

214 5263 .361

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



FROM THE LIBRARY OF
REV. DAVID HARRIES

The Gift of
MRS. D. C. HARRIES

April 14, 1922

THE
SUPREMACY OF GOD'S WORD ASSERTED,

IN REFERENCE TO

CERTAIN ARTICLES WRITTEN BY "ALETHES,"

IN DEFENCE OF

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE BILL,

BY REV. NATHANIEL WEST,

PASTOR OF THE FIFTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, PITTSBURGH.

Published in Pamphlet Form by Request.

"Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN."
ECCLES. XII: 13.

~~~~~  
PITTSBURGH:

SHERYOCK & HACKE, PRINTERS, CORNER OF THIRD AND WOOD STREETS,  
1851.

✓  
U55263.361

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
THE GIFT OF  
ARNO C. HARRIS  
APRIL 12 1922

## CORRESPONDENCE.

PITTSBURGH, 17th Jan. 1851.

REV. NATHANIEL WEST:

The intelligent part of the colored people of this community, having read with much interest, your communications, published in the *Tribune* of this city, on the *Fugitive Slave Bill*, do earnestly solicit you to publish those communications in pamphlet form. In our opinion, if they were brought together in the form of a pamphlet, where the train of your strong, and in our judgment, invincible arguments, might at a glance be seen, would effect a still greater good than they have already done. We think by their appearance in the public journals, much light upon the vexed question of abolition has been diffused; and we believe that pamphlets, containing those masterly Scriptural arguments, would send their luminous rays to still farther bounds, and accomplish a more extended good.

A greater good, in the same way, has not been done for the cause of the oppressed, in our view, than you have done in those communications. And we cannot stand silent and see our friends spend their time, their talents and their learning, in our behalf, and not bid them God speed, and speak of their labors as they so richly deserve.

The great *Babel* of Slavery must come down, and every well directed argument, based upon eternal truth, will prove a mighty power hurled against its towering form; and it cannot stand against the everlasting attacks of truth. "For truth is mighty and will prevail."

We have the honor, &c. to be your fellow-laborers for the emancipation of our race,

|                     |                           |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| JNO. PECK,          | M. M. CLARK,              |
| THOMAS A. BROWN,    | HENRY M. COLLINS,         |
| FRANCES JANE BROWN, | ELIZABETH G. COLLINS,     |
| JOHN N. TEMPLETON,  | JNO. B. VASHON,           |
| R. E. TEMPLETON,    | SARAH J. PECK,            |
| THOS. NORRIS,       | M. FRANCES VASHON CALDER. |

TO REV. M. M. CLARK, Messrs. JOHN PECK, JOHN B. VASHON, THOS. BROWN, JOHN TEMPLETON, THOMAS NORRIS, HENRY M. COLLINS, and others.

*Respected Friends:*—Your earnest solicitation to put in “pamphlet form,” the articles which recently appeared in the “TRIBUNE” over my signature, is now before me. Your wishes shall be gratified. And now gentlemen, permit me to add a few words by way of advice, to all our colored people. And,

1. Be not disheartened because you are called our “coloured population.” God made you the colour that pleased him. If he had made you a deep *blue*, that would please the Presbyterians, for *true blue* is their colour! If HE had painted you a brilliant *GREEN*, the Roman Catholics would love you, for *green*, is their favorite! If HE had given you a bright *ORANGE* colour, shaded with glowing *PURPLE*, “the Protestant boys” would admire you, because *orange* and *purple* are their choice! If HE had washed you over with *SCARLET*, the POPE and his *CARDINALS* would claim you, for *scarlet* is their livery! Rev. 17: 4. If HE had given you complexions tinged with as many colours as are in the *rainbow*, the *Covenanters* would claim elective affinity with you, for the rainbow is the sign of the Covenant! Gen. 9: 13. And if HE had dyed you a *DRAB* colour, the Society called *QUAKERS*, would be *greater friends* to you still, for among colours with that excellent people, *drab* is in the ascendant! All ministers of the Gospel *ought* to love you at any rate, for they generally dress in *BLACK*! Be not then disheartened my friends at your colour. God made your complexions as he chose, and resolve them into his choice, and therewith be content. Besides you are in the majority as it respects colour for there is *only one* is *six* of the human race, *WHITE*!

2. Depend *not* on politicians for the destruction of Slavery. Depend on the Lord Jesus. Pray to Him who proclaimed liberty to the captive, to give liberty to your people. Read the book of Judges carefully, and you will find all emancipations there recorded to have begun with prayer to the Merciful and Righteous God. God is the friend of the oppressed, and the avenger of their wrongs. Psal. 72: 4. And he is the hearer of prayer. Psal. 65: 2. He will raise up instruments for deliverance in due time, and in answer to prayer: therefore be a praying people, and especially for your enslaved brethren, for many of your *white* brethren pray for them.

Lastly: Be a *reading* people. It is said, by some of the coloured people themselves that they are not able for want of means, to educate their children. This I do not believe. Attend my friends to the duties of domestic economy, and retrenchment in unnecessary expenditures, and you will have means enough to pay for education. Next to pure religion, get knowledge. This you cannot obtain without reading. “Better to work the nails off your fingers, than to keep your dear little ones ignorant.” This is a true sentiment from a good writer. Money may leave you, learning stays with you! Good clothes will wear out, good learning will not! What a sight it is to see a fine dressed person not able to read! It puts us in mind of the old complot—

“A man without learning and wearing good clothes,  
Is like a gold ring in a barrow-pig’s nose!”

Now my friends all of you that can, read the pamphlet your worthy brethren have solicited. And remember, that knowledge makes one man a *MASTER*, while ignorance makes another man a *SLAVE*! Every one of you, who can read, be sure to read the Bible through once a year, and there you will find the liberty of the glorious Gospel to be as *free* to you, as to the *whitest white-faces* in the world!

Yours, very sincerely,

NATH’L WEST.

PITTSBURGH, 20th Jan. 1851.

PITTSBURGH, Jan. 18th, 1851.

REV. N. WEST:

*Dear Sir;*—Having read your lucid arguments on that bill of abominations recently passed by Congress, and generally known as the Fugitive Slave Law, we think much good might yet be accomplished by publishing them in pamphlet form; and believe the cause of God and humanity would be advanced thereby.

Yours, very respectfully,

ABEL DOBSON,  
CHARLES AVERY,  
REESE C. FLEESON,  
WM. LARIMER, JR.

TO MAJOR GEN'L LARIMER, CHAS. AVERY, ABEL DOBSON, REESE C. FLEESON, Esqs.

*Gentlemen:*—Your polite and respectful note is received. The suggestion it makes shall be complied with. The "arguments," referred to, shall assume the form of a *Pamphlet*. A late writer makes a very important distinction between "God and liberty," and "God and *my* liberty." God and liberty to *me* and *mine*, is very good, but very *bad* for the slaves! *I* must be at liberty for *my* good, and they must be in *slavery* for *their* good! This is beautiful preaching to be sure! So long ago as 1490 years *before* Christ, God made "a Fugitive Slave Bill," which ordered bondmen to fly from their bondage to liberty, and imprisoned their pursuers in the RED SEA, who strove to nullify his act! But 1850 years *after* Christ, "a Fugitive Slave Bill," is enacted in the United States, the greatest Republic in the world, to compel men at liberty, to fly back into bondage! and \$1,000 fine, and six months' imprisonment, must be the doom of any one found aiding to prevent the operation of this bill! Dear souls! they must in the South, very much love men and money, and *punishment*, and think but little of the Bible, when they go to all these pains, to make men disobey that wonderful Book! They would have us believe, that the destruction of slavery, would be the destruction of the Union! Fine fellows they are! Whenever they desire me, I will shew them from the Book of God, that slavery *continued*, and persisted in, did destroy, and *utterly* destroy national and confederated union! Those who think the ruin of slavery would prove the ruin of the Union, must surely look through JOHN MAGOWAN'S TELESCOPE, "which makes ants into elephants, and mole-hills into mountains!" We need not hope for deliverance from *double-minded* men. They have no *principle*, but what bears heavy *interest*, and they always add their *interest* to their *principle*! These will write, and speechify, and pray, and preach, and work for liberty, with anti-slavery people, and work the very *reverse* with pro-slavery people, and travel half way to each party when mixed up with both! Fie upon them! The South *hates* them, and the North *hates* them! Like the world-worshipping professor of religion, whom God will not have because he wears the world *inside*, and the world will not have him because he does not wear its *livery outside*, so Satan gets him from both parties! Thus it is with those who *trim* a principle of vital importance to be *Jack-fellow-like* with everybody!

Gentlemen! Be not weary. Write on, preach on, pray on, and hold on! God is just, yea merciful. Among all your praying do not forget the *poor slave-holders*, for they are enslaved to slavery! and be fervent for "those in bonds as bound with them!" Remember the day is advancing when your labor will be found, not to have been in vain in the Lord.

Most truly yours,

NATHANIEL WEST.

PITTSBURGH, 20th Jan. 1850.

# THE SUPREMACY OF GOD'S WORD ASSERTED.

---

To JOSEPH SNOWDEN, Esq. *Editor and Proprietor of the Tribune.*

NUMBER I.

MR. EDITOR:

*Dear Sir:*—I promised you that whatever I might write in reference to the controversy in relation to the Fugitive Slave Bill, should be given to your paper. The ablest defender by far of the obnoxious bill, who has appeared, as far as I have read, is the HON. JUDGE BAIRD, of this city. This gentleman, over the signature of *Alethes*, has given us a long series of articles, so eliminated, elaborated, profound and *varied*, in learning and extensive reading, that the mass of readers cannot give the time, even if they had the capacity to address themselves to the *study* of these elegant Essays; and without extended study, close application, and competent literary attainments, it is impossible to understand them. *Alethes*, is a Greek word, which signifies TRUE, in opposition to what is *false*. All, therefore, written over this signature, the writer would have us believe to be true; all to the contrary must, in his view be false. I shall accord this to him at all events—that no other man in Pittsburgh, in my opinion, could have accomplished so much in so short a time, and in such a cause. He certainly deserves well at the hands of the *South*, should he, or should he not, ever take up his residence there. Faithfully and learnedly has he defended them and sustained their interests, and *his* debtor, the slaveholding States are, to a very large amount. I am not of those who judge this HON. JUDGE, to be no christian. On the contrary, I think he is a christian, and one possessed of a generous mind, a warm heart, and kind sympathies. Part of his writings betray irritability and abuse towards his opponents, and an apparent desire to beat them down *before* they can be heard in defence. But this is lawyer-like, and therefore easily excused. Neither ought those who behold these defects retort upon their author in a similar manner in their replies. It is much more edifying to the reader to follow an author who is sometimes impulsive, irritable, and abusive, than one who is dull,

phlegmatic, and insipid. Between the *hurried* showers of words, from *the one*, there are occasional bright beamings from his intellectual sun, and his glory sometimes glitters even in the cloud, causing the descending drops that *wet* us, to appear more transparent and brilliant, while around the *other*, nothing but a chilling dense fog is felt and seen! I shall therefore *excuse*, in regard to their spirit, what others *condemn*, in these articles of *Alethes*, and endeavor to observe toward him all due deference, honor and politeness.

In what I have to say on the subject of the *Fugitive Bill*, it will be proper to write in a language which all my readers can understand, and which will not require much *criticism* to render it intelligible. I will try and observe this rule, and not puzzle my readers with either Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin, or French, or Choctaw, or Chinese. I will begin *first* with the voice of God in relation to compulsory slavery. Here is the mandate of the JUDGE SUPREME, to his own ministers, in reference to human involuntary bondage:—

“Cry ALOUD, SPARE NOT, lift up thy voice like a TRUMPET, and shew my people their transgressions and the house of Jacob their sins.”

“Yet they seek me daily, and delight to know my ways, as a nation that did righteousness, and forsook not the ordinances of their God; they asked of me the ordinances of JUSTICE; they take delight in approaching to God.”

“Wherefore have we fasted *say they*, and thou seest not? *Wherefore* have we afflicted, our soul, and thou takest no knowledge? Behold in the day of your fast, ye find pleasure, and EXACT all your labors.”

“Behold ye fast for strife and debate, and to SMITE WITH THE FIST OF WICKEDNESS; ye shall not fast as ye do this day, to make your voice to be heard on high.”

“Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to afflict his soul? *is it* to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes *under him*? wilt thou call this a fast and an acceptable day to the Lord?”

“*Is* not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and LET THE OPPRESSED GO FREE, and that ye BREAK EVERY YOKE.”

“Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out of thy house? when thou seest the naked that thou COVER HIM; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh.”

"THEN shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily; and thy righteousness shall go before thee; and the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward."

"THEN shalt thou call and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry and he shall say, here I am. If thou take away from the midst of thee THE YOKE, the putting forth of the finger, and speaking of vanity."

"And if thou DRAW OUT THY SOUL TO THE HUNGRY, and satisfy the afflicted soul, THEN shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noonday."

"And the Lord shall guide thee continually, and satisfy thy soul in drought, and make fat thy bones, and thou shalt be as a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not."

"And they that shall be of thee, shall build the old waste places; thou shall raise up the foundations of many generations; thou shalt be called, THE REPAIRER OF THE BREACH, THE RESTORER OF PATHS TO DWELL IN." Isa. 58: 1—12.

1. In this solemn passage, any reader of ordinary capacity, can perceive that God charges his *own people* with the sin and guilt of oppression.

2. That for their sins of oppression and cruelty, he rejected their religious services, and would take no notice of them at all.

3. That it is the DIVINE WILL that human bondage, as to the inoffensive should be forever destroyed. The yoke, "EVERY YOKE," should be, not only taken off, but BROKEN, and the wearers of the yoke allowed to go free. To *break* the yoke is to prevent its future use. That ye let "the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke." Matthew Henry in his commentary, says, "break the YOKE OF SLAVERY ITSELF, that it may not serve again another time, nor any be made again to serve under it."

4. That should the will of God thus revealed, be complied with by the nation of Israel, the choicest national blessings should follow. Verse 12. This fact seems to show, that on the destruction of slavery, the salvation of the nation depended! Quite a contrary view this, to that taken by some of the enlightened defenders of the institution in this country. Their motto is, that absolute involuntary slavery, as a *condition* for unoffending man, "is the corner stone of liberty."

5. That God's ministers are commanded to "*cry aloud and spare not,*" against the sins of slavery and oppression of every kind.



They are to reprove these sins whoever may be offended at them for so doing. They are to *cut deep* in their preaching against this fearful injustice, and as HENRY says, “lay it bare to the bone,” however painful to the sufferers.

6. That the righteous are to give the oppressed, enslaved, hungry, and naked *outcasts*, shelter in their houses, and food, and raiment, notwithstanding what oppressive constitutions and oppressive laws made by men may say to the contrary; and the reason of this is founded in the prior, and *higher law* of nature, which is none other than God’s Law, and it is “that thou hide not thyself from THINE OWN FLESH!”

And *lastly*, that God’s will revealed thus, by his holy and inspired prophet, applied not *exclusively* to the nation of Israel as it respects slavery and oppression, but applies to every nation, and to every age throughout the world, and during time. The contrary of this would be impossible to prove, because God is *invariable* in his hatred to all sin. It may be said, that it was the Jews oppressing and enslaving their own brethren, that called forth the divine reprobation —“Jews oppressing Jews.” Be it so. If God would not allow Jews to reduce Jews to absolute involuntary slavery, and cruel oppression under the law, surely he will not sanction professed CHRISTIANS in enslaving and oppressing CHRISTIANS under the gospel. The gospel is a revelation which, as it respects us *personally*, teaches that we are to “deny all ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and live soberly;” as it regards our conduct to *others*,—that we are to “live righteously;”—and as it refers to our duty to God, that we are to live “godly,” and all this, while we live “in this present world.” Titus, 2: 12. To be good *ourselves*, to do good to *others*, and to *glorify God* in all we are, have, and do, is certainly the teaching of the gospel. How the institution of Southren slavery can be thought to comport with these divine lessons of the gospel, I leave my readers to determine, in their own calm reflections.

## NUMBER II.

"Shall the throne of INIQUITY have fellowship with THEE, which frameth MISCHIEF BY A LAW?" Psalm 94: 20.

MR. EDITOR:

*Dear Sir.*—In my last, I closed with leaving the reader to judge in his own "calm reflections," whether the institution of Southren slavery can be thought to comport with the lessons taught in the Gospel. In this number I will endeavor to give an account of *that institution*, as established by law, and still leave my readers to judge whether a *fugitive* from such a condition, ought to be returned to it *again*, by those who profess to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; the *tendency* of whose doctrines every line of them, is to make men, "free indeed." John 8: 36. It is readily granted that this allusion of our Lord to liberty, was understood by the Jews to whom he was speaking to refer to literal freedom, but primarily it did not. It referred to spiritual enlargement—the liberty of the person of the Jew from the bondage of the Levitical ritual, and of his soul from the service of sin and Satan; ver. 32, 34. But the remark and question of the Jews to Christ, on that occasion, are worthy of special notice—"They answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and WERE NEVER IN BONDAGE TO ANY MAN; how sayest thou then, ye shall be made free?" verse 33. Here is one of the *conclusive* inwrought testimonies of the Gospel which proves that none of the Israelites were ever by the Divine sanction, involved in involuntary slavery, by their own nation. This remark will apply hereafter in another place. I shall now give my readers, REFERENCES TO SOUTHREN SLAVE STATUTES, "*Which frameth mischief by a law.*"

1. A slave is in law A THING, A CHATTEL. "Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed, and judged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners, possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to *all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever.*"—*South Carolina*, Brev. Digest, p. 229; Prince's Dig. p. 446.

"A slave is one, who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master." *Louisiana, civil code*, Article 35. "A slave is entirely subject to the will of his master." *Ibid.* Article 173.

Judge Stroud in his slave laws, says—"The cardinal principle of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among *sentient beings*, (i. e. beings possessed of perceptive faculties), but among *things*, is an *article* of property, a *chattel personal*, obtains as undoubted law in *all of these*, the slave States. pp. 22, 23.

2. A slave has *no rights*. Judge Stroud says—"A slave cannot be a party to a civil suit." Page 76.

"The slave can possess nothing, he can hold nothing. He is therefore *not* a competent party to a suit. The same rule prevails wherever slavery is tolerated, whether there be legislative enactments upon the subject or not." WHEELER'S LAW OF SLAVERY, p. 197. "A slave cannot stand in judgment for any other purpose than to assert his freedom. He cannot contest the title of the person claiming him as a slave." IBID, p. 199. "Whilst in a state of slavery, it (*i. e.*, marriage) cannot produce any civil effect, because slaves are deprived of *all civil rights*." IBID, p. 197. "A slave is in *absolute* bondage." IBID, p. 6.

3. A slave cannot be a WITNESS against a WHITE person. He can be a witness against all negroes or mulattoes, bond or free, "*and in no other case whatever*." 1 R. V. C. p. 422. This is the law in every slave State in the Union.

4. Slaves cannot DEFEND THEMSELVES. "If any slave shall presume to strike any white person, he shall, &c. And for the *second* offence *suffer death*." GEORGIA, Prince's Dig. 450. In SOUTH CAROLINA the law is the same, only death is awarded to the *third* offence. Brev. Dig., p. 235. Stroud, p. 97.

"A slave has never maintained an action against the violator of his bed. A slave is not admonished for incontinence, or punished for fornication or adultery; never prosecuted for bigamy, or petty treason," &c. MARYLAND REPORTS, 561-563.

5. Slaves can make NO CONTRACTS. "One general principle predominates in all the slave States, and that is, that a slave can make no contract, not even a contract of matrimony." WHEELER'S LAW OF SLAVERY, p. 180. "The slave cannot hire himself out in any of the States." IBID, p. 152.

6. Slaves may be killed by MODERATE CORRECTION. "Any person guilty of wilfully or maliciously killing a slave, shall suffer the same punishment, as if he had killed a freeman. *Provided always*, that this act shall not extend to any slave in the act of resistance to his lawful owner or master, or to any slave *dying under moderate correction*." North Carolina—HAYWOOD'S MANUAL, 531. The

same laws prevail in *Tennessee* and *Georgia*, with the like *proviso*, Laws of Tennessee, Oct. 22, 1799. Stroud's Sketch of Slave Laws, p. 27. Prince's Digest, p. 559.

7. Slaves can have NO SOCIETY. This is the case in Virginia, Mississippi, Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Tennessee, as shown in the laws of these States. "Any slave traveling in the night, without a pass, shall receive *forty lashes*; or if found in another person's negro quarters or kitchen, *forty lashes*; and every negro in whose company such vagrant shall be found, incurs also *twenty lashes*." Stroud's Sketch of Slave Laws, p. 103.

8. Every negro is presumed in law to be A SLAVE. "It is a settled rule in our courts, on questions of evidence, that the *black* color is proof of slavery; which must be overcome before the witness can be received." 3 HALST. Rep. 275. WHEELER'S LAW OF SLAVERY, p. 392.

I will pass by all the slave laws respecting torture, feeding, clothing, working, mental instruction, religious worship, the punishment of capital crimes *without* a jury, and the enactments in reference to the perpetuity of slavery or hereditary bondage, as enough has been cited to convince the reader of the *character* of *that condition*, to which the Fugitive Slave Bill requires christians and republican citizens to send back the trembling victim. I will, however, add here, the opinion of Judge Holroyd, given in the case of the slave Forbes. The Judge says:

"According to the principles of English law, such a right, to hold slaves, cannot be considered as warranted by the general law of nature. I do not mean to say that particular circumstances may not introduce a *legal relation*, to that extent; but assuming that there may be such a relation, it can have only a *local existence where it is tolerated by the particular law of the place*. When a party gets out of the territory where it prevails, the right of the master, which is founded on the *municipal law of the particular place only, does not exist*." BARNWELL AND CRESWELL'S REPORT. Again he says:—"Whatever service the slave owed by the *local law*, is got rid of the moment he got out of the *local limits*." IBID.

Nothing but *positive law* can sustain involuntary slavery. In the case of the slave Sommersett, the leading English case, it was decided "that slavery is of such a nature, that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, MORAL or POLITICAL, but only by

*positive law.* It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law." HOWEL'S STATE TRIALS, 82.

The truth of these principles caused the *fugitive bills* of 1793 and 1850 to be passed, which laws virtually make the free soil of every free State to be slave territory. The whole country must now sustain slavery; for the slave States cannot of themselves maintain the system, should the free States refuse to co-operate with them. And this they most assuredly know and feel, else why all the noise, and threatening of "the powers that be," to support the *fugitive bill*? No authority from the Constitution, the "supremacy of law," President, Judges, Statesmen, Orators, Newspapers, &c., is left untried; but all available influences are summoned to the struggle, to intimidate the people of the free States, under the threats of prisons, fines, disunion, revolution, civil war, and the epithets fanatics, bad citizens, and the like, and all to sustain an institution, which no considerations, "moral or political," can justify. But all will not do, so long as the people have BIBLES, and can read them, PERCEPTION to apprehend the truth, CONSCIENCE to feel the force of that truth, and HEARTS to realize their accountability to that God to whom they must shortly render up their final account, and from whom they shall receive the ultimate solution of the question, "Whether it is better to hearken unto God, more than unto men?"

---

NUMBER III.

"Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed"—ISA. 10: 1.

"Woe unto them that devise iniquity—because it is in the power of their hand."—MICAH, 2: 1.

MR. EDITOR:

We have seen that Southern slavery reduces a man to the condition of a thing, a *chattel* personal, and denudes him of *sentient* existence. That it deprives him of his will, his choice, his earnings, his wife, his children, the power to make contracts, even in matrimony, putting him, in his body, soul, food, raiment and industry, wholly and absolutely in the power of his owner, to do with him just as he pleases. And, indeed, the person called *owner* could not be entitled to that name, if it was otherwise with the slave. From this legalized condition arises all the *abuses* of the system of involuntary slavery. There is an *admission* on the part of those who defend the favored institution, that "there are grievous abuses, and

much unnecessary suffering;" but that slavery is nevertheless right enough in itself, "*as a relation, as a condition,*" &c. Let us come to the *essence* of the thing.

Slavery is service compelled without the contract, or consent of the servant, and without any stipulated reward for his labor, *because* his *person* is a subject of barter and sale, at the will of another exclusively. Therefore it follows:

1. That *involuntary* servitude, of itself, is not slavery. Apprentices, minors, paupers, and children at home, are often held to involuntary labor, but they are not slaves. There is no analogy between the relation of parent and child and the relation of master and slave; but there is strict analogy between the relation of master and slave and the relation of a man and his horse.

2. The *deprivation* of political rights and privileges is not slavery. Aliens, women, and children are deprived of political rights, but this does not make them slaves in any sense.

3. *Subjection* to the *control* of others is not slavery. We are all, in one degree or another, subject to such control.

4. Nor is *subjection* to *despotic* power, slavery. The children at school, the hired laborer, the subjects of reigning absolute sovereigns, are more or less in subjection to despotic power, but that does not make them slaves. The subjects of the despotic tyrants Nero and Diocletian, were not slaves.

The loss of *personal liberty* is not slavery. The inmates of our prisons, penitentiaries, alms-houses and houses of refuge, are deprived of their personal liberty, but they are not slaves. In the condition of all these, there is not one *essential* element of American Southern slavery.

6. Nor do *hunger, nakedness, hard work* nor corporeal punishments, constitute slavery; for many millions of mankind are thus exposed, and have thus to suffer, but they are not slaves. And I write these things partly for the *correction* of the wrong opinions of many anti-slavery men, who imagine personal sufferings and loss of liberty to constitute the sum of slavery. Slaveholders will not listen to such nonsense; neither will sensible men at the North. What, then, is the real essence of slavery? It is this: The legal changing of a man into a thing. A man is essentially enslaved, when he is, by law, "deemed, taken, held, and adjudged, to all intents, constructions, and purposes, whatsoever, to be a chattel, (i. e. a piece of property,) *personal*, in the hands of his master?" When the law puts him in the condition, that he is nothing himself, has nothing,

can have nothing, and never can be otherwise, but as his *owner* chooses, then he is a slave! This is Southern slavery. This is the reduction of human nature from its dignity and its *place* in the order of creation, to an equality in dignity and place, with irrational animals, and inanimate things.

It is depriving a man of his personal right, not merely his relative or conventional rights. It takes a man from himself. He no longer owns his *own* body, his *own* wife, his *own* children, the use of his own parts and faculties of soul and body, although the contrary of all this is accounted to "every man, everywhere," by "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God!" How else could "every one," be held responsible, to "give an account of himself to God?" It is to this horrible principle, of *legally* subjecting one portion of our race to the absolute disposal and caprice of another portion of our race, and that subjection the same as the subjection to their owners, of horses, cows, plows, and harrows, or anything else; that all the horrors and miseries of the system of compulsory bondage in the slave States owe their origin! If the essence of a thing is its real substance, and produces in external developements its own nature and character, then I see an impossibility of legalized involuntary slavery existing in this world of sin and sinners, separate from the commission of the most shameless abuses. The *original* sin of slavery is in giving man absolute unrestricted power over man! Its habitual sins, are its natural fruits of cruelty, oppression and suffering.

Now, shall this throne of iniquity have fellowship with God? Shall the "unrighteous decree," which binds millions of responsible immortal beings in interminable absolute slavery, stand? or shall this "covenant with death be disannulled?" Will the free christian people of the North help to return to this condition for life, the defenceless, despairing fugitive? Never! no never! whatever imprisonments, pains, or penalties may await them as consequences! If any aid in this business, it will be, because they are destitute of the principles and spirit of Him, who came "to preach deliverance to the captives, and to set at liberty them that are bruised!" Luke 4: 18. Real christians will never help in this matter.

But it is said that the Fugitive Slave Bill, "is the law of the land." the "expression of the people," &c. The former is true, if the latter is true. The former may be legally true, without being virtually and equitably true. The Fugitive Slave Bill, is not in accordance, we will venture to say, with the *expressed will of nine-tenths* of the

people of the North, nor of *one half* of the population of the South! Nor is it the expression of the free and unbiased will of the last Congress as the opinion of multitudes affirm. Attorney General CRITTENDEN, says, the bill is constitutional; ANSEL BASCOM, Esq., of Albany, says it is not so.

The Attorney General is a high government official, and a citizen, it is believed, of Kentucky, a slave State; this makes a large difference in judging the opinions of two learned gentlemen. Many Judges *appear* to sustain the bill; many lawyers oppose it. The people however, are not much divided in their judgment on the character of the offensive law. They are all for the Union, however, and so am I, but they are not all for the Union on the principle that absolute slavery be the condition of its permanence, neither am I. Let absolute involuntary slavery be the openly avowed *proviso*, on which the South will remain in the Union, and the question will soon be settled! But this will not be openly avowed by the body of the Southern voters. They know far better, and I have some little means of knowing that they will never agree to such a proviso. There are too many Godly ministers of Christ *there*; and too many real christians *there*; and too many true patriots *there*, who have never yet spoken on the subject publicly, to allow such a conclusion of the question. They pray, and hope, and wait for a brighter day! Lord send it soon!

---

NUMBER IV.

"It is time for thee Lord to work, for the have made void thy law."—Psal. 119: 126.

MR. EDITOR:—

The word "void" in the above passage signifies that which we understand by the term *useless*. To make *void* the law of God, is to render it useless, and although it is of force and efficiency, to make it of no force or effect. This is what the Psalmist complains, that men did with God's law; and our Saviour in his address to the Pharisees charges them with "making the Word of God of none effect through their traditions;" Mark 7, 13. God's law is supreme, and binds the conscience of every man. This is what is termed that *higher law*, in the allusions made to it by some, in the present contest in relation to the "fugitive slave bill." This *bill* is set up by the supporters of slavery as "the law of the land," and the suprem-



acy of human law, is held up as of binding force on men's consciences, under any pretext, whatever." This would be true doctrine, if there were no God, no revealed will from God, as "the infallible rule of faith and practice," and no future unerring tribunal by which the eternal destiny of man must be determined.

And because men make laws for their own interest, which involve *millions of other human beings* in the most miserable and degrading bondage, and set up these laws as supreme, our obedience is called for, to sustain them "under any pretext whatever." If conscience and God's authority be set up in opposition to this claim, the effort is explained away by masses of irrelevant matter, or held up to contempt and ridicule as the result of fanaticism or an evil mind toward the country. The struggle is indeed arduous between the spirit of slavery and the spirit of liberty. But the principles, doctrines, and spirit of liberty will be maintained, yea and unflinchingly maintained, against all the human advocates and human powers which are *now* arrayed, or may yet array themselves in favor of involuntary slavery, as a proper condition for unoffending men.

Perhaps in no case, at least of recent occurrence, has there been a stronger effort made to sustain the absolute slavery of mankind, than that which has just appeared from the pen of *Alethes*. No writer on the side of oppression has labored with an intensity of mind more strong, to bring the law of God as the main supporter of the system of Southern slavery. And yet the whole effort is intrinsically *weak*, signally weak! His attempt to make Deut. 23: 15, 16, to countenance the return of the trembling fugitive to his former bondage and master, and to explain the other scriptures he has worked up, to suit the *fugitive slave bill*, is matter of surprise and sorrow.

The learned and worthy Judge, labors with no little toil, to impress his readers with *his* exposition of the precept in Deuteronomy, above cited. That passage reads:—"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, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him."

ALETHES, makes the word *thou*, to refer to private authorized persons, the word *deliver*, to mean, to *enclose, shut up, restrain, stop, lock up, &c.* (No. III. Journal, Nov. 4th.) He gives his explanation of *deliver*, apart from the important negative prefixed, Thou shalt NOT DELIVER, &c. He then applies the word *not*, and the whole

precept, to *private authorized persons*, but in no sense to the public administrators of the law. But more of this *bye and bye*.

The Judge makes the whole precept to teach what is intended in the Fugitive Slave bill. The thing intended to be taught by this bill is, to *deliver* the fugitive slave to his master. This is the thing exactly, and this, the Judge by his peculiar method of interpretation, would have us believe he has made the divine precept to teach! The worthy Judge has hit the nail nicely; no writer could have managed with finer tact, how to dispose of the meddling little word *not*, better than he has done. But let us examine, gentle reader, how his exposition will suit the other parts of the sacred precept. The latter clauses of the passage should be used as interpreters of the former clauses. How will that good old rule apply?

When the fugitive should have made his *escape* good to any part of the land of Israel, the precept of the blessed laws says—"He shall dwell with thee, even among you." But the Judge maintains the fugitive was to be given up to his master! The precept says—"He shall DWELL with thee, even among you." To *dwell* means to have a fixed residence in a place. This is the import of the word, everywhere it is found in the Bible.—See Psalms, 15: 1, and 123: 1, Col. 2: 9, and 1, Tim. 6: 16, for examples. But the Judge teaches that the proper authorities of the land, or place where the fugitive fled to, were to *deliver* him up, on the claim being proved. How then could the fugitive have a fixed place of residence *among* the people of Israel? The precept says—"In that place which he (the fugitive) shall choose." But what *choice* is allowed to an absolute slave? A mere *chattel personal* to have a CHOICE! The idea is preposterous. Talk of a horse, a wagon, a plow, &c. a piece of absolute property having any choice separate from its owner! It is all nonsense. But the holy precept gives the fugitive slave a *choice*, because he is a man. He is an immortal man, and accountable to God, and must have both a *voice* to say *where*, and a *choice* to choose *which*, "*that place which he shall choose.*" Now is it likely the master of the fugitive, would *choose* to let his property remain with Israel, or that the slave would *choose* to return to his bondage? Again the precept says—"In one of thy gates where it liketh him best." The gates of cities among the Jews were places of public resort. Judges anciently held their courts in the *Gates*, or public places.—Deut. 17: 5, 8. To "*repose in the gate,*" is to judge causes publicly and authoritatively.—Isa. 29: 21, Prov. 1: 21. The fugitive was then to have a fixed

residence in such a public place as he would choose; and surely the public place he would choose and *like best*, would not be his former place of bondage, for that was not in the land of Israel; but that land was his choice, for he fled to it. Once more; thou shalt not oppress him." To *oppress*, signifies to *rob* one, by fraud or by force, to grievously harrass, and overburden or overwork one, and to enslave one for another's advantage. Now if the fugitive slave must not be *oppressed*, he must not be delivered to his master, for that would be remanding him back to absolute slavery. It would be oppression. The interpretation then is plainly this—the fugitive slave who might have escaped to the land of Israel from any of the surrounding nations, was to be received and succoured by God's people. They were not to give him back to his former master. He was to be allowed his *choice* of a public place among them, to reside in permanently. He was to be publicly and positively defended in his liberty, and none were allowed to oppress him in any way! O how worthy the compassion of a merciful God was this heaven-originating law! How effectually such recurring events would keep the people of Israel in remembrance of their own deliverance from the cruel slavery of Egypt, their happy and secure settlement, and their enjoyment of liberty in that blessed land of promise. And what a lively type is here, of the poor sinner awakened, and convinced of his lost condition by nature, and miserable bondage and slavery in which Satan held his soul, and of the happy and hearty reception he should meet with should he "fly for refuge to the hope set before him." Ought a soul having thus fled to God's people for refuge and security to be thrown back again to his former spiritual bondage? No! Will the authority of Christ give that soul up again to the slavery of Satan? No! shall that soul be allowed a name and place in the *gates* of the Lord's church? It shall! Is any one allowed to oppress or injure the newly arrived fugitive from the bondage of Satan? No, not one, even at the peril of his own soul! The soul *delivered* from Satan's service may truly exclaim:—

O thou blessed Redeemer! Thou matchless Saviour! Thou hast redeemed my person by thy blood! Thou hast liberated my soul from the galling fetters of Satan's yoke by thy blessed Spirit! Thou hast received me! Thy true Israel hath received me! and neither *thee* nor *thine*, have ever given me up to my former taskmaster, from the day I fled for deliverance to thee and thy people until now! I still dwell in a public *gate* of thy church, and in the

*very gate of Israel which liketh me best!* This is a passing hint, for the soul enslaved by Satan, and for those liberated from his cursed yoke! "It is a word for CHRIST," as the blessed RUTHERFORD would say. I cannot therefore, admit the correctness of the HON. JUDGE BAIRD'S interpretation of Deut. 23: 15, 16, because it answer not to the truth neither temporally nor spiritually! I will close this article with a sentence from himself and a few remarks. He says (in No. III. Nov. 4.), "If the abolitionists are right in their assertions, that this text in Deuteronomy creates a religious obligation binding on the conscience of every man to prevent the recapture of a fugitive slave, then I present it as a case of the most extraordinary delusion that has ever occurred," &c.

We remark for the information of the worthy *Alethes*, that conscientious Christian anti-slavery men make the very *assertion* he alludes to. And to this assertion they have held ever since "the law was given by Moses, and grace and truth came by an adorable redeemer!" The *delusion* has continued *ever since then!* And it is likely to continue as long as absolute slavery is in our world—as long as the BIBLE continues—as long as *conscience* and christianity continue; and as long as the authority of the supreme lawgiver continues, so long will the doctrine contained in the divine precept be believed!

The throne of God is established in "Justice and Judgment." Before his face "Mercy and Truth" ever hold on in their shining course! No customs or laws of ancient usage, or which may now exist, sanctioning the involuntary absolute slavery of men, not legally offending, by men as great sinners against God as themselves, can divert Christian anti-slavery men from their position!—Only God has the authority to point out who shall be enslaved and who shall enslave them; for "He made us," and owns us, "and not we ourselves."

Appeals may be made to President Fillmore's authority—to the decision of Judge McLean and the *expressed* determination of Judge Grier, to execute the law; to the opinions of Attorney General Crittenden, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and MAJOR NOAH! All this may be done in support of a law that forbids Christians to perform duties which they hold that God commands. But if the gentlemen possessed the authority of the Emperor Nicholas, of Russia; if they had the legal knowledge of Lords Chief Justice Hale, Coke, Littleton, Mansfield, Blackstone, Brougham, Tenterden, and Lyndhurst, all centered in themselves; if they could write

with the philosophical acuteness of Newton, Bacon, and Locke; if they could speak to arouse the passions and tickle the fancy with the eloquence of Demosthenes, Cicero, and Edmund Burke; and if they possessed the political sagacity of Tallyrand, Metternich, Pitt, and Peel; in the face of this, Christians would *take* the liberty to *conclude* that "they ought to obey GOD rather than *men!*" This is the work of conscience!—Acts 5: 29.

---

NUMBER .V

"They wrest my words"—Psal. 56, 5. "Which they that are UNLEARNED and unstable, wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own DESTRUCTION."—2 Pet. 3: 16.

MR. EDITOR:

To *wrest* the scriptures, signifies to turn them by force to a wrong sense or purpose. The interpretation of Deut. 23: 15, 16, by *Alethes*, and his working up of all the "other scriptures" he has cited to correspond with that interpretation, I take to be a *wresting* of the general and obvious sense of God's word on the subject. He has turned them by force to a wrong sense, and certainly to a wrong purpose.

This shall be illustrated by reading a few passages from the Bible in the light of the interpretation given to Deut. 23: 15, by the Hon. JUDGE. The meaning sought to be established by the Hebrew exegesis of the passage put forth by *Alethes*, is, that whereas God tells the people of Israel that they were "NOT to deliver to his master the servant that escaped unto them from his master," the Judge turns the sense of the words to mean that upon the claim for his person being properly made, the authorities of Israel were to give the fugitive *up*, and deliver him to his master! this is plainly "*wresting the Scriptures.*" Now in this light let us read, not to our *destruction* I hope, but to our edification. God sometimes convinces the unbelieving by *contraries*. Let us read thus: "Thou SHALT deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped unto thee from his master:" "He shall (NOT) dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates where it liketh him best, thou shalt oppress him!"

Isaiah 58: 4—"Behold ye (DO NOT) fast for strife and debate, and ye (DO NOT) smite with the fist of wickedness; ye shall fast as ye do this day to make your voice to be heard on high."

Ver. 6—"Is not this the fast that I have chosen, (NOT) to loose the

bands of wickedness, (NOT) to undo the heavy burdens,\* and (NOT) to let the oppressed go free, and that ye (DO NOT) break every yoke!"

Ver. 7—"Is it (not to DENY) thy bread to the hungry, and that thou (SHALT NOT) bring the poor that are cast out to thy house. When thou seest the naked that thou (SHALT NOT) cover him, and that thou (BE SURE TO) hide thyself from thine own flesh!"

Ver. 9—"Then shalt thou call and the Lord shall answer. Thou shalt cry, and he shall say, here I am. If thou (KEEP CONSTANTLY) in the midst of thee the yoke, and putting forth of the finger,† and speaking vanity!"

Ver. 10—"And if thou (WILT NOT) draw out thy soul to the hungry, and (WILT NOT) satisfy the afflicted soul, THEN SHALL THY LIGHT ARISE IN OBSCURITY, AND DARKNESS BE AS THE NOONDAY.

Psal. 12: 5—"For the OPPRESSION of the poor, for the sighing of the needy now will I (NOT) arise saith the Lord; I will (NOT) set him in safety from him that puffeth at him."

Psal. 72: 4—"He shall (NOT) judge the poor of the people; he shall (NOT) save the children of the needy; and shall (NOT) break in pieces the OPPRESSOR."

Pov. 3: 31—"Envy thou the oppressor, and choose (ALL) his ways."

Prov. 22: 15—"He that oppresseth the poor to increase his riches, and he that giveth to the rich, shall surely (NOT) come to want."

Eccls. 7: 7—"Surely oppression does (NOT) make a wise man mad."

I have given these few specimens to show the fearful consequences we run into in *wresting* the Scriptures. By doing so, we make them to give a sense the very contrary to what their divine and infallible author intended, and clearly revealed. We make them to say, that the practice which God has reprobated in the most explicit terms, he at the same time approves! By this mode of expounding, we make the crimes of hard-heartedness, uncharitableness, and oppression of the darkest hue, to be moral and heaven-pleasing virtues of the highest order? It has been denied by the abettors of slavery, as it exists in the slave States in the South, that it constitutes in a scriptural sense, oppression. But oppression is clearly defined in its nature when we say that "men are oppressors, when they practice violence upon other people's bodies, estates, or con-

---

\*"For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders but they themselves," &c.—Math. 23: 4.

† Oppressors pointed with the FINGER, the way the oppressed had to carry their heavy burdens, but would not "themselves move the burden with one of their FINGERS!"—*Ibid.*

sciences; when by force of terror, they work upon the ignorance, weakness, or fearfulness of the defenceless, or when they deprive a man in any way unjustly of his natural rights: his right to his wife, children, society, &c." Oppressions and oppressors, are alluded to by name *one hundred and seventeen times* in the Bible, and the consideration of these passages will demonstrate to any unbiassed mind that the above definition of oppression is just, or very nearly so. Now let a reference be made to the slave laws (in No. 2) and let it be shown if it can be, that Southren slavery does not constitute *oppression* in a scriptural sense.

But I am far from believing that JUDGE BAIRD would give his consent to have the Bible to read in accordance with the foregoing specimens. He would, I believe, revolt at it, as much, perhaps, as I would myself. What christian could do otherwise, unless he was hedged up, and hedged in, with palpable ignorance? But the Judge's *construction* of the meaning of Deut. 23: 15, drives him into the terrible error of *wresting* the sacred scriptures, of turning them by *forced* interpretation to a wrong sense, and to quite another purpose, than their author and revealer intended. *That construction* is FATAL to the *main* point he wishes to establish, which is, that by disobeying the requirements of "the Fugitive Slave Bill," that bill being now the law of the land, we disobey God himself, because civil Government is the ordinance of God. His grand error is in confounding the righteous institution of Government with the ACTS of its administrators. Because we acknowledge the divine institution of civil Government, which was intended by its author, "as a terror to evil doers, and as a praise to them that do well," must we therefore be held as violators of the ordinance of God, if we refuse to co-operate in the evil acts of those entrusted to act for us in making or altering laws, if their acts should be contrary to the expressed WILL of God? If an *affirmative* be given to this interrogatory by the public mind and voice, then the people at once *enslave* themselves; but if a *negative*, then the ordinance of Government is properly sustained, but the unrighteous acts of its administrators are condemned! Else why did the Puritans desert their native land and seek refuge in the American forest? Why did the sainted BAXTER submit to go to Jail, sooner than alter his paraphrase on the thirteenth chapter of the epistle to the Romans? Why were not the supreme and tyrannous laws of the Popes of Rome from the first of these absolute despots to the present one, obeyed? Why were not the laws of the British stamp act obeyed? Why did the

AMERICAN REVOLUTION take place? and above all other questions, why have we so many instances recorded in the Bible of direct and prompt disobedience to the mandates of supreme human law, manifested on the part of God's people? Was it because in all these, and every similar case, the people refusing to obey, were opposed to the institution of God's ordinance, called civil Government? No! all history proves that the disobedience exhibited, was produced by the oppressive acts of their rulers! What historical document in the whole world can set forth this truth clearer than does "THE DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE?" For the very same reasons those adverse to the institution of involuntary slavery, as a condition for unoffending men, refuse to co-operate in the administration of the "Fugitive Slave Bill." They will not *help* to send men back to such a condition.

The word of God is of supreme authority to the christian's soul. "My heart standeth in awe of thy word." Psalms, 119: 161. One of the surest signs of true christianity in the soul is, when the force of a command from God will determine duty. The soul thus influenced can say to bribes, and threats, and mobs, and human authority, so far as it opposes the will of God, "stand by, for God commands my service!" This is the true sublime of the christian's independence of wicked principalities and powers, and of his pure dependence on God! When the commands of human authority run counter to the commands of God, the commands of God must be obeyed although the greatest authority under heaven should be displeased and enraged. God never gave the highest power in this, or any other world, authority to disobey *his* commands, nor any liberty to make laws involving disobedience to his own word on the part of the governed. How beautiful, to be sure, it would look in the eyes of a christian and liberty-loving people to preach the contrary of this! The commands of men which are in opposition to the law of Christ are plainly sinful, and are *notoriously* rebellious against him. They are rebellion against the authority of Christ, the life of Christ, the crown of Christ, the government of Christ, the church of Christ, and against the souls of those who adopt them! Men who make light of the Bible and consult it not, and who treat conscience as a trifle, will laugh at this! But christians will believe the doctrine and act on it, and will never therefore help to return the *trembling fugitive* to his cruel and woeful bondage, for such an act would be in violation of God's plain and naked command, and contrary to the practice of his ancient church.



## NUMBER VI.

“Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee,” &c.—Deut. 23: 15, 16.

MR. EDITOR:—

Our worthy friend *Alethes* will perhaps say he is misrepresented in the meaning of his criticism on the above passage. Indeed he has once and again told us in his essays, that he expected this. Now I would not willingly misrepresent him, or any other man. We will give in two sentences his strongest position:—It is in his *third* number, (Journal, Nov. 4th,) he says—“The object of the precept was to prevent private unauthorized persons from *stopping* or *confining* runaway servants. Masters were left to their legal mode of recovery, and until they made *claim* in the proper manner, the slaves were *not* to be oppressed, but to be suffered to “*dwell*” wherever they chose.” Now this cannot be the object of the precept for the obvious reasons following:—

1. The precept for its execution was addressed to the PUBLIC authorities of Israel, for Moses did not deliver God’s law to *private* persons for administration. The precept was for all the nation. The contrary of this would have been absurd—“The object of the precept” then, could not be “to prevent private unauthorized persons from stopping or confining runaway servants.” Private persons dare not assume the authority of confining a man on the ground of suspicion that he was a runaway slave. This would be *wresting* authority.

2. The Judge admits, that if the master “made his claim in the proper manner,” the legal authorities would, on the *claim* of ownership being proved, have delivered up the slave. He means this, or he means nothing. And I deny this, for the *precept* denies it. I will admit for the sake of refutation, (for room for argument, there is none,) that the pursuing master found his slave in some part of the land of Israel; that he proved the slave to be his, and that he proved himself, not merely to be an employed agent, but the real master or *owner* as he would be in this country called, and then what follows? Why the precept says, “thou shalt NOT deliver unto his master, the servant which has escaped from his master unto thee.” No! not even if the MASTER HIMSELF in person, made the claim, and sustained his claim by the most indubitable proofs. This was God’s charge through Moses, to the proper authorities of Israel, and to the whole nation. To say that the object of the precept was to prevent

private unauthorized persons from stopping or confining a runaway servant, until he should be claimed and proved to be a runaway, is only making an assumption without proof, and begging the question. Neither the facts of running away, nor of ownership were grounds for surrendering the slave.

How does our learned friend know that what he states was "the object of the precept?" Where did he learn it? Not certainly in the Bible, nor in any rabbinical writing. The face of the precept proves the direct contrary. The respected JUDGE often refers to Henry's Commentary. What does that notable and truly learned commentator say, was the object of the precept? He says—"The land of Israel is here made a sanctuary or city of refuge for servants that were wronged and abused by their masters, and fled thither for shelter from the neighboring countries, ver. 15: 16. We cannot suppose that they were hereby charged to give entertainment to all the unprincipled men that ran from service.—But 1. They must not deliver up the trembling servant to his enraged master, till upon trial it appeared that the servant had wronged his master, and was justly liable to punishment. *Note.* It is an honorable thing to protect the *weak*, provided they be not *wicked*. God allows his people to patronize the oppressed. The servant here is supposed to escape, that is, to run for his life, to the people of Israel, of whom he had heard (as Benhadad of the Kings of Israel, 1 Kings, 20: 31) that they were a merciful people, to save himself from the fury of a tyrant; and in that case to deliver him up, is to throw a lamb into the mouth of a lion. 2. If it appeared that the servant was abused, they must not only protect him, but supposing him willing to embrace their religion, they must give him all the encouragement that might be, to settle among them." In this commentator's view nothing but punishable conduct proved in the servant toward his master, could furnish even a pretext for his surrender. The words "owner or ownership," by man in man are not found in the Bible. When we *are not our own*, we surely cannot own one another, and if we are "bought with a price," paid by another, we have no right to buy and sell each other, unless our true purchaser, who is our real proprietor gives us *his* warrant for the sale and purchase of what part of his own property he pleases: for how could we justly sell what belongs to another without his permission? Hence the legal tenure which gives man ownership in man is, in itself sinful; unless God gives his express grant to us to create such proprietorship.

But our friend *Alethes* will perhaps complain that I have not quoted him fairly, because I have omitted the word *not*, in my exposition of his interpretation. My exposition is confined to the sense he gave to the word *deliver*, which he made to signify *restrain, lock up, enclose, stop, &c.* This interpretation would make the impression on any reader's mind that the word *deliver*, did not in the time of Moses, signify what it is understood to mean now, or that the JUDGE'S meaning of the phrase is wrong. But why did he in his criticism *omit* the important negative used by Moses? Why did he leave out the word *not*? Because it would have destroyed the whole fabric he wanted to complete.

We shall read his interpretation including the *negative* he omitted, and give him all the benefit it can impart. The thing aimed at by *Alethes*, is to prove that it is contrary to the revealed will of God, to prevent the re-capture of a runaway slave. To take the word *not*, in with his interpretation of the verb *deliver*, would totally defeat his aim. Let us see how his explanation would read, in connection with this monosyllable. Thou shalt NOT *restrain, NOT enclose, NOT stop, NOT lock up, NOT shut up*, to his master, the servant which is escaped, &c. So we see that using the word *not*, which he omitted, would have turned his *affirmative* into a negative! What he wanted to prove ought to be done with the fugitive from slavery, namely, to give him up to his master, the word *not* would prove, should not be done!

But how is this troublesome, perplexing little thing, called *not* to be got rid of? Suppose I want to prove that the fugitive from absolute slavery should be returned to his bondage. I wish to make my proof appear to be completely in accordance with the law of God, the vexing clause in the Constitution, the Act of Congress of 1793, and the Fugitive Slave Bill of 1850. Well, I begin to expound Deut. 23: 15, 16; and I say—"This passage is very much relied upon by Christian anti-slavery men. I will, however, venture to interpret its meaning; and I read: Thou shalt NOT deliver, &c. Now the first step I take to prove that the fugitive ought to be given up, this little vigilant watchman, named NOT, meets me, and exhibits his authority! How shall I get past that angry little man? I must pass into the citadel of my argument some way. I will gently tread my way round a little, and dodge him, and thus will try to elude his vigilance! I will just leave the little man where he is, and not quarrel with him at all; for if we come in contact, he will perhaps spring his rattle, and then I shall be taken; so I will ex-

pound the word *deliver*, without the word *not*. This is the only way I can do with any kind of decency. Well but, how will the precept read? how would its reading without the word *not*, if extended to some other parts of the scripture, make them look? To leave this precept without the word *not* just where it has its station, would be like leaving a street in a large city without a watchman at night."

"The only way I can carry this point is, to state the object of the watchman being stationed where he is, and I will say *that* the object is, to prevent private unauthorized persons from stopping the runaway slave! This is just the duty of the watchman called *not*, on the *beat* he occupies in one of the gates of Israel. This is capital! I have found it out now! my alarm somewhat subsides, for it is not to hinder the *public* authority in sending the fugitive back to his master, that Mr. *Not* has his entrance at that street, but to prevent people who have no authority from intermeddling with those who are invested with legal power to decide the case of the runaway; for if *they* were to interfere, serious consequences might, perhaps, follow. Well after all I see nothing in the *precept* really to prevent the fugitive's recapture, and so I will just say that *private unauthorized* persons were *not* to restrain the fugitive, nor confine him at all.—They were to let the runaway slave live where he chose, until the proper authorities should decide upon his fate. Thus I will make my readers to believe the object of the precept was to prevent *private unauthorized persons from stopping or confining runaway servants*, but not at all to prevent them being given up to their masters by legal authority, when the claim of *ownership* was proved! This device will answer very well; it will suit every purpose first rate."

I will not allow myself to believe that *Alethes* meant to take a course of this description in omitting or passing by the word *not* in his interpretation. But the description I have given in the illustration used, is the conclusion his course leads to. That he *purposely* meant to evade the force of the perplexing word *not* in his exposition for the better conclusion of his case, I will not dare to say. I have followed *Alethes*, in his interpretation of the word *deliver*, and shewed the tendency of the course he was pleased to adopt, in reference to other parts of Scripture, and the difference in explanation which the omitted *negative* introduces. And now I insist that the fugitive who fled to Israel for refuge, was not to be given up to his pursuers by the constituted authorities on any ground asserted, save perhaps, that he was proved to be guilty of punishable offence

to his master. And even this last exception I admit only under the qualification of a *perhaps*, for the precept does not say, nor does any other part of the Bible that I recollect, say, that the fugitive was to be surrendered to his master on any pretext whatever! And certainly if the fugitive adopted the Jewish religion, and was accepted in point of examination, he could not be surrendered on *any* consideration, as we shall show in the next number. The precept then, being addressed to all Israel, and to be executed by the proper authorities of the nation, means precisely what it says, that is,

*“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 where it liketh him best, thou shalt not oppress him.”*

---

NUMBER VII.

“And he that *stealeth* a man, and *selleth* him, or if he be found in *his hand*, he shall surely **BE PUT TO DEATH.**”—Exod 21: 16.

MR. EDITOR:

My last number pledged me to show, that if the fugitive slave should adopt the Jewish religion, and his examination be sustained, he was not to be surrendered to his former master under any consideration. I now proceed to redeem my pledge. We read in the scriptures of *presolytes*, Acts 2: 10. We shall examine what is meant by the persons thus indicated, and how they were treated.

We shall first glance at the names applied to the descendants of Abraham, in the sacred volume. They are called *Hebrews*. This is their most ancient and most honorable name. This name was given because Abraham *passed over* the river *Euphrates* westward when God called him. Gen. 12: 1; Josh. 24: 2, 3. The name signifies *passed over*. They were called *Israelites*, *the children of Israel*, and the *house of Israel*; because God gave the name Israel, to the patriarch JACOB. Gen. 35: 10. And they were and are called **JEW**s, from the fact, that from the revolt of the ten tribes in the time of Rehoboam, the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which remained faithful to that prince, and to the family of David, were called ‘the house of Judah.’ Most of those who returned from the captivity, and who rebuilt Jerusalem, and restored the Mosaic worship, were of *the house of Judah*. Since then, the name *Jews* has been the general appellation of this people, and their descendants. Esth. 3: 13. Dan. 3: 8.

HEBREWS, is the general name, therefore, of the posterity of Abraham, from the call of that patriarch to the period when the Almighty gave to Jacob the surname Israel, which name continued generally until the revolt under Rehoboam; then Israel and Judah until the captivity, and from their captivity in Babylon until now the general appellation is JEWS. *House of Israel*, means the ten revolting tribes, and *House of Judah*, the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

The Jewish laws allowed no other nation to participate in their religious rites, yet none of other nations were excluded, provided they were willing to conform. When any did conform, they were termed PROSELYTES. Proselytes were of two sorts: Proselytes of the GATE, and proselytes of the COVENANT. Both sorts were always converts from heathenism, to either a part or the whole of the Jewish economy. We proceed to distinguish—

I. PROSELYTES OF THE GATE.—Proselytes of the *Gate*, were those gentile or heathen converts to so much of the Jewish religion, as bound them to renounce idolatry, worship the true God, and accept the seven precepts of Noah, but who could not be circumcised, nor oblige themselves to practice any other of the legal ceremonies. The seven precepts of Noah, which continued until the law was given on Sinai, were, 1. The worship of the true God alone. 2. Holding idolatry in abhorrence. 3. Avoiding and abhorring acts of incest, and all other crimes against nature. 4. The punishment of wilful murder by death. 5. That they shall not commit murder. 6. That they should not cheat, steal, nor rob. 7. That they should not eat blood, nor any thing that had blood in it. To this class of converts, the Jews admitted the hopes of eternal life, and permitted them to live in or out of the land of Canaan, as best suited them. To this sort belonged the 153,600 servants of Solomon; 2 Chron. 2: 17. Naaman, the Syrian, 2 Kings, 5: 15—19. The Ethiopian Eunuch, Acts, 8: 27; and Cornelius, the Centurian, chap. 10: 22.

II. PROSELYTES OF THE COVENANT.—This class of Gentile converts entered fully into the Jewish Church; they were circumcised, and obliged themselves to observe and do all the Mosaic Covenant commanded. They were considered eligible for office in the civil government, and very highly esteemed.

The description given by Jewish doctors of the mode of receiving proselytes into the Jewish church, is in substance as follows: If males, they were circumcised, baptised, and then offered a sacrifice. If females, they were baptized, and then made their offering to God. The

baptism took place in the presence of at least three Jews of distinction. In their examination for admission, great strictness was observed. Their *motives*, influencing their change of religion, were examined. They had to declare publicly that no secular motive induced this change; that sincere love to the true God and his worship, determined their choice; that they abhorred their past life, and that they would worship the only true and living God, according to the law of Moses, and keep his commandments. No boys under *twelve* years of age, or girls under *thirteen*, were admitted without the consent of parents; or, in case of their refusal, of the Judges of the place. All admitted, were carefully instructed in the principles of Judaism. The scriptures frequently mention these converts, as "strangers, sojourners, and proselytes." Levit. 25: 2, 45. Ezek. 14: 7.

If they had been *slaves*, when their reception to the Jewish church was completed, having by that initiation become Israelites, and a part of the church and nation, they were from that moment *free* from all former relations to their masters; because the law in relation to slavery made *kidnapping*, or *selling* into slavery, or *holding* in slavery any Israelite, a capital crime. "He that STEALETH a man, or SELLETH him, or if he be found in his *hand*, he shall surely be put to death." Here are kidnappers, slave-dealers, and slave-holders, all in the same category of crime, and all subjected to capital punishment. We all agree that the law just cited referred to Israelites, but proselytism made heathen converts into Israelites, and gave them all the privileges of Israelites, just the same as conversion to God, and reception into the christian church would now give men, women, and children access to the privileges of christianity. The Jews termed proselytes, who were not slaves, and slaves who fled for liberty and obtained it, even if they did not become proselytes, "new-born infants."

The profound and Reverend Dr. Lightfoot, the very greatest Hebraist of the age in which he lived, (i. e. 17th century,) informs us in his remarks on Matt. 3: 6, in reference to Jewish baptism, that the learned Jew, MAIMONIDES, expressly says:—"A Gentile who is become a proselyte, and a servant, i. e. a *slave*, who is set at liberty, are both, as it were, new born babes, and all those relations which he had while Gentile or servant, now cease from being so." So we see the fugitive slave who fled to Israel and adopted the Jewish religion, could not be continued in bondage nor surrendered to his master at all. Is the christian religion worse than the

Jewish? No! 2 Cor. 3: 11; Heb. 8: 7. Are christian professors worse than Jewish professors? Some are! "There are Jewish christians, and christian Jews," but neither a real "Hebrew of the Hebrews," nor a real "Christian of Christians," will ever return a fugitive slave to remediless and absolute slavery, who pleads for shelter and mercy at his hands—no, not if the *fine* for disobedience to "the fugitive bill," was one *million* of dollars instead of one *thousand*; and imprisonment *sixty* years in place of six months!

Natural and personal liberty, and obedience to God's revealed will, and the maintainance of inborn, inalienable, inextinguishable hatred of personal bondage are not to be eradicated from the land, nor from the immortal nature of man by legal threats of fines, or imprisonments, or of death itself! In my next I shall examine the *inwrought testimony* of the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, against the traffic in, and the involuntary slavery of men, for the purpose of gain.

---

NUMBER VIII.

"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sins."—John 15: 22.

MR. EDITOR:—

Whether God's ancient people were called Hebrews, Israelites, Jews, the House of Judah, or the house of Israel, they were still his people in covenant. None of them could involve their brethren in that covenant in involuntary slavery. All the blessings and privileges of the Jewish dispensation pertained to the nation of Israel *only*, others, who conformed to their religion might participate with them in their peculiar benefits. The Apostle Paul says, that his "kinsmen according to the flesh were Israelites, to whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the services of God, and the promises; whose are the Fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, CHRIST came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen."—Rom. 9: 3, 5. The privileges of the legal dispensation were thrown open to the Jewish nation and to the Gentiles who would conform, but the privileges of the New Testament dispensation are thrown open to the christian church, and to all throughout the whole world who will accept of Christ according as he is revealed in the Gospel. In other words, the Gospel dispensation is now to the christian Church and the



world what the legal dispensation was to the nation of Israel. Of this people it is said, "the Lord sent a word unto Jacob, and it hath lighted upon Israel."—Isa. 9: 8. But of the Gospel and the world; the command is, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature."—Mark 16: 15. Whatever the Jews were to each other in point of privileges and rights, Christians ought to be so, and much more to each other, because, "if that which was done away (i. e. the legal dispensation) was glorious, much more that which remaineth (i. e. the Gospel dispensation) is glorious."—2 Cor. 3: 11.

God's word in both old and new Testaments has been placed in support of involuntary slavery. The Jews had a clear and distinct law to prevent them from reducing each other to compulsory bondage. Exod. 21: 16. We noticed this in our last article. If they transgressed that law, they were inexcusable. "They had no cloak for the sins." We have a clearer light in the Gospel; in it Christ the son of God speaks to us. If he had not come and spoken, we might plead some excuse; but since he has come and spoken, and still speaks to us in his word, we have now "no cloak for OUR sins." We assert boldly that the entire *inwrought* testimony, or whole tendency and spirit of the Gospel is against involuntary slavery. Some instances of this kind of testimony will now be adduced. We lay down this position—That as the Masaic economy prohibited the Israelites from reducing any Jew to absolute involuntary bondage, so the Christian economy, in its whole binding force, prohibits Christians from reducing each other to the same kind of condition. We will keep mainly to the point in this article, of professed Christians enslaving professed Christians.

"Slaves are deprived of all civil rights—a slave is in absolute bondage."—*Wheeler's Slave Laws*, pp. 6 and 197. "The radical principle of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among *senti-ent beings*, but among things, as an *article* of property, a *chattel personal*, obtains as undoubted law in all of these, the slave states."—*Stroud's Slave Laws*, pp. 22, 23, (see No. I.I 1, 2, of this series, Nov. 27.) Let us see how *this condition*, for professors of the Gospel of Christ, to reduce their fellow professing Christians to, comports with the requisitions of the same Gospel which they all alike profess to believe. 1. The New Testament asserts that all mankind are identical in nature. How could it be otherwise, when the whole race descended from the same original pair? He giveth to all life and breath, and all things; and hath made of ONE BLOOD all nations

of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts, 17: 26. There is but *one* human nature. We have *four* kinds of animated nature described by the apostles—"there is *one* kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds." 1 Cor. 15: 39. Put any *two* of these natures together, and a monster is produced. A man would then appear, partly man, and partly beast, or partly fish, or partly bird; and so of the rest, when paired contrary to nature. It is, therefore, *not color*, but *kind*, by which human nature is identified—there is but *one flesh* of men. Now, the colored race are not beasts, nor fishes, nor birds; and, if they are not *human*, what are they? And if they are men, and form "nations of men," and "dwell" on a large portion "of the face of the earth," we desire to know by what right found in nature, one man can be absolute owner of another? Can one beast have absolute ownership of another beast? can one fish have a right title of property in another fish? can a bird hold property in a bird? These creatures may overcome one another by *might*, but never by *right*. How, then, can one portion of human nature hold property absolutely in another portion of human nature, when there is but *one* human nature; and say, too, that the part held as mere property, is not *sentient*, not possessed of perceptive faculties? One part of human nature *sentient*, and another part *not sentient*, and all the one *kind* of flesh!—This is certainly very strange doctrine, and hard to be understood! We ask, again, by what right a Dutchman can make an African his absolute property, more than he can an Englishman or an American? And, further, we ask, has not the African as much right to make an American *his* absolute property, as the latter has to make the former *his* absolute property? And, yet, further, we ask, how Christians can sell Christians to Christians, and buy Christians from Christians, every day the sun shines, for the purposes of gain, or any purpose at all, and be innocent before God? The thing, when viewed in the light of nature, and the purer light of the Gospel, is perfectly hideous. But the Bible gives the only proper reason of the horrid traffic in CHRISTIAN BLOOD, and it is, "on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they (the oppressed) had no comforter."—Eccles. 4: 1. This tells the whole story!

2. If the colored race be of mankind, the New Testament enjoins certain things upon men wholly incompatible with absolute slavery. The Lord Jesus said he came to preach "the gospel to the poor, deliverance to the captive, and set at liberty them that were bruised." Luke, 4: 18. But, how can this be believed, and believe at the same

time that it is the will of God that some men, for their worldly interest, and by their own laws, and at their own will, may hold other men as innocent as themselves, in "absolute bondage," in perpetual "captivity?"

3. The Jews said to Christ, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man." John, 8: 33. We cited this passage, and called attention to it in a former number. The bondage the Jews alluded to, is involuntary slavery, not any other kind of bondage. Ought Christians, then, to *enslave* Christians?—Or, even if in slavery, when their adoption of Christianity takes place, ought they to be retained in slavery? If the answer be, **YES**, then Christians plead a license from the Gospel, to treat enslaved converts far worse than the Jews ever dared to treat converts from heathenism to their religion. But the apostle asserts that a true convert to Christ is of the true "seed" of Abraham. And Luther said, "If I have the faith of Abraham, I am Abraham." "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3: 29. This is "the truth," which, if the Jews had received from Christ, would have set them free from the law, and its curse, and the bondage of Satan, as regarded their souls, as certainly as God's law kept them free in their persons from being in involuntary "bondage to any man." Christ said to them, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. If the son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John, 8: 33, 36. But the question is, do the words of Christ signify the freedom of the body from human involuntary slavery, as well as the liberty of the soul from the bondage of sin? The answer is, yes!—Else, how could an inspired apostle say that Christianity offers to men "the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come?" 1 Tim. 4: 8. What "promise of the life that now is," does the Christian religion hold out to man on the principle that it sanctions the condition of "absolute bondage?" the condition of an immortal being reduced to that of a mere chattel? a condition which throws him out of *sentient* existence, and ranks him with things? A grand "promise of the life that now is," "absolute bondage" is, to be sure! Liberty from absolute bondage, in both body and soul, is the refreshing, life-giving, life-preserving air of heaven, which God commands his ministers, with unsparing, loud, and trumpet-voice, to breathe through his mouth-piece, called the Gospel, to all the world! The Jubilee trumpet proclaiming liberty on "the day of atonement to all the inhabitants of the land" of Israel, set forth, figuratively,

but gloriously, the news of offered liberty, temporal and spiritual, to the world, by the joyful sound of the Gospel, based on the atonement of Christ. Levit. 25: 9, 10. The seraphic-minded TOPLADY saw this when he composed these thrilling strains—

“Ye *slaves* of sin and hell  
Your *liberty* receive!  
And safe in Jesus dwell  
And blest in Jesus live,  
The year of *Jubilee* is come,  
Return ye ransomed sinners home.”

This is liberty! Liberty through the Gospel!—Liberty from God by the Gospel to our lost and enslaved world! The sweet sound of *mercy* proclaims it! “Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound!”—Psal. 89: 15. But where is the blessing in making man a *chattel*, a *thing*, and binding him in absolute bondage? There is no mercy in the absolute slavery of christians by christians.

The NEW TESTAMENT enjoins upon men to “search the scriptures,” because the words Christ has spoken “shall judge them at the last day.”—John 5: 39; chap. 12: 48. But this is impossible for the “absolute slave” to perform, unless his *absolute master* grants him *leave* to learn to read, and then *leave* to read and practice what he learns in the Bible! It is not likely that wicked *absolute owners* will give their *absolute slaves* this liberty. Some humane masters may grant this leave, but this is the *exception*; not to do so, is the general rule. For they argue rightly when they say, “what is the use of the Bible, or of reading to an article of property, a *chattel*! a *thing*?”

The new Testament enjoins it upon men to marry, and says, that “marriage is honorable in all.”—1 Cor. 7: 2; Heb. 13: 4. It further says, and by Christ himself, that “a man shall leave father and mother and cleave to his wife.”—Matt. 19: 5. And that the husband is the **HEAD** of the wife, and that the wife is to submit in all things unto her husband as unto the Lord.”—Eph. 5: 22, 24. It further says, that marriage is to continue until the death of one or both of the parties, and, that children are to obey their parents.” Rom. 7: 2. Eph. 6: 1; all which, is *impossible*, on the principle of christianity sanctioning the absolute involuntary slavery of christians. For, the slave cannot “contract matrimony.” He cannot go where he pleases to choose his own wife. The master is the *head and owner* of husband, wife, and children. These do not belong to each other, but to the master! He can take them from each other, sell the husband from the wife, for he is not her *own* hus-

band at all, the wife from the husband, for she is not his *own* wife, but the master's *chattel*; the parents from the children, for the children are not theirs, but his property; the children from the parents, and, if he pleases, compel the wife *not* to submit to her husband, and the children *not* to obey their parents, and all to obey him, in every thing and all things! Oh! the curse of the involuntary slavery of man by man, but the *tip-top* wickedness of *christians* enslaving christians, or of refusing them their liberty. Christian Freeman! will you help to send back to *this bondage* the poor *fugitive* "who escaped from his master unto thee?" Your full and ready response is, No!

---

NUMBER IX.

"I have surely seen the affliction of my people, and have heard their cry, by reason of their taskmasters for I know their sorrows."—Exod. 3: 7; Acts 7: 34.

MR. EDITOR:

I must continue the subject of my last number, which was the *inwrought* testimony of the NEW TESTAMENT against the involuntary slavery of human nature!

The New Testament places all true christians in a covenant relation to God. They are his through Christ, "by covenant and by oath," and "not their own."

God saw the affliction of his old Testament Israel, by reason of their taskmasters. He sees the affliction of many thousands of his New Testament Israel, for the *same reason*. How many slaves in the South, suppose you, are members in the orthodox Christian churches of those States? You cannot tell, and I cannot tell exactly, but there are certainly many thousands. Does the NEW TESTAMENT sanction the condition of "absolute bondage," as the condition of man, especially of God's covenant people? We have shown this in several instances, to be impossible, from both the light of nature, and the light of the Gospel. We proceed to show further on this subject.

5. The NEW TESTAMENT enjoins that we are to love the Lord our God, with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our strength, and with all our mind, and our neighbor as ourselves." Luke 10: 27. If we ask, like the lawyer in ver. 29th, "who is our neighbor?" the answer is at hand. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But

I say unto you, love your enemies," &c. Matt. 5: 43, 44. Every man is our neighbor. Our *enemies* are our neighbors. Were we to love even them, just because we should like them to love us! "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that man should do unto you, do ye *even so* unto them, for this is the law and the prophets," Matt. 7: 12. Were we flying for liberty from the tyranny of "absolute bondage," would we wish freemen to seize and send us back to that bondage? Were we in our flight, weary and half naked, and hungry, and imploring relief from those possessed of plenty, and at ease and secure, would we wish to be refused? If I refused my help to the helpless, under such circumstances, I should expect the curse of a righteous God to follow me through all time, meet it at his awful tribunal, and send me to remediless woe! Psal. 41: 1; Matt. 25: 41, 46. "Therefore, ALL THINGS, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." This is conscience! But what has conscience to do in the matter of God's word, if the law of man "must be obeyed under under all pretexts whatever?" *Alethes* would fain have us believe that the "fugitive slave bill" is in strict accordance with God's word! But darkness and light, faith and infidelity, Christ and Beliel, are not so easily made ONE; neither can absolute bondage, and rational liberty be made to cohere! One will infallibly destroy the other sooner or later.

6. The NEW TESTAMENT, tells us that, "if any provide not for his own and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."—1 Tim. 5, 8. This, of course cannot apply to slavery, for the slave has nothing, can acquire nothing, never can have anything he can call "*his own*." Neither eyes, ears, tongue, hands, feet, body, soul, wife, children, or house can he call his own. They are all another man's or another woman's, but they are not the slaves, own! HENRY CLAY says "what the law makes property, is property," and what he says must always be right, for he is "Achilles in the camp," and the prince of compromisers.

But even the Great, the Good, "the eloquent orator," himself will not be believed, any more than the learned *Alethes*, (and the latter possesses far more knowledge than the former) nor will any advocate of the fugitive slave bill be believed by any intelligent christian, until he asserts over his own signature that he would rather be an absolute slave, than be free! and should either or both of these worthy men so aver, we shall then deplore the sad calamity, that they have lost their senses!

7. The word of God in both TESTAMENTS, enjoins it upon us, "to give *meat* to the *hungry*; *drink* to the *thirsty*; *shelter* to the *stranger*; *clothes* to the *naked*; to undo heavy burdens; to let the oppressed go free, not to hide ourselves from our own flesh; and not to spoil any by violence."—Matt. 25: 34, 35. Isa. 58: 6. Ezek. 18: 7. But in the face of all this, the fugitive slave law says: (Sect. 7.) "Any person who shall aid or assist a person owing service aforesaid, directly or indirectly, or, shall harbor or conceal such fugitive, shall for either of the said offences be subject to a fine not exceeding *one thousand dollars*, and an imprisonment not exceeding six months, and shall moreover forfeit and pay by way of civil damages, to the party injured by such conduct, the sum of *one thousand dollars* for each fugitive so lost." Here, worthy reader, you see that if it can be proved that you gave any aid whatever to a poor fugitive from bondage, and that fugitive should make his final escape, your fate will be to pay *one thousand dollars*, and suffer *six months imprisonment*! O thou insatiable spirit of absolute slavery! God's word is against thee! Here is God's law and man's law side by side in their respective claims. Which will you obey my worthy reader! I think you will agree with the good old orthodox doctrine, that "we ought to obey God rather than men!"—Acts. 4: 29.

The spirit and tendency of the Gospel is far enough developed for the purpose of showing its opposition to compulsory slavery. Only allow it to be fully preached to every creature, and I will ask no other instrumentality to effect, with God's blessing, the destruction of everything in the world which exalts itself against God! If every man loved God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself, there would be no slavery, no wasting or destruction in any of our borders, for the earth would be full of the knowledge of the Lord. But when men will either suppress the truth to gain their end, or *twist* it so as to make it sanction and sustain what it is destined in the counsel and wisdom of God to destroy, their effort is then to establish *twistianity*, and not Christianity! But our good and learned *Alethes*, thinks it right to send back the fugitive to bondage. He thinks the case of ONESIMUS, the servant of the wealthy merchant PHILEMON, of Colosse is conclusive evidence, that fugitives ought to be recaptured and remanded to slavery. Now I for one, *deny* that Onesimus was either recaptured or sent back to absolute slavery. I will admit that Onesimus was Philemon's servant—that *perhaps* he robbed or wronged, in some way, his master—and that he became a *fugitive* from his master's service, and fled as far as

the city of Rome, in Italy, from the city of Colosse in lesser Asia. That Onesimus was a slave to Philemon in the same sense as a Southern slave is in bondage, I will not admit until it be proved. The remainder of these remarks will show my reasons.

1. Onesimus in his flight went as far as Rome. There he found the Apostle Paul a prisoner, was converted to the Christian faith, through the instrumentality of the Apostle, and confessed to him that he had left Philemon's service. Onesimus was not, therefore, *re-captured*, but voluntarily made known his situation.

2. The Apostle sent Onesimus back to Colosse, entrusting him with his Epistle to the Church at that city, and his letter to Philemon. Tychicus was deputed along with Onesimus on this journey. They do not *send* fugitive slaves back after this manner, to their masters in the South. The Apostle *sent* him, but for what purpose? He sent him

3. NOT AS A SLAVE again to absolute bondage, Paul knew the Jewish law, for he was an "Hebrew of the Hebrews," and he knew that a slave who fled from another nation to Israel, and conformed to their religion, was free the moment he was accepted. He was a Christian too, and knew that a sinner flying to Christ ought to have his liberty, both of body and soul the moment he was received. This, he earnestly wished that all who heard him, when he stood in chains and spoke before Festus, might enjoy,—Acts 26: 29. He wished all to have liberty, but none to have bonds.

4. He sent him back *not* as a slave, but *above* a slave, ver. 16. Onesimus was now not on a level with slavery or servitude. He was *above* that level. "Not now a servant, but ABOVE a servant."

5. He sent him back as one highly elevated in privilege and dignity. "Above a servant, a brother beloved," &c. Exalted to brotherhood with the Apostle himself, a brother beloved, "specially, to me," and with his master Philemon, "but how much more unto thee;" and lest this might be restricted to spiritual brotherhood, "the flesh" is added, to show that the blessing of Gospel liberty reached to the body as well as the soul, in the design of it its merciful author.—"Specially to me but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord." This is not like sending him back to such bondage as Southern slavery. Moreover,

6. The apostle pleads to have Onesimus received by his master. This kind of *beseching* is not commonly employed to persuade slaveholders in the South to receive back runaway slaves! "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus; thou therefore, receive him."—



Ver. 10, 12. "Receive him as myself."—Ver. 17. Onesimus had got pretty high. From being a runaway 'slave and purloiner,' as he has been called, he now comes back to the same master he had fled from, with a recommendation to an equality of brotherly reception and treatment with the apostle himself! "Receive him as myself!" This was rather curious bondage to send Onesimus back to!

7. The apostle goes *bail* for any loss Philemon might have sustained by the conduct of Onesimus. "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth aught, put that on mine account."—Ver. 18. An absolute slave can owe nothing to any one. "He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what belongs to his master."—Onesimus could not have been a slave, therefore, in the hands of his master as a mere piece of property, or in the sense of Southern slavery. We are informed that Onesimus became an eminent Christian, and was appointed pastor or bishop of the church at *Berea* in *MACEDONIA*. There can be nothing clearer than that the *NEW TESTAMENT* is against absolute slavery. Its whole internal evidence is against it. The spirit of Christianity, being love to God and all mankind, "especially the household of faith," is against it; every sound moral principle is against it; and the employments and enjoyments of heaven are against it; for as there is no slavery *there*, so there should be none among christians *here*; because, in all imitable ways, the will of God ought to be done on earth as it is done in heaven. Nothing, therefore, but pride, love of money, and the power of sin, of which power slavery is made a frequent figure, can be pled justly, as the causes and means of the institution of absolute bondage. The whole world, except the Jews, was in a state of heathenism when Christianity appeared. Slavery was universal.—The Jews were as much opposed to the Christian religion as were the barbarous heathen nations. When any one became a convert to the Christian faith, if a slave, almost his first question was, "Am I now to be free?" This question arose from the liberty the soul experienced by faith in the Son of God, from the vassalage of sin and Satan.

The answer to such interrogatories by the Apostle, shows how he regarded the subject. It is as if he had said, and as every true minister of Christ would say, under the circumstances—"You are called from darkness to light in this state of servitude. Your body is enslaved to man; your soul was enslaved to sin and Satan. The whole world lieth in wickedness, and is in the hands of the wicked one. To assert your liberty from human bondage, (although you

ought to be free) and *because* you have become a servant to Christ; would raise up the most resistless opposition to the spread of the Gospel, which is God's grand instrumentality for the salvation of men, and for redressing every evil, and for ultimately filling the world with *peace and good will*. Let the spirit of the Gospel work its way. In Christ there is neither bond nor free; his will is supreme, for none can serve two masters. Your way to liberty will perhaps open up bye and bye, and if it comes, accept it and use it to the honor of Christ. Now you are his freemen, but bound to men; then you will be free from men, but bound still more closely to Christ. Therefore, 'Art thou called being a servant, care not for it; BUT IF THOU MAYEST BE FREE, USE IT RATHER!'—1 Cor. 7: 21. And so the advice given to masters, corresponds with this spirit:—"Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a master in heaven;—Col. 4: 1. But this precept certainly implies promise, and agreement, for it enjoins justice and equality of dealing, as well as kindness; and in view of the final account. Nothing from the New Testament, then, can be urged to justify absolute bondage, as an institution; and nothing to warrant the return of one to that condition who makes his escape from it. Christians, read Matt. 7: 12, and Luke 10: 27; and do what those passages teach.

---

NUMBER X.

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.—Rom. 8: 19: 21.

MR. EDITOR:

The meaning of the passage quoted above is, 1. that God gave every living creature at its creation a liberty and a happiness suitable to the full requirements of its nature. 2. that this liberty and happiness departed from every creature when man sinned, and that corruption and bondage succeeded purity of nature and liberty. 3. that the *earnest* wish of every living nature, is deliverance from bondage, and restoration to the liberty and happiness, nature is capable of. 4. that when all men manifest the true spirit of the Son of God, and show that they are "the sons of God," then the creature, or *whole creation*, i. e. the living creation at that time, will enjoy the happiness longed for and *groaned* after. And 5. that

this happy consummation had its commencement with the introduction of the gospel. The apostle says "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together UNTIL NOW," Ver. 22. The whole visible creation, termed in the singular, *the creature*, was thrown into "pain together," by man's sin. My doctrine is, and that man's nature being capable of liberty and happiness, if that nature be involved in bondage, its *earnest expectation*, and most constant wish and desire is for liberty and happiness. My inference is that the slaves *earnestly* wish for and long after liberty, or they are not a part of the living creatures of God. I will prove this point conclusively, and set at rest as far as I can the foolish assertions, that, "the slaves don't want their liberty;" and "they are contented and happy." My proofs shall not be drawn from professed anti-slavery men, abolitionists, fanatics, fools, disunionists, or NEW LIGHTS, as our friend, *Alethes*, calls them; but shall all be drawn from the *sunny South* itself?

In the winter of 1831-32 the Legislature of Virginia was engaged for more than two weeks in discussing slavery. During this discussion, Mr. MOORE said—"they (the slaves) will always be disposed to avail themselves of a favorable opportunity of asserting their NATURAL rights!" Again, the same speaker said—"It may be safely assumed, that whenever the slaves are as numerous as the whites, it will require *one half of the effective force of the whites to keep them quiet*, such is the fact, as to the whole of Eastern Virginia."

Mr. M'DOWELL—"Sir you may place the slave where you please—you may oppress him as you please; you may dry to your uttermost the fountains of his feeling, the springs of his thought and *the idea that he was born to be free, will survive it all*. It is allied to his hope of immortality. It is the ethereal part of his nature which oppression cannot reach."

Mr. MOORE again—"I lay it down as a maxim *not to be disputed*, that our slaves are now, and will ever be actuated by *the desire of liberty!*"

Mr. PRESTON—My old friend from Halifax (Mr. Bruce) told us that the Virginia slave was contented and happy. Mr. Speaker, *this is impossible; happiness is incompatible with slavery: the love of liberty is the ruling passion of man; and he cannot be happy, if deprived of it.*"

Mr. CAMPBELL—"The ever abiding spark of liberty, silently but surely exists, in the bosom of even the most degraded, oppressed and humble on earth,

Mr. GHOLSON—In describing the attempts to keep the slaves from gaining their liberty, said: "And think you, sir, that this attempt will not be resisted—just as sure as the love of freedom and the immediate prospect of attaining it *will influence the heart and inspire revolution—The love of freedom will be armed with desperation.*"

Mr. DANIEL—"The slaves cannot long remain ignorant of the sentiments thus publicly expressed, and it would indeed be strange if they did not greedily adopt expressions so favorable to their cause."

The preceding extracts are from speeches made in the Legislature of Virginia, on the 16th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 23d, and 26th of January, 1832.

The late Judge TUCKER, of Virginia, professor of law in the University of William and Mary, published a letter to a member of the Virginia Legislature in 1801, in which he says—"The love of freedom, sir, is an inborn sentiment. At the *first favorable moment* it springs forth and denies all cheek. Whenever we are involved in war, if our enemies hold out the lure of FREEDOM, they will have in every NEGRO a *decided friend*."

HON. B. W. LEIGH, Senator in Congress from Virginia, in a series of letters to the people of that State in 1832, speaking of the slaves, says—"The peculiar interest they must take in the subject, we may be sure, makes their hearing very acute. It is the most combustible matter that takes fire the soonest."—Page 77.

HON. P. BARBOUR, of Virginia, since a Judge of the Supreme Court U. S. said in Congress in 1820 (see National Intelligencer of that date)—"Slavery, disguise it as you will, is still a bitter draught." He quoted from Sterne.

Gov. GILES, in his address to the Legislature of Virginia, (1827) speaking of the number of crimes punished by sale into slavery, says:—"Slavery must be admitted to be a punishment of the highest order, and according to every just rule for the apportionment of punishment to crime, it would seem that it ought to be applied to crimes of the highest order." (Men are punished to the utmost by inflicting "happiness" upon them.)

In 1787, every slave holder in Congress voted the following resolution:—"There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the territory North-west of the Ohio, otherwise than for the punishment of crime."

HENRY CLAY, at a meeting of the American Colonization Society in January, 1818 said:—"He has placed a false estimate on liberty who believes that many (slaves) would refuse the boon, even when coupled with such a condition." (i. e. Going to Liberia.)

REV. J. D. PAXTON of Virginia who had always lived in the midst of slaves, says in his letters on slavery, page 153, "The slaves, man, woman and child, are longing for freedom." Dr. PAXTON has since gone to the liberty and joys of heaven. He was a good man.

PATRICK HENRY in his letter to Robt. Pleasants dated Jan. 18th, 1778 says: "Let us transmit to our descendants a pity for their (the slaves) *unhappy* lot. Let us treat the *unhappy* victims with lenity."

JEFFERSON in his notes on Virginia p. 71, says—"That the slave entails his own miserable condition on the endless generations proceeding from him. In his published correspondence he says:—"When the measure of their tears is full—when their groans have involved heaven itself in darkness, doubtless a God of justice will awaken to their distress."

WASHINGTON in his letter on Robert Morris, April 12th, 1786, says—"I hope it will not be conceived that it is my wish to hold those unhappy people in slavery." McCALL, in his history of Georgia, says:—"This class of people (slaves) who could not be supposed to be *contented* in slavery, and who would grasp with avidity at the most desperate attempts that promised freedom."

HON. BUSHROD WASHINGTON, in a letter in the Baltimore Telegraph, Sept. 18th, 1831; says: "I had good reason for anticipating the escape of ALL THE LABORING MEN OF ANY VALUE to the Northern States as soon as I should leave home."

This testimony is quite sufficient to make out the case, that it is *impossible* to believe that happiness and contentment could be associated with the condition of Southern slavery. And should it appear that some of the slaves are contented and happy in their condition, peculiar circumstances must be the cause, or the fact appears that their reason, through degradation, has lost its power of estimating what happiness is. But admitting the terrible character of this institution, which no honest man will deny, who has intelligence to comprehend it, and which the Hon. JUDGE is frank to acknowledge; what is to be done to remove it? Truly am I persuaded, that no instrumentalities will be more available for its overthrow than the calm discussion of the subject, guided by the light and Spirit of the Gospel of Christ, and accompanied with incessant prayer to God. His promise of deliverance is sure!

---

NUMBER XI.

“Commending ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God!” 2 Cor. 4, 2.

MR. EDITOR:

The question, whether God’s law or human law is to take precedence, is “the mightiest of the mighty questions” of the present day. A piece of mine appeared in the TRIBUNE of Oct. 4th, containing the doctrine, that God’s law is always supreme, and supporting this position with *eight* instances from the Bible, wherein direct *disobedience* to human law is shown without waiting for the *repeal* of such laws; and these instances shown to be the acts of *conscience* recognizing God’s will as the supreme rule of action. I have been covertly assailed by different writers for taking this ground. I have observed, however, that none of the writers have *condemned* the colonists for not waiting for the *repeal* of the stamp act law of the British Government, before they manifested disobedience to it! The Hon. JUDGE in his introductory article (Jour. Oct. 31,) refers to me, and the instances I gave from “the holy scriptures,” and alluded to me as “a reverend declaimer.” This is a very honorable title. I do not find fault with it at all. A *declaimer* is one who makes speeches *with intent to move the passions*, and no speech or sermon, or oration, will do much good that does *not move* the passions; so Demosthenes, the PRINCE of speakers, thought, “The passions are the avenues to the heart;” therefore, on some subjects, especially concerning human liberty and the prerogative of con-

science, it has been thought by high authority that "'Tis madness to be calm!"—Isa. 58: 1. Eph. 5: 14. The JUDGE has often moved the passions of men himself, in his eloquent pleadings, and no one found fault with him. He denies that the instances of disobedience which I cited have any relevancy to the subject in hand, because they were acts of disobedience to the law of individual *despots*, and where there was no *rule of political action*. But I am unable to see how a law emanating from five hundred *despots*, and based upon a rule of *political action*, could make *wrong into right*, or satisfy *conscience* that God's word ought to be disobeyed as well as "nature's law," because *five hundred* persons instead of *one*, make a law which, in the judgment of conscience, involves that sin, if obedience to it be yielded. If five hundred make a law that a man shall not eat when hungry, unless legally permitted, or *death* as a penalty shall be the consequence, and *one* having power to make the same sort of law and attach the same penalty, and does so, I cannot see how numbers will sanctify what God and nature condemn! Sure I am, I had rather be a slave to one *despot* such as Gov. McDuffy, of S. C., who says that "slavery is the corner stone of liberty," than be a slave to five hundred! I might manage to obey *one* absolute master, as the word *despot* implies, and he might be a pretty good fellow, too, but to obey five hundred would be hard to perform.—*One* of infinite knowledge says that I could not obey *two despots*, much less could I serve ten or five hundred! "No man can serve two masters." Not many are willing to have *mobs* to rule them! The Judge has not at all, therefore, disturbed the ground I laid down for *conscience* to act upon, by his statement in reply.

But what is this conscience? Conscience is the "testimony and secret judgment of the soul." Is conscience a rule or law of action? No it is not, neither when sound or erroneous. It is the secret judgment of the soul on the subject presented before it.—Conscience has to be influenced to action by law. God's word being supreme, is therefore the supreme rule of action for conscience. If conscience itself, was its own rule, then Judge M'Lean, as cited in the Journal, and the writer in the same paper, on the supremacy of law, who says "the law of the land must be obeyed under all pretexts whatever" would be right. But these gentlemen argue as if they understood "the law of the land" to be God. "The law of the land" is not God, nor can it stamp its will upon the christian patriot's heart in opposition to the authority of the revealed will of God. Neither is *conscience* God, nor can its dicta be taken for in

dispensable laws. The Judge on the bench is not the law. He is to give the law existing in its true application, in view of the testimony in the case before him, but his will of itself, is not the law. *Conscience* is a secret judge sitting in judgment in the court of the heart, hence the heart is sometimes called "the court of conscience." It is God's deputy in that court, but not God. The word of God should therefore be always its rule of decision, just as the law in the case is the rule of decision for the judge on the bench. The dictates of conscience, then, can only bind a man so far as they are agreeable to the law of God. Conscience requires understanding and the knowledge of the law as a rule of action, it is considered therefore as a practical *Syllogism*—the major proposition contains the rule—the minor is the witness of the fact—and the conclusion is the judge. "To the law and to the testimony if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them.—Isa. 8: 20.

We should "keep a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man,"—Acts 24: 16. But *conscience* is said sometimes to be *evil* when it is influenced by self-interest, bad habits, or base motives,—Heb. 10: 22. It is sometimes said to be *seared as with a hot iron*. This is the case when it is in nowise affected with the teachings, promises, threatenings or authority of God's holy law, 1 Tim. 4: 2. And it is sometimes said to be *defiled*, when it is so blinded, and perverted, and stupified, that it calls "evil good and good evil, darkness light and light darkness, bitter sweet and sweet bitter,"—Isa. 5: 20; Tit. 1: 15. No human law standing in opposition to the law of God, can therefore bind conscience. No human laws or constitutions can make it appear, that a *condition* originating in the curse of ALMIGHTY GOD, which in its history in all ages and nations, has been, and is, the curse of men and of every country where it prevailed and does prevail, whether viewed religiously, politically, socially or morally—a *condition* to afford *contentment and happiness* to man! Such a *condition* is absolute involuntary slavery! This is the judgment of WASHINGTON, of Jefferson, of Franklin, and of the best statesman, the best writers, the best moralists, the best christians, the best patriots and the greatest men, that ever the great God made in this or any other nation! To argue the contrary, is to exhibit a conscience influenced by self-interest and base motives; a conscience, evil, blinded, perverted and reckless of God's word and authority, even as wicked in judgment as Judge Jeffries was on the bench, when he abused and condemned the righteous Richard Baxter, or that other wicked Judge, dispos-

essed of his seat, by Lord Chief Justice Hale, in the case of the two brothers.

In all cases "the manifestation of the truth will commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God." Every man has therefore a conscience, and unless that *secret Judge* in the soul be perverted, defiled, drunk, or under the influence of pride, passion, or bribery, it will, according to the testimony before it, generally approve the right, and condemn the wrong.—Rom. 2: 16.

Conscience cannot admit the righteousness of an institution *because* of its *antiquity*. This is one argument used by the sustainers of slavery. "The institution," say they, "has existed in all ages." The *age* of an institution is no honor to it, if it be unrighteous. The age of an impenitent sinner only aggravates his doom. "The sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed." Isa. 65: 20. Sin has existed since the fall of Adam; it is sin still! The condition of man in slavery, is the figure of the condition of the sinner under the law of sin. Rom. 7: 23. In similies, evil cannot be represented by a metaphor which in itself is good, and what is good in itself cannot be made to represent that which in itself is evil. If slavery be the representation of sin, the thing in the image is in itself sinful, as certainly as the thing represented, is *sin*. And so natural liberty to legally unoffending men is right, and the spiritual liberty of the Gospel, which the other represents is right! Both figure and substance are right in the one case, and both are wrong in the other!

*Conscience* being good, that is, washed by the blood of Christ, and instructed by the Holy Spirit in the word of God, will be clear in its views, holy in its aims, and will vigorously oppose whatever is contrary to the will of God, so far as knowledge of that will is possessed. Such a conscience will not take *antiquity* for sanctity, nor ancient usages for righteous principles. If antiquity be found on the side of right it is a grand argument, but not otherwise. Jer. 6: 16. Here I will cite the quotations used by MORAL, found in the *Journal* of Nov. 22, for which though I know him not, I thank him. These quotations are to the purpose—

"There is not, it may be, a greater obstruction to the investigation of truth, or the improvement of knowledge, than the two frequent appeal, and the too supine resignations of our understanding to antiquity."—LORD CLARENDON.

"If we are to wait for improvement till the cool, the calm, the discreet part of mankind begin it; till church government solicit,



or ministers of state propose it, I will venture to propound that we may remain as we are till the renovation of all things.”—DR. PALEY.

“For a person to retard his own progress, much more posterity, is an outrage on the rights of man.”—KANT. The argument that “compulsory slavery is as old as the Jewish Theocracy,” is no proof of it being a condition suited to the nature of man. It is a condition of high judicial punishment.

Neither will an enlightened conscience come to any decision in its interpretation of human law, which will conflict with natural right or the claims of God upon the obedience of man. And this is agreeable to the legal maxim, *summa ratio est quæ pro religione facit*—“the highest reason is that which makes for religion;” the legal translation of this maxim is: “When the laws of God and man conflict, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the latter.” Coke and Littleton, 341. *a.* NOT so, say some, “The law of the land is to be obeyed under all pretexts whatever!” NOT so, says the intelligent christian! “I will *take* the liberty to compare ‘the law of the land,’ with the law of God, in any case where the former appears to conflict with the latter, and the light of the latter shall influence the *secret judgment* of *my soul* in deciding upon duty, before I agree to obey the former, “under any pretext whatever.”

To every command of lawful authority, obedience is, not only right, but *necessary* on the part of the governed. But no command is of lawful authority which conflicts with the law of God revealed, or the law of *nature*, which law is interwoven in the natural constitution of man. God’s authority is always supreme, and man’s nature existed before human legal authority was instituted. Hence God’s revealed will, and the rights of human nature must always have precedence of human enactments, whether civil or ecclesiastical. In all things lawful, we may and must “obey the powers that be.” But all things are lawful that are not sinful, therefore obedience to human laws is positively binding upon the conscience, and by the authority of God, in all things not sinful. This is the true doctrine of christian liberty. I will give a few short quotations in closing this article from a very learned and acute stickler for obedience to human law.

“There is no power but from God, that is, no lawful power; for power got into man’s hands by unlawful means is not from God.” “The powers that be are ordained, of God.” The powers that *be*, not what *they be*, right or wrong, as some would have it.” “God’s word is a perfect rule of faith and manners.” “I do easily yield

that God is Lord of *conscience*." "Where, I say, the divine and human laws do thwart and contradict one another, then we are to obey God rather than men."

These passages are taken from the works of the Rev. Dr. Adam Littleton, London edit. 1680, part 1, p. 220 and part 2, pp. 314, 315.

Where there is no revealed will of God, *reason* is the only rule of man's actions. Where this rule does not guide, in obedience to God's word where it is, and without that word where it is not, man sinks his nature by sensuality into the nature of a *beast*, or by tyranny and malice transforms himself into the nature of a devil! The *Bible* is the *moral sun*, the "greater light to rule the day" of pure and refined knowledge, and *reason* is the *moral moon*, "the lesser light to rule the night," of heathen darkness, superstition, and barbarism! The Bible gives reason its purest and brightest light, just as the sun gives the moon the light she reflects with which to rule the night. There is no light from the moon of human reason, which *contradicts* the light of the sun of divine revelation, and although the light of *this* sun is far brighter, and far beyond the light of *this* moon, yet is there nothing in the former which makes against the latter!

The "Fugitive Slave Bill," is, in the end it seeks to accomplish, *diametrically* opposed to the light which shines from both the sun called the *Bible*, and the moon called *right reason*. Therefore *the secret judgment of the soul* called *conscience* utterly rejects *that bill*.

One more article, Mr. Editor, and for a season my *pen* shall give way to the meditations of my readers.

---

NUMBER XII.

Let us hear the conclusion.—Eccles. 12, 13.

1. I commenced with the *fifty-eighth* chapter of Isaiah, and cited, and made some remarks on a part of that chapter. *There* God's mind is seen to be against cruelty, oppression, and the very institution of slavery, making the *breaking of every yoke*, and the taking it away from their midst the main condition of national prosperity to Israel. On the contrary, he shows by another prophet that the continuance of bondage, and its attendant cruelties, would secure the overthrow of the nation; and so it proved. "Therefore, thus saith the Lord: Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming LIBERTY, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor; be-

hold I proclaim liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine.”—Jerem. 34: 17. God’s judgments do not ordinarily fall upon a nation, without many previous warnings, and long waiting. God tells the nation of Israel that he set them free from their Egyptian bondage. But that instead of doing to others as he had done to them, they extended, and perpetuated slavery amongst themselves as a nation, and even re-enslaved those who were made free.—See ver. 12, 13. Hence the heavy national judgment threatened. Let the United States, as a nation, look back to her *deliverer*, her deliverance, her protestations of liberty to the world, and at what she is NOW doing!

### CONCLUSION.

1. The CHARACTER of “the fugitive slave bill.” I will give the view of Governor Ford of Ohio, in his recent message to the legislature of that state. It is in general accordance with my own.

The concluding remarks of Gov. Ford, in relation to this law, are as follows:

“This law, in its whole fabric, implies a general distrust of the good faith of the people of the free States, to abide by the provisions of the compact under which we exist as a government. Such distrust, which I believe is without any real foundation, weakens the ligaments which bind us together, and of course strikes at the foundation of our government. But the whole law, in all its provisions cannot be considered in this document. Suffice it to say that it is objectionable, because it makes slavery a National instead of a State institution, by requiring the costs of reclaiming the slave in some instances to be paid out of the United States Treasury—because it attempts to make *exparte* testimony, taken in another jurisdiction, final and conclusive in cases where its effect may be to enslave a man and his posterity for all time, and commits the decision of this question of civil liberty to officers not selected for their judicial wisdom or experience—because it attempts to compel the citizens of free States to aid in arresting and returning to slavery the man who is only fleeing for liberty, in the same manner as they would rightfully be bound to aid in arresting a man fleeing from justice charged with the commission of a high crime and misdemeanor.

Finally, in relation to the mode of trial, and other particulars, the law is contrary to the genius and spirit of our institutions, and therefore dangerous to both free and slave States, and consequently ought to be amended or repealed. But a forcible resistance to this, or any other law, is only rebellion, and is not the way to procure the remedy. Let there be a generous confidence in all parts of the nation, each with the other. Let the evils be plainly laid before the law-making power of the country. Let argument, and reason, and love of country, be the ruling principles, and the constitution will prevail. Let a law be passed, giving to the master his constitutional rights only, based upon common principles of evidence, adjudication and execution, thus being consistent with the spirit of our free institutions—and I venture

the assertion that it will be fulfilled to the letter and spirit in all parts of the Union, and the country again settle down in harmony and peace.”

2. The doctrine of FORCIBLE RESISTANCE to iniquitous laws.—*Forcible resistance* to wicked laws is altogether different from *non-obedience* to such laws. God tolerates many things in our world which in themselves are *void* of moral equity, so that the gospel may be brought to *bear* against every evil. But no where does he enjoin active obedience to laws commanding what he forbids—the true doctrine is to obey “the powers that be,” or “*suffer* for righteousness sake.” On this particular I will present you with the Hon. Judge JAY’s view found in a letter of his, dated BEDFORD, Oct. 2d, 1850. The Judge, in reference to the course proper for the colored people to pursue, remarks:

You ask me how you shall secure yourselves from the kidnapper. God only knows. May he have mercy upon you, for our law-makers have none. Rumors have reached me, of an intention on the part of our colored citizens to carry arms in self defence. If I have earned any title to your confidence, may I not ask you to ponder my advice, to abandon such an intention? Most freely do I confess my utter ignorance of any system of morals founded by divine authority on the color of a man’s skin. Whenever and for whatever cause, God permits a white man to take life, I believe he equally permits a black man, in similar circumstances, to do the same. Some, I know, maintain that life may never be taken in self defence, but it is not on this ground that I urge you to abstain from the use of deadly weapons. I implore you, I beseech you not to attempt the life of a kidnapper; first, because his death will not secure your safety, and being therefore unnecessary, it would be morally wrong; and secondly, because such an act of violence would prove the source of great evil to yourselves and to your brethren.”

I agree with the sentiments of this extract!

The *dissolution* of the Union. The State of South Carolina has been at the work of dissolving the Union for over twenty years.—She was at this business when Gen. Jackson was President, and more or less ever since. What a mad project! All these *hot-spurs* at the South, and the no-government abolitionists at the north are on a *par*. The unity of this confederacy is like the unity of the church; one made of many parts. Now, as an old divine writes of the church, so I write of this *whole republic*. He says: “He that dissolves the Union of parts, overthrows the Union of the whole.”—And on the subject of separation from the church because of existing evils, the renowned *Augustine* writes—*Non propter malos boni sunt deserendi, sed propter bonos mali sunt tolerandi*—which signifies, “Forsake not the good because of the evil, but tolerate the evil because of the good.” This sentiment will teach disunionists

a good lesson in respect to the State, as well as the church. But nearer to us than *Augustine*, the celebrated *Calvin* taught this very doctrine. He says, "we should know in the church that when we can bear no imperfection in others, then, (*diabolum nos tumefacere superbia*) the devil blows us up with pride." Among the family of States in this Union, there may be some bad and headstrong members, just as there are often found in the domestic circle, or in a body corporate. But they as unruly children, must be curbed. If they will fly from us, let them take the consequences, but let not us, as *Austin* says, fly from ourselves! *We* surely can live without *them*, better than *they* can live without *us*. To break up the Union for the sake of extending and perpetuating absolute, involuntary slavery! The whole world would curse them! No, no! they know far better! There are two or three millions of voices to be heard from the south first—voices we never heard yet on the subject of slavery.

FINALLY. The Fugitive Slave Bill will do good. God can make the wrath of man to praise him. The subject of slavery will be all discussed over again. Hundreds of thousands will now understand it who could not ten or twelve years ago. God will thus sow the land with the seed of liberty again. The seed must be renewed once in a while or it will deteriorate. Only the seed of God's eternal truth is an exception to this rule. *It* cannot "return void."—And now, Mr. *Editor*, you can bear me witness that I have dealt *gently* with our good friend *Alethes*; I have not abused him or any one else. I am fond of *facts*, but not of controversy.

Neither have I puzzled my readers with many words which they cannot take time to study out. I have purposely used plainness.—I have not perplexed them with the *Kal*, *Niphal*, Hiphil, Huphal, Hithpael, paragogics, prefixes, suffixes, six princes, ten kings, gutterals, and vowel points of the Hebrew. Nor with the *nine mutes*, divided into three times three, of lip-letters, palate-letters, and teeth-letters of the Greek, and as for "the ancient sonorous Latin tongue," I have, as you know, only very sparingly used it. I love plain facts, and if the southern christians will only do with their slaves as the Jews did with theirs, *abolitionists* will soon be forced to hold their tongues—that is, set every slave free who professes to believe and adopt their religion, the moment his or her religious examination shall be sustained. This would sap the institution of slavery at the foundation. And firmly do I believe that God thus designed its overthrow by the Gospel.

Thanking you, sir, and your worthy co-workers in conducting

your paper, for the courtesy you have extended to me in granting me the privilege of your columns—I conclude with subscribing my self most respectfully yours, &c., &c.

NATHANIEL WEST.

ERRATA.

Page 37, second line, for "were we," read *We are, &c.*; page 37, twelfth line, for "meet it," read *meet me, &c.*; page 38, first line, for "God," read *God, &c.*; page 40, ninth line, for "Oweth ought," read *Oweth thee ought, &c.*

## OPINIONS OF THE CONTROVERSY.

---

*From the Weekly Mercury Dec 27, 1850.*

### MR. WEST ON THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

We this day conclude the series of Essays written by the Rev. Nath'l West in reply to articles recently published in the Journal over the signature of "Alethes." These Essays have been read with considerable interest by our readers, and have also been re-published by contemporaries in other parts of the country. We are gratified at this; for apart from the high esteem in which we hold the Reverend writer, his Essays possess an intrinsic merit that entitles them to extensive and careful perusal: though written upon a topic of painfully exciting interest, and in answer to the fallacies of an exceedingly crafty writer, and therefore necessarily controversial, our author has not swerved from his purpose, by indulging in any disparaging personal allusions—his object was not to assail his opponent, but to demolish his argument by the potent power of truth and reason. In this he has succeeded. He has proved the unity of the human race, and proved it by the word of God, he has shown by the enactments of the slave-power the revolting character of slavery as it exists in the Southern States—that slavery is utterly inconsistent with the principles of christianity—and that obedience to the Fugitive Slave Law cannot be rendered by any who regard the Sacred Word as their guide; and though the duty of obedience to that "higher power" is urged as paramount to the imperfect enactments of man, the Reverend writer is eminently conservative—he places as high a value upon the Union, and its perpetuity, as the noisiest of those who cry aloud for its preservation. We think these Essays are of great value to the seeker after truth on this vexed question, and we would suggest to the Friends of Freedom, the propriety of having them re-published in pamphlet form, and freely circulated.

---

*For the Weekly Mercury.*

### THE "FUGITIVE" CONTROVERSY.

Well, it is finished, the voice of contending spirits is hushed; and the champions have laid aside their intellectual swords. We may now ask what has been accomplished? Have the pillars of truth trembled on their eternal foundation? or has the just prejudice (if some *will* call it so) of millions of freemen been shaken? Like a drop of spray on hot iron have the arguments in favor of slavery fallen on the hearts

of men? Is it for nought that a christian public study the Bible, or listen from Sabbath to Sabbath to the pure teachings of the peaceful Gospel? Surely not. Men have not read so much in vain the immortal "Sermon on the Mount," by the light of heaven sparkling around them in this wonderful age, as to believe that American slavery, with all its tendencies, is no crime. And yet arguments have been addressed to the public inferring it perfectly justifiable. The motive, doubtless, was good. No one, I presume, imagines anything else. It was intended, it seems, as a salvo to men's consciences if they should in any case be under the necessity of carrying into effect the law passed by Congress. A defence of that law seemed necessary, it is true, because it was so generally objected to. And why was it found fault with? Simply, as every body knows; because it required men to do what they considered a cruel act. I believe it is very generally admitted that "Alethes" managed his manner of defence with great skill. For my own part I read his articles with pleasure, because I admired adroit reasoning; but I may say as one of the public to whom his articles were addressed, that I found nothing to convince me of error in regard to my general opinion on the subject of slavery. Men do not now as in former times depend *so much* on the word of the teacher of any doctrine. They have books to read now, and they do read and think. This should make the man who advances an idea exceedingly careful lest a discriminating public detect an error therein. I do not by any means mean anything disrespectful to "Alethes" by thus expressing myself; but I think it is a truth very generally applicable in this intelligent age. Our standards of truth are open to the inspection of every man, and those who pretend to teach, will find it difficult to make converts unless he is obviously sustained by the books. It was thought necessary that "Alethes" should receive a reply. This task was undertaken by the Rev. N. West. For my own part I thank him for the manner in which he has accomplished it. His array of splendid facts together with its masterly arrangement, cannot be too much admired. But the instincts of our common nature, with the true spirit of the gospel so happily expressed, give it a power and a charm which must be felt by all.

READER.