

OUR COUNTRY,

AND

OUR COUNTRY'S CONSTITUTION AND LAWS.

A

DISCOURSE

DELIVERED ON THANKSGIVING DAY,

DECEMBER 12th, 1850,

IN THE

CHELSEA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NEW YORK,

BY

EDWARD DUNLAP SMITH, D.D.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

NEW YORK:

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, 285 BROADWAY.

1851.

ENTERED according to Act of Congress in the year 1851, by

EDWARD DUNLAP SMITH,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

ROBERT CRAIGHEAD, PRINTER,
112 FULTON STREET.

TO THE
MEMBERS OF THE
Chelsea Presbyterian Church
AND CONGREGATION
THE FOLLOWING DISCOURSE
IS MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED
BY THE AUTHOR.

DISCOURSE.

"Thou hast increased the nation, O Lord, thou hast increased the nation; thou art glorified."—*Isaiah* xxvi. 15.

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers."—*Rom.* xiii. 1.

On the third of August, 1492, was commenced the most important voyage of maritime discovery recorded in the annals of the world. The little fleet engaged in this enterprise, consisting of three inconsiderable vessels, left the port of Palos, in Andalusia, at the close of a long summer's day. A poetical, if not a logical mind, can see a propriety in this voyage being begun at the approach of evening, when the sun, as he sank slowly in the west, seemed to be beckoning the adventurous navigators towards the obscure and remote scenes of their proposed research.*

In the course of this ever-memorable voyage, the variation of the needle and the setting of familiar stars seemed at once to denote a change in the laws of nature, and an advance into a region from which all return might be impossible.

In these novel circumstances, consternation seized

* Hume says (vol. iii., *Harpers' ed.*), Columbus sailed Aug. 2. Taylor's *Manual of Mod. Hist.*, 1850, Aug. 3d. Tytler's *Gen. Hist.*, 1823, Aug. 3.

the minds of all the adventurers except one—the stern, enthusiastic captain, who retained the calm assurance of success. At length, on the 12th of October, 1492, Columbus landed on an island, called by him San Salvador, lying with others of greater magnitude along the central portion of the great western or American continent. After visiting several other islands, among which were Cuba and Hayti (*Tytler's Hist.*, p. 474), he set sail for Europe, Jan. 4, 1493.

The Spanish discoveries were limited practically, if not actually, to the regions lying south of the 30th parallel of latitude.

The American continent, as distinct from the islands on its coast, was not discovered by Columbus till his third voyage, in 1498. Fourteen months before, and consequently in 1497, Jno. Cabot, a Venetian by birth, and a resident of Bristol in England, sailing under a patent granted by Henry VII., first saw the American continent in a high northern latitude (56°) still lying beyond the range of modern civilization. (*Bancroft's Hist.*, vol. i. p. 9.)

With John Cabot (Giovanni Gaboto—*Tytler's Hist.*, p. 474) sailed his distinguished son, Sebastian, who in 1498, first touching at Labrador, continued his voyage to the south, passing along what is now known as the coast of the United States, as low as the State of Maryland. (*Bancroft's Hist.*, p. 11.)

Through these discoveries by the Cabots, father and son, England obtained, according to the views then and subsequently prevalent, a title to the northern part of the American continent.

The connexion of this country with England has been attended with momentous results and with unspeakable advantages. The development of consequences was the work of time, and of agencies which were not foreseen in the early period of discovery. Those results, so far as they have been exhibited, have afforded the most cheering proofs of a kind, fostering providence.

The peculiar destiny of North America was shaped in a signal degree by a private enterprise, begun and prosecuted by men seeking the enjoyment of religious liberty.

In the sixteenth century, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, under a rigorous system of ecclesiastical conformity, a serious division commenced in the Church of England. This division increased in the reigns of James I. and of Charles I. and II. Such were the circumstances in the period mentioned, that the conclusions of men on the subject of religion were *strongly* drawn and strongly maintained. They loved the more the doctrines which their reason approved, and against which their opponents, armed with governing power, sought to array a persecuting and oppressive force.

Accordingly, a number of Englishmen, loving religious freedom better than their English homes in which constraint was put on their consciences, first went to Holland, and thence to New England. In their second and more perilous emigration, true to their pious faith and convictions, they sought the divine blessing, as essential both to their temporal and spiritual welfare. Holding a fast, they said, "Let us seek of God a right

way for us and for our little ones, and for all our substance." (*Bancroft's Hist.*, vol. i. p. 306.) On leaving Delft Haven, one of the pilgrim emigrants has informed us, in brief and graphic phrase, of the mode in which the English residents at Leyden separated from their brethren about to brave the autumnal storms of the Atlantic, in search of a western home. "Lifting up our hands to each other," he says (Edward Winslow, see *Bancroft's Hist.*, p. 307), "and our hearts for each other, to the Lord our God, we departed." They first visited England, and then, September 6th, 1620, entered upon their purposed voyage amidst uncertainties and the just apprehensions of trials and dangers. They landed at Plymouth, Dec. 11th (old style), and formed the germ of that civil and social development to this day prevailing in New England, and which, as lovers of the human race, we may wish to see admired and imitated in many distant nations of the earth.

Large accessions were made to the New England colony as the oppressive measures against non-conformists, begun in the days of Elizabeth, were continued by James I., and augmented by Charles I. About the year 1630, when Archbishop Laud was at the height of his power, extreme and vigorous persecution caused many men who loved the very soil of England (*Bancroft's Hist.*, vol. i. p. 347), to expatriate themselves and seek a home among their brethren, who as pioneers had entered the western wilderness before them, and amid privations and sickness were rejoicing in civil and religious freedom. (*Neal's Hist. Puritans*, vol. i. pp. 367, 477, 534, 546.) (See Note A. Appendix.)

Among the emigrants were some men of education, talents, and learning, as well as piety, who were amply qualified to grace the pulpits of the Metropolis or fill the professorial chairs of the Universities.

The names of Higginson, of Elliot the apostle to the Indians, of John Colton, B.D., Fellow of Emanuel College, Cambridge, John Davenport, B.D., Vicar of Coleman Street, London, Thomas Hooker, Fellow of Emanuel College, Cambridge, and Lecturer of Chelmsford, Essex, Thomas Sheppard, M.A., John Norton, Peter Bulkley, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Richard Mather, are recorded with admiring eulogy by Neal (*Hist.*, vol. i. pp. 546, 571, 573, &c.), and appear in the early colonial history. (*Bancroft's Hist.*, vol. i. p. 363.)

While emigrants were thus flocking to New England, others were establishing themselves in the more southern latitudes. Some of the men who thus laid the foundation of this great Republic were adorned with high intellectual and social endowments, as well as imbued with the spirit of Christ. There were also among the colonists a good proportion of industrious practical men, who were willing to obtain a support by regular and continued exertion. They were agriculturists or merchants, and as such cultivating the soil and engaging in trade, were occupied with employments promotive of comfort and an advancing civilization.

They did not, like the Spaniards in South America, waste their time and energies in the rabid pursuit of gold. Being Englishmen, and sharing the English spirit, they were fitted to found a republic capable of

making for itself a name among the nations of the earth. Here a consideration presents itself of the first importance. The time of the emigration to America was after the overthrow of the *Papacy* in England, and the wide diffusion of Protestant sentiments. Those who first came to these shores came as English *Protestants*, loving religion, the Bible in the vernacular tongue, loving education and liberty. Like John Knox, they understood the importance of "planting the parish school close by the kirk."

As Protestants, they admired free inquiry; as Protestants, they were not afraid to have the Bible in the hands of the people for general perusal; and were prepared to examine principles and strike out new modes of civil government. Instead of feeling themselves bound down to established forms and precedents, and dependent on hoar antiquity, they were bold enough to consult reason and common sense, and judge of the rights of man and trust to the *ability of the people* to make and maintain a government. They could dispense with a *King's* counsel in the formation of a civil community, and with a *Pope's* or *Bishop's* in the adjustment of Church order.

Let it never be forgotten that the civil freedom of this country had its origin in the *Protestant* mind, and was fostered and established by the same Protestant influence which gave it birth.

In vain will you look over the world through a course of ages till the last generation, to find a papistical power giving to a civil community the form of a republic. The freedom of England is for ever associated with

Protestantism. Germany has more freedom than Austria, Italy, and Spain, because there Catholicism has in a measure ceased to have the ascendant. In France, the inveterate hatred of Catholic usurpations and superstitious inventions and abuses led to the premature and unnatural formation of a republic. A dire responsibility rests on the Catholic Church for *driving* the people of France at the close of the last century into *infidelity*, and *even Atheism*. (Appendix B.)

The career of this nation was due to its origin under Protestant influences. How marked the difference between the United States and South America! Even intelligent men scarcely know the names of the countries in the southern part of this continent, while the flag of the United States is known as a familiar ensign in every harbor of the globe.

In resuming the line of thought with which this discourse commenced, it may be stated that the country of North America, about the middle of the eighteenth century (in 1754), became of sufficient importance to form a matter of earnest contention between England and France. In the war thus ensuing, the English colonists acquired considerable skill in the use of arms, and fostered that military spirit which was destined to manifest its depth and power in a desperate struggle with the mother country. This struggle was precipitated by the cruel indiscretion of some English soldiers at Lexington. The war from this date (1775) may be said to have begun—a war the result of which was, in the course of events, to give rise to the great American Republic. The battles of Bunker Hill, of Trenton, of Princeton,

the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga, the battle of the Cowpens, the siege of Yorktown, and the surrender of Cornwallis, gave to this country independence and peace.

But the peace was soon to be broken. Within thirty years the British and Americans, who ought to have been brethren, met in hostile array on land and sea. The battles of Queenstown and Lundy's Lane on the northern frontier, and the defence of New Orleans, demonstrated that if military skill and courage be the test, the descendants of Europeans in America will bear comparison with their ancestors in their palmiest days. But it was on the ocean that the Americans won the most astounding victories. America dared to meet Britannia "on the mountain wave" and along the pathway of the deep, and the event showed that her confidence was not misplaced. Victory succeeded victory, fleet conquered fleet, and ship conquered ship, with such uniformity, that the suggestion of chance as an explanation of the occurrence, might be passed by in contemptuous silence. The contest lasting for three years, gave place to a settled and durable peace, which it is hoped will ever remain unbroken. May Great Britain and the United States move hand in hand as brethren in the regeneration of the world!

In taking a retrospective glance now at the portion of our history to which our attention has been directed, several points of interest rise into view.

First, our intelligent, virtuous ancestry was an inestimable blessing. A kind providence contemplating great events, brought originally to these shores a people,

wise, learned, pious, trained to look boldly at principles, and strike out new forms of civil government. They loved freedom, and they determined to enjoy it, and leave it as a legacy to their children. For this they were willing to toil and strive in battle—and die. A second point of interest in our review, is the escape of this country from the mighty despotism of Britain by a successful revolution. Such an issue must have seemed at first impossible. How could a few colonists cope with the indomitable might of the greatest empire of the globe? But the United States achieved their independence, and still keep it.

A third point of interest is the success of American arms on the ocean. The mistress of the seas was forced, by repeated disasters, to acknowledge the activity, energy, and prowess of our infant navy. In the origin of this nation, and in the course along which it has been conducted, we see in light as clear as that of the sun, the proofs of a guiding, favoring Providence. Events were shaped for our advantage by an invisible, mighty hand. It becomes us to acknowledge distinctly and devoutly the hand of God in our history. God has made us a great nation.

From the year 1775 to the present, as a nation, we have been moving forward in a steady progress towards an unknown height of grandeur. In 1783 we assumed, with the consent of the world, "the separate and equal station among the powers of the earth, to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled us." (*Declaration of Independence*.) In 1815 we stood boldly forth among the chief nations of the earth. It was then

evident that we were a people destined to possess greatness, and exert a wide-controlling influence. Since that period we have been expanding our wide territory, and attracting more and more of the attention of remote empires and kingdoms.

Within a few short years our national resources and just expectations have been presented in new manifestations, which have filled our own minds with astonishment, and drawn forth unusual admissions from foreign statesmen. It marked an era for this country when Sir Robert Peel, in speaking of it on the floor of the House of Commons, described it as "that great country, the United States." Intelligent statesmen must have known it before, but Sir Robert Peel, with graceful candor, publicly acknowledged it. We shall certainly be pardoned by foreigners in distant countries, if we feel our vanity excited, and suffer an expression of exultation to steal over our countenances as we gaze with patriotic pride on the sublime spectacle which the United States now presents, bounded as they now are on the east by the Atlantic, and on the west by the Pacific ocean. Our fellow-citizens are now occupying the western slope of this vast continent, as our fathers peopled the Atlantic seaboard. Already a new State exists on the Pacific. Several Territories are there marked out by legislative decree, soon to be transformed into States, and send their senators and representatives to the Federal Capital. This condition of things will peremptorily demand the means of speedy communication between the old States on the Atlantic and in the Mississippi Valley, and the new States lying far towards

the setting sun, within sound of the loud murmur produced by the broad waves of the Pacific ocean as they roll in upon the shore, and break, at intervals, with startling violence. At first the swift steamship will rush to the Isthmus, and from the western side of the Isthmus northward to the sister States of this Republic: but ere long the steam whistle will be heard on the prairies, and in the deep primeval forests of the national domain. A bond of iron will unite the East with the West. The soul kindles into strange fervency at the contemplation of the scenes which now open upon our view. The great highway of nations is to lie across the territory of the United States. Intelligence and commercial wealth destined for England and all parts of Europe, will forsake the old route by the Cape of Good Hope and through the Mediterranean, and be conveyed across this continent. The British Possessions in the East are to receive new value through the growth of this nation, and the changes involved in that growth.

On these prospects the eye of the statesman may rest with increasing interest; but there are other prospects which possess an equal fascination for the Christian and the enlightened philanthropist. A more frequent and closer intercourse is to be established between Christian and pagan countries. Of this we already have the indication in the colonization of the Chinese *in the State of California*. The subjects of the Middle Kingdom "have received on a public occasion portions of the Scriptures in the Chinese language at San Francisco."

It will be henceforth impossible to maintain the framework which has kept the Chinese separate from all other nations. Commerce and Christianity will work revolutions in the vast millions of Eastern Asia.

The Islands of the Pacific are to acquire greater importance in the general wide-spread changes now in progress among them. May civilization and Christianity diffuse among them their ennobling influences! In giving utterance to these sentiments and in venturing to cherish them, it is assumed that a pure Christianity will prevail over that which is false,—that truth, as *God revealed it*, will subdue error as men choose to hold it. Should truth and a pure Protestant Christianity not prevail, confusion and misery are the sure doom of the nations. Civil freedom will be first *restrained* and then *loaded with fetters*. An oppressive legitimacy will bear sway, and ecclesiastical and political despotism will form with each other a dread league of amity. It must now be confessed that our national firmament is not entirely free from clouds. There are dark masses along the horizon from which the *lightning* may break with fatal violence.

Why does Papal Rome at the present moment wear such a look of hope and exultation as we see gleaming upon her brow? Why have all signs of depression ceased, and been replaced by an expression of undisguised joyousness? Are there deep laid schemes, the result of which is anticipated by Rome as a glorious triumph? *And is the Papacy to predominate* as in the dark ages, and lord it over the consciences and souls of men? Woe, woe, to the world if it be so! Behold

the movement in England re-establishing the Romish hierarchy which Henry VIII. destroyed, and connect with this the bold statement by Bishop Hughes that Protestantism is on the wane, and consider the still *bolder declaration* of Dr. Ryder that the *Jesuits* are to be *revered* for their *purity* and *usefulness*. The goodness of Jesuitism provokes a smile! (Note C, Appendix.) According to Bishop Hughes Protestantism is only a transient outbreak, a mere unsightly excrescence without inherent life, or power of self-maintenance. But when he tells us of *the decline of Protestantism in France*, surely his recollection of history failed him. Did Protestantism die of itself in France? Did *consumption* seize upon it and cause it to *waste away*? Did Bishop Hughes ever hear of a certain massacre in Paris on the eve of St. Bartholomew's day? (August 24th, 1572.) Was not the slaughter of 30,000 Protestants in Paris and France an event which would go far to account for the decline of French Protestantism? Pope Gregory XIII. deemed it a most joyful event, as he celebrated it in the church of Minerva by a solemn mass, and afterwards made it the occasion of a jubilee throughout Christendom. If the muse of history never condescended to inform Bishop Hughes of St. Bartholomew's day, August 24th, 1572, and the treacherous and bloody work then perpetrated by Catholics on Protestants, she has not failed to whisper some information of this to every intelligent Protestant in the world. But the Protestant church in France suffered still more deeply and dreadfully in the reign of Louis XIV. when the Edict of Nantes was revoked (1685).

(Note D, Appendix.) As the grand step in a course of inhuman oppression and butchery might not, it may be asked without presumption, the loss of *half a million of French Protestant Christians* affect in some degree the cause of Protestantism in France? And yet Bishop Hughes appeals to the *history of Protestantism in France* to show that Protestantism has no inherent life, no soul. With the same rigorous means Catholicism or Protestantism might be hunted out of the United States and of any country in Europe.* Suppose the logic of sword and fagot were so unsparingly employed in England that half a million Romanists were slain and exiled, would not Catholicism feel the blow, and suffer a "decline?" Unless statistics are grievously at fault there would not be a *single Papist left in England*, from the Tweed to Land's End. If there be new vitality now in the old trunk of the Papacy, in any degree in proportion to the elation of feeling manifested by Bishop Hughes and others, this state of things is due in part to the general indifference among Protestants in regard to their distinguishing and noble principles, and in *far greater* part to the *high churchism* of which many boast who belong to the Episcopal denomination in England and the United States. The treachery of some Protestants—especially of some Protestant ministers—has inspired Rome with unbounded confidence of approaching triumphs. The proof is at hand ("Mornings among Jesuits at Rome") to show that the Jesuits at Rome profess to *know* of a wide defection in England

* Stern, inhuman persecution, to the extremity of absolute extermination, prevented the spread of the Reformation in Italy and Spain. (Note E, Appendix.)

among the established clergy. If this be true, if such defection does exist and in part only meets the public eye, then the final resort must be had to the *people*, to the *LAITY* as distinct from the clergy, thus showing the value of that fundamental Protestant principle, the *right and duty of the people to possess the Scriptures in their own language, and read them, and so judge of all doctrines founded on the Word of God.*

In thus referring to anti-Protestant principles and feeling as a cloud upon the political sky which overhangs our country, and a sign adverse to our national prosperity, the rule of judgment has been this,—that we can only prosper as a *free people*. To such prosperity an *ecclesiastical despotism* cannot cordially and of choice contribute. Romanism has ever on emergency (*Guizot on Civilization*) sided with political despotism.*

But there may be a show of love for freedom (by Roman Catholic bishops and others) in a country like this, where democracy is deemed sacred by the mass of the people. Through the forms of the extremest liberty the designs against liberty can be most effectually accomplished. When political Jesuitism speaks to our people, therefore, you will find an advocacy of freedom to the utmost extent. Have we not from time to time already heard the wily *priest* claiming to be the apostle of liberty?† And is it possible in the nature of things that

* "But when the question of political securities came into debate between power and liberty; when any step was taken to establish a system of permanent institutions which might effectually protect liberty from the invasions of power in general, the Church (Catholic) *always ranged itself on the side of despotism.*" —*Guizot*, 138.

† "In times gone by Jesuitism sought to rule the world by pushing itself nearer

such sentiments and views can be uttered with sincerity? Must they not be connected with a hidden design? The Romish hierarchy is a *despotism*. The member of the Jesuitical Society is sworn to obey the dictum of his captain-general, and can the lover of ecclesiastical and Jesuitical *despotism* love *civil liberty*? The *laws of the human mind* answer, No! If it be said that the number of Roman Catholics is comparatively small, and hence, supposing them to be unfriendly to political freedom, they can do no great harm in this country; the reply is, their number may become formidable in a contested election when an unprincipled political demagogue will engage to favor them on condition that their assistance be granted him in the accomplishment of his ambitious designs.

But there is no wish to magnify their power of evil and their hostile will. Let the people of this country *understand* their principles, and thence reason on what must inevitably be their influence when it can be fully exerted, and there is no danger which need appal us.

There is a danger far greater than any which has been mentioned. The danger above described is future, perhaps remote—this to which allusion is now made is *nigh*, and well fitted to awaken immediate dread. You can scarcely be at a loss to understand the bearing of

and nearer still to *thrones*; or by actually edging itself on to seats of power. But in *times to come*, as we may imagine, it will seek to compass the same design by shouldering the *mob* forward in every *popular* assault upon thrones. So long as monarchies rested solidly in their places upon the field of Europe, the Jesuit Society wished to stand upon the same *terra firma*, but now that this ground trembles beneath the foot, it will commend itself upon its own raft to the mighty deep—the ‘many waters—the people!’—*Taylor's Loyola*, 371.

the remark just made. But that there may be no misapprehension, let it be fairly and openly stated that *slavery* is now causing sectional divisions, and exciting deep and bitter feelings of hostility and enmity between the North and the South. In the length and breadth of the North there is not in all probability *an individual* who may be regarded as an *advocate of slavery*. It is *known* to be an evil, and as such in the abstract is condemned.

Perhaps on the *abstract* question the *South* would agree with the North. But slavery in the South is not an *abstract question*; it is something which exists; something *palpable*; something *difficult* to manage and remove.

The true view to be taken of the people of the South by us is that they are in a most *unfortunate* situation. Slavery has a foothold amongst them, and enters as a constituent element into their social and political fabric. The present generation of men did not originate slavery, it becomes us to remember—they found it fastened on them by their ancestors. At the time of its origin it was not deemed so great an evil as it is now known to be. *Religion* was pleaded for it—since the Africans were a heathen people, and if made slaves were to be introduced into a Christian country and be within reach of Christian influences. (Note F, Appendix.)

The opinion of slavery in New England in the early colonial times may be learned from two facts: first, Gov. Winthrop mentions Indian slaves among his bequests; and secondly, “the articles of the early New England

confederacy class persons among the spoils of war." (*Bancroft*, vol. i. p. 168.)

But slavery soon ceased, it may be said, perhaps, in the Northern States. Ah! the pure and deep *benevolence* of the *North* set the slaves free because they could not endure the sight of bondage. On this subject hear what is said by Bancroft, who may be safely trusted as an impartial historian on the subject of slavery (vol. iii. p. 407).

"The physical constitution of the negro decided his home in the New World: he loved the sun; even the climate of Virginia was too chill for him. His labor, therefore, *increased in value* as he proceeded *South*; and hence the relation of master and slave came to be effectually a Southern institution; to the Southern colonies mainly Providence intrusted the guardianship and the education of the colored race." (Note G, Appendix.)

So writes the historian of New England. Accordingly, *self interest* at the North *abolished* slavery—*self interest and not pure benevolence*. It becomes the people at the North then, in candor towards the facts of history, to remember that slavery ceased in this region because it was *unprofitable*. Had it been profitable, and hence had it become an *essential* part of our *political system*, it is likely it would have remained to this day. (*Bancroft*, vol. ii. p. 171.)

The same historian (vol. iii. p. 408) thus describes the improvement of the African in a state of slavery in this country: "The concurrent testimony of tradition represents the negroes at their arrival to have been gross and stupid, having memory and physical strength, but

undisciplined in the exercise of reason and imagination. Their organization seemed analogous to their barbarism. But at the *end* of a *generation* all observers affirmed the marked progress of the Negro American. In the midst of the horrors of slavery and the slave trade, the masters had at least performed the office of *advancing* and *civilizing* the negro."

Having thus seen the representation given by Mr. Bancroft concerning the connexion of slavery with Southern institutions, we may turn to behold for a moment the views expressed concerning slavery in 1787 by members of the Convention which formed the present Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Sherman of Connecticut (Wed. Aug. 22d, 1787, *Madison Papers*, vol. iii. p. 1390) said, "He disapproved of the slave trade; yet as the States were now possessed of the right to import slaves, as the public good did not require it to be taken from them, and as it was expedient to have as few *objections* as possible to the proposed scheme of government, he thought it best to leave the matter as we find it. He observed the abolition of slavery to be going on in the United States, and that the good sense of the several states would probably by degrees complete it." Mr. Sherman was followed by Col. Mason of Virginia, who used in debate this strong language—the more valuable now as showing the complexion of Southern feeling in 1787—"This infernal traffic," said Col. Mason, "(slave trade) originated in the avarice of British merchants. (*Bancroft*, vol. iii. pp. 232, 402, 412, 414.) The British Government constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop

to it. Maryland and Virginia," he said, "had already prohibited the importation of slaves expressly." He thus described the pernicious effects of slavery. "Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the emigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. They produce the most pernicious effects on manners. Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of heaven on a country : as nations cannot be rewarded or punished in the next world, they must be in this. By an inevitable chain of causes and effects Providence punishes national sins by national calamities. He lamented that some of our *Eastern brethren had, from a lust of gain, embarked in this nefarious traffic.* He held it essential in every point of view, that the General Government should have the power to prevent the increase of Slavery." Mr. Ellsworth of Connecticut said, "Let us not intermeddle. As population increases poor laborers will be so plenty as to render slavery useless." Mr. Pinckney and General Pinckney of South Carolina contended for the *right of importing slaves.* Mr. Gerry of Massachusetts thought, "we had nothing to do with the conduct of *States*, but ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it." Mr. Gouverneur Morris of Pa. wished the whole subject to be committed, including the clauses relating to taxes on exports and to a navigation act. "These things may form a bargain among the Northern and Southern States." "Mr. Sherman said it was better to let the Southern States import slaves than to part with them (the States), if they made

it a *sine quâ non*. He was opposed to a tax on slaves imported as making the matter worse, because it implied they were *property*." (*Mad. Papers*, vol. iii. p. 1396.)

From the sketch of the debate now given, we may learn the tone of feeling in 1787 on the subject of slavery at the North and at the South. The views of gentlemen at the North and at the South resemble those which now prevail in the same sections of our country ; but this difference is discernible—the absence of bitter feeling on the part of Northern men towards their brethren of the South who claimed the right of upholding slavery.

Several suggestions now arise on a review of the debate just presented. First: Moral considerations had some weight with the members of the Convention from the North—in their judgment of slavery ; but there were other considerations less worthy. Secondly: Several Southern States wished the continuance of the slave trade from its *utility* rather than from any view of it as right and good. Thirdly: Even Southern men contemplated it as an evil which was in time to be removed. Fourthly: The Constitution was adopted by men who saw slavery in all its bearings, its effects, and demerits, and hence was adopted on a principle of compromise. The North did not trample on the South, and the South did not prevail against the North. If slavery was important to some of the States, the feeling was that it might exist rather than prevent the comprehension of all the people of the States into one great nation. Fifthly: The Constitution was formed amid *difficulties*, and jarring and conflicting sectional interests.

A happy illustration of this may be found in the speech made by Franklin before the Convention in expressing his views in favor of the Constitution which had been deliberately adopted. (*Mad. Papers*, vol. iii. p. 1596.)

He said, "there were some parts of the Constitution of which he did not approve, but agreed to the Constitution with all its faults, if they were such, because he thought a General Government to be necessary." He added, "I doubt, too, whether *any other Convention we can obtain*, will be able to make a *better Constitution*. He continued, "Much of the strength and efficiency of any Government in procuring and securing happiness to the people depends on opinion,—on the general opinion of the goodness of the Government, as well as the wisdom and integrity of its governors. I hope, therefore, for our own sakes as a part of the people, and for the sake of posterity, we shall act heartily and unanimously in recommending this Constitution (if approved by Congress, and confirmed by the Conventions), wherever our influence may extend, and turn our future thought and endeavors to the means of having it well administered." So spake Benjamin Franklin, whose last public act was to sign a memorial to Congress as President of an Abolition Society.

That the members of the Convention of 1787 felt a solemn responsibility resting upon them, must be apparent to all acquainted with the history of our country. Slavery was acknowledged and felt to be an evil that ought to be removed, and which, according to their expectations, would be removed in the progress of time. Northern men, feeling the impotence of such a confede-

ration among the States as had existed, and the necessity of a *Constitutional Union* and a controlling General Government, did not deem themselves warranted to separate from the South on the question of Slavery, and, therefore, they gave their consent to the Constitution as it now stands. That Constitution may not be perfect, as was said by Franklin, but it was probably the best, which, all things considered, could be formed. Such as it was, its formation tasked the wisdom of the Fathers of the Republic then living. At one period Benjamin Franklin, under the pressure of extreme difficulties, exclaimed, that God governed in the affairs of men, and, therefore, moved that prayer should daily be offered in the Convention for his aid and direction, before proceeding to the business demanding its attention. (*Mad. Papers*, vol. iii. pp. 984, 5.) This motion was not sustained, but its being *made* is proof to us of the exigency in which one of the wisest of our country's sons judged the Convention to be placed. (Note H, Appendix.)

Comparing the present with the past, we find slavery as a cause of division between the North and the South vastly augmented. The prevailing fear among certain members of the Convention was that the Constitution contained elements tending to monarchy. In this fear Benjamin Franklin participated. (*Mad. Papers*, vol. ii. p. 790.) George Mason and Edmund Randolph of Virginia feared that the power of Congress was excessive, and would grow into a despotism.

But did George Washington feel no scruples in regard to the Constitution, or did *he* give to it his full

consent! George Washington, the President of the Convention, spoke *once only* with a view to direct the action of the body over which he presided, and on that one occasion expressed his wish that there might be a representative for every 30,000 of the population, instead of one to every 40,000, but said not a word on the *subject of slavery*. (*Mad. Papers*, vol. iii. p. 1599.) The amendment proposed was made by a unanimous vote.

The Constitution thus formed with *much labor and wisdom*, and by men of *distinguished ability, moral worth, and zeal for civil liberty*, has directed our national affairs for more than sixty years, and will any one say, the nation has not enjoyed prosperity and liberty under our General Government? Imperfection in some legislative acts and measures there may have been, and so there are spots in the sun. But the fears of Franklin and others about a *despotism* have thus far proved groundless. Our republican institutions will probably remain as they are unless divisions, factions, and civil war should exalt a successful soldier to a dangerous height, and give him the power of holding and wielding an iron sceptre.

The mention of divisions, factions, and civil war excites doubtless, in the minds of us all, the recollection of recent events during the late session of Congress, and the subsequent agitation in regard to slavery in certain portions of the church and in several of the States.

That Christian men, professing to fear God and revere his ordinances, should have pursued the course

adopted by them is cause of humiliation and profound regret. It is feared they cannot escape the charge of expressing a *sedition* spirit, and abetting sedition, which, once in action, may proceed to lengths which would stain the land with blood. May that God who, as Franklin, on a memorable occasion, said, "governs in the affairs of men," maintain peace and order throughout our borders!

The opponents of slavery profess a devoted zeal for the cause of humanity, and an ardent desire for the welfare of the colored race. They consider the slaves at the South as an oppressed and suffering people, and hence they are led to seek their emancipation, and through their emancipation, their true interest and welfare. As has already been stated in this discourse, there are *no advocates* of slavery at the North. We all desire men to be free.

But some require the *immediate liberation* of *all* the slaves in the country, and others think the liberation should be *gradual*, allowing preparation to be made by the slaves themselves for their self-support in a state of freedom. The latter class think that many of the slaves, destitute of forethought, and accustomed to only one kind of labor, would fail to obtain a livelihood when thrown on their own resources; and, therefore, ought not, out of regard to *their true welfare*, to be at once set free. These men would be satisfied if they could see measures for *prospective* freedom in the Southern States. Such measures Thos. Jefferson considered in the highest degree important, as we may judge from the fact, that in an enumeration of acts per-

formed by him, tending to benefit his fellow-citizens and posterity, he named the part he had taken against the perpetuity of slavery in Virginia. (Compare Note G, p. 143, vol. i., with page 40 Jefferson's Works.)

The political question to which slavery gives rise is one of *great difficulty*. If the subject were viewed *in thesi*, the South would agree with the North in stating the doctrine of freedom as it is found in our Declaration of Independence—"We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But slavery in this country is politically complicated and interwoven with a variety of interests. Such as it is, it is the *joint work* of the *North* and the *South*. In Jefferson's remarks on the proceedings of Congress in regard to the original draught of the Declaration of Independence (*Jeff. Works*, vol. i. pp. 15 and 19), he states that the clause relating to the slave trade "was stricken out in complaisance to S. Carolina and Georgia," but adds, "Our *Northern brethren* also, I believe, *felt a little tender on these censures*, for though their people had very few slaves themselves, yet they *had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others*." The clause above mentioned, and which was struck out of the declaration, was as follows:—"He (the king of Great Britain) has waged a 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 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 dye, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms against us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them by murdering the people on 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." Such just and noble sentiments as these were held by Jefferson, and many others of those who composed the Congress of 1776.

To the extract given above, it is proper to subjoin another. (*Jeff. Works*, vol. i. pp. 39, 40.) "The bill on the subject of slaves (Assembly of Va.) was a mere digest of the existing laws respecting them, without any intimation of a plan for a future and general emancipation. It was thought better that this should be *kept back*, and attempted only by way of *amendment*, whenever the bill should be brought on. The principles of the amendment, however, were agreed on, that is to say the freedom of *all born after a certain day*, and deportation at a proper age. But it was found that the public mind would not yet bear the proposition, nor will it bear it even at this day (1821); and yet the *day* is not *distant* when it *must bear and adopt it*, or *worse will follow*. Nothing is more certainly written in the

book of *fate*, than that *these people* are to be *free*; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, *cannot live* under the *same government*. Nature, habit, opinion, have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably, and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place be *pari passu* filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up. We should in vain look for an example in the Spanish deportation or deletion of the Moors. *This precedent would fall far short of our case.*" Language of this tenor is extremely rare now, if indeed it exists at all among Southern statesmen. Statesmen and private citizens there are who might use it and would, if they were to give utterance to their reflections and convictions, but they feel in the present emergency *compelled to silence*. As they are reduced to silence, so they are almost prevented from exerting any active influence to diminish and ultimately remove the evil of slavery.

The state of restraint here mentioned is the result of declarations and movements by zealous and extreme abolitionists who denounce the South, and pour forth curses on the slaveholder.

These men, in their mad proceedings (to say the least), violate all the rules and principles of rhetorical philosophy. With defamation for *argument*, with slander and abuse for *persuasion*, and ribaldry and scorn and curses for *pathos*, how can they ever hope to gain the ear and sway the judgment of the South? South-

ern men must be more *slavish* than their own slaves to yield meekly to the favorite appeals of abolitionists. It is not in human nature to do it. On the contrary, they will be exasperated, and repay scorn with scorn, and add to the restrictions which already bind the slaves, and make broad declarations about rendering slavery perpetual. Were Jefferson alive at this day to witness what is familiar to us, instead of writing as he did, and assuming an attitude in opposition to slavery, it is more than probable that he would take part with the South against the *rage*, and *abuse*, and *slander* of Northern abolitionists.

In the ranks of abolition are to be found unquestionably *some* benevolent, pure minded men, who love God, and love all that is humane and generous,—but there are *others*, *destitute of all reverence for God's revealed word*. If it suits their purpose, they will quote the Bible; and *if the Bible is against them*, they will scorn its authority. On the subject of slavery they will take a passage from Deuteronomy, and treat it as laying down the law for all nations and ages; but on the subject of *capital punishment* the same men will say that "they can judge for themselves without the aid of *any book* (allusion is made to the Bible) whatever." Some of them will not scruple to deny the *inspiration* of the Scriptures, and thus transform Christianity into a refined Deism.

But the Bible is quoted against the Fugitive Slave Bill passed at the last session of Congress, by students of the Scriptures, by ministers and Christians, by good, well meaning persons who seek the welfare of mankind.

The passage which has become celebrated for the frequent appeals to it, is found in *Deut.* xxiii. 15 and 16, and is in these words: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates which it liketh him best, thou shalt not oppress him." This passage is often quoted by extreme abolitionists, *as if* it were as simple as a drop of rain, and as decisive in their favor as a *sign from heaven*. Now to form a just estimate of this passage as respects its weight and worth in the present controversy carried on in our country, the proper course is to refer to interpretations of a *previous date*, and by persons under *no bias* to distort the truth. Such interpretations are easily obtained from a variety of sources. The five now to be mentioned are taken from Pool's synopsis (*Synopsis criticorum*, &c.):—1. "Thou shalt not deliver to his master a servant to be unjustly molested, until his anger abates, when the master seeks to kill or mutilate him;" "Thou shalt not deliver a slave to his master on his bare demand without evidence of the justness of his claim." 2. "A price shall publicly be given to the master for the servant." 3. "Perhaps in this manner God manifests his displeasure against slavery, as the laws of Moses favor liberty, *Ex.* xxi." 4. "It treats of a foreign (heathen master), and thus the land of Israel was an asylum, where slaves *embracing* the *true religion* might find security. This is said to be justified on the ground that the *Canaanites* were devoted to destruction, and all that they had was given to the Israelites. The

ancients say further (with great probability of truth, Pool thinks), that a Canaanitish slave escaping from his Jewish master, while living out of Judea, was not to be restored to him." 5. "The 15th verse can be rendered,—'Thou shalt not hide, or secure a slave from his master, but shalt keep him that he may be delivered up when a demand to that effect is made.'" "The 16th verse (He shall dwell with thee, &c.) seems to favor the fourth interpretation (a slave escaping from a heathen master, or a Jew living in a heathen country), but may be expounded to mean (1st interpretation), that a slave should be protected against the cruel wrath of his master."

Bishop Patrick, in his Commentary, makes these remarks—"The Hebrew doctors understand this of a servant of another nation who was become a Jew; whom his master, if he went to dwell out of Judea, might not carry along with him against his will; and if he fled from him when he had carried him, he might not be delivered to him, but suffered to dwell in the land of Israel. Which they understood also of a servant that fled from his master out of any of the countries of the Gentiles into the land of Israel, which was to be a safe refuge for him." (His authority is Selden, lib. vi. *De Jure Nat. et Gent.*, juxta discip. Hebr., cap. viii. p. 711.)

Scott, the commentator, thus speaks on this passage:—"We cannot suppose that this law required the Israelites to entertain slaves who had robbed their masters or left their masters without cause, but such only as were cruelly treated, and fled to them for protection,

especially from the neighboring nations. To such they were commanded to afford shelter and show great kindness, both in order to recommend their religion, and to give them an opportunity of learning it." (No authority quoted.)

Jahn, in his *Archæology* (sec. 171, p. 183), says—
 "A slave who had fled from another nation, and sought a refuge among the Hebrews, was to be received and treated with kindness, and not to be forcibly returned back again."

Let the question now be asked, whether these conflicting interpretations do not conclusively show that *this celebrated, oft-quoted passage*, Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, is appealed to with too much confidence by the opponents of the Fugitive Slave bill, as *applicable* to the circumstances in which *we find ourselves in this country*? From their manner of appealing to it, you might suppose the Mosaic polity sought to abolish slavery; but so far from doing it, it merely legislated in regard to it with a humane view to *diminish the evils of slavery*. *Native Israelites, Hebrews of the Hebrews*, might be slaves for six years, and even by consent, for life. They might become slaves *in payment of debt*, 2 Kings iv. 1. As regards men of Gentile origin in general, *they could be held in perpetual bondage*.

Does the Mosaic polity favor the abolitionists who pronounce slavery in all circumstances a sin in itself? How can those men approve of the laws of Moses? how can they avoid *censuring them*? But the Mosaic polity was *theocratic*, and hence the censure passed on that touches the *divine Legislator*. Will they accuse

God of indifference towards human rights and human freedom?

Those men who take the position, as many at the present day in our country boldly do, that a *civil constitution* which *allows* slavery to exist is *unfit to stand*, is so *contrary* to the divine laws as to deserve in any way to be frustrated and destroyed, have a *delicate* and *difficult* task to perform. They declare the Mosaic institutions *unworthy* of a place in the world. They affix to those institutions the *stigma* of *dishonor*. But as they feel bound to set themselves in array against a civil constitution that authorizes slavery, do they not virtually blame Jesus Christ and the apostles for want of lofty principle and sublime moral daring in not condemning slavery in the most *open* and *public* manner, and declaring its sanction by any man *proof* against his piety? It is not easy to see how the extreme abolitionists of this day can call Christ master, or be willing to follow the teachings of apostles and inspired men. Did Jesus Christ excite sedition against the Jewish or Roman government on account of the existence of slavery? Did Paul say, that Christian men, men of high and pure moral principle, owed to the Roman government no allegiance, and were authorized to treat its laws as a nullity, because that government allowed a most galling and oppressive slavery (*Bancroft*, vol. i. p. 161). Hear his language on the duty of Christians in the Roman Empire to that Empire—for he has spoken distinctly upon this very subject, Rom. xiii. 1:—"Let every soul (man) be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the

powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." It gives significance to this language to know who sat on the imperial throne at the time the epistle to the Romans was written. Who was then the Roman Emperor? *Nero, the cruel, bloody Nero*, the man who *first* enacted laws against the church of Christ. And yet Paul says, that the civil government of Rome, administered by such a man *as Nero*, was entitled to obedience.

But the teaching addressed by abolitionists to the slaves themselves is very different from that which formed part of Paul's inspired apostolic ministry. The abolitionists say that a slave should strive for his freedom, and is *authorized* in doing so to *slay his master* if necessary. Hear the teaching of Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2:—"Let as many *servants* as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine *be not blasphemed*. And they that have *believing masters*, let them not despise them because they are brethren; but rather do them service because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit. These things *teach and exhort*." Whithy (an English, not a prejudiced American, divine) thus paraphrases the passage quoted:—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke (*of bondage to the heathen*) count their own masters as worthy of all (*due*) honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed (*or evil spoken of, as tending to dissolve those civil obligations, but rather honored in all estates of men, as tending to make them better in their several relations*;

Titus ii. 10: and more subject even to hard and froward masters;" 1 Pet. ii. 18). Does not the Bible then favor slavery? No. The Old Testament diminished the evils connected with it, though it allowed it to stand just as it allowed polygamy to stand; and the New Testament, by its clear teaching on the law of kindness, and in regard to things which are just and equal, and its exhibition of man's immortality and supreme *accountability* to God, set in motion mighty influences promotive of universal freedom.

The difference between the doctrine of the abolitionists and the doctrine of the Bible is this—that while the abolitionists would destroy civil government in order to effect their object, the Bible upholds civil government, while it *publishes truth* and employs *persuasion*, tending conservatively and happily to produce emancipation and moral goodness. Let the Bible infuse its spirit into all men, and the world would rejoice in liberty and purity. This the inhabitants of the Southern States should know, and of this they are to be told. *This*, too, and *more*, they will hear, if they are properly approached and addressed, and hearing this, will regard it. Leave the South to its own view of right and duty—leave it to act generously, and soon, it is believed, they would begin to move as the God of the Bible, and as the civilized world urges them, in the adoption of measures for the emancipation of the African race, and their removal to their own sunny and fertile land. Africa must be regarded as the proper *home* of Africans. *There* must they be *free*: *there* must they be enlightened; *there* possess power, *there* be happy. In the

present state of our country, African colonization becomes unspeakably important, demanding (if the South consent) national attention and national legislation and effort. Oh! when shall we pay back our debt to Africa in sending to her her long lost sons, transformed into a civilized Christian race, that may be to her as life from the dead!

Agreeably to what has now been said, it appears that a civil government entitled to obedience may stand, while there is not embodied in it the entire moral system of the Bible. Did not the theocracy by Moses allow polygamy, and hence fail to establish the true doctrine of marriage? How much true Scriptural moral principle and truth were embodied in the imperial government of Rome when *Nero reigned*!

But God adjusted the theocracy, and gave his sanction through Paul, Rom. xiii. 1, to the government of Rome so far as to *prohibit sedition*.

If, now, we assume that the Constitution of the United States does not embody the moral code of the Bible, shall we destroy that *Constitution*? A momentous, yet, in the present crisis, a practical question. Is the Constitution less worthy of support and permanence than the *government* of Ancient Rome? Does it favor liberty less, and the church or religion less? These questions deserve consideration by those who profess to be guided by safe principle and by the *Bible*. Did not the civil code of Moses *provide* for slavery from one end of the promised land to the other—from Anti-Libanus to Idumea? Did not that code tolerate polygamy? And did not imperial Rome persecute the

church, enact laws against it, and strive to crush it? But with direct reference to that government Paul said, “Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth *the ordinance of God*.”—Rom. xiii. 2.

If it be said the doctrine here laid down makes passive obedience (in all circumstances) a duty, and condemns the Revolution of 1776, the answer is not—it does not, but it *does forbid sedition*. Against what do many extravagant, reckless men lift their *sacrilegious* hands when they seek to rend in pieces our national charter? Against the noblest Constitution the world has ever seen—a *Constitution* consulting to the greatest extent the rights and liberties of men—allowing the utmost freedom in preaching the Gospel, and granting all required protection to the Church of Christ. And shall such a Constitution be overthrown together with the government of which it is the basis? Shall *both perish*? This *Union* was formed with *extreme* difficulty,—so many and so great were the conflicting sentiments and interests of the thirteen original States.—(*Mad. Papers*, 1593, 1594, 1600, 1602.)

The *Union* was judged to be *desirable* and *necessary*, after experience had taught the insufficiency of the old Confederation.—(*Jeff. Works*, vol. i. 63; *Federalist*, 9, 14, 18, 21, &c.)

The prosperity of this country in the last seventy years has shown the importance of the Union and the wisdom of the Constitution. With profound sadness, therefore, do we hear of the Union being in danger. It *is* in danger,—no man can doubt it. And there are men who war against the Union, and think they do

God service. Does God delight in strife and bloodshed? Does God desire to see brother arrayed against brother in civil conflict? That the States of this Union can peaceably separate from each other is scarcely within the compass of possibility. No! Such separation being made, a long border stretching from the Atlantic, and losing itself in the west, would be the line of strife and bloody commotion. Courageous and exasperated men on the north and south of that line would soon meet on the battle-field. Imagination cowers and trembles to view the dire spectacle. Would *God* rejoice at it? Would *angels* hurry from remote spheres to find delight in the mutual butchery of brothers? No! Misguided men! God would behold such deadly strife with retributive anger, and angels would hasten from it, or weep as they linger to gaze on it. *Infernal spirits* might rejoice; the *demons* of monarchy and legitimacy might hold a jubilee; and all the leagued adversaries of freedom in Europe, from Russia to the point of Italy, would join in a shout and chorus of triumph. A blow would be struck at Republicanism which might prove fatal for ages to the liberties of mankind.—(See Note I. Appendix.)

Are *we* (of this day) only possessed of the wisdom to know the rights of men, or of the virtue to state and uphold them? Are political wisdom and virtue confined to the advocates of abolition and the men who raise the cry—"Perish the Constitution of the United States, it is unfit to exist?" Shall we then go to the graves of such men as Benjamin Franklin, Rufus King, and of George Washington, to call down

imprecations upon their mouldering remains, while we proclaim them traitors to the cause of freedom and enemies to human happiness? There is *error*,—there *must be* error, if not *guilt*,—on the part of some who now seek to convulse this country with agitation, endangering both peace and freedom. Once let the storm of civil war break over this land, and who can tell what portion of liberty would remain?

The country wants *rest*. The cause of *religion* wants it. Divided Churches in a state of repose might reunite, and join as formerly, in the same acts of worship. If agitation must continue on the principle of abolition, the South has no security against continual encroachment. Ye professed lovers of truth and godliness, if you *must* make war against the political Constitution of the United States, tell us what would be your course as missionaries in a heathen country? Would you *first* stir up sedition there against a government that favored *idolatry*? So did not the Apostles of Jesus Christ. They opposed idolatry with the utmost force of reason, and with an undying zeal for the glory of Jehovah, but they never cast about them "firebrands, arrows, and death" (*Prov.* xxvi. 18); never maligned the civil authority; never strove to clothe the imperial magistracy of Rome with curses and revilings. As the cruel grinding despotism of the Cæsars suffered them to *preach the Gospel*, they thankfully availed themselves of the privilege, and, in return for the favor they enjoyed, they taught explicitly—and who dare say insincerely?—the duty of submission to the government. Such was the example of the Apostles, and unquestion-

ably *their* example was by the design of our Lord Jesus Christ to guide *us* and others in all subsequent times.

That example is to guide us *now*, if we are to abide by the "higher law" of the Scriptures. The enactment of the Fugitive Slave Bill does not demonstrate the Government of this land to be worse than the iron despotism of Rome, and so much worse that we are forbidden to reverence or regard it by all that is noble in manhood and sacred in moral principle. If avowed and notorious infidels had represented the Bible as teaching the bloody sedition with which we are strangely made familiar as the doctrine of Christian ministers, we should have been sure that their design was to sap the foundations of religion, and to stir up against the Church the strong embittered feeling of partisan and political rancor. And when Christian ministers take ground, such as infidels only can consistently occupy, they are doing irreparable injury to the cause of Christ which they profess to love and promote.

That wonderful book, the *Bible*, contains instruction suited to the present emergency in our country, and so exactly fitted to the times that we feel as if the prophetic eye of inspiration has looked through the vista of ages to the present hour, and across the world to this remote land. Listen! We are told by *men* that the Fugitive Slave Bill is iniquitous, base; that it exposes the Government to scorn; that it is to be treated as a nullity, and even to be resisted by force of arms at the risk and sacrifice of life; and that death in such a struggle is a blessed and glorious martyrdom. This doctrine is the "higher law" possessing such extreme

sanctity as to nullify the acts of any government which ventures to violate it!

Let the question now be distinctly put, whether an inspired man, an *Apostle*, ever felt himself bound to restore a slave to his master? Did this ever occur? It *did*, and the fact is indisputable.

A slave whose name was Onesimus, fled from his master Philemon, living at Colosse, and coming to Rome, there met with the Apostle Paul, and was converted under his ministry. After his conversion he was for a season detained by Paul at Rome, for the sake of certain services of which he was capable, and which were deemed of great importance.

This man, this fugitive slave Onesimus, *the Apostle Paul sent back* to his master Philemon, with an apology for not having sent him sooner. (*Epist. to Phil.* v. 10, &c.) "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me, whom I have sent again; thou therefore receive him: whom I would have *retained* with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the Gospel; but without thy mind would I do nothing."

This fact is on record in the Bible; this fact is part of Apostolic Church-history; this fact is part of scriptural teaching; is *one mode* in which God has chosen to teach *us* our duty under the Constitution which forms the several sovereign States of this Republic into one great nation. The *fact*, as has been said, is *indisputable*. Its import cannot be annulled by saying Paul did not appreciate the advantages of freedom. (1 *Cor.*

vii. 21.) "Art thou called being a *servant* (slave) care not for it; but if thou *mayest be made free*, use it rather;" nor by saying that the fact stands alone in the Bible, having no analogous teaching connected with it. (*Eph.* vi. 5, 6.) "Servants (including slaves), be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart." (*Titus* ii. 9.) "Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things." Now the "higher law," of which we hear so much, assumes to be the law of the Bible, but you see it is not the Bible, and that it finds no support in the Bible; nay that the *Bible condemns* it. What then? These boastful teachers of a sublimated morality are "higher" than the Scriptures, and, in being so, are higher and purer than God himself. They object not only to a human enactment but to divine legislation. They are, therefore, holding up the Scriptures before the eyes of men, and denouncing them as defective, *behind the times, below* the morality of this day. They profess (we know) to love the Scriptures and to love Christ. "Judas, betrayest thou the son of man with a kiss?"

But, as has been said, the Bible favors liberty, and seeks to give men freedom, purity, happiness, and will do it, the most surely and the most effectually, according to the methods which God himself has described and established.

CONCLUSION. We have taken on this occasion a

hasty glance at the history of our country from its first settlement until now, and have seen abundant proofs of the divine care and goodness. Surely our hearts should, in view of God's great mercies, rejoice with thanksgiving. A little more than two centuries ago, the pioneers of the South were starving in Virginia (see *Bancroft's Hist.*, vol. i. 140), and the first settlers of the North were shivering, encased in ice on the seaboard of Massachusetts. After wars with the Indians, the French, the British, we took our place in the front rank of nations. Institutions of religion, learning, and benevolence adorn our country. The spires of churches in every city, town, and village, pointing towards heaven, give their solemn, silent admonition to us to prepare to meet God. Our national ensign is known and respected on every sea and in every harbor. Our commercial enterprise penetrates every avenue leading to the different nations of the globe. With commerce the Protestant religion goes forth on its embassy of peace and mercy. And is our prosperity to be disturbed, to cease? Shall the ship of state, after outriding two fearful tempests raised by the demon of war, now sink and perish amid the crested billows of an angry sea? Shall the temple of our liberty, the noblest structure ever reared by the hands of man, and which seemed to be destined to perpetuity, now be shaken, and fall on its foundations a heap of ruins? Shall the flag of the Union which has waved "in the battle and the breeze," which has waved over a happy people, be torn in pieces, and cast upon the winds? Forbid it, Almighty God! Let not the strife of words proceed to the strife of deeds!

Let not brothers meet in armed array to shed each other's blood!

True patriotism summons us to *preserve* the *Union*; *religion* aids *patriotism*. The States can never separate except in wrath, involving war. May they never separate! May the Temple of the Union stand till it slowly arrays itself in the hoary mantle of antiquity! May it stand century after century till the Archangel's trumpet sounds the knell of the world and of time!

A P P E N D I X.

Note A.—(Page 8.)

"As the ships were bearing Higginson and his followers out of sight of their native land, they remembered it, not as the scene of their sufferings from intolerance, but as the home of their fathers and the dwelling-place of their friends. They did not say, 'Farewell, Babylon! farewell, Rome!' but 'Farewell, dear England!'"—*Bancroft's Hist.*, Vol. i. p. 347.

Note B.—(Page 11.)

Whoever reads the objections of the infidels of France, before and during the French Revolution of 1793, to Christianity, will find that they are in reality objections to Roman Catholicism. The Bible, fairly interpreted, escapes many of their censures. Romish abuses, therefore, caused French infidelity.

Note C.—(Page 17.)

See "*Loyola and Jesuitism*," by Isaac Taylor, where Jesuitism is thus represented:

"But this same principle of unreasoning and unscrupulous subserviency to the will of a superior, how different a thing does it become when it is lifted into the place of sovereign importance in a society that has been constituted for the very purpose of laying an ambitious hand upon the things of the world and of fixing itself on every human interest with an unrelenting grasp."—P. 287.

"An utter forgetfulness of these first principles of morals—or an entire ignorance of them—an ignorance chargeable, in great measure, upon the system under which Loyola had been trained, vitiates the Jesuit Institute throughout. As to modes of living, that is to say, ascetic practices, the Society enjoins and imposes nothing; it would wish its members to live among other men as other men do; yet allowing any, with the consent of their superiors, to adopt more severe rules."—P. 306.

Accordingly, a Jesuit can conceal his Jesuitism, and in any capacity, or in any profession, plot and scheme for the interests of the Society to which he belongs.

"Therefore it hath seemed good to us in the Lord (Jesuitical Society), with the express exception of the vow of obedience to the Pope for the time being, and the other three fundamental vows of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience, to declare that none of these Constitutions, Declarations, or Rules"

of Life shall make *obligatory any sin*, whether mortal or venial; *unless the Superior may COMMAND it*, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of the vow of obedience."—P. 323, 324.

If the Jesuit may, at the command of the Superior, commit a great number of sins, it is not easy to believe that he may not commit any sin towards which he may be drawn by the interests of the Society.

"The Jesuit Institute, therefore, is at once an absolute monarchy, a mixed monarchy, and a democracy, and it is so—not by a balance of the several elements of power in simultaneous juxtaposition—but by an alternating and variable supremacy of each."—P. 328.

"On this principle, as well as in the interpretation which Loyola has put upon the doctrine of obedience, the *most candid inquirer* into the merits of Jesuitism is *compelled* to acknowledge that the system rests upon a principle and authorizes practices that do the *most frightful violence* to human nature, and that contravene, in an *outrageous manner*, the *first principles* of NATURAL and revealed religion. In these instances the inherent and irremediable viciousness of this Institute obtrudes itself upon our view."—P. 337.

"Every Jesuit is a spy upon every Jesuit: a network of perfidy embraces the entire community, and from its meshes not even those highest in authority stand for a moment clear."—P. 340.

"But that these doctrines and these practices (forming the 'debauched morality exposed and condemned by Pascal'), necessarily fatal to virtue and piety, had not only received authentication from Rome, but, though diverse, and in some respects novel, they had all sprung out of Romanism." "They were so far exaggerations of Romanism, that it would not have been possible to deal with them in a conclusive manner, without coming very near to the ground which the Reformers of Germany and Switzerland had made their own."—P. 388.

Francis Xavier is sometimes referred to as an illustration of Jesuitism, but without good reason. Such a reference tends directly to deceive the unlearned reader or hearer. Taylor says truly that Xavier scarcely came under the influence of Loyola (p. 106), "for the high-spirited and heroic Francis Xavier seems to have held an independent course, almost from the first period of his associating himself with Loyola. His was a mind, and his a moral power, which could not permanently adapt itself to a subordinate position."

Pascal, in his "Provincial Letters," thus represents a Jesuitical monk endeavoring to prove that a criminal act may be changed by a good intention.

"They have no more to do than turn off their intention from the desire of vengeance, which is criminal, and *direct it to a desire to defend their honor, which, according to us Jesuits, is quite warrantable*. And in this way our doctors discharge all their duty towards God and towards man. *By permitting the action they gratify the world*, and by purifying the intention, they give satisfaction to the gospel. This is a secret, sir, which was entirely unknown to the ancients; the world is indebted for the discovery entirely to our doctors."—P. 154.

"From all this it appears that a military man may demand satisfaction on

the spot, from the person who has injured him, not indeed with the *intention* of rendering *evil for evil*, but with *that of preserving his honor*."—P. 155.

Such is Jesuitism—such *its goodness*. Dr. Ryder must have no small courage—or, more properly, hardihood, to extol Jesuitism before an intelligent Protestant audience in the city of New York.

The Edinburgh Encyclopædia thus speaks of the Jesuits. "The monk was a retired devotee of heaven; the Jesuit is a chosen soldier of the Pope. That the members of the new order might have full leisure for this active service, they were exempted from the usual functions of other monks. They were not required to spend their time in the long ceremonial offices and numberless mummeries of the Roman worship. They attended no processions and practised no austerities. They neither chanted nor prayed. 'They cannot sing,' said their enemies, 'for birds of prey never do.'" As quoted in Encyclopædia of Relig. Knowledge.

The Jesuits are thus described in Macaulay's History, Vol. ii, pp. 50 51. "Throughout Catholic Europe the secrets of every government, and of almost every family of note, were in their keeping. They glided from one Protestant country to another, under *innumerable disguises*, as *gay cavaliers*, as *simple rustics*, as *PURITAN PREACHERS*."

Page 52:—"It was alleged, and *not* without foundation, that the ardent public spirit which made the Jesuit regardless of his ease, of his liberty, and of his life, made him also regardless of TRUTH and MERCY; that *no means* which could promote the interest of his religion seemed to him *unlawful*; and that by the interest of *his religion*, he too often meant the interest of his Society." "Instead of toiling to elevate human nature to the noble standard fixed by divine precept and example, he had lowered the standard till it was *beneath the average level of human nature*." "It was not strange that people of all ranks, and especially of the highest ranks, crowded to the confessionals in the Jesuit temples, *for from these confessionals none went discontented away*." Page 53:—"He had at his command an immense dispensary of anodynes for wounded consciences. In the books of casuistry which had been written by his brethren and printed with the approbation of his superiors, were to be found doctrines *consolatory to transgressors of every class*. There the bankrupt was taught how he might *WITHOUT SIN* secrete his goods from his creditors. The servant was taught how he might, *WITHOUT SIN*, run off with his master's plate." "In truth, if society continued to hold together, if life and property enjoyed any security, it was because common sense and common humanity restrained men from doing what the Society of Jesus assured them they might with a safe conscience do."

But Dr. Ryder, who, as a distinguished Jesuit, must know the character of his brethren, declares that they are "all, all honorable men." Does the sun shine? Does white differ from black? Dr. Ryder overtakes our credulity. Protestants must yield to Catholics in the ability to swallow camels.

Note D.—(Page 18.)

"Louis the Fourteenth had, from an early age, regarded the Calvinists

with an aversion at once religious and political. As a zealous Roman Catholic, he detested their theological dogmas. As a prince, fond of arbitrary power, he detested those *Republican* theories which were intermingled with the Genevese divinity."—*Macaulay's History*, vol. ii. p. 13. "The final blow was struck. The Edict of Nantes was revoked; and a crowd of decrees against the sectaries appeared in rapid succession (all this was done in despite of the most solemn promises and declarations). Boys and girls were torn from their parents and sent to be educated in convents. All Calvinistic ministers were commanded either to abjure their religion, or to quit the country within a fortnight. The other professors of the Reformed faith were forbidden to leave the kingdom; and in order to prevent them from making their escape, the outposts and frontiers were strictly guarded. It was thought that the flocks, thus separated from evil shepherds, would soon return to the true fold; but, in spite of all the vigilance of the military police, there was a vast emigration. It was calculated that, in a few months, fifty thousand families quitted France for ever. Nor were the refugees such as a country can well spare."—(*Ib.* p. 14.) "*Spain and Rome* loudly reprobated (p. 15) the cruelty of turning a savage and licentious soldiery loose on an unoffending people. One cry of grief and rage rose from the whole of Protestant Europe."

Even James the Second was compelled (p. 17) "to declare publicly, that he disapproved of the manner in which the Huguenots had been treated, granted to the exiles some relief from his privy purse, and by letters under his great seal invited his subjects to imitate his liberality." In such language does Mr. Macaulay describe the "*decline of Protestantism*" in France. In a report of the lecture delivered by Bishop Hughes, Nov. 10th, 1850, (published in the *Evening Post*, Nov. 11th), Mr. Macaulay is said to be "one of the clearest minds of which the great English nation can this day boast." Now see how Mr. Macaulay employs his *clear mind* in depicting Roman Catholicism (*Hist.* vol. i. p. 44). "From the time when the Barbarians overran the Western Empire, to the time of the revival of letters, the influence of the Church of Rome had been generally favorable to science, to civilization, to good government; but, during the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object." (N.B.—This is said by the "celebrated Macaulay," so warmly extolled by Bishop Hughes, for the *clearness of his mind*.) "Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, and wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made *in spite of her*, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her powers. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rules, been sunk in poverty, in *political servitude* and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. * * * The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have, doubtless, shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when

misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. *But this apparent exception* will be found to confirm the rule; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic, has the *Roman Catholic Church*, during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France."

Note E.—(Page 18.)

PERSECUTION IN SPAIN AND ITALY.—"The Reformation made a considerable progress in Spain and Italy, soon after the rupture between Luther and the Roman Pontiff. In all the provinces of Italy, but more especially in the territories of Venice, Tuscany, and Naples, the religion of Rome lost ground, and great numbers of persons, of all ranks and orders, expressed an aversion to the Papal yoke.

"In several places the Popes put a stop to the progress of the Reformation, by letting loose upon the pretended heretics their bloody *inquisitors*, who spread the marks of their usual barbarity through the greatest part of Italy. These formidable ministers of superstition put so many to death, and perpetrated on the friends of religious liberty such horrid acts of cruelty and oppression, that most of the reformists consulted their safety by a voluntary exile, while others returned to the religion of Rome, at least in external appearance." "But the inquisition which could not gain any footing in the kingdom of Naples reigned triumphant in Spain; and by racks, gibbets, stakes, and other such formidable instruments of *its method of persuading*, soon terrified the people back into Popery, and suppressed the vehement desire they had of changing a superstitious worship for a rational religion."—(*Mosheim*, vol. iv. pp. 128, 129, and 131.

Knowing as Bishop Hughes does all these and other similar facts, it certainly required no little assurance, not to say audacity, for him to speak publicly of the "*decline of Protestantism*."

Note F.—(Page 21.)

"The Slave-Trade united the races (Caucasian and Ethiopian) by an indissoluble bond; the first ship that brought Africans to America was a sure pledge that, in due time, ships from the New World would carry the equal blessings of Christianity to the burning plains of Nigritia, that descendants of Africans would toil for the benefits of European civilization. That America would benefit the African was always the excuse of the Slave-Trade."—*Bancroft*, vol. ii. p. 465. The Africans have unquestionably been benefited, but that does not warrant the perpetuity of slavery—though it led to its origin and increase; but rather intimates to us, that now the slave should be set free and sent "*home*" to Africa.

Mr. Bancroft's own theory in regard to slavery is thus expressed, vol. iii. pp. 403-4. "Our systems of morality will not explain the phenomenon; its cause is not to be sought in the *suppression of moral feelings*, but rather in the condition of a branch of the human family not yet conscious of power, nor yet fully possessed of its moral and rational life. In the state of humanity itself in Senegambia, in Upper and Lower Guinea, the problem of the Slave-Trade finds its solution. The quick materials of life, the faci-

lity of obtaining sustenance, the nature of the negro as influenced by a hot sun, a healthful and fertile clime, an *undeveloped intelligence*, and the fruitfulness of the race, explain why from century to century the slave ships could find a freight, and yet the population of the interior be constantly replenished." According to this theory, the existence of the Slave-Trade did not denote formerly a gross moral debasement—such as would now inevitably accompany it. The truth of this remark appears in the following historical facts. "Whitefield, who believed that God's providence would certainly make slavery terminate for the advantage of the Africans, pleaded before the Trustees in its favor (the laws of Georgia condemning the Slave-Trade, when slaves were first brought to Savannah, where Whitefield was) as essential to the prosperity of Georgia. The Moravians (in Georgia) still expressed regret, moved partly by a hatred of oppression and partly by antipathy to the race of colored men. At last, *they too* began to think that negro slaves might be employed in a *Christian spirit*; and it was agreed that if the negroes are treated in a Christian manner their change of country might prove to them a benefit. A message from Germany served to hush their scruples. 'If you take slaves in faith, and with the intent of conducting them to Christ, the action will not be a sin, but may prove a benediction.'—*Bancroft*, vol. iii., p. 448.

Note G.—(Page 22.)

"We have seen Elizabeth of England a partner in the commerce of which the Stuarts to the days of Queen Anne were distinguished patrons; the city of Amsterdam did not blush to own shares in a slave ship, to advance money for the outfits, and to participate in the returns. In proportion to population *New York* had imported as many Africans as Virginia. That *New York* is not a slave state like *Carolina* is due to climate, and not to the *superior humanity* of its founders. Stuyvesant was instructed to use every exertion to promote the sale of negroes. They were imported sometimes by way of the West Indies, often directly from Guinea, and were sold at public auction to the highest bidder."—*Bancroft*, vol. ii. p. 303.

"At that period (during the boyhood of General Israel Putnam, born January 17, 1718) there were slaves in all the Colonies. It is true they were not very numerous in New England. Still slavery existed, and African bondmen and bond-women and bond-children were found, 'tell it not in Gath,' in all the towns and scattered over the farming districts of Massachusetts. It fell to the lot of one of Putnam's neighbors to have one of these slaves in his family, who was noted and feared for his fierce, ungovernable temper, and a disposition that would have served a savage or a fiend. There seemed to be no way to subdue him *but with the lash*, and that, though often repeated, was far from being as effectual as could have been wished."—*Life of Putnam*, p. 223.

Note H.—(Page 27.)

The present Constitution of the United States was adopted by our forefathers, after they had found by experience the utter inadequacy of the Confederation to answer the purposes of a general government. They adopted

a Constitution under a deep conviction of its utility and even its absolute necessity. They dreaded disunion. They regarded the Union of the States as essential to the permanence of our Republican institutions, and the peace and prosperity of our country. A reference may here be properly made to some of the expressions used by statesmen of an earlier period in regard to the Confederation and the Union.

Thomas Jefferson says (*Works*, vol. i. p. 63), "Our first essay in America to establish a federative government had fallen on trial very short of its object." Alexander Hamilton (*Federalist*, p. 8) says, "It may be thought superfluous to offer arguments to prove the utility of the Union, a point no doubt deeply engraved on the hearts of the great body of the people in every State, and one which it may be imagined has no adversaries." John Jay says (*Federalist*, p. 9), "It has until lately been a received and uncontradicted opinion that the prosperity of the people of America depended on their continuing firmly united, and the wishes and prayers and efforts of our best and wisest citizens have been constantly directed to that object." Again, Mr. Jay (*Federalist*, p. 12) says, "It is worthy of remark that not only the first, but every succeeding Congress, as well as the late Convention (1787), have invariably joined with the people in thinking that the prosperity of America depended upon its *Union*." The Union was regarded as important in maintaining peace with foreign nations (*Fed.* pp. 13 and 14); and equally important in securing the regard of the nations generally (*Fed.* p. 18); in preventing conflicts between the States (*Fed.* p. 21); and insurrections among the people (*Fed.* p. 69.) Mr. Madison (*Mad. Papers*, p. 689) says, "Maryland consented to adopt the Confederation after much delay—under the persuasion that a final and formal establishment of the Federal Union and Government would make a favorable impression not only on other foreign nations, but on Great Britain herself."

Mr. Gorham (in Convention of 1787, *Mad. Papers*, p. 987) "conceived that a rupture of the Union would be an event unhappy for all." Mr. Madison (*Papers*, p. 992) considered the total separation of the States to the formation of partial Confederacies, "to be an event truly *deplorable*, and that those who might be accessory to either could never be forgiven by their country, nor by themselves." Alexander Hamilton (*Mad. Papers*, p. 994) said, one consequence of a dissolution of the Union would be that "alliances would be formed with different rival and hostile nations of Europe, who will ferment disturbances among ourselves and make us parties to all their quarrels." Gouverneur Morris (*Mad. Papers*, p. 1029) used this language in the Convention. "This country must be *united*. If persuasion does not unite it, the sword will. He begged this consideration might have its due weight. The scenes of horror attending civil commotion cannot be described, and the conclusion of them will be worse than the term of their continuance."

Note I.—(Page 42.)

The following advice was given to Fugitive Slaves through a religious paper of this city (*Independent*, Oct. 24th, 1850). "Be fully prepared for your own defence. If to you death seems better than slavery, then refuse not to die, whether on the wayside, at your own threshold, or even as a felon

upon the gallows. Defend your liberty and the liberty of your wife and children, as you would defend your liberty and theirs against the assassin. If you die thus, you die nobly, and your blood will be the redemption of your race. Should you destroy the life of your assailant you will pass into the custody of the criminal law, as administered in the Free States, under an indictment for murder; but the verdict of the community and the verdict of almost any jury will be "justifiable homicide in self-defence," and that fact being known, the South will cease to molest you and your fellows, &c., &c."

It is also suggested to them to go back to slavery to plot *in secret* against their masters.

If moral principle were not absolute—we should begin after this to feel kindly towards the Jesuits, and to unite with Dr. Ryder in calling them "good men"—for THEY did not presume to claim for their atrocious subtleties the sanction of the Bible, but according to the Monk in "Pascal's Letters," declared them to be *inventions* of their own, concerning which the ancients were wholly ignorant. It is true there is in the editorial of the Independent for Oct. 24th, 1850, something about peaceable measures and the unlawfulness of combined and organized resistance. But all such twaddle is child's play and nonsense, after advising a fugitive slave to *slay* his pursuer, or even the officer of the Law who would arrest him. Kill him is "the advice"—but kill him *peaceably*. One interpretation only can be put on the article in the Independent—it is murderous, seditious, bloody, fiendish. And such "advice" comes too from those who profess to have drunk deep of the Christian religion, and to be meek followers of the Prince of Peace! The nullification of law by individuals, or by a few men feeling themselves aggrieved by a legislative act—is *sedition*. If a few men of themselves may despise and trample on a given law, others may do the same in reference to a law which they may deem oppressive; and thus there is a suspension of law—(*anarchy*)—the most appalling condition of things, but *no such Revolution* as our fathers sought and effected at the close of the last century. "They remonstrated and petitioned for ten years" (Patrick Henry's speech), acting according to what is said by Mr. Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence—that "Prudence will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."—*Jefferson's Works*, vol. i. p. 16. But, as regards the offensive law of the last session of Congress, no attempt has been made to change it, nor has there been any opportunity for the attempt. Under such a government as ours, a government of opinion—*of the people*—seditious resistance to the law is the more criminal. Before resistance is ever made it should be profoundly considered, and the consequences most carefully weighed.—(*Paley's Moral Philosophy*, p. 310.)

If the horrible advice given to Fugitive Slaves is justifiable, then it may be extended to those *in bondage* in the Southern States—to *all of them*. Let us now suppose such advice given and adopted, and you have three millions armed for murder and devastation. If the fugitive may thrust a dagger into

the man who attempts to carry him back to bondage, surely the slave in the house of his master may do the same towards him who would retain him in bondage. Are we to wonder now that Southern men are indignant, and even vindictive? The doctrines urged against them do not leave them safe at their firesides or in their beds.

And should the Fugitive Bill be annulled to-morrow, that would not stop the agitation on which some men live. They would still feel bound to array the North against the South—for their resistance is to *slavery itself*.

But the inhuman extravagance of the Abolitionists is not the sentiment of the North, or the Northern people. Of this the South may feel perfectly assured. It is not requisite for any of us to live south of "Mason and Dixon's Line" in order to appreciate the cool and diabolical atrocity of striving to agitate a servile war, *that most horrible of all wars*. To such a result the "advice to Fugitive Slaves" directly tends. If the consequences stated are disavowed, as it is hoped they may be, by the authors of the "*advice*," then we acquit them of *bad intention*, but we cannot forbear to stamp their *principles* with the seal of reprobation. A suggestion now arises in view of the "*advice*" and the remarks which accompany it—that if the fugitives may contend unto the death against their masters and the officers of the law, then those white men who uphold them and urge them on, may in their cause use the stiletto and wield the sword. If a "halo of glory" encircles the contending fugitive, why may not a few rays from the halo flit about the head of his white abettor and coadjutor? Thus the servile army may be augmented by the array of white Abolitionists, eager for *glory* and the death of martyrdom or universal freedom. But perhaps, after all, this reasoning proceeds on a wrong assumption, since the position of the "Independent" (Dec. 12th, 1850) appears to be equivalent, if we may trust to implication or intimation, to that which Peter and John took when they were commanded by the Sanhedrim "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus," and made this reply, "whether it be right to hearken unto you more than to God, judge ye." Is it indeed true, then, that the author or authors of "Advice to Fugitives" only mean that when a human law directly contravenes a divine law, the latter is to be obeyed, and the consequences of disobedience to the civil statute endured even to the worst extremity which tyranny can devise? If this be so, they have taken a most infelicitous mode of expressing their principles, and *truth* and *religion* demand an immediate explanation from them. If they do not consider themselves as acting according to the example of Peter and John, why do they refer to *that example* as conclusive against the views of certain opponents? The train of thought here pursued leads to the inquiry—what is the great principle on which the Fugitive Slave Bill is to be resisted and opposed? What is *that principle*? Answer, 1. It is not that a divine law is a higher law than any adverse human statute. In regard to that, all in our country are agreed (unless Hobbes may chance to have some followers among us). 2. The principle is, that our Constitutional law is opposed to the higher law of the Bible, and hence as the Bible governs the conscience, the Fugitive Slave Bill must be withstood. Accordingly it is assumed that the Bible so opposes slavery that it annuls all law in the maintenance and regulation of it. If the Bible does not so oppose

slavery, then where is the source of the "higher law" of the Abolitionists? Is it their reason and their conscience separate from the Bible, and in disregard of its teachings? Then the Abolitionists *oppose the Bible*, or exceed it, as well as resist the Constitution and Laws of the country. If they say we abide by the Bible—"to the law and to the testimony," then we join cheerfully with them in the reference, and proceed to test the doctrine by the Scriptures. *They* speak to the slaves, and so did Paul; and we compare directly their respective teachings.

1. Doctrine of Abolitionists as conveyed in "Advice to Fugitive Slaves." "Be fully prepared for your own defence. Defend your liberty and the liberty of your wife and children, as you would defend your life and theirs against the assassin. If you die thus you die nobly, and your blood shall be the redemption of your race. Should you destroy the life of your assailant," &c., &c.

2. Doctrine of the Bible to be compared with the former.—Eph. vi. 5. "Servants (slaves) be *obedient* to them that *are* your masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, *as unto Christ*."—1 Tim. vi. 1. "Let as many servants as are *under the yoke*, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." See Col. iii. 22. Tit. ii. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 18. 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22. Epist. to Philemon.

If, now, "Arm yourselves against your masters, and kill your masters if they refuse you freedom," is the same as "Obey your masters, and count your masters worthy of all honor"—then the abolitionists have the support of the Bible, and not otherwise. Whether their teaching agrees with the teaching of the Bible, judge ye.

In the general argument on the subject of slavery, the grand reference is to the law of love, which is deemed decisive in requiring emancipation. That the law of love, together with considerations which respect man as a moral agent, supremely accountable to God, does contemplate emancipation at some fitting period, and as soon as may be, in consistence with the rights and interests of master and slave, is a truth imbedded in the scriptures, and of most happy influence—happy, because persuasive. But, allowing this, must we *enforce the law of love*? The "quality" of love, like that of "mercy," "is not strained, it droppeth like the dew from heaven." Now, the abolitionists would enforce the law of love, and others equally desiring all slaves to be free, would not. It was not enforced by our Saviour, nor by his apostles, nor by the early church; but the work of freedom went on under the influence of the church (*Waddington's Ch. Hist.* p. 204)—so that her noble achievements in this cause became works of historical commemoration. It is under the impression of some religious feeling says Guizot (*On Civilization* p. 132), "the hopes of the future, the equality of all Christian men, and so on, that the freedom of the slave is granted." Some time must be allowed for the influences mentioned by Guizot to produce their effect. Observe the following statement by Mr. Macaulay (*Hist. England*, vol. i. 20): "It is remarkable that the two greatest and most salutary social revolutions which have taken place in England—that revolution, which, in the thirteenth century, put an end to the tyranny

of nation over nation; and that revolution, which, a few generations later, put an end to the property of man in man, were *silently* and imperceptibly effected. They struck contemporary observers with no surprise, and have received from historians a very scanty measure of attention. They were brought about neither by legislative regulation nor by physical force. Moral causes noiselessly effaced, first, the distinction between Norman and Saxon, and then the distinction between master and slave." We want moral causes to work now as the Bible contemplated, for they are adequate to the work of emancipation. If the law of love is to be the great principle by which slavery is to be made to cease, it is the law of love as *understood* and *inculcated by the apostles*. The apostles understood the law of love, yet—observe distinctly—they *never* sought at once to dissolve all servile bonds, choosing rather to pursue a course which would first soften all the evils of slavery, and then terminate it. Had such a course been pursued in this country, the result would, at this day, have filled the hearts of us all with joy. Thus will the South, if ever, consent to the freedom of all whom they hold in bondage. The law of love exists in the south, as truly as it does here; there are as good Christians *there as here*; and religion and the church, if not hindered by rash interference from without, will there, as in the early ages in Europe, and afterwards in England, loosen the bonds of the enslaved, and lead them forth to freedom. Since history is what it is, and the Bible what it is, no wonder reflecting men are shocked at the mention of dissolving the union of these states, if slavery is not at once abolished. Extravagant men here exclaim, "Perish the Union," and men as extravagant at the South re-echo the same cry. Thus abolitionists and pro-slavery men both seek a separation of the states. Suppose a separation, and it may well be questioned whether the friends or enemies of slavery would find cause of joy. Such a result would exactly tally with the great design of England, in the war of our revolution (*Lee's Southern War*, p. 10. *Putnam's Life*, p. 142), and be in contradiction to the ardent hope of our fathers, who contended for our national freedom. If the South were a nation by itself, would the evils of slavery be less, and its end ensue the sooner? Who could expect either? If the South were separate, would the opinion of the civilized world against slavery be nothing to her? and would her slaves be more secure with a line of indefinite length, over which the slave might easily pass to freedom? The dissolution of the Union as a *remedy* for slavery, or as the equivalent of abolition, is absurd. The world is in *progress*—and the world of slaves as well as that of the free; and to prevent emancipation for any very long period, is about as feasible as to imprison the rays of the sun or enchain the tides of the ocean. But the work of emancipation will go on more rapidly, in the absence of all agitation by the extreme abolitionists, and, at the same time, the condition of the slaves, antecedent to freedom, be greatly ameliorated.