a little discouraging to your speaker, after laboring as hard as he did upon that occasion, did he not remember that there is a certain kind of bird, of not very beautiful exterior, whose nature is to be blinded by the light of the sun; so with prejudice. We never expect to convince such persons. They are like Ephraim, joined to their idols. Some find fault because Blackstone was quoted to show that liberty was one of the absolute rights of all men. Well, we don't blame them, for he is good authority, and it is perfectly natural that one should squirm when he sees his Dagon kicked down by the old English Jurist. Some say, "the speaker is making himself enemies." If the truth makes enemies, be it so. Christ says I came not to send peace, but a sword. By God's grace assisting him, the speaker always expects to be an enemy to evil of all kinds, and as such he anticipates opposition from Satan, and all his minions.

But the great objection is, that "it was a political sermon;" some say, "a stump speech." We will vindicate the right of the pulpit in the body of our discourse. All we have to say here, is that we tried to keep clear of that question, as well as we could, in the former discourse, and if we failed, probably it would not be best to try this time.

People who have got the political fever connected with spiritual, or moral jaundice, can make politics out of anything, as the following anecdote will show. A farmer had a hired man noted for his ignorance, and strong prejudice. He was firmly bound to that party which is so fearful of politics in the pulpit, and concluded he would not attend preaching any more, because the preachers had all apostatized. One Sabbath, a minister was to preach who belonged to the same denomination to which the farmer belonged, and as the hour for church drew nigh, the farmer requested his hired man to accompany them, but he refused, saying, "he didn't want to hear any political preachers." But after some persuasion, he agreed to go. The minister took for his text, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly, and the sinner appear?" and preached a powerful sermon. But there sat the poor man, as black as a thunder cloud, until the discourse was about half out, and then left. When the farmer came home, he asked him how he liked the sermon. "O, I didn't like it at all! It was all politics from beginning to end. Even the text was politics. 'He said if the Republicans be saved, where shall the hard-headed Democrats appear?'" This illustration might benefit some in nearly every community, and from it, we learn that some men cannot be satisfied,

Having made these general remarks, which would have been unnecessary had circumstances been otherwise, we must now prepare the way for our Scriptural discussion. And,

1. *The condition of the world at our Savior's advent.*

In the land of Judea, there were few if any, slaves held by the Jews, after they returned from the Babylonish captivity, until it became a Roman province. This was not the case in other portions of the world. The Roman Empire, alone, contained nearly sixty millions of slaves, which constituted half the population of that vast Territory, ruled by the Cesars.—These were white captives, taken in war, and even were they lawfully held in bondage, furnish no proof in favor of African Slavery in this country.—When nations went to war, it was an understanding between them that all

prisoners were to be held as slaves, unless redeemed by their friends, or by the national government. This certainly was an honorable way of procuring slaves compared with ours.

Of all the mean, despicable, soul destroying business under the light of the sun, that of skulking around the coast of Africa, like panthers, or wolves, stealing inoffensive men, women, and children, is superlatively the meanest; and holding these in bondage who have been stolen, or pleading that it is right to do so, does not fall far behind it. Look at that little child out at play, dreaming of no harm, she trips along the running rivulet, gathering the wild flowers, chasing the gay butterfly, or listening to the sweet notes of the song bird among the foliage; suddenly the inhuman monster, the American slave catcher, springs upon her, and notwithstanding her cries and tears, bears her off to his vessel. The terrified mother, attracted by her screams, rushes to her rescue, but arrives just in time to catch a glimpse of her darling girl, as she is dragged on board the ship; she stands as if paralyzed for a moment, viewing the scene, but then remembering what it means, she exclaims, "the white-faced *Christian* has stolen my dear." But knowing the danger to which she is exposed, she rushes back again into the wilderness, to mourn in silence, while her earthly hopes are borne under the proud emblem of American liberty, to a land of bondage. All our laws in regard to this vile traffic have not suppressed it, and we fear will not, while the home market remains.

But to return. Slaves under the dominion of Rome were oppressed, for in its mildest forms slavery is oppression, yet they threw no barriers in the way of emancipation, but rather encouraged it, while in this country some of the States have enacted laws so as to render it nearly impossible for those to liberate their slaves, who have the desire. But not to pursue this farther we will come to our *Scriptural Argument*. *And 1st, we will notice some general precepts against the system. And 2nd, examine those passages adduced in favor of it. And 3rd, conclude with some of the general effects of the system, as seen in this country.*

1st. CHRIST'S PRECEPTS.

Our Savior's ministry being confined to Judea, and almost entirely to those of Jewish origin, he seldom came in direct contact with slavery, hence his silence on that subject. But this silence is no more proof in its favor than his silence on the tyranny of Cesar; the unjust wars in which the Romans were engaged, the licentious rites of the pagan temple worship, or the bloody gladiatorial combats of the Amphitheater is in favor of those things. To say that Christ sanctioned, or even connived at them, would make him an impure Being. He gave general precepts, which if obeyed, would abolish all of these; he has done the same on the subject under consideration. No man can comply with the teachings of our blessed Lord, who required all his followers to love each other as he had loved them, and hold his fellow beings in bondage.

1. We have seen that the 5th, 7th, and 8th commandments of the Decalogue, are diametrically opposed to slavery. This Christ has re-enacted, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." *MATT. 5, 13.* See also, *LUKE 16, 17.* This comes to us from the highest authority, and should be binding upon every creature. Any system that abrogates any one of the ten commandments must be essentially and eternally opposed to the teachings of our Savior, and as such should be not only discountenanced, but opposed by every member of Christ.

2. The Lord's Prayer is opposed to slavery. "Thy kingdom come thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." Throughout all the glorious dominions of the kingdom of heaven, there is not a slave. The clanking chains were never heard along the gold-paved streets of the celestial city. No auction block, with trembling victims surrounded by filthy dealers in human flesh, stands before the throne of the Eternal. The groans of the fugitive under the lash, and the frantic mother's cry, as her child is torn from her bosom, never disturb the pure atmosphere of heaven. Every one who says "Thy kingdom come" asks God to make earth like heaven.—Who then, but the most consummate hypocrite, can use the Lord's prayer understandingly, and yet plead for slavery, which is as opposite to the kingdom of God as light is to darkness?

3. Christ says, "Neither be ye called master." MATT. 23, 10.

In the Scriptures, to be called generally signifies that the thing, or person either is, or resembles what it is called. Thus in speaking of our Lord it is said, "He shall be called the Son of God:" that is he shall be such. So to be called master signifies that the person stood in that relation to some one else, which is here positively forbidden. Slavery stands entirely upon this relation. Do away with the authority of the master, and the system expires. Its obsequies will be celebrated in one grand Jubilee.

4. The law of love. MATT. 22, 39. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and "The Golden Rule," MATT. 7, 12. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them," are opposed to the entire system of human bondage. No man can love another as himself, or do to him as he would wish to be done by, and yet tear him away from his native country, from kindred, and friends, and doom him to a state of bondage. It is utterly impossible to obey these precepts, and at the same time compel your fellow man to toil from year to year, under the overseer's lash, fed upon the coarsest food, with scarcely clothing sufficient to cover his nudity; liable every moment to be insulted by men of the basest passions, with no hopes of his condition ever being bettered. Although poor human nature is fallen, yet its testimony is true, and the man who says slavery is right compels his lips to belie his heart, and is false to his better feelings. Go clank the chains of bondage over him, tell him he is doomed to spend the remainder of his life among the Southern rice and cotton fields; that his wife and children are to be torn away from him, she to be the mistress of another man, his daughter to lead a life of the lowest degradation. Let the screams of agony from that mother's heart fall upon his ear, as his infant son is torn from her breast, and she tied in the chain-gang, and driven from his sight. See how he turns pale; he trembles; he is almost distracted; he rages with fury; the pent up anguish of his heart cannot find vent.

Slavery right? Yes, ha! ha!! Don't mock his agony. It is human nature that speaks. Will he now brand that minister as a fanatic, a black republican, an abolitionist, who rises up to plead his cause? No, sir.—With out-stretched arms and tearful eyes, he implores assistance. He will now justify almost any means. Conventional restrictions and party creeds are nothing to him. And yet, Oh! tell it not among the heathen lest they despise the name of christian, that while such scenes as that above described are of frequent occurrence in these United States, we have men, yes, and women too, who not only refuse to hear anything said on the subject, but would gag the pulpit, lest others would hear. Can this be christianity? Is it doing to others as we would have them do to us?

Is it obeying the commandments of the loving Jesus? Judge ye. These precepts from the lips of Christ come as gently as the crystal stream, and yet they are the thunderbolts of Jehovah against wickedness.

To be brief, this is the sum of the moral law with regard to each other, and is in accordance with the dictates of nature, and the Revealed Will of God, and consequently superior to all human laws, and as Blackstone says, "It is binding over all the Globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this." Again, "Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human law should be suffered to contradict these." Then as an illustration he brings up the case of murder, saying, "Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine." The Slave Code, and especially the Fugitive Slave Law, are in direct violation of the laws of nature, and those of God which says, "Feed the hungry, clothe the naked," and, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." The Golden Rule, these commandments, and many more, came from the same God who said, "Thou shalt not kill," and if the law which would compel us to violate the one is void, that which would prohibit us from obeying, or oblige us to transgress any other divine precept, cannot be binding. But as we have said before, we should not be hasty in setting up our judgment against human laws; neither should we, if it can be avoided, by violence oppose them, but resort to proper means and have them repealed.

WE WILL NOW EXAMINE THOSE PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE ADDUCED IN FAVOR OF SLAVERY.

But 1st, we wish to ascertain what constitutes a Scriptural proof. It was hardly to be expected God would give a special rule for every case that should occur to the end of time, but that he would give us certain precepts of a general character, and leave us to the exercise of an enlightened judgment in regard to the right or wrong of many things. Any practice or acts, in accordance with these precepts, needs no proof to establish it, as it is already known to be in accordance with the principles of right; but if these precepts admit of any exceptions, these exceptions cannot be established but upon the positive command of God. We have seen that slavery is directly opposed to these general precepts, which we might call the GREAT MORAL CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSE. The framers of a constitution may make exceptions. But where in the New Testament has God made any to this? Where has he given one man a right to hold property in another; to buy, or sell him, or to receive his labor for nothing? Even were we to admit that such things were admissible under the Jewish dispensation, we look in vain for them under the Christian.

God has pronounced blessings on the merciful, the peace makers, the pure in heart, and those who are reviled and persecuted for righteousness' sake, but where has he said, "Blessed are those who traffic in human flesh and blood; who enrich themselves by the toil of others, for which they render no recompense, who are deaf to all the cries of humanity, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven?" Where will you find it? An echo answers *where*. The command for servants to be obedient to their masters does not prove that the masters have a right to that obedience unless he has sanctioned that relation. This he has not done, but he has condemned it by saying, "Be ye not called master"

We are commanded not to resist evil; but if we are smote upon the one

cheek to turn the other also, but that gives the other no right to smite us. Humility is enjoined as a christian duty. So with servants who find themselves in that relation when converted. Religion does not change worldly relations where they can be complied with, and no command of God violated. Obedience on the part of a christian servant now becomes a religious duty, to which he is to submit for Christ's sake.

The Divine Being having so frequently declared that he is no respecter of persons, we contend that nothing but a positive command, if that were possible, can doom any portion of the human family to the condition of mere things.

We are now prepared to examine the Apostle Paul's teachings on this subject. His mission was confined principally to the Gentile nations, and as the Gospel is generally received first by those in the humblest walks of life, it is presumable that the servants of the rich were the first to embrace it. Consequently we find Paul in his epistles frequently giving instructions to both masters and servants.

In our first discourse we stated that the Greeks had two words to denote the condition of those held to labor. 1. *Doulos*, a servant. This word may also mean a slave, but not necessarily so; for it is applied to christians in their relation to God, to Ministers of the Gospel, and even to Christ. It would sound rather singular to say, "the slaves of God," or to call Christ and his ministers "slaves." The word in these instances undoubtedly means a servant, and as it is the same used by Paul in his epistles, I do not see by what rule of logic it can be so confidently asserted that those persons called servants were slaves. The second term is, *an-drispodon*, a down-trodden man, and properly means a slave, but is not, I think, once used by the Apostle in speaking of servants.

If I mistake not the word slave occurs but twice in the Bible. First in JER. 2, 14, the question is asked, "Is Israel a servant? Is he a homeborn slave?" Here it is supplied by the translators. The second place in which it is mentioned is REV. 18, 13. This is in connection with the sins of Babylon, and properly means "bodies and souls of men." It may be truly said, that the word slave is not to be found in the Bible, but as we wish to give the opposite party all the advantage we possibly can, we will, for their special benefit, admit that those to whom the Apostle wrote were slaves, and now after this admission, we challenge them to prove from anything the Apostle has said, that slavery is right, and especially that found in this country.

WE WILL NOW EXAMINE THOSE PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE ADDUCED IN FAVOR OF THE SYSTEM.

And 1st, your attention is invited to I. COR. 7, 20-23.

"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou being called a servant, care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman; likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men."

Although this passage forms part of the argument employed by those slave-ocrats, who wish to turn the fountain of life into a fetid pool of gall to four millions of human beings in the United States, yet I do not think it has any reference to slavery, but to the condition of the persons under the Law with regard to the ceremonies. In the 18th verse we read, "Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised," &c. If we suppose this passage has reference to any civil relation, then none can change their occupation, and there is a manifest contradiction between

the 21st and the 23rd verses, but taken in the sense for which we contend, and it harmonizes throughout. "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called," *i. e.* in circumcision, or in uncircumcision. Seek not to change that rite. "Art thou called being a servant," *i. e.* under the law, which the Apostle calls a yoke, care not for it, but if thou mayest be made free, delivered from these ordinances, use it rather. The Jews were unwilling that the Gentiles should enjoy this liberty. Even Paul upon one occasion was obliged to comply with their request in the case of circumcision.

But we are not tenacious in regard to the above exposition; you are welcome to all the advantages you can derive from pressing this passage into your service. Does Paul say that slavery is right? No, sir; but he does say, "If thou mayest be made free, use it rather." To support the vile system the Apostle should have said, "If any man wants to make you free don't listen to him. Choose bondage, it is a glorious institution. ordained for your benefit." Those who say that the slaves are in a better condition than if they were free, are a little wiser than the Apostle, and he was considered a wise man. But hear him farther. "Ye are bought with a price; be ye not the servants of men." To say as many have done, that the Apostle is in this verse addressing freemen, and exhorting them not to sell themselves into slavery, is I think, incorrect; for he has made no change in the discourse; these are the same persons as those addressed above, and upon the supposition that they were slaves, this is commanding them not to continue in that relation any longer, because they are bought with a price. There, now you have the whole advantage of the passage, and what does it prove in your favor? 1. That slaves are to get free if they can. 2. That no christian bought by the blood of Christ is to be the slave of men.

What kind of pro slaveryism would that be down in the land of cotton? Let any man go to the sunny South and proclaim in the ears of the oppressed sons and daughters of Africa, "If thou mayest be made free choose it rather." "Be ye not the servants of men," &c. And even his apostleship, accompanied with the broad seal of heaven, would not secure him from the murderous hyenas of rebeldom.

The next passage to which your attention is invited, is Eph. 6, 5, 6, 7, and 9. "Servants be obedient to them that are your masters according to your 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 service as to the Lord and not to men. And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him." Obedience is here enjoined as a christian duty; but not as a right based upon any claim of the master, but as unto Christ. Not with eye service: that is, not simply when your master is present, but also in his absence. "Doing the will of God from the heart." This is as far as servants were required to be obedient; God's will was superior to that of any earthly master, and where the two came in conflict, the former must be obeyed, and the latter disregarded. It is God's will that every one should be recompensed for his labor; that all should read his Word; that children obey their parents; that wives live chaste, and honor their husbands. The slave system in this country ignores all these. But we will not here dwell upon a picture that is sufficient to bring upon our country a tornado of fiery thunderbolts from the throne of the Eternal. The Apostle says, "Doing service as to the Lord

and not to men." Men have no right to that service, yet as they claim it, it is better to let them have it, that to get into a strife that could not possibly better your condition, going upon the principle that if one takes away your coat, you are to let him have your cloak also.

But now let us hear what he has to say to the masters. "And ye masters do the same things unto them," [the servants,] "forbearing threatening," &c. From the language we might almost infer that the master was to do as much for the servant as the servant was for the master. "The same things," is the language, but we understand from it that masters were to act toward their servants, in the same loving christian manner, doing all with an eye to the glory of God; requiring nothing of their servants contrary to his will. "Forbearing threatening." This is the mildest kind of punishment, and if it was forbidden, all other kinds must have been also. The reason assigned for this, is that "they have a Master in heaven; who is no respecter of persons," but in whose eyes, they and their servants, are on a perfect equality. We look in vain for anything in the above text to favor slavery, as it exists in this country. Dr. A. Clarke, in commenting on this passage, says, "In heathen countries slavery was in some sort excusable; among christians it is an enormity, and a crime for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment." That is good Methodist doctrine, but we fear some in these parts, if they were ever converted, have fearfully apostatized from this faith. In the third chapter of COLOSSIANS, Paul gives the same instructions to servants as he did to those at Ephesus. He commands them to do all as unto the Lord, and not unto men, and by this expression he appears to guard the rights of the servant. He also informs them that there is no respect of persons, which is a death blow to the right of property in man. In the first verse of the fourth chapter, masters were required to give unto their servants, "that which is just and equal." Justice is giving to every man his own. That every one is entitled to a recompense for his labor none dare deny. But is not every person entitled to himself, or to his liberty, until by crime, he has forfeited that right? If he does not enjoy this, he can have nothing else. Justice then required that the master liberate his slaves, and give them social and political equality, which we have never claimed for the African; and unless some great transformation should take place, we presume we never will.

We will now turn to Paul's instructions to Timothy, I. EPI. 6, 1, 2.— Timothy was a christian minister, and probably had pastoral charge of the church at Ephesus. If so he had undoubtedly read the Apostle's letter to that church, but Paul as a kind father in the Gospel wishes to give him farther instruction in regard to his sacred calling, and among various topics discussed, he introduces the "Irrepressible Conflict," and gives advice to servants, whom he exhorts to count their masters worthy of all honor. Not because they were an inferior race, or because their masters had bought them, or had any just claim upon them, but, "That the name of God, and his doctrine be not blasphemed." Had servants immediately demanded liberty upon conversion, civil commotion would have ensued, and in that heathen government the Gospel would have been blamed, and God's name blasphemed. And they who had believing masters were not to despise them, &c. They are now brethren, and will do what is right. Under certain circumstances a christian may probably for a time, hold one who might be called a slave, but I would sooner believe a horse thief could enjoy religion, than suppose that one could enter into the spirit of slavery, as it exists in this country, and be a christian. But to continue the Apos-

tle's argument. "If any man teach otherwise,"—that is, that as a christian duty, servants were not to obey their masters, honor all men, and especially those who are closely connected to them by civil or religious relations, "He is proud."

To Christ's words the Apostle appeals, and where has he said anything to favor slavery. Is it where he has said, "Be ye not called masters?"—Or, "Whatsoever ye would that men would do unto you do ye even so unto them." Some contend that what follows in this paragraph, is to be applied to those who are opposed to slavery, but it is much more applicable to pro-slavery men, who are proud, ignorant, full of envy and strife, men of corrupt minds, destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness. For while they hold the slave to enrich themselves, they contend that they are doing God's service, and acting the part of the missionary. No one is opposed to slavery for the sake of personal gain, as we know by experience.

Your attention is now invited to the case of Philemon, and Onesimus, which is the last passage of Scripture adduced in favor of slavery, which we will notice upon this occasion; and we do this the more readily, as unprincipled men have endeavored to press this in favor of the "Fugitive Slave Law," and implicate Paul in the nefarious business of returning fugitives, thereby endeavoring to screen themselves from just odium. It has generally been admitted that Ones. was a slave, and that he ran away from Ph. But the Apostle does not say that he was a slave, but a "*doulos*," a servant. Neither does he say that he ran away, but that he "departed for a season;" and you will admit that there is a difference between departing, and running away. The most of you departed from the East, but you would not like it to be said that you ran away. But we will admit that Ones. was a slave, and that he ran away, and came to Rome, where Paul was imprisoned. Attracted by the rumor of his preaching, he sought him out, and was converted to the christian faith, and now he returns to Ph., the bearer of a letter from Paul. The question is, did he return as a slave, admitting he was one? We answer emphatically, no, for the Apostle could not return him as such without violating that law in DEUT. 23, 15, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master," &c. If you say that law was not enforced, then all your argument drawn from the Mosaic Code in favor of your system, falls to the ground.

Ones. was not returned against his will. There was no Marshal with his fetters, to drag him back to bondage. He was not returned as a servant, but "above a servant, a brother beloved." Who but a black-hearted villian would enslave such? We have heard of men in the South enslaving their own children, but such conduct would have disgraced a pagan. Paul exhorts Ph. to receive Ones. as he would himself, and expresses his confidence that he would do more than he asked. Would Ph. have enslaved the Apostle? If not, then he could not enslave Ones., but lest he might think that Ones. should serve him a little while for debt, or something of that kind, Paul offers to pay all such obligations. What more could Ph. do for Ones. than to grant him his entire freedom, and recompense him for past labor, if such had been performed. And although Paul does not emphatically demand the emancipation of Ones., yet what he says amounts to the same, and no doubt Ph. complied, for according to Grotius and Ignatius, Ones. was shortly afterward enstalled bishop of the church at Ephesus. With these facts it is a burning shame that any person should insinuate that an inspired Apostle engaged in, or sanctioned the most degrading business under the sun. By turning to I. TIM. 1, 9, 10, you will

see where Paul ranks those who barter in human flesh and blood. See the motly crew : we would expect to find *mén stealers* in just such company. The Greek word, *Andropodistuis*, means men stealers, slave dealers. Our whole system is one of force, and Bengolinus says, "Men stealers are those who by force, make slaves of men." Dr. Clarke places the original thief, those who buy, and the nations that legalize, or connive at the traffic, all on an equality, and says they are the most flagitious of mortals. Benson says, "Of all thieves, those who steal human beings, are the worst. In comparison of them, highwaymen and house-breakers are innocent." Wesley says the same. This is Methodist testimony. But with shame we must confess that we have some professing to be the followers of those christian Fathers, who would gag the pulpit on this subject ; and others, if there is a sermon to be preached touching slavery, will absent themselves from the place of worship, saying, "The minister has no business to touch it." Is this Methodism ? Is it christianity ? Should a minister's support be withdrawn, his church deserted, his members turn his most bitter enemies, because he walks in the footsteps of his Fathers, and in obedience to the divine command, "Pleads the cause of the oppressed ?" To pen the above to me is painful, but the truth is not all told.

We have concluded on Bible argument, so far as particular texts are concerned, and we blush when we think that it is necessary in this enlightened age, to attempt to prove that the Word of God does not sanction the concentration of all abominations. To say that the Bible sanctions slavery, as it exists in this country, is a base slander, emanating from the regions of eternal night, concocted by the prince of darkness, with which to drown men's souls in perdition.

There are some who do not in so many words, say that slavery is right, and yet by their actions in reading everything in favor of it that they can get, in refusing to hear anything against it, and in denouncing those who speak in favor of emancipation, they declare their attachment to the institution. Suppose that in an adjoining country, there was an organized band of horse thieves and counterfeiters ; and there was a party here who every year sent a delegation to help them make rules and regulations for their government. The same party will not listen to any person who says anything against that gang, or against their business. But still they say, "We don't want you to believe that we are in favor of horse stealing, or counterfeiting." What would the conclusion be ? Why, that they were not only in favor of these things, but that they were dishonest. The application is easy.

WE COME IN THE THIRD PLACE TO EXAMINE THE EFFECTS OF SLAVERY, AS SEEN IN THIS COUNTRY. And we will do this as briefly as we possibly can, abridging some of our remarks and quotations, as used in our extemporaneous discourse. Obedience to the precepts of Inspiration will always exert a beneficial influence, both individually and nationally. The wicked have been transformed by the renovating power of God's Word, applied by the Holy Spirit, into respectable citizens and faithful christians. Nations have been raised from the lowest depths of degradation, by the same power. Education has followed the circulation of the Scriptures ; Schools and Colleges have sprung up as if by magic. The more closely a nation lives to the requirements of the Divine Law, the greater will be its prosperity, and the more powerful its influence. The masses will be intelligent, and the benign influence of religion will pervade community. If then, slavery is a divine institution, its beneficial influences will be manifest in those portions of the country where it exists. They will be the most pros-

perous, the most enlightened, and the most humane. But what are the facts? 1. The slave-holding States cover as great an amount of territory as the free. They have the advantages of climate, and a soil equally as productive. In 1790, the present free States had the advantage in population of 7,000. In 1860, that difference had increased to nearly eight millions, all free men, while one-third of the population of the Southern States are slaves, which gives the North the advantage of nearly two and a half to one, in free population. In 1790, Virginia had over four hundred thousand more inhabitants than New York. Now the latter has more than two millions the most. 2. *The free States have the commerce of this Nation.* Massachusetts alone has more tonnage than all the slave States put together. In manufacturing and agriculture, they exceed the South. Northern money has bought slave territory, and paid more than their quota for the support of this Government, while Southern men have filled the offices. There is not a single slave State that pays its postal expenses. In the year 1859, they sunk over four millions of dollars. Thus the North has been paying for the circulation of treasonable letters and newspapers. It has been proven that the free States are worth 2,700 millions of dollars more than the slave. New York city could buy the whole of the State of Virginia, and the State could buy some eight of the slave States. Boston, a town in a little State, only one-seventh as large as North Carolina, could buy the whole of that State. Land on an average, in New York, is worth \$36,97; in North Carolina, \$3,06; in New Jersey, \$28,96; in South Carolina, \$1,32. (See Helper.) It does appear that the curse of God rested on the very soil trod by the foot of the bondmen.

3. But let us look at that which in some respects is more valuable than dollars: Education. In the free States, there is 1 in 53 that can neither read or write. In the slave States 1 in 12. Connecticut has but 1 native illiterate white person for every 586 of her inhabitants; Virginia, 1 in 12½; North Carolina, 1 in 7. Massachusetts, with a population greater than that of North Carolina, has only about 1000 but what can read and write, while North Carolina has more than 70,000. There are nearly seven times as many copies of newspapers printed in Massachusetts as there are in Virginia. Shame on that system that dooms the poor man to such ignorance. Shame on that man from the South who can't bear to hear it spoken against. Look simply at Virginia, the once proud Dominion of this Continent; her exports are dwindling, her soil is impoverished, her undeveloped wealth lies hid in her mountains, her sons have apostatized, the deadly sirecco is sweeping over her, and Ichabod is written on her banners. What has caused this? From her mountains and valleys; from her hills and dales; from her rivers and running brooks, comes the response: SLAVERY! Were I a loyal Virginian, a lover of my State, and had I the voice of an Archangel, I would cry, "Crush the deadly Anaconda."

4. *The effects of Slavery are seen in the barbarity of the Slave Code.* In South Carolina and Georgia, if a slave leaves his master's plantation without some white person in company, and refuses to submit to an examination of any white person, such white person may moderately correct him, and if he resists may lawfully kill him. In South Carolina, North Carolina, and Tennessee, if a slave lets loose, or takes away any boat, &c., for the first offence, thirty-nine lashes on the bare back, and for the second, have an ear cut off.

In North Carolina, for hunting in the woods with dogs, thirty-nine lashes. In the same State any person may lawfully kill a slave who has

been outlawed by running away. In South Carolina and Georgia, if one slave harbors or conceals a runaway slave, he is subjected to corporal punishment, to any extent not effecting life or limb. In Maryland, thirty-nine stripes is the penalty for harboring one hour. (Abridged from Elliott's quotations of Stroud.)

What can be more fiendish than these laws, and especially the last one quoted. That runaway may be an only child, or a bosom companion, who had been torn from your embrace by the slave buyer, and whom you had not seen for years. Still affection burned upon the altar of the heart, and she escapes from her master, and comes to your door, and begs protection. Probably the deep baying of the blood hounds, the clattering of hoofs, and the voice of pursuers are heard in the distance. She holds out her emaciated arms, and with heaving breast and tearful eyes, exclaims, "O, my husband, protect me, save me; they come. Let me enjoy your society; let me live with my children." The little ones awake, and exclaim, "It is mother. She has come back again. Won't you stay this time?— Oh, it has been so long, mother, since you went away!" But dare that husband protect her? Would not even Satan answer, yes? No, sir; he cannot. In enlightened christian America, there exists laws that forbid it. See that drunken gang come, and with cords bind that wife before his eyes, and drag her off. Hear the christian's cry. She has seen them, but not embraced them. All she can say is one faint, "Farewell."

Shall such laws continue to disgrace this country? Shall the pulpit be silent while they exist? No, sir! Show your rage, get angry, leave the congregation, threaten mob law, say I have ruined the society, I will preach against such a system.

5. *The advertisements in the Southern Press show the effects.* "RUNAWAY. My man Fountain; has holes in his ears; a scar on the right side of his forehead; has been shot in the hind parts of his legs; is marked in the back with the whip, &c." "RUNAWAY. Hannah, &c., a brand on the cheek. I tried to make the letter M. Branded with a hot iron."

"Blood hounds always ready to catch runaway negroes. Apply, &c., West Tenn." Is that Bible doctrine?

6. *The Whipping Post.* This is an accompaniment of almost every negro plantation. See its victim tied by the hands; probably a wife, or child, and the husband, or father, must stand there while the drunken, brutal overseer, inflicts the punishment. He must hear the pleadings, and see the imploring looks of her whom he promised to love, but he has no power to give relief.

7. *Scenes at the auction block show the effects of the system.* The strongest family ties are separated. Parents part with their children, husbands from their wives, to meet no more on earth. This parting is ten-fold worse than death.

Let me present a couple of illustrations, abridged from Elliott. "A husband and wife were sold in St Louis. The man was sold first. The woman was next ordered to ascend the platform. Slowly and with cheeks wet with tears she obeyed. The man commenced pleading with his new master to buy his wife, who replied he did not want her, but if she went cheap, he would buy her. But she was soon struck off to another person, and as soon as they became aware that they must separate, they both burst into tears; and as she came down from the platform, her husband walked up to her, and taking her by the hand said, 'Well, Fanny, we are to part forever on earth. You have been a good wife to me. I did all I could to get my new master to buy you, but he did not want you. All I

have to say is, I hope you will try to meet me in heaven. I shall try to meet you there.' The wife made no reply, but her sobs and cries told too well her feelings."

"In the city of New Orleans, Jan. 1855, a lot of slaves, numbering 260, belong to Mr. Hill, deceased, were sold at auction. One old woman clasping her son to her bosom, exclaimed, 'Bob, I will never see you again, never, NEVER. O, God, it will break my heart! Your poor mother will die!'"

The man in a christian country, who pleads for or throws his influence in favor of a system that causes such anguish, must be blinded by prejudice, or destitute of the first principles of humanity.

8. *The effects of Slavery are manifest by the treatment those who are opposed to it receive.* It has been defined by one, as a "Bloody touch me not." It cannot bear the light. In our own General Conference, it tried to enjoin silence. The same has been true in Congress. In the States where it exists, laws have been passed prohibiting the circulation of books and papers, against it; also depriving persons of the liberty of speech. Our Sunday School Advocate has been condemned. Wayland's Moral Science has been excluded from the Schools. Spurgeon's sermons have been burnt, with the threat that if he was there they would hang him. An aged Finley has been assaulted, a Bewley, and a Lovejoy, have been murdered. Others have been tarred and feathered, abused and hung. The same disposition manifests itself in the Slave States, and among the pro-slaveryites of the free States. Drunken politicians around the gambling table, with inflamed eyes and clinched fists, would dictate to the minister of God how he must preach and pray. Lukewarm professors, who think more of their party than they do of their God, who read a vile pro-slavery paper, more than they do the Bible, are liable to catch the same spirit.— If the minister touches "the sum of all villainies," the cry is raised, "Political preaching," thinking thereby to render him unpopular, or deter him from his duty. Ask many of these same persons what politics are, and they cannot tell you. The extent of their political knowledge is *negro*. This forms the soul and body of their political creed.

Politics, correctly understood, may occasionally form a proper subject for the pulpit, as there are some texts that cannot well be preached without discussing that subject; but this low slang, this berating of political parties, for party sake; this defamation of the character of public men, called politics, should never enter the pulpit, except to warn men against its deleterious influence.

Slavery, as well as many other subjects, has a moral, as well as a political phase. It is the pulpit's place to denounce it as a sin, and the Statesman's to devise some plan to get rid of it. But if any political party will aid its perpetuity, they must expect to be treated as sinners in general.

You cannot. Nay, you shall not, while the Constitution guarantees to us the liberty of speech, curtail the rights of the pulpit. To the Reformation, under the agency of the Holy Spirit, and the christian ministry, we are indebted for our liberties, and we know how to appreciate them.

We have the example of the Prophets before us, in our denunciations of political sins, and by the grace of God assisting us, the howling of political demagogues, even from the Senate chamber, shall not deter us from walking in their footsteps.

On this question at the present day, there is no neutral ground. Neutrality is cowardice. Slavery must be sustained, or it must be crushed.— We must have a land of liberty, or one of bondage. A nation, or a hostile

foe. The war clouds are over us ; the furious storm is upon us ; the ship of State is loose upon the waves ; shall she by the steady hand of freemen be safely landed in the harbor, or shall she be dashed upon the rocks ?

What say ye, sons of the North, and ye loyal men of the South ? Let us have no neutrality, no compromise, no political quackery about this matter. Too many act as the quack doctor did, who was sent for when a viper had sunk its fangs into the side of a young lady. He had neither the courage, or the inclination to kill the monster, but commenced pouring in the medicine, but left the serpent hanging there, saying, "It had a constitutional right to bite." Just so with our political quacks, who want to cure this nation, but leave the viper hang, saying, "It has a constitutional right." Crush it. Crush the monster ; for our country's sake, for humanity's sake, for heaven's sake, crush slavery, and then cure the nation. Suppress the rebellion, and we will have but one interest in the future.

9. *We see the effects of Slavery in the present aspect of our country.*— Whether it was brought about by the abolitionists of the North, or by the traitors of the South, it is an undeniable fact, that slavery is the cause of this war. Had it not been for that accursed institution, our country to-day would be in the enjoyment of peace. We admit that in some respects the North is the cause of this war, but it is because the North is unwilling longer to act the part of cowards, and submit to the will of the negro-driver.

Probably there are not three hundred thousand actual slave-holders in this country, and yet they have ruled the nation, and now when they can rule it no longer, they would ruin it. Up to the commencement of the present administration, the Presidency had been in the hands of Southern men forty-eight years, Northern men 23. Speaker of the House, Southern men, 46 years ; Northern men, 25 years. Secretary of State, Southern men, 40 years ; Northern men, 29. Attorney General, Southern men, 42 years ; Northern men, 27. The majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court are Southern men. (Helper.)

Slavery has given the South some thirty votes in the House of Representatives, that they otherwise would not have had. Thus placing the negro on an equality with nearly three hundred thousand voters in the North, and compelling him by proxy to vote for his own enslavement.— Think of this : before this rebellion there were thirty of the "Southern gentlemen" in Congress, the representatives of the negro population of the South, casting their votes against the freemen of the North, to make them slave catchers. This is more negro equality than I like, but if their votes could be only cast against those weak-minded men, who glory in their shame, I would have no objections. In compliance with the will of pro-slavery men, the Missouri Compromise was established. We yielded to the same power, and had it repealed. The Fugitive Slave Law was forced upon us, and now because we are unwilling longer to submit to this usurpation, the Southern rebels, and craven hearted cowards, accuse us of being the cause of this war.

No, sir, slavery has brutalized numbers in the South ; robbed them of humanity, and transformed them into traitors. They have perjured themselves ; plundered the treasury ; scattered the navy ; trampled our proud emblem of liberty in the mud, and then arrayed themselves in battle against the government. Men, because they refused to fight against this Union, have been shot down in their own doors, and their wives compelled to drag them into the house, by the hair of the head. Women have

been whipped, because they loved the old flag. Union men have been tied to logs, and flogged until the blood oozed from every pore on their backs. Some have been bound to trees, and their bowels and breast cut out. Even the tombs of our brave soldiers have not been sacred, but their bones have been taken for trinkets, and their skulls for soap dishes. Rebels returning to Tennessee carried the dried heads of our brave countrymen through the streets by the beards. Why all this? Answer: to defend slavery; and the man who pleads for slavery, pleads for just such men.*

But go to yonder battle field; behold the deadly conflict; the ground trembles with the thunder of artillery; the burnished steel glitters in the sunlight; hosts of armed men move in dark columns. The combat deepens; the maddened steed covered with foam rushes to the scene; blood flows in torrents; the ground is covered with the dead and dying, and as the conflict dies away, the air is burdened with the cries of agony. Who are those blackened creatures, strewed upon the ground; the victims of horrid war; some are dead, some are dying; stern vengeance is pictured on the countenance of some; others are bathed in tears; some grasp the deadly musket; others press a memento of love to the lips. These are your husbands, sons, and brothers. Eighteen months ago, your home was happy. Now desolation reigns. What has caused it? Answer: *Slavery*. Go to yon resting place of the dead; look down into its silent depths; behold the forms you loved so well, mouldering in corruption; that eye beholds you not; those lips return no pressure; the heart beats not; that hand moves not; that tongue that used to whisper wife, sister, father, or mother, is silent in the grave.

They died from home. You were not there to receive the parting kiss, or to wipe the death dew from the brow. The last words lisped may have been your name, but you heard it not. Ask the question why? And from the gloomy abode of the dead, in guttural tones, comes the response, *Slavery*. And after all this suffering, and bloodshed, shall slavery be saved? It should be sunk a million of fathoms below the lowest hell; and would be, but for pro-slavery men in the North, who sympathize with the murderers of our sons and brothers. Go, tell the traitors how well you served them, by pleading for that institution for which they were fighting. Go, lick the dust of the feet of those who call you the "mud sills," and "greasy mechanics" of the North. Go, embrace those whose hands are red with the blood of your neighbors. Go, save the institution of slavery, if you can, and bring the eternal vengeance of Jehovah upon this nation again.

Will you do it? Heaven forbid that you should longer plead for an institution of this kind.

A letter that probably was not written.

ANONYMOUS CO., GUESS WHERE P. O., July 4, '62.

OUR VERY DEAR JEFF.:

Most Honored Sir:—We have long thought it our duty to address you on a subject deeply interesting to us both, and let you know how we work things up here. You know that less than two years ago we were all brethren, belonging to the same great political party, and although we would not offend you, yet we do think that you were a little naughty, in going off from us as you did. Had you remained, the Lincolnites would never have got into power, and you know you could have had things pretty much your own way, as you have always had, but as it is, we fear we are ruined. The most of these whom we used to think the most intelligent in our party,

*Note.—When this was said, one man arose saying, "It is a lie," and left the congregation.

see errors
 are finally attached to the despotic Union, and many of them are becoming rapidly abolitionized. That name which was formerly a stigma in the North, has lost its terror, and will not answer our purpose in electioneering any more.

We are all Union men, or profess to be, and you may rest assured that we are great sticklers for one or two clauses of the Constitution. Yet we are willing that that instrument should be changed, so that you could take your slaves just where you please. We support that paper that condemns the administration, and calls Lincoln an "infamous tyrant." We opposed the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the law to keep the Territories free. We did all we could against the Confiscation Bill, and war tax, and as to arming the negroes, or putting them to work on our fortifications, we think it outrageous. They should be returned to their masters, so that they could raise corn for your army, or build your fortifications. We are working our card as well as we can. Many of our people are tired of the war, and although you know the Union went to sticks under our administration, we are telling the people that we alone can save it, and we tell you we are succeeding finely. If nothing happens all will go right. Many in our country hate the negro, and we collect all the old stories of negro outrage—probably half of them committed by white men, blackened—and publish them in the papers, and we tell you they make a sensation. If there is a speech published condemning the party in power, we do all we can to circulate it. We condemn the Abolitionists of the North for being the cause of the war, but sometimes, for appearance sake, we link you in along. We will not listen to any person who speaks against your "peculiar institution," and are particularly hard on political clergymen. But we won't tell you how we use them, for fear it would fall even below Southern chivalry.

But we have some heard things to bear. It was cast up to us some time ago, that out of the fifteen Governors belonging to our party eighteen months ago, some ten or twelve of them have turned traitors, and you know we could not deny it. Some have pointed us to the Five Points Precinct, New York City, the most degraded place in the North, but which in 1856 gave our party 574 votes, and the other but 16, and intimated that we had many such in our party. There stood the figures, we could not deny it. Some say that hereafter people will think before they vote, and not be led by party names. We fear that such will be the case, and if they do, we are ruined.

Now, dear Jeff, what is the difference between us? After this war is over can we not be brethren?

With all due respect, we are your most obe't servants.

APPENDIX.

1. For the want of space I have omitted the quotations from our Statesmen, &c., with the comments upon them. Although these gentlemen were connected with slavery, they deplored its existence. Our beloved Washington declared that it was among his first wishes, to see some plan adopted by which slavery, in this country, may be abolished by law.— Again, he says he would be happy to join in so laudable work, as the abolition of slavery. He was not only abolition in theory, but in practice, for he emancipated his slaves.

The profound Jefferson says, "Nothing is more certainly written in the Book of Fate, than that this people shall be free." We believe it, but apostate sons of noble sires, are doing all they can against it

2. I could not find the Custom House Receipts at the time of writing, on the wealth of our country, and as the amount had been disputed, I did not wish to rely on my memory. I here present them for 1854.

Free States,	\$60,010,489
Slave States,	5,136,969

Balance in favor of freedom, \$54,873,520

This shows who has paid the expenses of this Government.

3. It will be discovered that the last discourse is not only designed to vindicate the Bible from pro-slavery slander, but that it is also aimed at those who are opposed to discussing this subject. This I cannot fully explain, but had the reader been in my place, I believe he would have thought it necessary. Having sent my Preface to the Press before my last discourse was delivered, I must here put on record another of those low, mean, despicable attempts of unprincipled pro-slaveryites, to debar us of liberty of speech. *Things* in the shape of men, have gone along the road, howling that I dare not preach my sermon, or I would be egged, and when the congregation assembled in the grove, in the morning, to hear my last discourse, they found the stand and seats smeared with cow dung. Who would think that in this enlightened age, in this free country, any persons were so god-forsaken, so abandoned, so far beneath the dignity of even the negro, whom they would enslave, as to do a thing of that kind. That is pro-slavery argument, the best they have got. But there is a bright side even to this, which I must not pass without noticing. Some of those who have been thought pro-slavery, cleaned the stand before I arrived, furnished chairs, and made everything comfortable, and I hope that they and all other respectable men, will leave the low, contemptible crowd, and come out on the side of freedom.

All this occurred before my second sermon was heard. Read the first, and judge of the character of the persons.

There are defects in these discourses, which could have been avoided, had my time and health permitted me to re-write them.

APPENDIX

It is the wish of every I have united the operations of the
 Government, but with the consent of the people. Although these people
 were not consulted in the matter, they desired to know. Our object
 was to show that it was not necessary to have a plan
 adopted by which slavery in this country might be abolished by law.
 I wish to say he would be happy to be included in the
 operations of slavery. He was not only excluded in reality, but in practice,
 he was excluded by the law.

The present Federal system, whether it be a matter of course in the
 course of time, that the people should be free. We have seen it, but
 operations have not been able to be carried out as yet.

I could not find the means of doing so in the time allotted.
 I wish to say to our country, and to the world, that I did
 not wish to rely on my country. I have written them for the
 Free States

Free States \$1,000,000
 Slave States \$1,000,000

It is the wish of every I have united the operations of the
 Government, but with the consent of the people. Although these people
 were not consulted in the matter, they desired to know. Our object
 was to show that it was not necessary to have a plan
 adopted by which slavery in this country might be abolished by law.
 I wish to say he would be happy to be included in the
 operations of slavery. He was not only excluded in reality, but in practice,
 he was excluded by the law.

The present Federal system, whether it be a matter of course in the
 course of time, that the people should be free. We have seen it, but
 operations have not been able to be carried out as yet.

I could not find the means of doing so in the time allotted.
 I wish to say to our country, and to the world, that I did
 not wish to rely on my country. I have written them for the
 Free States

Free States \$1,000,000
 Slave States \$1,000,000

It is the wish of every I have united the operations of the
 Government, but with the consent of the people. Although these people
 were not consulted in the matter, they desired to know. Our object
 was to show that it was not necessary to have a plan
 adopted by which slavery in this country might be abolished by law.
 I wish to say he would be happy to be included in the
 operations of slavery. He was not only excluded in reality, but in practice,
 he was excluded by the law.

The present Federal system, whether it be a matter of course in the
 course of time, that the people should be free. We have seen it, but
 operations have not been able to be carried out as yet.

I could not find the means of doing so in the time allotted.
 I wish to say to our country, and to the world, that I did
 not wish to rely on my country. I have written them for the
 Free States

Free States \$1,000,000
 Slave States \$1,000,000



