

was confounded, is probably a case of accommodation from the Oriental *barkuk*." Now it is true that our *apricot*, O. Eng. and Fr. *abricot*, comes from the Arabic *al-birquq*, through the Sp. *albaricoque*, Pg. *albricoque*, It. *albercocco*. But the Arabic, in its turn, is derived from the Lat. *praecox*, *praecocia*, through the Greek of Dioscorides, who says, 1. 165, τὰ μῆλα ἀρμηνιακά, Ῥωμαῖστί δὲ πραικόκκια. Dioscorides's treatise on *Materia Medica* was, as is well known, translated into Arabic, and was the chief authority in their schools. Through this the Arabians gained many words, and among them this.

ARTICLE IV.

THE STATE AND SLAVERY.

BY PROF. E. P. BARROWS, ANDOVER, MASS.

THE treatment received by the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers, too truly represents the fate that has overtaken the question of American slavery. It has fallen into the hands of partisan politicians, and been made by them a powerful engine for the advancement of sectional interests, while the true welfare of the nation as a whole, and of the slaveholding states in particular, has been forgotten. This was not always so. It is well known that the patriots of the revolution, both North and South, regarded slavery as a great evil, and earnestly desired its extinction.

"Slavery has been opposed by eminent men in America from the beginning. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Jay, Hamilton, and many more of those who took a conspicuous part in laying the foundations of the government, regarded slavery as a great evil, inconsistent with the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the spirit of Christianity. They confidently expected that it would gradually pass away before the advancing power of civilization and freedom; and, shrinking

from what they regarded as insurmountable obstacles to emancipation in their own time, they consented, in the formation of the constitution, to give the system certain advantages, which they hoped would be temporary, and therefore not dangerous to the stability of the government."¹

This statement admits of abundant corroboration from the documents that have come down to us from the early history of our government. Mr. Jefferson attempted to incorporate into the Declaration of Independence a clause reproaching Great Britain in the most severe terms for the introduction into the colonies of slavery and the slave-trade, which he calls "a war against human nature itself," and a "piratical warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers." But the clause, being objected to, was struck out.² Again, in 1787, when the ordinance was passed excluding slavery from the territory north-west of the Ohio river, all the Southern States then represented in Congress voted in its favor; and, according to Mr. Benton, it was "pre-eminently the work of the South. The ordinance, as it now stands, was reported by a committee of five members, of whom three were from slaveholding states, and two (and one of them the chairman) were from Virginia alone."³ This ordinance was coeval with the formation of our present federal constitution, and the Southern States insisted upon the insertion into it, as into the constitution, of a clause for the

¹ New Am. Cyclopaedia, Article, Slavery.

² The whole clause reads thus: "He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of *infidel* powers, is the warfare of the *Christian* King of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce: and that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting these very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which *he* has deprived them by murdering the people upon whom *he* also obtruded them; thus paying off former crimes committed against the *liberties* of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the *lives* of another."

³ *Thirty Years in the U. S. Senate*, Vol. I, pp. 133, 134.

rendition of fugitives held to service. If the noble patriots and statesmen of that day could only have had foresight enough of the coming future, and enough of moral strength and union, now was the golden opportunity for prohibiting forever the extension of slavery into any territory then possessed, or that should afterwards be acquired. This would have saved us the terrible scenes of the present day. But the ordinance of 1787 extended only to the territory north-west of the Ohio river, and a great change soon came over the views and feelings of the South. The introduction of the cotton-gin, and of machinery for the manufacture of the article, multiplied immensely the facilities as well for throwing the raw material into the market, as for working it up into fabrics; while the enormous expansion of commerce increased to an equal extent the demand for cotton goods. Thus cotton, from being an inconsiderable article of commerce, rose rapidly to be a staple production, of primary importance not only to the United States but to Europe. And, since it was assumed everywhere in the Southern States as an indisputable axiom that the culture of cotton must be by slave labor alone, an immense pecuniary interest was created in favor of the institution of slavery, which operated among the southern slaveholders as it would have operated anywhere else, cementing them together most firmly in the maintenance and defense of that system which they had now learned to regard as the corner stone of their prosperity and sectional strength. Visions of unbounded wealth and power rose before their imagination, of which the cotton states were to have the monopoly, and thus, in connection with the principles of free-trade (a necessary concomitant of slavery, as will be shown hereafter), to control the policy of the civilized world. The consequent action of the southern slaveholders — and this is equivalent to saying the action of the Southern States themselves; for, wherever slavery has taken firm root in any state, the slaveholders have a monopoly of wealth and power in that state — this action of the Southern States necessarily took a *political* form; for wherever slavery exists by the side of free insti-

tutions it creates separate and antagonistic interests, both material and moral, as we shall have occasion to show at some length in the course of the present Article. The maintenance of the supremacy of the Southern States, in all three of the departments of the national government, for the interests of slavery; the territorial aggrandizement of the slaveholding states for the interests of slavery; the administration of the national affairs generally in the same interest; the extinction in the Southern States of the spirit of loyalty towards the national government by the assiduous inculcation of the doctrine of state rights in its most extreme form, and thus the preparation of these states for secession, in view of the very probable contingency of a loss of the controlling power in the national councils—this is the line of policy that was long ago fixed upon by southern leaders, and which has been pursued with a steadiness, earnestness, and sagacity worthy of a better cause. On the part of the free states this stupendous scheme for making, first of all, the United States, and through them the civilized world, subservient to the cause of slavery, was, at the beginning, acquiesced in, with the indifference of incredulity, and an overweening confidence in their own superior strength. But as the plot began more and more to reveal itself, they aroused themselves, as it became freemen, to meet it with stern resistance. The heat and acrimony generated by this controversy, protracted through so many years, and the many political intrigues that have very naturally clustered about it, have made it extremely difficult to discuss the question of slavery in its relations to the state with that calmness and comprehensiveness of view which belong to the true statesman, who seeks not the aggrandizement of a political party, but the general welfare of the nation. We propose to consider the institution of slavery in its bearings on the interests of the state, material, intellectual, and moral. and to show that, by an internal law, inexorable in its operation, it must ever be an incubus on the prosperity of the states that cherish it, and a fearful element of discord in the nation at large. To some it may seem that such a

discussion is superfluous ; but we are persuaded that now is the time for going deep down to the first principles of society. It is of the highest importance that the people understand not only the fact that the free states have always exceeded the slave states in prosperity, but the grounds of this superiority ; and, further, that the present terrible struggle has not come about by any accidental combination of circumstances foreign to the element of slavery, but is the necessary result of the growth of the institution in the United States. Our argument in a previous Article was from Scripture. Our present argument will be from the public good — not simply the material good of the public, but its good, material and spiritual, in the widest sense of the term.

We begin with the operation of slavery on the slave states themselves. Mr. Bledsoe introduces his examination of the *Argument from the public good* with these remarkable words :

“ Here, at the outset, we may throw aside a mass of useless verbiage, with which our inquiry is usually encumbered. We are eternally told that Kentucky has fallen behind Ohio, and Virginia behind Pennsylvania, because their energies have been crippled and their prosperity overclouded by the institution of slavery. Now, it is of no importance to our argument that we should either deny the fact, or the explanation which is given of it by abolitionists. If the question were, whether slavery should be introduced among us, or into any non-slaveholding state, then such facts and explanations would be worthy of our notice ; then such an appeal to experience would be relevant to the point in dispute. But such is not the question. We are not called upon to decide whether slavery shall be established in our midst or not. This question has been decided for us. Slavery, as everybody knows, was forced upon the Colonies by the arbitrary and despotic rule of Great Britain, and that, too, against the earnest remonstrances of our ancestors. The thing has been done. The past is beyond our control. It is fixed and unalterable. The only inquiry which remains for us now is, whether the slavery which was thus forced upon our ancestors shall be continued, or whether it shall be abolished ? The question is not what Virginia, or Kentucky, or any other slave state, *might* have been, but what they would be in case slavery were abolished. If abolitionists would speak to the point, then let them show us some country in which slavery has been abolished, and we will abide the experiment.”¹

¹ Liberty and Slavery, pp. 227, 228.

He then attempts to show, from the example of emancipation in the British colonies, that emancipation here must be disastrous in its results. Respecting this statement of "the question," we remark :

First, that it is very partial and inadequate. One of the most important points involved in the question is, as every one knows, that of the *extension* of slavery. In truth, from the day of the Missouri compromise to the present hour, the main struggle has been here. To this the annexation of Texas as a slave state, in 1845, looked ; to this, the acquisition of an immense territory from Mexico, by treaty, in 1848 ; to this, the repeal of the Missouri compromise, in 1854 ; to this, the late decision of the supreme court of the United States, in the Dred Scot case, which purported to extend slavery, by the operation of the constitution alone, into the territories of the United States ; to this, the present civil war, at least on the part of its originators and leaders.

Secondly, his demand to have some country pointed out, in which slavery has been abolished without disastrous results, is unguarded. It is within his knowledge that slavery was long ago abolished, with entire success, in New England and the Middle States. He must mean, then, some country where slavery has taken deep root, and become a controlling element in society. This will leave some, at least, of the present border slave states—we should say, all of them—out of the account. No one can seriously pretend that Missouri and Delaware and Maryland could not abolish slavery without the alleged disastrous results that followed in the British colonies. It is quite certain that if the people of these states would do so, their prosperity, spiritual as well as material, would be greatly increased. This would be an immense gain to the cause of freedom.

Thirdly, his appeal to the example of the British colonies is utterly fallacious. The whole force of his argument is contained in the following syllogism :

If emancipation fails in one case, it must in every case :
 Emancipation has failed in the case of the British colonies ; therefore
 Emancipation must fail in the case of the United States.

If this were indeed so, it would furnish us with a potent argument against the extension of slavery. We should then have a full right to say: In the name of patriotism and humanity, let not another inch of American soil be given to this ineradicable curse. Then each Southern State, awaked alike to the consciousness of its misery and its helplessness, might well occupy itself, like Theseus amid the torments of Tartarus, in warning all new states against the unspeakable folly of allowing themselves to fall under a curse that could never be removed.¹ But the whole argument is a fallacy. We shall not stop, at present, to inquire respecting the truth or falsehood of his minor premise, that emancipation in the British colonies has been a failure, though we are strongly inclined to believe that a candid investigation of the facts would show that, in what constitutes the true welfare of a people, these colonies have gained by the operation; while they have before them brighter prospects for the future than they could ever have had under the reign of slavery. We content ourselves with affirming that his major premise — that if emancipation fails in one case, it must in every case — is an unfounded assumption. It does not follow that, because emancipation, in one particular instance, in one particular way, and in one particular class of circumstances, has been followed by disastrous results, it must be disastrous in all instances, under all methods, and in all circumstances. No man, in the sober exercise of his judgment, can suppose that the mere outward act of setting free an immense body of slaves, the children of slaves, brought up in ignorance, never taught or even suffered to provide for themselves, having their character formed, from infancy, under the idea that whatever they could do or earn belonged to another, and consequently without the strong motives to industry and thrift which animate freemen; no sober-minded man, we say, can suppose that the mere outward act of emancipation

¹ "Sedet, aeternumque sedebit,
Infelix Theseus: Phlegyasque miserrimus omnes
Admonet, et magna testatur voce per umbras:
'Discite justitiam moniti, et non temnere divos.'" — *Aeneid*, vi. 617 – 620.

could convert this mass of ignorant slaves into intelligent and industrious freemen, able and willing to plan and provide for themselves under the high motives which liberty offers; especially where the act of emancipation was compulsory, coming from without, and where, consequently, the masters, as a body, had no sympathy with it, and no wish that it should succeed, but rather threw obstacles in its way, and took towards the liberated slaves a cold, repulsive attitude, as much as to say: "Now you are free; take care of yourselves." Yet this is the solitary example to which the appeal is made! Very different, indeed, we think, would be the result, if the movement should be inaugurated by the state itself where the institution existed, and should thus be its own hearty act; and if, also, especial care should be taken to prepare the slaves, by a suitable education, for the transition from servitude to full freedom, and to help them, by sympathy and friendly counsel, in passing through it. As we are not writing an article on emancipation, we shall not pursue this subject any further. We only say that when the example of the British colonies is urged against the policy of emancipation in any form, the argument is unfair and inconclusive. Our present object is to show the ruinous influence of the institution of slavery upon the states that cherish it, and upon the nation at large. If this can be fully understood by the people of the United States, we shall have not only a safeguard against the further extension of slavery, but also the best possible preparation for its abolition, at least in the border states—its abolition by their own free action; for whatever may be the difficulties encompassing the subject in the cotton states, it is manifest that, if the border states were once fully awake to the magnitude of the evil that oppresses them, they could soon find some way for its removal.

Our plan of discussion is to consider, first, the influence of slavery on the states that cherish it. This we shall follow out in a two-fold line: that of the slaves themselves, and that of the free white population. We shall then proceed to examine the corrupting and disturbing influence of the system on the nation at large.

Our first work, then, is to consider the influence of slavery on the slave states *in the line of the slaves themselves*. We begin by regarding the slaves simply as a *producing* power; that is, in their relation to the *material* interests of the state. This we should call the lowest view of its prosperity, were it not for the fact that every system which has the effect of depressing the material prosperity of a community will be found, upon careful examination, to contain in itself the element of injustice. So true is the divine maxim here also, as well as in all other respects, that "righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people." The two great antagonistic principles of free and slave labor may be thus stated: on the side of freedom, *hope and reward*; on the side of slavery, *fear and penalty*. These are the opposite factors of the two systems, and the common factor with which they enter into combination is human nature, — the same in every race, and age, and clime. The two opposite products are thriftiness and unthriftiness; not thriftiness or unthriftiness in the case of every individual under the two systems (for here many modifying and counteracting influences come in), but thriftiness or unthriftiness in the state at large. Let us consider each of these two great principles separately.

The animating principle, then, of free labor is *hope and reward*. It is to be understood, as a matter of course, that the free states, owing to the common infirmity of human nature, are not wholly exempt from vicious arrangements and combinations, formed and sustained in the spirit of slavery, and having in a measure the depressing effect of slavery. But the predominating principle of free labor is that which we have stated; and it yields, in the free states, its appropriate harvest of material prosperity. Every child is trained up from infancy under the formative influence of the idea that, when he has attained to manhood, he will be, under God, his own master, and himself possess and dispose of the avails of his own industry and skill, be they much or little. He is not driven forward unwillingly, under the lash of fear; but his energies are drawn out, invigorated,

and expanded under the impulse of hope. Hope is, in truth, the element which he breathes. He has every inducement set before him to make the most of himself, in soul and body; for, whatever powers, mental or corporeal, he may be able to accumulate, will be at his own disposal, and the avails of them will be his own. But it is not in respect to the *quantity* of activity alone, that the system of free labor has power. It calls into vigorous exercise, also, every *variety* of talent; since in a free state there is scope for the endless diversity of endowments which the Creator has distributed among the individuals of the human family. Each man is at liberty to consult the natural bent of his own mind. If he has not the faculties requisite for success in one line, another is open to him. Hence, the mechanical arts flourish in a free state, as well as agriculture, trade, and commerce; while they cannot flourish under the influence of slavery. It has been quite fashionable with slaveholders to speak of the "greasy mechanics" of the North, as if mechanical employments were illiberal and degrading, and it were more dignified and honorable to depend on the free states for the very tools which the slaves must use, than to produce them among themselves. The truth is, on the contrary, that the prosperity of the mechanical and manufacturing arts in the free states, in all their endless varieties, and their languishing and depressed condition in slaveholding communities, unite in marking the system of free labor as one in accordance with nature, and that of slave labor as against nature. For this prosperity, let it be remembered, is not secured by any sacrifice of agricultural interests. Wherever the nature of the soil permits, agriculture flourishes in the free states, side by side with the arts and manufactures. It is only in the comparatively rugged and sterile regions that it holds a subordinate place.

The antagonistic principle of slave labor is *fear and penalty*. We freely admit that this bad principle does not prevail exclusively in the management of slaves. The good principle of *hope and reward* is able to find its way even into the servile relation. Masters may, and many of them do, encour-

age their slaves by giving them a liberal share in the avails of their own industry, to be used, for example, in the purchase of their own freedom and that of their families. Between many masters and their slaves the kindest relations exist. Here the principle of hope and reward comes in under the shape of approbation and confidence, with the numberless advantages and privileges which these always bring in their train. Above all, the living power of Christianity is capable of purifying and ennobling the mutual relation of master and slave, preparing the former to render to his servant "that which is just and equal, remembering that he also has a master in heaven"; and the latter to be obedient to his master according to the flesh, "in singleness of heart, as unto Christ," "doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to man"; being subject "with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." But these are cases in which the better side of human nature counteracts and overcomes the appropriate principle of the system. So far as the provisions of the slave-code are consistently carried out, this is, and must be, fear and penalty. For the slave-code begins with divesting the slave of the ownership of himself and all the avails of his industry. His intellect, his knowledge, his skill, and the labor of his hands, are not his, but his master's; for "the master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything but which must belong to his master." How could the slave be more effectually cut off from all hope of earthly reward? Suppose that he has superior knowledge, skill, and physical power. How shall these be drawn forth to their utmost extent for his master's benefit, since the product of them goes not to himself, but to another? It can only be by introducing some plan of reward outside of the system itself; that is, by substituting, so far forth, the principle of free labor. And this can be done only to a limited extent, and in a very imperfect manner. For the masses of slaves, the underlying principle of the system can alone be made available, which, as we

have shown, is fear and penalty. They are not working for themselves, but for their master. The grand motive power, therefore, must be, not the hope of possessing and enjoying the fruits of their toil, but the dread of the lash. In entire harmony with this bad principle of fear, we find among the permanent arrangements of every plantation, the driver with his whip. The writer once had occasion to visit a plantation on the Mississippi, some ninety miles above New Orleans. The master was among the very best specimens of southern slaveholders, humane and liberal in his treatment of his slaves. They were all plump and hearty, giving unmistakable signs of their good keeping. We went, together, into the cotton field, and there, in the midst of a gang of some forty slaves, male and female, stood the driver, himself a slave, whip in hand. The master was manifestly ashamed of the arrangement, for he volunteered to say: "You see the man with his whip; it is the custom in these parts; he is mainly for show." On that particular plantation, doubtless, he was mainly for show, but not on the plantations generally, as the master himself, upon being questioned, candidly admitted. The driver with his whip is the true exponent of the system. He represents the truth that it is a system of fear, where men must be driven by penalty, because they cannot be drawn by reward. "He is mainly for show," said the kind-hearted planter; that is, to show the only way in which indolent slaves can be stimulated to industry. Think, now, how it would look to see a man stationed, whip in hand, among a body of free laborers; say in Winans's machine-shop in Baltimore, or in the Pacific mills at Lawrence, or among a gang of laborers on a new rail-road, or on one of our magnificent western farms in harvest time—"mainly for show!" Such an instrument is never seen under the system of free labor, because pay-day is coming, when the faithful laborer will receive his appropriate reward, and the unfaithful laborer be discharged.

To show that, in respect to *quantity of service*, the system of free labor has immensely the advantage, would be a superfluous undertaking. Owing to peculiarities of character or

circumstances, some slaves may be better laborers than some freemen. But of the mass of them, this never was and never will be true. To individual slaveholders the system may be a source of wealth. But on the state it must always exert a depressing influence; for it deprives it of an immense amount of labor, which would be drawn forth by the stimulus of freedom. No legislation, and no skill on the part of slaveholders, can make the principle of fear and penalty as efficient as that of hope and reward. But if the system of freedom has the advantage over that of slavery in respect to the quantity of labor, how much more in respect to the *quality* and *variety*! The freeman labors for himself and his family. He has, then, a high motive to do his work in the best manner. We are aware that even this motive cannot prevail with all. Some men are, by nature or education, indolent and slack; and they will remain such under any system. There are slaves, on the contrary, who show towards their masters "all good fidelity." In this course they ought to receive every encouragement. When they thus obey their masters, "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," great will be their reward in heaven. But we are now looking at the two systems on the broad scale. In individual cases, the labor of the slave may excel that of the freeman, in quality as well as in quantity; but, as a general rule, the reverse will be true; for God will not work miracles that he may give a vicious and unrighteous arrangement the advantage over one that is just and salutary. If one would find the farms best cultivated, the roads in the best condition, and the mass of the people best provided for in respect to houses, dress, and furniture, he must go to the free states. In these respects, slavery has a depressing influence on the non-slaveholding white population also, as will be shown hereafter.

And then, under the fostering spirit of freedom, what an endless variety of forms does labor assume! It is like a full stream which finds its way into every bordering creek and

channel, and flows wherever there is a place for it to flow. The products of free labor in the Northern states are so numerous, and take so many shapes, that it is almost impossible to enumerate them. Wherever anything is wanted for comfort or convenience, some one is found able and ready to produce it. The farms are supplied with the best implements of agriculture; the shops with the best tools; the houses with the best furniture. It is notorious, on the other hand, that slave labor is restricted mainly to agriculture and domestic services. The mechanical arts have never flourished, and cannot flourish, among them. They might be employed in some processes of manufacture; but it is quite certain that manufacturing establishments dependent on slave labor, could not successfully compete with those that employ free labor. The production of the raw material — tobacco, cotton, rice, sugar, maize, and the other products of agriculture — this must ever be the main reliance of those states in which slave labor prevails over that of freemen. If we take any two states, equal in territory and natural advantages, the one a free, the other a slave state, and compare them in respect to the products of manufacture and the mechanical arts, we shall be struck at once by the immense disparity in favor of freedom; and all this, while in agriculture and commerce, also, the free state surpasses the slave state. But this is a matter which we propose to consider more in detail, when we have examined the influence of slavery on the white population also of the slaveholding states.

The attempt has often been made to neutralize the power of the preceding arguments and facts by an appeal to the condition of the *free blacks*. It is affirmed that this is worse than that of the slaves, and that they are more indolent and vicious. Without pausing to inquire how far this allegation can be sustained by facts, it is a sufficient reply to say that, with the exception of some border states of the South, the free negro is regarded in the slaveholding states as a nuisance: his services on the plantations are repelled; his very presence there is regarded with suspicion; the laws are hard

in their operation upon him ; in a word, he is everywhere shut out from kindly aid and sympathy.¹ What wonder, then, that he should succumb to such unpropitious influences operating on him from childhood. The fault is not in the principle of free labor, nor in the nature of the African race, but in the treatment which he receives at the hand of those who dread nothing so much as the successful competition of free with slave labor, and are determined that the free blacks shall have neither patronage nor encouragement. In the Northern states we all know what an incubus of prejudice and proscription rests upon the colored race. In some of them, we are ashamed to say, these unkindly feelings find their most intense manifestation. Yet it cannot be denied that, even here, the root of the evil is slavery, which has put the white and black races into opposite castes. The true question is, not what is the comparative condition and character of the free blacks in states where slave labor is the law, and where, as a natural consequence, they are frowned upon and discouraged in every way, but what would be their condition where free labor was the law, and where, moreover, they were kindly treated, furnished with ready employment, and their religious and intellectual wants carefully provided for. Among the incidental benefits of colonization is the demonstration to the whole world, that freedom is as congenial to the African as to the Saxon race ; and that the system of free labor has the same high prerogatives in Africa as in the Northern states. We need not, however, go to Africa for the proof of this. Wherever in our own land the free colored people are placed in comparatively propitious circumstances, the happy results abundantly manifest themselves. Take for example, their condition in the city of Baltimore, where the principle of free labor prevails almost exclusively. The magnitude of the city naturally opens to them abundant avenues of honest

¹ These remarks apply especially to the plantations. In the large cities, where there is scope for a great diversity of services, the condition of the free blacks is more comfortable ; and in some of the northern cities of the slave states, as, for example, Baltimore, it is better, we apprehend, than in the free states generally.

industry. Their religious culture, too, has received an unusual share of attention, particularly on the part of our Methodist brethren. It is true, indeed, that much remains to be accomplished. Yet the result of what has been already done shows that upon no class of the community can true Christian kindness and sympathy be expended with the hope of a richer harvest of good.¹

Thus far we have considered the slaves mainly as a producing power in the state. But every slave is an immortal being, made in God's image; placed in this world, like his master, on probation for eternity; equally dear to God with his master; and capable of everlasting progress in knowledge, holiness, and happiness. He is not, then, to be estimated simply as so much bone and muscle. His higher spiritual nature is to be taken into the account. We proceed, then, to consider the proper tendency and result of slavery, so far as *the mind* of the slave is concerned. Here the contrast between the two systems of free and slave labor is as great as that between light and darkness. The affinity of free institutions with knowledge is like that of light and heat with vegetation. In a free state every parent understands, every teacher inculcates, every child is taught, that the more of true education there is in the community, the

¹ On the question whether in a free state, where the white is the dominant race, a large colored population can co-exist harmoniously and prosperously, the community is unfortunately divided. Many have made up their minds, prematurely we think, that emancipation and colonization must go hand in hand. We have no doubt that for the fullest development of the African race, they need, as in Liberia, a country to themselves. At the same time we believe that, if they could be kindly treated, provided with avenues of labor, their children educated, and their moral and religious culture carefully attended to, they would constitute a peaceable and useful element of our own population. But here again the bitter influence of slavery manifests itself. It has created a prejudice of color which, in some parts of the country at least, seems unconquerable. As we are not writing an Article on emancipation, we will not enlarge on this point, but will simply add that, to the border states at least, both plans are open. Perhaps if among them both are adopted, the question will be solved in a practical way. Perhaps, also, if they sit still in this solemn and awful crisis, refusing to do anything, the question of emancipation will take care of itself, without their legislation.

better will it be, as well for the individuals who possess it, as for the commonwealth. The people grow up under the influence of the idea that they are to govern themselves, and that the indispensable requisites for self-government are mental and moral culture. It is with us an axiom, handed down from our fathers, that ignorance and wickedness are incompatible with true liberty. Hence the intense interest of the free states in education,—not the education of a select few, but of the masses. Hence the multiplication everywhere, not only of colleges and seminaries designed to furnish a higher education for those whose means are ample, or who enjoy the patronage of the wealthy, but also of common schools and free academies, open alike to the children of the poor and the rich. Hence the multiplication of reading-rooms, lyceums, and libraries, as well as of newspapers, books, and periodicals. The universal feeling is, that every ignorant person is a detriment to the whole community.

We are well aware of the danger that this all-pervading interest in education should take a merely secular turn, and thus defeat its own end. The experience of the world has abundantly shown that no system of education which looks chiefly to men's material and worldly interests, and therefore neglects, or throws into the shade, the moral and religious element, can preserve a community from corruption and profligacy, much less prepare it for the successful maintenance of its free institutions. Nor is it enough that the education of a community have a show of godliness. The system of ancient Pharisaism was eminently religious in its outward form; but it wanted the soul and substance of piety. It was the religion of worldly and wicked men, and under its influence pride, ostentation, hypocrisy, and daring impiety attained to a rank and luxuriant growth. That we may have a true education, it must be an education based on the Bible, pervaded and moulded by the living power of Christianity. It must make men humble and heavenly-minded, not merely wise in the affairs of this world. We do not affirm that free institutions can of themselves secure such an education, but we say that they are eminently con-

genial to it, and that, where freedom is the law — freedom, not in name but in reality — there the gospel of Christ has full scope, and it will be the fault of its friends if it do not become a leavening and controlling power in the community.

But under the system of slavery it is not so. There the law for the colored race always has been, and must continue to be, not education, but the suppression of education. The slave is held as a personal chattel, soul and body, for his master's interest. In respect to the education of slaves, the first question raised among a body of slaveholders is not: How will it affect their personal welfare? but: How will it affect our interests? They judge (rightly, we suppose) that to educate them will be to endanger the quiet and peaceable possession of them. It would be uncharitable and unreasonable to suppose that the masters have any objection, in itself considered, that their slaves should know and understand the word of God. But, as remarked in a previous Article, the ability to read the Bible implies the ability to read other things also. And consider how rich is our English literature in discussions on the cardinal principles of human rights! how resonant throughout with the clarion call of freedom! The slaveholders know that its whole drift is against slavery, and in favor of freedom; that outside of their own circle the institution of slavery is regarded with abhorrence and reprobation. They understand well enough that to allow the slaves to become a reading community would be to pour this mighty current of anti-slavery feeling over all the plantations of the South. Hence, it is with them an axiom, that the slaves must be kept in ignorance. This is the reason why penal enactments for the suppression of education among the slaves hold so conspicuous a place in the slave-codes;¹ and why, over and above these direct legal hindrances, the whole spirit of the institution is opposed to

¹ This reason is avowed in some of the enactments. In an act of the state of North Carolina "to prevent all persons from teaching slaves to read or write; the use of figures excepted," it recites that such teaching has a tendency to excite dissatisfaction in their minds and produce insurrection, etc.; forbids teaching or giving books. See Hurd, *Law of Freedom and Bondage*, Vol. II. pp. 86, 87.

the education of the slaves. In a previous Article we have considered the unchristian character of such enactments.¹ It remains to consider their effect on the welfare of the state. That uneducated slaves can perform well, under the superintendence of their masters, the simple labors of agriculture and domestic service is admitted. But that a great mass of slaves systematically kept in ignorance, and never trained to provide for themselves, cannot be of as much value to the state as the same number of educated freemen, is a truth too plain to need demonstration. They cannot, as we have shown, be of the same value as a producing power; and when we look to the *strength and stability* of the state, we find them an element of weakness and danger. In a free state, where the law of equal rights and privileges prevails, all parts of the community contribute to its strength, for they are all parts of the state, and have an equal interest in its prosperity. In the present tremendous struggle of the United States against treason and rebellion, we see how readily and cordially our citizens of foreign origin espouse the common cause, notwithstanding the disadvantage of an early education widely different from our own. In minor matters they may not be able immediately to comprehend the genius and spirit of our institutions; but when their very existence is assailed, they stand shoulder to shoulder with us, as well they may; for it is their country as well as ours, and they have as deep a stake as we in its welfare.

¹ We would not detract a particle from the merit of those conscientious masters and mistresses who carefully instruct their slaves, by oral communication, in the truths of Christianity. If they do what they can under the slave-laws, they will have their reward. But the system itself, which shuts up the masters to oral instruction, is radically vicious. It is for substance the system of Romanism, and rests on the same foundation. The church of Rome discourages the reading of the Bible by the people at large, on the plea that they are in danger of misinterpreting it. The universal study of it would endanger her authority over the masses. They must have, through her authorized priesthood, her authorized interpretation of so much of it as it is profitable for them to know. The slave-codes proceed, in like manner, upon the principle, that to entrust the reading of the Bible to the masses of slaves would endanger their property in them. They must be instructed in its truths in a discreet way, through the medium of their owners; that is, so far as their owners may choose to attend to the work.

But the slaves, though they are in the state, are not of the state, so far as its privileges and immunities are concerned. This their masters avow, and this the slaves themselves well understand. They have no rights as citizens; they have no right to the possession and use of their own persons, nor of their wives and children; for all these the master may dispose of as he sees good. They have no home in their own power, for their owners may sell them, as they do horses and mules, from one plantation or state to another. Why, then, should they be expected to identify their interests with those of their masters? The religion of Christ may enable individuals among them to perform this difficult work; but from the slaves as a body all worldly motives for so doing are systematically withheld. Thus the masters sow to the wind, and, sooner or later, they must reap the whirlwind. They think, by withholding from their slaves the means of knowledge, to keep them in quietude. But they cannot, with all their precautions, keep from them the fact that American slavery is regarded with abhorrence by the civilized world. The ignorance of the slaves may be a security against intelligent and well-concerted plans of insurrection, but it can furnish no safeguard against the fierce and bloody outbreaks of fanaticism, the very aliment of which is ignorance and oppression. The extreme sensitiveness of the southern people on the point of servile insurrection is an unanswerable evidence of the danger they apprehend from it. The very rumor of it fills their hearts with anxiety, and sets them upon the adoption of the most severe precautions. How ominous to them the prospect for the future!

And then there is the contingency of war — a contingency which, by the action of the slaveholders themselves, has now been changed into a dread reality. In war the sympathies of the mass of the slaves will be, not with their masters, but with their enemies. Wherever our armies have penetrated, the blacks have welcomed them with joyful countenances. Even when excluded from our lines, they have hung around them in the vain hope of admission. How rapidly they escape from bondage where the proximity of the federal troops

affords the opportunity, is well known to all. It is true, that so long as their masters can retain the control of them, they can employ them on their fortifications. But an equal number of freemen, heartily devoted to their cause, could not only fortify but fight for them. The employment upon fortifications of a mass of disaffected slaves, who are watching their chance to escape, is like putting a mutinous regiment into the trenches, because it cannot be trusted before the enemy's line. Such a regiment, though it may be compelled to use the spade, is still an element of positive weakness in an army. In like manner the presence of an immense body of slaves, whose sympathies are, with only individual exceptions, on the side of the United States, is to the rebellious Southern states a source not of strength but of weakness. And the trouble from this quarter will rapidly accumulate as the war is protracted. The policy of repelling the slaves of armed rebels, which had for its end the conciliation of their masters, has proved suicidal, and cannot be continued. As sure as the war lasts, they must and will be received, and employed, as opportunity offers, in the service of the United States. The sooner this policy is carried into thorough operation the better, for it is striking at the life of the rebellion. The men who have risen up in arms against the United States have no claim to have their property in slaves respected. Let the good work of liberating them go on; and let it be a precedent for all future wars waged upon freemen by slaveholders.

Thus far we have considered the influence of slavery upon the slave states in the line of the slaves themselves. Let us now examine it *in the line of the free white population*. Here we shall soon find that our sympathy need not be all expended on the slaves; that the poor, non-slaveholding whites deserve at least a moiety of it, since the effect of the institution on them is as deplorable as on the slaves themselves.

If we look at the states where slavery has taken deep root, and exerts a controlling influence, one of the *most* prominent peculiarities that strikes us is *the amassing of*

wealth, education, and power in the hands of the slaveholders, who always constitute a small minority of the population, while the mass of the white people remain poor, uneducated, and weak. This law of slavery has its fullest manifestation in the agricultural districts of the slave states, though its influence is felt more or less everywhere. It has its origin in the very nature of the institution. To be the proprietor of a plantation of slaves requires an amount of capital beyond the reach of all but the wealthy few. Under the system of free labor a man, with the help of his sons, or two or three hired men, can conveniently and economically cultivate a farm of moderate size. With such farms the free states are dotted all over. The number of freeholders is very numerous, and thus wealth and influence are widely distributed. But a small plantation with two or three slaves is neither economical, nor worthy of the dignity and ambition of an aristocratic planter. He wants from forty or fifty to several hundred slaves, with a proportional extent of territory. Hence the inevitable tendency of slavery to increase the size and diminish the number of the plantations. Thus the wealthy slaveholders become a landed aristocracy, monopolizing, to a great extent, the possession of the good and fertile soil. It follows that the poor non-slaveholding whites must either be tenants at the will of their wealthy neighbors, the slaveholders, or must be forced to occupy the barren and worn-out regions rejected by the planters. This of itself exerts a depressing influence on the mass of the free white population. But the evil does not stop with the mere fact of a landed aristocracy created by the institution of slavery. Landed aristocracies may exist under free institutions also, as in England. But in England the landlord is dependent upon the labor of tenants. His estate, however immense, must be throughout cultivated by freemen under the protection of British law, and sustained by British law in all their rights as men. If they need his patronage, he needs their services also. Though he has the many advantages which wealth confers, there is still an interdependence between him and them. It is a mutual bargain, in which the

landlord seeks to secure the best tenant, and the tenant to find the best landlord. An analogous principle prevails in the large manufacturing establishments of the northern United States, where there is an interdependence between the proprietors and the free operatives.¹ But on the southern plantations there is no room for the labor of free whites. The masters are alike the proprietors of the soil and of its cultivators, and therefore independent of the poor whites. They do not desire their services along side of their slaves; and the free whites, on their part, would scorn to render such services; for with them the pride of caste is as strong as with the masters themselves. It only remains that they provide for themselves in some small way, as best they can. The whole influence of the institution of slavery is to discourage industry on their part, for it makes labor the business of the servile class. When they think of rising in the world, their ambition is to become the owners of slaves; for they have been accustomed from infancy to see wealth, luxury, education, refinement, social position, and power, in the hands of the slaveholders, who, instead of honoring labor as a divine appointment, regard it as undignified and degrading, especially all forms of mechanical toil.

Here it is in place to consider the acknowledged fact that the manufacturing and mechanical arts have never flourished in the slave states in any degree corresponding with their progress in the free states. The disparity is too great to be accounted for from physical causes. If there are in the Northern states comparatively sterile regions, abounding in water privileges, and better adapted to manufactures than to

¹ We do not mean that the tendency on the part of the strong to oppress the weak is not as great in the Northern as in the Southern states. This is everywhere the vice of fallen humanity. But we are now looking at the organic arrangements of society, and following them out to their legitimate results. Among the examples of oppression at the North, that of compelling needlewomen to work for inadequate wages has often been mentioned. But this is not the fault of free institutions; it exists in spite of them. Of the free states of the North it may be boldly affirmed that nowhere else in the world are the masses of the people so well provided for, and so free from pinching penury. The stories of "bread riots" that have figured in the Southern papers are all the figments of Southern editors.

agriculture, so are there also in the Southern states. Yet the same conditions do not produce, in the latter case, the same results. The difference must be explained mainly from the different institutions of the North and the South. Free institutions give full scope to the diversity of human talents. In the free states capitalists are ready to invest their money in any business that will remunerate them. But in the slave states capital is, to a great extent, absorbed in the single line of the plantations, with the immense outlays required to furnish them and carry them on. In the free states every branch of honest industry is honored. But in the slave states—we mean those states where the institution of slavery has the controlling influence—the rich and influential planters set the example of despising and dishonoring mechanical trades, as something beneath the dignity of southern chivalry. They speak contemptuously of the “greasy mechanics” and “mud-sills” of the North. How can it be expected, then, that the poor whites should willingly take up these employments? Poverty is not incompatible with pride. They are too proud to devote themselves to pursuits which their superiors regard with contempt, and too poor to be the owners of fertile soil. Hence they settle down in indolent and spiritless poverty. Their sluggishness and thriftlessness, present a sharp contrast to the enterprise, versatile industry, and comfort of the laboring classes in the Northern states. The New Englander may be born on a sterile soil, but he will manage to obtain in some way a comfortable livelihood, and to maintain withal the spirit and bearing of a freeman; but the poor white man of the South, who has been forced by his wealthy neighbors to take up his residence among barren sands, always remains poor and spiritless.¹ The above remarks do not, we freely admit, apply to all parts of the slave states. There are among

¹ Marion hit the nail on the head when he said, as reported by Weems (*The Life of General Francis Marion*): “The people of South Carolina form two classes, the rich and the poor. The poor are generally very poor, because, not being necessary to the rich, who have slaves to do all their work, they get no employment of them. Being thus unsupported by the rich, they continue poor and low-spirited. They seldom get money; and, indeed, what little they

them regions where labor is honored, and manufactures and mechanical arts flourish. But of the slave states taken as a whole, in contrast with the free states, they certainly hold good.

Let us next consider the influence of slavery as it respects the *education* of these poor whites. That the mass of them fall far behind the people of the free states in education, is a fact revealed by the statistics of the different states. Of the *native* population of the free states, only a very small percentage is unable to read or write, the uneducated belonging mainly to the class of foreigners. Thus, according to the census of 1850, of the 28,345 adults, in the state of Massachusetts, over twenty years of age, who could not read and write, 26,484 were foreigners, leaving only, 1,861 natives, and that out of a population of 994,514. According to the same statistics, there were in the same state 222,220 children attending school, of whom 11,927 were the offspring of foreigners.¹ If we look now to Virginia, the oldest of the slave states, with a *white* population of 894,800, we find (to say nothing of the slaves and free blacks) 77,005 unable to read and write, of whom only 1,137 are foreigners. The number of white and free colored children attending school in the same state, in 1850, was only 109,775.

A comparison of Maine, with a total population, in 1850, of 583,169, with North Carolina containing, at the same date, a *white* population of 553,028, gives the following results : adults in Maine (white and colored), unable to read and write, 6,282, of whom 2,134 were natives, and 4,148 were foreigners ; in North Carolina, *white* adults unable to read and write, 73,566, of whom only 340 were foreigners : children attending school in Maine (white and colored), 186,222 ; do. in North Carolina, 100,808.²

do get, is laid out in brandy, to raise their spirits, and not on books and newspapers, to get information."

¹ In the above statistics of Massachusetts the colored population is included, which amounted in 1850 to 9,064. In the statistics of Virginia only the white population is reckoned. The same rule is followed with regard to Maine and North Carolina.

² The literary statistics of the *free colored* population in the Southern States

Olmstead, in his "*Seaboard Slave States*," gives the following table to show the *native white* population, and the number of *native white adults* ignorant of letters, in a few states. It is compiled from the census of 1850, the states being grouped together in pairs, one free and one slave state.

States.	White Population.	Ignorant Adults.
Maine,	549,674	1,999
North Carolina,	550,267	73,226
Massachusetts,	819,044	1,055
Tennessee,	749,661	77,017
Ohio,	1,732,698	51,968
Virginia,	871,393	75,868
Connecticut,	324,095	726
Maryland,	366,650	17,364
Rhode Island,	119,975	981
Louisiana,	187,558	14,950
New York,	2,388,830	28,241
Missouri,	514,527	34,448

We add a table of the *total white population*, and *white children* attending school, in the same states, copied also from the census of 1850.

States.	Population.	Attending school.
Maine,	581,813	185,941
North Carolina,	553,028	100,591
Massachusetts,	985,450	220,781
Tennessee,	756,836	146,130
Ohio,	1,955,050	512,278
Virginia,	894,800	109,711
Connecticut,	363,099	82,433
Maryland,	417,943	60,447
Rhode Island,	143,875	28,359
Louisiana,	255,491	32,838
New York,	3,048,325	687,874
Missouri,	592,004	95,245

exhibit a great disparity between the number that can read and write and that in attendance upon schools. Thus of the 54,333 belonging to Virginia, only 11,515 are unable to read; of the 27,463 belonging to North Carolina, only 6,857—in both cases about one fifth. Yet the number put down as attending school in the former state is but 64; in the latter, 217. We infer that they have obtained their education by other means.

The average result would not be materially different if the other free and slave states were compared. The depressed condition of education in the slave, as compared with the free states, can be due to nothing else but slavery. How this institution operates to check the general diffusion of knowledge, can be easily shown. The education of the masses must always depend mainly on the general tone of public sentiment in the community. But public sentiment will be always moulded, to a great extent, by the attitude of those who occupy the highest place in respect to wealth, education, and social position generally. If they are, in word and deed, the warm promoters and patrons of *general* education, schools for the instruction of the masses will spring up everywhere. But if they take towards the education of the people at large the attitude of coldness and indifference, it will certainly languish. Positive hostility is not needed to kill the system of common schools. A negative position in regard to it will do the work. Now one of the most remarkable characteristics of the early settlers of New England, and of the free states generally, was their interest in the education of the people at large. The men who colonized New England were themselves thoroughly educated, and it was a part of their system to give education to all, as well as religion. They were republicans, not in name only, but in reality, — republicans of the most earnest character. They possessed, in the best sense of the term, the democratic spirit. They believed that civil government is ordained of God for the good of the people; that the people, acting through their representatives, are the rightful depositaries of its high functions; and that, for the proper exercise of their prerogatives as freemen, they need both religion and education. Every virtuous and intelligent citizen they regarded as adding so much strength to the state; every vicious and ignorant man, as an incumbrance upon it. Their great solicitude was that *every one in every station of life* should be an educated Christian. Hence, wherever they penetrated into the wilderness, the log sanctuary and the log school-house sprang up, side by side. It was this enlightened policy that made New

England what she was in the war of the Revolution, and what, with some sad drawbacks, she continues to be now. We have mentioned New England, because she is emphatically the hive of the free states. But wherever free institutions are the law, there we see the same tendency towards the diffusion of education among the masses. They, not a few aristocrats, are the constitutional depositories of power; and in their intelligence and virtue the state has the deepest possible stake.

But where slavery is the law, a different spirit prevails. We do not mean to represent slaveholders as any worse by nature than other men. We simply affirm that their system makes it extremely difficult for them to feel, as a body, any warm sympathy with the education and consequent elevation of the masses. Of course, while they are, by law, excluding one large class of the community — their own slaves — from all education, they cannot take the ground that education is good for men *as men*. They do not hold any such doctrine in theory, much less in practice. Their theory and practice too is, that education is good for a certain part of the community, especially and principally themselves; because, in conjunction with their large plantations, it enables them to keep the power and patronage of the state in their own hands. They are the aristocracy of the land; and while we cheerfully concede to them the good qualities of a cultivated aristocracy, we cannot exempt them from the radical fault of isolation from the masses of the people, so far as a warm and active interest in their education and elevation is concerned. We do not say that they set themselves in direct hostility to the general diffusion of education through the community, or that they are even conscious of such hostility. But we affirm that they cannot but feel, instinctively, that the maintenance of their supremacy depends on the depression of the masses. They know that the existence in the community of a large body of educated, independent, and thriving yeomanry, such as may be found in any one of our Northern states, would be the end of their present despotic power. In such circumstances they must

be more than human, they must be angelic, to feel and manifest the same warm interest in the education and elevation of the people at large that prevails in the free states. Such an interest they do not feel, as a body. The effect of their apathy is seen in the ignorance of the masses; and the root of the evil is the institution of slavery.

From this tendency of slavery to accumulate the wealth and education of a state in the hands of a small minority,¹—a tendency most fully manifested where the institution of slavery has taken the deepest root—it follows that the *power* of the state must be in the same hands also. The mass of the people are accustomed from childhood to look up to the rich and educated slaveholders as the sources of public opinion. Hence deference to their opinions and submission to their dictates becomes with them a second nature. Without property, and without mental culture, they cannot stand up and face the lordly owners of the plantations. How can they contradict their maxims and statements when they have not the means of investigating for themselves? How can they, without money or land, successfully withstand those who have both in abundance? “It is hard,” says the true proverb, “for an empty bag to stand upright.” Intelligent piety, fed and sustained by scriptural truth, can indeed make a poor man firm and unyielding in the presence of great men. But no merely natural courage and independence can accomplish the work. It is impossible for one who has not resided in the midst of slavery to understand the weakness of the non-slaveholding masses as opposed to the will of the slaveholders. The masses of the people in the Northern states have breathed from childhood the air of freedom. They have always been accustomed to maintain their own opinions, and to follow their own judgment in political and social, not less than in religious, matters. To them the idea of prohibiting, under pains and

¹ We say a small minority. The number of the slaveholders is commonly stated to be between three and four hundred thousand. It is certainly under half a million, while the number of large slaveholders is but a fragment of this.

penalties, the free discussion of any public measure, or any social institution, justly seems absurd and tyrannical. They cannot conceive that a man should be liable to suffer personal violence for expressing his determination to vote for this or that candidate for the presidential chair. But with the rule of slavery, such freedom is incompatible. The slaveholders know well enough that to allow it would be a dangerous precedent. Their indignation falls, not merely upon Northern men, whom they suspect of seeking to aid their slaves in escaping, but upon their own citizens also, who dare to maintain, in an open and manly way, that slavery is a system founded in injustice, and ruinous to the state that cherishes it. If there are exceptions to this rule, it is not in the case of the poor whites, but of men whose social position and standing places them above the power of the slaveholders. True freedom did not exist in the South before the commencement of the present civil war, any more than it does now. Of course certain topics might be discussed there freely, as in all states where despotism prevails. Men might investigate, to their heart's content, the merits of different systems of geology, or the claims of different religious sects. But if they were going to write or speak on the vital topics of free institutions and slavery, they must take care to be on one side only of the question. The government of the United States has, as it seems to us, failed to apprehend the terrible despotism of the slave oligarchy over the masses of the people. They did not believe that they could force several hundred thousands into the ranks at the point of the bayonet to fight their cause with the free states, and therefore they did not promptly meet the Southern conscription with corresponding Northern levies. To the thoughtful observer of the current of events in the Southern states, it must be manifest that, should they succeed in establishing their so-called Confederacy, it will be a republic only in name. To a true republic it is essential that the power be vested in the masses of the people, and that there be real liberty of thought and speech. But where the institution of slavery has taken deep root and become

the controlling element of the state, neither of these is possible.¹

From the influence of slavery, as it has now been described, as well in the line of the slaves themselves as of the free white population, it follows that, so far as the general interests of the state are concerned, slavery must ever be a heavy incubus upon it. To the slaveholders themselves, it is a source of wealth and power, but it impoverishes and weakens the community at large. On this point, any one who compares together the statistics of the free and the slave states, may soon satisfy himself.

Let us look at the item of population. Between the territory of the free and the slave states — leaving out of account, on both sides, the vast sterile tracts that border on the Rocky Mountains — there is no essential disparity ; yet, as every one knows, the former have immensely outstripped the latter. If it be said that the tide of western emigration has been towards the Northern states, we answer : Why towards the Northern states, except because they were free, and because the souls of freemen instinctively shrink from the dominion of a slave oligarchy ? The Southern slaveholders may lord it over their own poor whites ; but they cannot induce the body of emigrants to forego their manhood by putting themselves under their control. The most effectual way to fence out of any state educated and intelligent immigrants, is to set up there the odious rule of slavery.

¹ In South Carolina the oligarchical spirit manifests itself most prominently. To illustrate this we copy from Olmsted's "Seaboard Slave States" the following : "Even now, no man can be admitted to a seat in the legislature of the state, unless he is the owner of real estate to the value of, at least, one hundred and fifty pounds sterling ; and, to be eligible to the upper house, he must possess a freehold estate of at least three hundred pounds value. The number of representatives, from any particular part of the state, is proportionate, not to the number of citizens residing in it, but to the value of the property owned in it.

Five sixths of the whole white population of the state, residing in those counties where there are the fewest slaves, have but seventy-eight out of one hundred and twenty-two representatives. The Pendleton district, with over 26,000 white inhabitants, is represented by seven members ; the two parishes of St. Philip and St. Michael, with less than 19,000 white inhabitants, send eight." — pp. 497, 498.

But slavery operates also internally to check the growth of the population; otherwise the Southern states would have had as large a surplus of native citizens (to say nothing of foreigners) to send into the southwest, as the Northern states into the northwest. But we all know that this has never been the case. If we compare particular states, the disparity appears in a still more striking light. Thus Virginia, with a territory of about sixty-one thousand square miles, and having the advantage, also, over every other state in the Union as it regards the time of its settlement, had, in 1850, a total population of 1,421,661. Pennsylvania, with but forty-six thousand square miles, had, at the same date, 2,311,786 souls. To what shall we ascribe the difference? It cannot be the sterile regions of the Alleghanies which occupy so much of Virginia, for they run through Pennsylvania also. It cannot be, to any large extent, the mineral wealth of Pennsylvania; for, although she has the precedence here, yet Virginia also is rich in mineral treasures. Besides, other free states, without this advantage, go ahead rapidly in population. It cannot be the mighty city of Philadelphia; for the existence of such a city in Pennsylvania, without any preëminent natural advantages, such as belong to the city of New York, — the existence, we say, of such a city in Pennsylvania rather than in Virginia, is itself due mainly to the stimulus of free institutions. Then we have, lying side by side, Kentucky with 37,680 square miles, and Ohio with 39,964. Kentucky had many years the advantage of Ohio as respects the time of settlement. Her soil is unsurpassed in excellence. Yet in 1850, Ohio outnumbered her, two to one. What is the explanation? Slavery; nothing else but slavery. Once more: there is the fertile state of Missouri, with an area of 67,380 square miles. By her side lies Illinois, with 54,405 square miles. Her settlement was begun later than that of Missouri; yet in 1850, the population of Illinois exceeded that of Missouri by about 150,000. Here, again, the explanation is slavery.

For the *agricultural interest* of a state, we may take the value of the farms as a fair exponent. Let us compare the

same couplets of states in this respect, taking the statistics, as heretofore, from the census of 1850.

States.	Sq. Miles.	Value of Farms.
Pennsylvania,	46,000	\$407,876,099
Virginia,	61,352	216,401,543
Ohio,	39,964	358,758,603
Kentucky,	37,680	155,021,262
Illinois,	54,405	96,133,290
Missouri,	67,880	63,225,543

We add a comparison of Georgia, one of the best of the slave states, with Massachusetts.

States.	Sq. Miles.	Value of Farms.
Massachusetts,	7,800	\$109,076,347
Georgia,	58,000	95,753,445

Yet Massachusetts is preëminently not an agricultural but a manufacturing state, while the reverse is true of Georgia, as of the Southern states generally. Thus in 1850, the capital invested in manufactures, in the two states, the value of raw material consumed, and the value of the products was as follows :

States.	Capital invested.	Raw Material.	Value of Products.
Massachusetts,	\$83,357,642	\$85,856,771	\$151,137,145
Georgia,	5,460,483	3,404,917	7,086,525

We do not deem it necessary to carry out these statistics in the line of manufactures or commerce, since the immense superiority of the free states, in these respects, is universally acknowledged. Of education and the general diffusion of knowledge, we have already spoken. The general conclusion at which we arrive is, that slavery is a vampire, nourished and made strong at the expense of the vital blood of the commonwealth.

It may be thought that *in war* the advantage is on the side of a powerful and consolidated aristocracy, like that of the southern slaveholders. It cannot be denied that their despotic power over the masses of the people has, thus far, given them an advantage which our government has been

slow to understand and estimate at its true value. But the material sinews of war are men and money. Here, as well as in the moral strength and vigor which the consciousness of a righteous cause inspires, the advantage is altogether on the side of the free states. They are stronger in wealth and numbers than the slave states, because freedom has made them so. It is certain that, without foreign aid, the Southern Confederacy must succumb to the arms of the Union, because slavery has made them weak in the essential requisites for protracting a war.

It remains to consider the disturbing influence of slavery on the nation at large.

We have seen that the necessary tendency of the institution is to accumulate the wealth, education, and influence of the community in the hands of an aristocracy of slaveholders; and that in exact proportion to the extent to which the institution has taken root and become a controlling element of society. Thus the slaveholders of each particular state become a *caste*, having on their side the most powerful elements of influence — wealth, culture, and social position, and naturally drawing into sympathy with themselves a large circle of the rich and fashionable outside of their own proper body. Their heavy monied interest, with the power, patronage, and social position which it gives, cements them together into one unbroken phalanx. They have everything at stake in the institution, and will be sure always to present to their opponents an unbroken front. The same principle, moreover, which binds together the slaveholding communities of the separate states, unites the whole into one grand league for the maintenance and advancement of the institution. However their adversaries may be divided and weakened by the contentions of opposing factions, they are sure always to act unitedly, and to have the strength and persistency which union gives. Here, then, we have a vast and compact combination, resting on the basis of slavery, and absorbing into itself most of the wealth, patronage, and power of the Southern states.

We proceed to show that between this natural confederacy of slaveholders and the free states there must be an *antagonism material and moral*. For reasons that have been already sufficiently considered, the slaveholding states can never compete with the free in the production of manufactured articles. Their interests must ever be mainly in the line of agriculture; and their commerce must consist, to a very large extent, in the exchange of these products for manufactured goods of all kinds, domestic and foreign. Hence their policy has ever been strongly in the line of free trade; and in their opposition to a tariff they have been united and determined. The North, on the other hand, has desired a tariff for the protection of its vast manufacturing interests. Here is a ground of material antagonism. We all know what an apple of discord this question of a tariff has been to our general government, and how the first attempt of open resistance to the federal government, in 1832, in the shape of South Carolina nullification, had opposition to the tariff for its foundation.¹

The moral antagonism between the free and the slave states—that is, between the free states and the slave oligarchy of the South, cannot but be deep and intense. The people of the free states believe, with all their hearts, that among the “inalienable rights” of men as men (so far as they are not forfeited by crime) are “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” The slaveholders scout at this doctrine as an idle reverie. They hold that the normal condition of the colored race is that of slaves in the hands of masters. The people of the free states reject, with abhorrence, the idea of property in human beings—of converting their fellow men into personal chattels, to be set up in the market at auction, and bought and sold like horses and mules.

¹ To discuss the merits of a *protective* tariff, is no part of our present design. We simply remark that here, if anywhere, there is just ground for the principle of compromise; since the general government is bound to regard impartially all the various producing interests of the nation. Now, however, we mention the question of a tariff simply as a ground of material antagonism between the free and the slaveholding states.

But with the Southern slaveholders this principle is the corner-stone of their system; since by it they have their wealth, power, and social standing. The people of the free states believe in educating and elevating *the masses* of the people, not because they belong to this or that class of the community, but because they are men. The slaveholders exclude, under heavy penalties, one large class of the community from the privileges of education; and for the education and elevation of the mass of the non-slaveholding whites they have no warm sympathy and effort. The people of the free states believe in the distribution of political power among the masses of the people; the slaveholders, in its accumulation within their own circle. The people of the free states believe in the dignity of labor—the free labor of their own hands; the slaveholders, in the dignity of being able to compel their fellow men to do the labor for them without wages. In a word, the people of the free states hate and reject slavery, as a great political, social, and moral evil; the slaveholders love and cherish it as a very Pactolus, whose golden streams shall be to them a perennial source of wealth and power.

In respect to the item of slave property, the material and moral antagonism between the free states and the oligarchy of slaveholders both meet and flow together. The “personal chattels” of the latter, in the shape of men and women, constitute an immense moneyed interest which they naturally guard with jealous watchfulness. At the time of the formation of the Constitution they secured the insertion of a clause for the rendition of persons held to service or labor escaping from one state into another, which has been from the first interpreted to include fugitives from slavery. Upon this have been based the fugitive slave laws, that have occasioned so much mutual irritation and crimination. The slaveholders seem to be incapable of appreciating the feelings of the northern people on this point. They regard their slaves simply as so much property, and they cannot understand why the people of the free states should not take the same view of them, and return them to their owners with the

same indifference that they would stray horses. But the people of the North look upon them as men entitled to the rights of men. All their feelings as freemen revolt at the idea of being compelled to help in the work of reducing them again to the condition of chattels in the hands of their masters or owners. They are, with only individual exceptions, loyal to the Constitution, and desire to see all its provisions faithfully executed. Yet they cannot but keenly feel the false position in which they are placed by being compelled to aid in the maintenance of a system which they thoroughly abhor; while, at the same time, they are excluded by the Constitution from having any voice in the matter of the treatment of these slaves. For the right of *making* the slave-laws belongs wholly to the Southern states. To the people of the free states is left only the poor privilege of being subservient to the slaveholders in *enforcing* them, however atrocious they may choose to make them. If the people of the free states say to the slaveholders: "You ought not to convert your fellow men into merchandise, and buy and sell them like cattle;" the answer is: "That is none of your business; we choose to do so; do you fulfil your duty of returning them to us when they escape from service." If they further say: "You ought not to forbid their education under penal statutes;" they reply: "That is none of your business; we choose to do so; it is your part to restore them when they escape from us." If they add once more: "But your laws allow the master to sell the husband from the wife, and the child from the parents;" the answer is: "That is none of your business; do you return our fugitive slaves." Finally, if the people of the Northern states ask: "Do you mean that, treat your slaves as you may, it is our duty to help you in maintaining your dominion over them?" they reply: "Yes, that is precisely what we mean; do you be still, and restore our fugitive slaves." Such is the practical operation of the requisition now under consideration. Need we wonder then that it has ever been to the nation a source of mutual irritation? The people of the free states are displeased because they are required to aid in upholding an

odious system placed by the Constitution entirely beyond their control. The slaveholders are displeased because the people of the North perform the service so reluctantly, and with so many open manifestations of disgust.

Let it be further remembered, that the antagonism of the slaveholding aristocracy towards the free states is not one of mere theory and sentiment, but of most vigorous, persistent, and systematic action. Hence "the inevitable conflict" between the two parties is nothing artificial or imaginary, but a terrible necessity. The disturbance of harmonious relations between the North and the South has, we know, been often charged to the agitation of the question of slavery by Northern men. That there has been in the Northern states a party of extreme anti-slavery men characterized by their violent and indiscriminate abuse not only of the South, but of the North also, so far as it could not be persuaded to indorse their measures, cannot be denied. That their course has advanced the cause of freedom either North or South, we cannot believe; for it has not been, as we judge, in harmony with the principles of God's word, which are the principles of truth and righteousness. But if any one thinks that the conflict could have been avoided without an abandonment, on the part of the free states, of the interests of freedom, he is greatly mistaken. Abusive and uncharitable words and special pleading in respect to either the provisions of the Constitution or the declarations of scripture; are always wrong, and always injurious.¹ But it is, after all, the *effectiveness* of Northern resistance to the aggressions of slavery,

¹ As examples of special pleading we may mention the attempt of some to set aside all fugitive slave laws on the ground that the clause of the Constitution respecting the rendition of "persons held to labor or service" does not include slaves; also a great amount of exegesis designed to show that, because the Hebrew and Greek words for *servant* are often used in a *generic* sense, therefore they never refer in any of the scriptural laws or precepts to servants in the *special* and proper sense of slaves, although it is notorious that they are the customary words for designating that class of persons. The tendency of all such special pleading is to corrupt that candor and integrity which is the first attribute of a true freeman. Another evil is that, when the sophistry is discovered, it prejudices men against valid arguments on the side of liberty.

that most stirs up the wrath of the slaveholders. If the writings and speeches of the so-called "radical abolitionists" could have had only the effect of dividing and distracting northern sentiment, they would have looked on with composure. What they feared was the revelation to the Northern masses of their policy for ruling the country in the interest of slavery; the credit of exposing which certainly belongs largely to these extreme men. It is folly to suppose that *kind and conciliatory words* would have reconciled the oligarchy of slaveholders to *vigorous measures* for checking their usurpations. It was not the noise of the thunder that they dreaded, but the power of the lightning. At the roar of the thunder they could laugh; but wherever they saw that the lightning was about to strike, there they carefully set up the lightning-rods of their diplomacy, that they might divert the flaming bolt without damage to their party.

In proof of this we have only to look at the first attempt at disunion made by the nullifiers of South Carolina, with which anti-slavery agitations had nothing to do. As a slaveholding state they were, for reasons which we have already considered, bitterly opposed to the then existing tariff. They determined to overthrow it, and the method which they adopted was *resistance to the general government*; then, as now, under color of reserved state rights. The President, though himself opposed to a high tariff, was an honest, as well as an energetic man. He decided at once that, while the tariff laws existed, they should be alike enforced in South Carolina and in the Northern states. He issued his proclamation against the nullifiers; Congress supported him by the force-bill; the nullifiers receded from their position, and then, by Mr. Clay's compromise, they obtained substantially what they had demanded. The intrinsic merits of the tariff question we do not propose to discuss. We simply call attention to the fact that in 1832, before the inauguration of our modern anti-slavery agitations, the spirit of resistance to the Federal Government was rampant in South Carolina. Then, as now, the motto of their slaveholders was: *Rule or resist*. Just so it has been ever since. And from that state

as a centre, the contagion has spread through the whole confederacy of slaveholders. For the last third of a century, they have had a settled policy to keep the federal government on the side of the Southern states, and to use it for the interest of their peculiar institution. For accomplishing this end in the face of a large majority on the part of the free states, their plan has been *to array a united South against a divided North*. On every question affecting the interests of slavery, they have always presented an unbroken front, while they have managed to keep a large body of Northern allies on their side, whom they have been careful to reward with a liberal share in the immense patronage of the general government. That there have been in this party of Southern sympathizers many good and upright men we do not doubt. But their policy has been controlled by crafty demagogues, and it has been ruinous to the cause of freedom. But for their subserviency to the oligarchy of slaveholders, through many dreary years of corruption and mercenary intrigue, we should not have been to-day contending in arms for the priceless heritage bequeathed to us by our fathers.

The special lines of Southern policy, under the general plan that has been indicated, may be thus briefly stated :

1. The cherished aim of the Southern leaders has ever been *to increase, by all means in their power, the number of the slave states*. If they could but once plant the institution of slavery in a new state, they considered it as secured forever to their side. It was not the true prosperity of the state that they regarded, but its subserviency to their cause. Under the depressing power of slavery it might fall behind the neighboring free states in population, wealth, and education — in a word, in all that constitutes true prosperity ; but no matter ; it would be under their control, and they could use it for the accomplishment of their ends. The shrewdness of this policy has been abundantly shown since the commencement of the present civil war. Wherever slavery exists, there the spirit of secession has been rampant. Look at the state of Maryland, especially at the city of Baltimore, where the

principle of free labor prevails almost exclusively. What interest in the Southern Confederacy has that state with her noble metropolis? Her true affinities—if she is to have sectional affinities—are with the North. True, Baltimore has a large Southern trade, but so also have Philadelphia and New York. How came it to pass, upon the breaking out of the rebellion, that there was so powerful an interest in Maryland on the side of secession, and not in the adjoining state of Pennsylvania? Why was it that no stone was left unturned to win over the noble and patriotic governor Hicks to the side of treason, while no such pressure was brought to bear on governor Curtin? Why did Philadelphia need neither forts nor forces to protect her from domestic traitors, while Baltimore must be environed with forts and garrisoned with regiments of Union troops? Why, in a word, were our troops fed in Philadelphia and fired upon in Baltimore? The answer is one and simple. Pennsylvania was a free, Maryland, a slave, state. Maryland has many devoted and self-sacrificing patriots, true as steel to the American Union. But the cause of loyalty there is compelled everywhere to encounter the spirit of slavery, and that is a spirit of disloyalty and bitter hatred toward the armies of the Union. Whoever has walked through the streets of Baltimore, and seen the faces of disunion men and women in high social position radiant with joy at the report of some Federal disaster, although they admitted that the only hope of their city lay in the continued preponderance of the Federal arms, has felt the malignant power of slavery in a manner that he will not be likely ever to forget. Look, once more, at the great and rich state of Missouri, where slavery seemed before the war to be struggling for existence. What has made the difference between this and the adjacent state of Illinois? The answer is: Slavery. Slavery is the parent of the raids upon Kansas in former years, and of the present distractions and desolations of civil war. Look, finally, at the state of Kentucky. Why did Ohio promptly respond to the call of the United States, while Kentucky attempted to assume the attitude of neutrality? The answer is again: Ohio was a

free, Kentucky, a slave, state. The southern slaveholders understand well the power of their peculiar institution in attaching states to their interest. From generation to generation they have been at the top of society, as it respects wealth and social position, and have naturally drawn into alliance with themselves a large circle of the rich and fashionable outside of their own body. Throughout all the slave states they are leagued together in bitter and determined opposition to the ascendancy of the North, even though it be gained fairly and in a constitutional way. In every state where they can plant the institution of slavery, they are sure to have an organized and resolute body of men devoted to their interest, men who think only of the triumph of the Southern party, and are ready to sacrifice on its altar the very life-blood of their own state. No wonder, then, that they have been so intensely solicitous to increase the number of the slave states. They know that slavery is a bloody cement of terrible efficacy.

The first move of the slaveholders for securing this end was in the case of Missouri. To the United States this was a momentous crisis. The great question of the extension of slavery came up for decision in a practical way, and, by means of the celebrated Missouri Compromise in 1820, it was decided in the interest of the slaveholders. They gained a powerful slave state; while the friends of freedom gained only a pledge for the exclusion of slavery from all the territory north of a certain parallel of latitude, only to be meanly repudiated thirty-four years afterwards, when the Southern party had derived from it all the advantages it was capable of yielding, and they wished, contrary to its provisions, to bring Kansas into the Union as a slave state.

But it was not enough to carve new slave states out of existing territory. The unparalleled growth of the North threatened to overthrow the slave interest, unless new territory should also be secured for the same end. Hence the series of movements by which, first Texas was annexed to the Union, and afterwards a large portion of Mexico.

On these we do not propose to dwell in detail, for they are familiar to the people of the United States. When Texas (which had been ceded to Spain in 1819 during the crisis of the Missouri controversy as a measure for disarming the opposition of the North)¹ had established in 1836 her independence by the battle of San Jacinto, Mr. Calhoun advocated not only her immediate recognition, but her admission into the American Union, even at the expense of a war with Mexico. This plan failing, the next attempt was to bring in Texas, in 1844, by a treaty, which Mr. Benton characterizes as "covertly conceived, and carried on with all the features of an intrigue, and in flagrant violation of the principles and usages of the government;" in which the previous consent and authorization of Congress "had been eschewed and ignored by the secrecy with which the negotiation had been conducted; and was intended to be kept secret until the treaty was concluded, and then to force its adoption for the purpose of increasing the area of slave territory, and to make its rejection a cause for the secession of the Southern states."² The treaty was, nevertheless rejected, and Texas finally came in by legislative act in 1845, with a proviso that four more new states might be formed out of it; and, since all south of the parallel of 36° 30' (that is, the main part of the region) was left free to admit slavery, it was virtually a provision for ultimately creating four or five new slave states.

In the train of the admission of Texas into the American Union followed the war with Mexico. It was preëminently a Southern measure. It might, and doubtless would, have been avoided, but for the tempting prospect of another large territory to be made into slave states. It is well known that,

¹ "In 1819, as one of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, he [Mr. Calhoun] had concurred in giving it [Texas] away, in order to conciliate the anti-slavery interest of the Northeast by curtailing slave territory in the Southwest."—Benton's *Thirty Years in the U. S. Senate*, Vol. II. p. 587.

"Their justification [that of Mr. Monroe's cabinet] for this cession of a great province was that the loss was temporary — 'that it could be got back again whenever it was wanted.'" "It was these reasons [Northern conciliation, and getting it back whenever we pleased] that reconciled General Jackson to the cession at the time it was made."—*Ib.*, Vol. I. p. 667.

² *Thirty Years in the U. S. Senate*, Vol II. p. 600.

when the territory ceded by Mexico had come into the possession of the United States, Mr. Calhoun proposed to extend the Constitution of the United States to the territories, "with a view," in Mr. Benton's words, "to make it carry slavery into California, Utah, and New Mexico." The measure did not succeed — that is, not at this time and in this form; but its failure was not due to any want of zeal on the part of its abettors.

Lastly, in the series of congressional acts, came the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The very men who in 1845 had recognized the validity of this compromise and applied it to the territory of Texas, and in 1850 had extended it to the Pacific Ocean, now discovered that Congress had no power to legislate on the subject of slavery in the territories; a thing which it had been doing all along from the beginning of the Constitution! So the Missouri Compromise was repealed, that the way might be clear to bring in Kansas also, if possible, as a slave state. The base act failed of its end, and Kansas came in free. But at the same time these corrupt politicians, who had not the public weal, but their own private ends, in view, opened the box of Pandora, which none of them had any power to close, and its curses flew abroad all over this fair and once peaceful republic. Some of them — not all — live to see the awful calamities inflicted on the people by their folly and wickedness.

"Quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi."

"The rulers play the fool; the people pay the penalty."

This is the law of divine Providence. Would that the citizens of the United States might understand it, and send to their national legislature, not corrupt and intriguing politicians, who "all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter"; but "able men, such as fear God; men of truth, hating covetousness."

2. Another point of vital importance to the slaveholders has been *to secure on the bench of the Supreme Court a majority of judges who sympathized with them in their policy*

concerning slavery. It is with reluctance that we advert to this point. The Supreme Court of the United States is venerable, alike from its position and its early history, and its decisions ought to be invested with sanctity in the eyes of all the people. But it is a matter of history that, for many years previous to the commencement of the present civil war, the Federal Government has for most of the time been Southern in its policy, and that a majority of the judges nominated by the Executive and confirmed by the Senate have been men of Southern proclivities. That the decisions of the Supreme Court have tended more and more to strengthen the interests of the slaveholders, all feel and acknowledge. They claim that it is because their cause has justice and the Constitution on its side. We believe that the Supreme Court has encroached in an unconstitutional and unjust way upon the interests of freedom. The clause in the Constitution on which the rendition of fugitives from slavery is claimed, is the following :

“No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.”

The most obvious and natural construction of this clause is, that he is to be delivered up by the state into which he has escaped ; just as the previous clause, respecting fugitives from justice, has always been construed. Such was Mr. Webster's opinion. In his speech in the Senate on the fugitive slave law of 1850, he said :

“I have always thought that the Constitution addressed itself to the legislatures of the states or to the states themselves. It says that those persons escaping from other states ‘shall be delivered up,’ and I confess I have always been of opinion that it was an injunction upon the states themselves. When it is said that a person escaping into another state, and coming, therefore, within the jurisdiction of that state, shall be delivered up, it seems to me the import of the clause is, that the state itself, in obedience to the Constitution, shall cause him to be delivered up. This is my judgment. I have always entertained that opinion, and I entertain

it now. But when the subject, some years ago, was before the Supreme Court of the United States, the majority of the judges held that the power to cause fugitives from service to be delivered up was a power to be exercised under the authority of this government. I do not know, on the whole, that it may not have been a fortunate decision."

The decision of the Supreme Court to which Mr. Webster refers was that made in 1836, in the celebrated case of *Prigg vs. the commonwealth of Pennsylvania*. The earliest fugitive slave law, that of 1793, had contemplated the concurrent action of the states in the rendition of fugitives from labor or service, and the states had accordingly passed laws in accordance with its provisions.¹ But by the decision in *Prigg's* case, the business of seeing these fugitives delivered up was taken entirely out of the hands of the states and state magistrates, on the ground that it is a power vested exclusively in Congress and the national judicature. Mr. Webster's remark upon it is worthy of special notice: "I do not know, on the whole, that it may not have been a fortunate decision." He has never thought, and does not think, that it is in accordance with "the import of the clause" in the Constitution; but he does not know, on the whole, that it may not have been "a fortunate decision," — fortunate, we presume, because it exempted the states from the unwilling performance of an odious work, which was creating more and more friction and disturbance between them and the general government. So many warm anti-slavery men reasoned and felt at the time. They openly expressed their joy at the decision, because it relieved the states from all obligation in respect to the rendition of fugitive slaves, except that of passive acquiescence in the action of the general government, through its marshals and courts. But if they had carefully studied the opinions rendered by some of the judges in that case, they

¹ The fugitive was to be brought by his alleged owner, or his agent or attorney, before any judge of the circuit or district courts of the United States, residing or being within the state, or before any magistrate of a county, city, or town corporate, wherein such seizure or arrest should be made. The rendition of the fugitive was, therefore, regarded, as the *joint duty* of the state and the Federal Government.

might have seen in them the foreshadowings of future assumptions very dangerous to the cause of freedom.¹

Of the decision in *Prigg's* case, it would be presumptuous for us to speak in a purely judicial point of view. We venture, however, to offer two remarks upon it: First, we are persuaded that this remarkable change of front in the Supreme Court was not the result of any new insight into the true construction of the clause of the Constitution touching the rendition of fugitives from labor; but that it rather grew out of the conviction that in this way alone could the masters recover their slaves by a summary process; since the progress of anti-slavery sentiments was continually making the free states more reluctant to co-operate in the work, to which, nevertheless, they were bound by the old construction: Secondly, as a matter of fact, this new position of the Supreme Court prepared the way for its aggressions on the cause of freedom in the *Dred Scott* case. We do not affirm that such was the intention, but that the one decision naturally prepared the way for the other. By the former, all legislation of the states, on the subject of the rendition of fugitives, was pronounced null and void. They had nothing to do but to acquiesce in the doings of the Federal courts. The opinion had been already maintained, in *Prigg's* case, that the Constitution puts the master's "right to the service or labor upon the same ground, and to the same extent, in every other state as in the state from which the slave escaped, and in which he was held to the service or labor;"² also, that the legislation of Congress is unnecessary, because the clause of the Constitution executes itself.³ It was quite natural that, at a later day, the majority of the judges on the bench of the Supreme Court should decide, as they did in the

¹ Such, for example, as the opinion held by the majority of the court, that the owner of the fugitive slave could seize and remove him by virtue of the clause of the Constitution alone; and of Judge Baldwin, that legislation on the part of Congress also, as well as of the states, is unconstitutional, since the clause of the Constitution executes itself.

² By Judge Story.

³ By Judge Baldwin. Afterwards admitted by other judges of the Supreme Court.

Dred Scott case, that the Constitution extends itself, without legislation, over the territories; giving the master the same right to carry his slaves thither, and hold and use them there, that he has to hold and use them in his own state; and thus making slavery no longer local, but national. But one further step only was wanted, that the Supreme Court should decide that a master may take his slaves into any one of the *free states*, as well as territories, and hold and use them there, at least so long as he does not become a citizen of such free state. But for the events that have suspended the action of the Supreme Court in the matter, such a decision might very probably have been, before now, established as the supreme law of the land.¹

3. Since it was uncertain whether the slaveholders, with

¹ On this point we subjoin the following, from the pen of Judge Joel Parker. We take it from the columns of the Boston Journal:

“But let us pursue the principles of the six judges in the case of Dred Scott to their legitimate consequences in another direction. Whether or not the Constitution of the United States extends over the territories while under a territorial government, there is no question that it extends over all the states of the Union. Now, if it be true that the Constitution recognizes slaves as property, and therefore authorizes the owner to take them with him as property into a territory, and hold them there as slaves, against the prohibition of Congress, by the same reason he may take them to a free state, and hold them there as slaves, temporarily at least. It is not necessary to inquire what his rights may be, if he voluntarily becomes a citizen of a free state. Entering the free state as a citizen of another state, with his slaves, for a temporary purpose, the six judges cannot hold, consistently with their principles, that the slaves become free; for if the Constitution recognizes a right of property, which is paramount to the laws of Congress, it must, also, thus far, be a right paramount to the laws, and even the constitution, of a state. ‘The citizens of each state shall be entitled to the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.’ This right of coming within the free states with slaves for a temporary purpose, and of passing through such states is strenuously maintained by many Southern politicians; and perhaps while I am writing, the Supreme Court are making up this very decision in the ‘Lemmon case,’ which occurred in the city of New York.”

In “Cobb on Slavery” we have a labored argument, to show that “the mere transit of the master with his slaves, either from necessity or convenience, through the territory of a non-slaveholding state, does not change the *status* of the slave”; and “that, as a general rule, where there is a *bona fide* temporary residence of a master with his slave in a non-slaveholding state, the *animus revertendi* will protect the master’s right in his slave to the extent of his personal service, and the right to return with him to his domicile.” See Chapters vii. – ix.

all their efforts, would be able to maintain their ascendancy in the National Government, it was necessary that the Southern leaders *should prepare the minds of the people for secession*, when the proper crisis should arrive. They could not stand on the general right of revolution, because, by concession of all, that applies only to the extreme case of long-continued oppression. Such a case the complainants could not possibly make out; for they had been themselves in possession of the Federal Government during most of the preceding thirty years, and had managed matters in their own way. They chose rather to stand on the doctrine of "state rights," pushed to its extreme extent, by which the Federal Government is converted into a rope of sand, and every state is left at liberty to withdraw from the Union whenever it suits her convenience, though the United States as a nation may have paid millions for her territory, and millions more for her defence.

Here, then, we have the singular phenomenon of a great and powerful party in the nation vigorously pressing forward, at one and the same time, two opposite doctrines — contending, through the Supreme Court, for a theory but little short of absolute centralization, which makes the Federal Government everything and the states almost nothing; while, at the same time, they maintain and assiduously teach an extreme theory of state rights, which makes the states everything, and the General Government nothing. Under such a system of training it is no wonder that true loyalty to the United States as a nation has almost died out from the regions where slavery is in the ascendancy. The Southern leaders have regarded the General Government too much as an instrument for the advancement of their interests, and they have been for a long time preparing the people for secession upon the contingency of their being unable to retain any longer the management of it. Not so the people of the Northern states. They are attached to the Union from principle. Whatever may be true of some particular factions among them, never embracing more than a very small fragment of the people, and of some particular acts of state

legislation which, although unwarrantable, were never intended to array the states adopting them against the General Government; whatever may be true, we say, in these exceptional cases, the great Northern heart has ever remained loyal to the Union. The masses of the people in the free states have ever sought to correct what was wrong in the way provided by the Constitution. So they endeavored to do in the Autumn of 1856, through the legitimate channel of the ballot-box. They were unsuccessful, and loyally submitted to the rule of their opponents. Again they made a second attempt in 1860, and were successful. What did their antagonists, the slaveholding aristocracy of the South? Did they loyally acquiesce in the result of the ballot-box, as their brethren in the North had done four years before? Not they; for they had no loyalty to the Union. Their motto was: *Rule or resist*. They called conventions; they passed ordinances of secession; under an imbecile administration, with the Federal offices — even the highest of them — filled to a great extent with traitors, who had been for years using their high position to destroy the government which fed and enriched them, and which they were under solemn oath to defend; under this imbecile administration, palsied throughout with swarming multitudes of official traitors, they seized the forts and arsenals of the United States; and, last of all, when the new President, duly chosen by the people, had been duly inaugurated, they opened upon the United States, at Sumpter, with the roar of the cannon. “*This is war, CIVIL WAR,*” inaugurated by the party of the Southern slaveholders, because they could no longer keep in their own hands the reins of the General Government.

Before God we have nothing to say; for our iniquities testify against us. We have been a nation of practical atheists. Now God is compelling us to see and feel that he holds our national existence, with all in it that we hold dear, in the hollow of his omnipotent hand. Many a time, since the commencement of this bloody struggle, has he so shaped the course of events as to teach all concerned that wisdom to forecast the future, as well as power to execute

present plans, must come from him. We have been an avaricious nation, putting money above righteousness and the fear of the Lord. Now God is forcing us to give hundreds of millions piled on hundreds of millions for the maintenance of our national institutions. As a nation, we have been for years plunging deeper and deeper into luxury and extravagance. By this civil war God is teaching us that our treasures should be given to some higher end than personal vanity. Our national councils have been controlled by the spirit of faction — a thoroughly corrupt and venal spirit, that sets up truth and justice for sale, and measures everything in heaven, earth, and hell by party interest. The events of the present conflict are fast teaching us, that not the cunning and corrupt combinations of partizan leaders, but comprehensive and patriotic statesmanship must, by God's help, save the nation. Of the profanation of God's name and God's Sabbath, the neglect of God's sanctuary, the virulent, abusive, and slanderous spirit of party presses, North and South, and all our other national sins, we forbear to speak. Before God we can only say, with the holy prophet: "O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee; but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day."

But before the civilized world our nation stands up to-day with bold and undismayed front, amidst the surging sea of treason, rebellion, and blood that surrounds her, and calls aloud to all the kindreds of the earth: "Be ye my witnesses, as God in heaven is witness, that this bloody war was forced upon me. Does any one ask: For what are you contending? I am contending that I may be a nation; for the principle of this rebellion strikes at the heart of my nationality. Of all the nations Britain ought best to understand this; for she has made immense expenditures of blood and treasure over Ireland and America in past ages, and over India during the present century, that she might maintain her national integrity. Why then should I consent to die ingloriously at the hand of a rebellion born in the den of slavery,

'Mongst horrid shapes, and shrieks, and sights unholy,'

and having, as all the world knows, the exaltation of slavery for its chief end? Why should I sit still and see this fair republic, made one alike by the hand of nature and the wisdom of its founders, divided into two hostile nations, with some thousands of miles of border territory; each side striving to surpass the other in fleets and armies; the people groaning under taxes for their maintenance without hope of relief; and, what is worse than all, the great nations of Europe complacently looking on and saying: 'Aha! so would we have it; for now we can use one republic to keep the other under.' I am contending for national existence, and for this reason I deserve the respect of the world. I am contending, too, for free institutions against a rebellion whose corner-stone is the institution of slavery. For this reason I have a right to claim the sympathy, at least, of England, for she has filled the world with her denunciations of slavery. O England, the land of free institutions, whose voice has been lifted so high against American slavery, shalt thou now falsify all thy teachings for the past century by giving thy sympathies to the side of American slavery, against both the Constitution of the United States, and the cause of freedom in the United States? If thou do, God judge between me and thee."

In bringing to a close our previous article on "*the Bible and Slavery*," we remarked that the consideration of the manifold evils which grow out of the system naturally and necessarily, would come up more appropriately under the head of the Relations of Slavery to the State; and that the institution, like every other, must be judged by its results — its results not in certain select cases and in limited periods of time, but its results as they manifest themselves on the broad scale. The evil results of slavery to the state we have now endeavored to point out, though in a very summary and imperfect manner. We have shown that it is of necessity an incubus on the prosperity, material and moral, of the states that cherish it; and that in the line of both the slaves themselves and of the free population. We have

further shown that it has been from the beginning the great disturbing power in the American Union, and has finally plunged the nation into a bloody civil war. Such are the fruits of slavery. "Their vine," then, "is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah; their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter; their wine is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps." Let him that has understanding judge whether such a plant of gall and wormwood can be of heavenly origin; and whether, also, with its poisonous shoots overrunning the nation, it can ever have true peace and prosperity. May God, in his infinite goodness, show us a way in which it can be extirpated, root and branch, from this fair Republic!

ARTICLE V.

**ENGLISH ETYMOLOGY, AS ADAPTED TO POPULAR USE:
ITS LEADING FACTS AND PRINCIPLES.**

WITH A BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES.

BY BENJAMIN W. DWIGHT, LL.D., CLINTON, N. Y.

(Continued from page 309.)

MANY have begun to hear with admiration of the wonders of the new philology, and perhaps themselves "see men, as trees, walking" within its sphere of grand and ever-enlarging discovery. Fain would they see more facts as facts, and these both more definitely and widely than they now do. Words they want in large numbers; and if they can have them in a thorough, reliable form, will greet so welcome a contribution with gladness. It has been a great gratification to the author, in the midst of other abounding labors, to undertake to meet, in even the partial manner here employed, so natural and urgent a desire on the part of those scholarly minds that highly appreciate the vast