

452

A LETTER
TO
LORD BROUGHAM,
ON THE SUBJECT OF
AMERICAN SLAVERY.
BY AN AMERICAN.

LONDON:
JAMES DINNIS, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1835.

WILLIAM TYLER,
PRINTER,
BOLF COURT, FLEET STREET.



A LETTER,

§c.

MY LORD,

Nothing but duties of an imperative character could have prevented the writing of this letter at an earlier period. I make no apology for addressing it to your Lordship, feeling well convinced that the interest you take in the subject to which it relates, is such, as to render *that* wholly unnecessary.

It is not, my Lord, in *defence* of Slavery that I undertake to address your Lordship. I bless God that this is an evil with which I have had nothing to do, except to endeavour, by humble means, to mitigate its pressure, and to hasten its peaceful termination. But it is with the view of defending my country, against some of the misrepresentations which have been recently heaped upon it; as well as giving to the British public some information on this subject which, I apprehend, they have not possessed.

It happened to me, my Lord, to be called by duty to visit London during the late season of the Anniversaries of those Religious and Benevolent Societies, which are both the ornament and shield of Great Britain. None of these meetings excited in my mind a more intense interest than that of the Anti-

slavery Society, at which your Lordship presided. With the greater part of what was said and done on that occasion, I could not feel otherwise than gratified. But in regard to some of the statements made, and the language employed in reference to the United States of America, I confess that I felt deeply pained; not so much, I assure your Lordship, from any sense of wounded pride, as from the deep conviction which I felt, and do still feel, that, so far as relates to those statements, and that language, the most effectual course was pursued to injure and retard the cause of the emancipation of the slaves in that country.

As I shall have occasion, in another part of my letter, to revert to this subject, I shall not dwell upon it here, but only say that I must wholly exonerate your Lordship from even the suspicion of having participated in those statements, or of having employed that language. The admirable speech which your Lordship made upon taking the chair on that occasion, as well as on leaving it, gave me unmingled pleasure.

It is true, indeed, that your Lordship, when alluding to the state of things in the United States of America, (which was done in a manner characterized by an accurate judgment, and an excellent sense of propriety,) fell into an error, which, although considerable, was wholly unintentional. It consisted in expressing the opinion, that there is reason to fear that the Americans are settled down in contentedness, with the existence of slavery amongst them. I do not quote your Lordship's language; but I think that I give the idea which was thrown out on that occasion. It is but justice to say, however, that you expressed not only a hope, but a firm belief, that the people of that country would soon awake to a decided action in con-

formity with the noble principles of their political organization.

It is my purpose, my Lord, to endeavour to demonstrate that the people of the United States are neither now, nor ever have been, contented with the existence of Slavery amongst them; and that there is good reason to believe that the benevolent anticipations of your Lordship will be realized.

The entire history of the United States, both as Colonies, and as Independent States, I affirm, proves that they have never been indifferent to the evils and the wickedness of Slavery. To support this assertion, let us review their history, commencing with that which is Colonial.

I ask, my Lord, who it was that introduced slavery into the then colonies of Great Britain, and imposed and rivetted the chains of slavery upon them? No one knows better than your Lordship does, that it was the British government.* It was, from first to last, a measure of that government, in order to promote its commerce, and, above all, its navigation interests. This is a statement which needs no proof from me; for it is known to every one who knows any thing of the history of Great Britain and those colonies. Yes, my Lord, the slave trade was then maintained by England, and hundreds of thousands of slaves were imported from Africa, into the colonies, upon the same principle, and with about as little remorse, as the Newfoundland Fisheries, or any other branch of trade, was kept up—to *extend and cherish her navigation interests!* Was it not so, my Lord? The colonies had little, or, rather, no Foreign commerce, carried

* It is no valid contradiction of this statement to say,—which was really the fact, that the first slaves introduced into these Colonies, were imported into Virginia in 1620, by a *Dutch* ship. The British Government allowed it to be done; and then took up, itself, and perpetuated the horrible work.

on in their own shipping, for a long period after their settlement. It was not considered to be for the advantage of the mother country that they should have. Every thing which could be done by legislation on the part of Great Britain, to prevent it, was done. And it was British, and not colonial ships, which monopolized this infamous traffick, so far as it was connected with that portion of the American continent which is now called the United States.

And what was the course pursued by the colonies? *They opposed the introduction of slaves amongst them.* This was done so generally that it may with propriety be said that this opposition was universal. But still the horrid work went on. Some persons were found in the colonies who were willing to buy slaves, for cupidity is to be found in all countries, and in every age of the world. By degrees slavery gained a lodgement in every colony, though the greatest accumulation of it was in the southern colonies, which were less free in their forms of government, and more under the control of the British Crown, than those of the north. Other causes also co-operated to create that accumulation.

To the evils of slavery, as well as to those of any other sort, people may become gradually accustomed, and even to too great an extent reconciled. It was so, in some measure, with the colonies. Stern necessity shut them up to this alternative. But were they entirely contented? No; they petitioned the government of Great Britain again and again not to allow slavery to be perpetuated amongst them. Virginia did so; Pennsylvania did so; Massachusetts did so; others did so. And *all* would have done so, if they had not been discouraged by the unsuccessful attempts of their sister colonies.

The power which turned a deaf ear to the cries of these infant colonies, entreating that slavery might not be forced upon them at its commencement, still refused to hear when they besought that it might not be rendered perpetual.

The case of the colony of Georgia was, if possible, more remarkable and afflictive than that of any of the others. That colony was not founded in the darkness of the seventeenth century, but almost in the middle of the eighteenth. It was the last, in the order of time, of the whole thirteen British colonies, which afterwards formed the United States. The worthy and beloved General Oglethorpe was its founder, and first governor. As usual, no sooner was the colony established, or rather commenced, than slaves began to be forced upon it. The governor and council besought the British government not to allow slaves to be brought for market, to that colony. This they did at a time when the parent country might easily have prevented the evil. The colony itself had no such power. None of the colonies had such power. It was the claimed prerogative of the British government to regulate the commerce of the colonies, to prescribe what articles of trade should be admitted into them, and under what, if any, restrictions; whilst there was, on the part of the colonies, no power to prevent the entrance of such articles of commerce as were allowed by the government of the mother country. Consequently so long as there were any persons to be found in any colony who were willing to buy slaves, they were sure to be imported. Such being the case, all that Georgia could do was to *petition*, and to *remonstrate*. This was done nine or ten times, as can be proved by the records of that colony, until the British government, wearied by the importunity of the venerable Oglethorpe, and his council, dis-

missed him from his office! These, my Lord, are matters of fact, and if they are not known to the world, it is time that they should be.

But still the colonies did not cease from their efforts to induce the government of Great Britain to relieve them from the evils of slavery, or at least not to allow more slaves to be imported into them. Their efforts, however, were of no avail; and when their resistance to oppression assumed an open and general character, one of the numerous grievances of which they complained, and which stood prominently on the long catalogue, was that the parent country had not only forced slavery upon them at first, but had also continued to introduce slaves among them even after they had repeatedly remonstrated against it. They even took some measures themselves, the year before the commencement of the war of the revolution, to put a stop to the slave trade. For the Continental Congress, as it was called, which met at Philadelphia in 1774, recommended, by a resolution, to the colonies not to import, or purchase any slave imported, after the first day of December in that year; and wholly to discontinue the trade. The Convention of Delegates of the people of Virginia had anticipated this measure, for in August preceding they resolved to discontinue the importation of slaves. And, my Lord, I need not inform you that when the distinguished committee, appointed by the American Congress, in 1776, to prepare the Declaration of Independence, composed of Jefferson, Adams, R. R. Livingston, Sherman, and Franklin, brought in that celebrated document, it contained the following passage in relation to slavery, which was, with some other passages, struck out by Congress, not because it was not approved by almost every member, but because it met with the opposition of a few from the southern

colonies, and entire unanimity was considered to be of paramount importance:—

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

With regard to this, as well as every other species of oppression enumerated in that declaration, it is added, “ In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms; our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injuries.”

During the war of our revolution, the attention of our fellow-citizens was absorbed in the protracted conflict with a powerful enemy. As the slaves were not then so numerous as to excite apprehension of danger from them, and were, moreover, almost universally attached to their masters, the war, by employing the white population to a very great degree, and leaving the support of their families almost wholly to the industry of the slaves,

incredible as it may at first sight appear, operated rather to make the people, especially in the southern states, less repugnant to slavery. At its termination, the thirteen colonies were left free and independent states, but with nothing which properly deserved the name of a general or united government. Articles of confederation had, indeed, been adopted, and a congress composed of delegates chosen by the legislature of the several states, annually assembled. But their legislation was limited to a few general subjects, of which slavery was not one. This state of things lasted five or six years, until the present constitution was formed, in 1787, ratified by almost all the States during the next year, and went into operation in 1789.

It has often been a matter of surprise, that the framers of the constitution did not, by that noble instrument secure either the immediate or the gradual abolition of slavery; or, at any rate, bring the subject under the legislative control of the general government, which was created by that instrument. I confess, my Lord, that I have a thousand times wished that they had done so. Perhaps they might have done it. If so, a noble opportunity was then lost for accomplishing this desirable object. But, on the other hand, your Lordship, I presume, is fully aware of the difficulties by which they were surrounded. The majority of the States then held slaves; for none but two or three of the New England States had abolished slavery in the interval which had elapsed between the declaration of independence, and the meeting of the Convention to form the constitution. The political power was, therefore, in the hands of the slave-holding states. And so great was the difficulty of forming a united and efficient government, owing to the fact that each state had its own organization, and had long

exercised the prerogatives of state sovereignty, that it required great wisdom and prudence, and an uncommon spirit of conciliation on every point not absolutely essential. For it was rightly deemed an object of primary importance to have but one general republic, instead of what would otherwise have been the case, several, if not thirteen. It was this consideration alone which led those distinguished men—those philanthropists I will call them—to concede the whole subject of slavery to the legislative control of the individual States. They were compelled to do so, or to forego the advantages of a union, and encounter all the risks or rather inevitable evils which the want of it would have occasioned. This was undoubtedly the position in which the question stood. The journal of that Convention fully proves this. And what is more, such men as Franklin, and Washington, and Wilson, and Elsworth, and other distinguished members of that Convention, as sincerely desired the abolition of slavery as any abolitionist of modern times, and were quite as good judges of what was then practicable.

This Convention has been censured for not doing more; and yet it was greatly in the advance of any similar body then to be found in the world. For to it belongs the honour of having taken the first effective measure for abolishing the infamous slave trade. Yes, my Lord, it is even so. And although that measure was prospective, and was not to go into actual operation until a period of twenty years had elapsed, that is until 1808; yet it was a step greatly in advance of what had been done by any other nation. At that period, and for years afterwards, the British government did nothing. And even after Mr. Wilberforce had begun to call the attention of Parliament to this subject, it was not until March,

1807, that the slave trade was effectually condemned by statute in Great Britain. So that it was literally twenty years after our convention had condemned that execrable trade, and less than one year before it actually ceased by the constitution formed by that Convention, that England could be brought to abolish it also. In my opinion, we fairly led the way, and did what was truly remarkable for that epoch. But if one should still say that they ought to have done more; I answer that it is easy to say so *now*, with all the light which has been shed upon this subject; but I consider it truly wonderful that they did as much as they did. They commenced the demolition of the monstrous superstructure of slavery; they attempted all that was then practicable, and they showed their wisdom in doing so, whatever mere theorists may think, or say to the contrary.

What has been done in the United States, in relation to the subject of slavery, since the adoption of the Constitution, I will now briefly state.

I. Slavery has been abolished in the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and New York; states which embrace nearly a fourth part of the entire population of the whole union. The number of slaves in those states was not, however, great. But yet it required much argument, and many years, in the case of the last named three states, to induce them to come into this measure. This work of justice and mercy was achieved mainly by the efforts of the Anti-slavery Society of Pennsylvania, which was formed about the year 1787, by Franklin, and other excellent men of that day, and of the Manumission Society of New York, which was founded about the same time by the exertions of the late distinguished John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the United States, and others of a similar

spirit. The abolition of slavery in these states has been, by a wise provision of the law, gradual, so that at this time there are but few slaves (and they are chiefly aged and infirm persons, for whose comfortable maintenance the laws oblige their former masters to be responsible) to be found in them.

And here, perhaps, it may not be amiss to present to your Lordship's view the actual state of this question, by a brief statistical account. It is this: The six north-eastern states, commonly called the New England States, viz., Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, at present containing more than two millions of inhabitants, became freed from slavery soon after the revolutionary war. The four middle states, which I have just spoken of, viz., New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, containing a population at present of little short of four millions, have become freed from slavery since 1790. The last of them that adopted this measure was New York, about ten or twelve years since. The four north-western states, (including the territory of Michigan, which is about to enter the union as a state, and will be the twenty-fifth,) viz., Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan, which do not at this time contain a population of less than two millions, are free states. These four new states have been chiefly colonized from the other ten non-slaveholding states. The result is, that there are now fourteen states, in which it may be said that slavery does not exist, and which have all either been delivered from slavery, or have been colonies from those states which have experienced that happy deliverance. These fourteen states now embrace a population exceeding *eight millions* of souls, and still increasing at a rate which is absolutely without a parallel in the history of the world.

The slaveholding states are Maryland, Virginia,

North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Missouri, and Louisiana, in all eleven. To this number we may add the two territories of Arkansas and Florida which will soon become states, having now, it is supposed, the requisite number of inhabitants. This makes the entire number of the slaveholding states and territories thirteen. In this statement I include the little district of Columbia, in the states of Virginia and Maryland, of which it formerly made a part, and which can never become an independent state. The entire population of these thirteen slave states, and territories, does not much exceed, at this time, *six millions*, of whom 2,002,177 were, in 1830, slaves; and 166,215 free persons of colour.

For your Lordship's satisfaction I submit the following tabular view of the states and territories, with their population in 1830, as derived from the census taken by order of the general government. This census was made, however, five years ago. In the general statement which I have just given, I have estimated, on undoubted data, the *present* population of the several grand divisions spoken of.

FREE STATES, WITH THEIR POPULATION IN 1830.

	White Persons.	Free Coloured Persons.	Slaves.	Total Population.
Maine	398,263	... 1,192	... none	... 399,955
New Hampshire	268,721	... 607	... none	... 269,328
Vermont	279,771	... 681	... none	... 280,652
Massachusetts...	603,359	... 7,048	... none	... 610,408
Rhode Island...	93,621	... 3,578	... none	... 97,199
Connecticut ...	289,603	... 8,072	... none	... 297,675
New York.....	1,868,061	... 44,870	... 75	... 1,918,608
New Jersey ...	300,266	... 18,303	... 2,254	... 320,823
Pennsylvania...	1,309,900	... 37,930	... 403	... 1,348,233
Delaware	57,601	... 15,855	... 3,292	... 76,748
Ohio	928,329	... 9,574	... none	... 937,903
Indiana	389,399	... 3,632	... none	... 343,031
Illinois	155,061	... 2,384	... none	... 157,445
Michigan	31,346	... 293	... none	... 31,639
Total ...	6,923,301	154,020	6,024	7,187,647

SLAVEHOLDING STATES, WITH THEIR POPULATION IN 1830.

	White Persons.	Free Coloured Persons.	Slaves.	Total Population.
Maryland.....	291,108 ...	52,938 ...	102,994 ...	447,040
Virginia.....	694,300 ...	47,348 ...	469,557 ...	1,211,405
North Carolina	472,843 ...	19,543 ...	245,601 ...	737,987
South Carolina	257,863 ...	7,921 ...	315,401 ...	581,185
Georgia	296,806 ...	2,486 ...	217,531 ...	516,823
Alabama	190,406 ...	1,572 ...	117,549 ...	309,527
Mississippi ...	70,443 ...	519 ...	65,659 ...	136,621
Louisiana.....	89,231 ...	16,710 ...	109,588 ...	215,739
Tennessee ...	535,746 ...	4,555 ...	141,603 ...	681,904
Kentucky.....	517,787 ...	4,917 ...	165,213 ...	687,917
Missouri	114,795 ...	569 ...	25,091 ...	140,455
Arkansas	25,671 ...	141 ...	4,570 ...	30,388
Florida.....	18,385 ...	844 ...	15,501 ...	34,730
Dis. of Columbia	27,563 ...	6,152 ...	6,119 ...	39,834
Total...	3,602,947	166,215	2,002,177*	5,781,555

These statements, my Lord, show that the preponderance is greatly on the side of the non-slaveholding states. But another circumstance is to be added, which renders the prospect still brighter. It is, that the states of Maryland and Kentucky, containing a population of more than one million one hundred thousand souls, of whom nearly two hundred and seventy thousand are slaves, will soon join the ranks of the non-slaveholding states. Of this I do not entertain a doubt. A few years will witness this transition. And further, I have as little doubt that Virginia, Tennessee, and Missouri will, before many years pass away, adopt the same measure. Upon the occurrence of the abolition of slavery in Kentucky and Maryland, the number of the non-slaveholding states will be sixteen, whilst that of the slaveholding will be reduced to eleven, including Arkansas and Florida. And when Virginia, Tennessee, and Missouri become freed from slavery, or

* The above statement of the number of slaves differs from that given in the census, which is 2,009,049, and includes the slaves in ten free states, as they are called, and also some persons in Connecticut, &c. who are not slaves.

have commenced this blessed work, the number will stand nineteen to eight.

Your Lordship will perceive that I take it for granted that no new territories will hereafter be created, in which slavery will be allowed to enter. This is my decided opinion. There is indeed a vast extent of country, claimed by the United States government, and lying westward and northward of the remotest western states and territories; but by an act adopted by our Congress, when Missouri had permission to form her constitution, preparatory to becoming a member of the union, slavery cannot extend northward beyond the degree of latitude which forms the northern boundary of that state. Of course it is excluded from the immense regions of the Upper Mississippi. The country immediately westward of Arkansas territory has been assigned to the Indian tribes, which were formerly within the limits of the states and territories. There they are collecting, and it is believed that there they may become civilized, and eventually form a constituent portion, as a territory of the United States. There, at any rate, the experiment may be made, and under circumstances widely different from those which existed when they lived within the bounds of organized states, and where their oppressions were occasioned in almost every instance by the charters granted originally by the British Crown. They will now be assembled on a sufficiently extensive country, beyond the claims of any state, and it is hoped that they will not be disturbed. This leaves but little room for new territories to be formed westward of the present states, into which slavery can enter, unless the government should buy Texas from Mexico, an event not unlikely. But even if that purchase should be made, I am very confident that there is a feeling existing at present in the

United States which will prevent it or any other district of country from being organized as a territory with slavery existing in it. Indeed it is possible that the territories of Arkansas and Florida may not be received into the union as states, until they abolish slavery. But this I do not expect. It is too late for the government to take that stand, after having allowed these territories to be organized, as such, with the existence of slavery in them. The proper course for the general government to pursue is, to prevent the introduction of slavery into every territory when it is organized as such, and long before it is sufficiently populous to become a state. This the general government has power to do; and of this course none, or at any rate but few, could have a right to complain. Those who choose to emigrate to such a territory would know what to expect, and could not afterwards complain that the government had taken advantage of them.

You will learn, my Lord, from the preceding statements, that it cannot be said that the people of the United States have been indifferent to the evils of slavery. When we entered into the struggle for our independence, slavery pervaded the land; now fourteen states are free from it, and the prospect is encouraging in regard to several others. Let it be remembered too, that for more than thirty years after our independence, the attention of our people was absorbed by internal difficulties,—Indian wars, embargoes, and finally by a war with Great Britain. I am far, however, from saying that we have done all that we should have done. That there has been an increasing interest felt on this subject, of late years, may be inferred from the formation of the American Colonization Society. This society has been in existence some sixteen or eighteen years;

and although it has been denounced, in the most violent manner, I am persuaded that the object of its founders was benevolent, and that the plan, if properly carried out, is calculated to promote the abolition of slavery to a considerable extent. I have always been an advocate of the colonization scheme for three reasons.

1. It gives those slave-holders who are desirous of setting their slaves free, but who are prevented by the laws of the states in which they reside from doing it, (unless they send them out of those states,) the opportunity of sending them to colonies in which there is a prospect of their doing well.

2. It leads incidentally to a discussion of the evils of slavery among the slave-holding states, and so does good.

3. It promises to be of incalculable benefit to Africa by planting colonies, from which I am persuaded that the lights of Christianity and civilization will shine forth to bless large portions of that benighted continent. For I firmly believe that although many difficulties have been encountered, from perhaps not selecting the best sites for these colonies, &c., yet they may all be overcome, and those colonies so organized as to do great good to Africa, and to the world. I am free to confess, however, that much as I love the colonization cause, I think that it has not been well managed. The society has been far from acting with that vigour and wisdom which ought to have animated it, and which so great and good a cause demanded. I fear, too, that it has been too frequently held up, by indiscreet advocates, as the grand means of delivering the country from the existence and evils of slavery, and that it has, by such advocacy, ministered to the erroneous but wide-spread opinion that the slaves cannot become free and remain in the United States.

This position I deem wrong and injurious, and wholly unnecessary to the cause. Colonization can be defended on other and better grounds. That the society has done much good I do firmly believe ; but it is due to candour to state that it is possible that many good men in the slave-holding states have, for some years, been depending too much upon it, and whilst doing so have not looked at more efficient and direct ways of getting rid of slavery.

Still further.—Many who began to think that the colonization scheme was inefficient, and who were stimulated by the success of the efforts of your Anti-slavery Societies in England, have, within a few years, determined to form similar associations in the United States. This has led to the formation of the American Anti-slavery Society, with the avowed and direct purpose of attacking slavery and urging its immediate abolition. This society has formed many affiliated associations throughout the free states, and by discourses, by public debates, and by a large number of periodical and other publications, it has commenced a violent assault upon the object of its attack ;—the discussion has become animated and bold, and truly exciting ; it is now agitating the whole country, and has assumed an aspect somewhat portentous. Great opposition is made to this society, not only by the southern states, but by vast numbers in the non-slave-holding states ;—it would, indeed, seem that the integrity of the union is seriously endangered.

I am disposed to think, my Lord, that my fellow citizens who formed the American Anti-slavery Society, and all who sustain its proceedings, have not sufficiently considered the widely different circumstances of Great Britain and the United States. Certainly the cases of the two countries cannot be

deemed analogous. Parliament and the Crown have with you entire and undisputed control over slavery, whether existing in your island or in any other portion of the British dominions. All that is requisite, in order to effect its abolition, with you, is, by discussion, so to enlighten the people that they shall, by a decided majority, demand of parliament that slavery shall end. With us the case is wholly different. By our constitution the subject of slavery is reserved to the individual states in which it exists; they alone can legislate over it,—each state for itself. They alone have a right to say when slavery shall cease within their respective limits. Our congress has no manner of control over it. The fourteen states which are free from it, although they have a large majority of the entire population, can do nothing on this subject except prevent, through congress, its spread into new territories, and abolish it (by their majority of votes in congress) in the district of Columbia. Now this being the case, your Lordship must see that Anti-slavery Societies formed in the free states can do nothing *directly* to secure the abolition of slavery in the southern states. They may, possibly, if rightly conducted, do something indirectly. But it is manifest that it is only the people of the slave-holding states themselves who can do any thing effectual in this work,—to them it undoubtedly belongs. The formation of Anti-slavery Societies in the free states, for any purpose beyond that of inducing congress to do what alone belongs to it—the prevention of the extension of slavery into new territories and its abolition in the district of Columbia—is not likely to have a very good effect. It alarms and irritates those who have exclusive power over the subject.

I have not a doubt, my Lord, that the gentlemen

who are the leading members of the American Anti-slavery Society are actuated by the purest motives. They have, indeed, been denounced, I am sorry to say, as the worst of men,—as fanatics, as aiming at the ruin of the country, &c. Almost every opprobrious epithet has been heaped upon them. But it would require much more than I have yet seen or heard, to cause me for a moment to distrust the integrity and benevolence of purpose of Mr. Arthur Tappan and many others who are engaged in that society. They feel deeply for the condition of the slave, and for the honour of the country; and they sincerely desire to do their duty. They are not infallible, nor do they claim to be so; yet I have no doubt that they have aimed at doing what cannot be done by the people of the free states. All the excitement which they can create on this subject in the free states cannot reach the case. It belongs to the people in the slave-holding states to do any thing effectual. Nor have I a doubt that some of the coadjutors of these good men have done irreparable injury to the cause which they have advocated, by their dreadful violence. Surely it does no good, but much injury, to call men by such names as have often been applied to the slave-holders. Nor is it just. As I have not seen any of the late publications of the Anti-slavery Society, nor of those who labour independently of it, in the same cause, I do not know what is the ground for the charge which has been brought against them of aiming at exciting insurrection among the slaves; I firmly believe that this charge is not true. Yet I can also easily believe that there has not been a proper degree of prudence on this point. Much as we may desire the abolition of slavery in the United States, and no one can desire

it more sincerely than I do, yet it will not do for a moment to think of effecting it through violence. No, my Lord, that must be opposed at the very threshold: and I am sure it will be by every good man in the United States. That course is too horrible to be spoken of, and the man deserves everlasting infamy who dares to suggest it.

I have said, my Lord, that our congress—in other words, our general government—has no control over slavery as it exists in the organized states. And I have also said that it is not likely that they will exert the power which they have over it in the two territories of Florida and Arkansas—which, however, can never, for physical reasons, have a large population. But you will ask, “May not your constitution be so altered as to allow congress that power?” I answer that it *might* be so changed; but it is not likely that this will be done. There are two ways by which our constitution may be amended according to its expressed provisions, as your Lordship will perceive from the following extract from it. “The congress, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this constitution; or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by congress.” You will see from this statement that it is wholly improbable that an attempt to amend our constitution, on this subject, could be successful. Nor is it likely that such an attempt will be made.

I have said, my Lord, that there is at this time very great excitement throughout the United States, occasioned by the proceedings of the Anti-slavery Society; the newspapers are full of it;—to judge from their tone, one would be almost disposed to think that the country is on the eve of a grand revolution. Much deplorable violence has been displayed. Such being the case, your Lordship, and many others in England and throughout Europe, are most solicitous to know what will be the issue of these things. My Lord, I make no pretensions to the prophetic power, but I have no hesitation in answering, as one who has had good opportunities of knowing every portion of the United States within the last few years, and has seen much of the very best men, of all parties, in that country, that there will be no such revolution. Nor will there be, I believe, a separation of our happy union. There will be much discussion of the right of the free states to interfere on the subject of slavery. And this discussion will do good. It will settle principles. Such discussions have always done us good. We cannot do without them. And the result of *this* discussion will be that the people of the free states—in an overwhelming majority—will say to their brethren of the slave-holding states, “We deplore the existence of slavery among you; we abhor its injustice; but we respect your rights; we deeply sympathize with you; we will do nothing to interfere with the right of controlling the subject of slavery which the constitution has vested in you, nor will we do any thing to endanger your safety; we stand ready to aid you, if our aid can be of any avail; we leave to your wisdom to devise and your hands to execute some safe and practicable plan for the extinction of slavery, in which you shall have

our co-operation, if you should need it ; but we do hope, (and you will allow us to say it,) that some such plan may be speedily devised." This, my Lord, is the language of the overwhelming majority of the people of the north. What then will be the result ? It will be that after some legislation has been adopted by the southern states to prevent the circulation of dangerous publications, (or such as they may deem to be so,) and perhaps some action of the general government, the country will settle down into a state of quietude—not, however, of *indifference* to the evils of slavery. Meanwhile the southern states themselves will think more intensely on the subject, and some of them will act too, before many years will pass away. Time will of course be required, and time will work wonders on this as well as on every other subject.

Another means of promoting emancipation—gradual, but sure and safe in its influence—is the religious instruction which is generally given from the pulpit, in almost all parts of the slave-holding states. For it must be said to the honour of my country, that no legislature of any state has ever attempted to place any hinderance in the way of preaching the gospel to the slaves ; for I do not view in that light the laws which have been adopted in two or three states, to guard against dangerous or incompetent persons who attempt to preach. That the influence of the gospel, when faithfully preached, is not only calculated to make masters treat their slaves with greater kindness, but also to think of giving them their liberty, and to prepare both the slave and the master for that state of things when slavery shall cease, cannot for a moment be doubted. In four of the slave-holding states there is no law forbidding the instruction of the slaves in reading and

writing, and in those states there are many who attend the Sunday-schools, and some few are taught in other schools. I am far from saying that all is doing which ought to be done for their instruction, even in those states. In one or two others, the consent of the master is required before the law allows the slave to attend even a Sunday-school. Whilst in five states, and two territories, I am sorry to say laws have been made forbidding the instruction of slaves in reading and writing. And even two or three have gone so far as to forbid, as in Louisiana and North Carolina, the instruction, in schools, of even the free people of colour. I condemn these enactments as much as any man. They are condemned by many of the best men in those states; and they will, I am persuaded, soon be repealed and become obsolete, if the present excitement should disappear. They were passed a few years ago, upon the appearance of a pamphlet, published at Boston, by an infamous wretch who attempted, by it, to excite the slaves to rise against their masters. I know that such laws expose us to severe animadversions abroad, where nothing is known scarcely of the peculiar forms of our government. But, however just such censures may be when directed against those states to which they are applicable, they are wholly unjust when applied to the entire people of the United States, who in their national capacity have no control over the subject.

Other causes are also in operation, which (in conjunction with those of a moral character which I have just mentioned) will expedite the destruction of slavery. Such, for instance, as the fact that the south-western states are rapidly becoming settled and cultivated. The result will be that the new states will be densely populated, and all the cotton and sugar

lands will be soon reduced to a state of cultivation. When this shall have been the case, the immense market which exists in those states for slaves, and which causes the iniquitous internal slave trade, by which slaves from Maryland and Virginia are carried to Alabama, and Mississippi, and Louisiana, and sold at enormous prices, will be supplied and overstocked. The consequence of this will be a reduction of the price of them, until those who own them, and who now feel such an interest in this species of property, (I am sorry to apply this word to such a use,) will find it unprofitable, and of course become more reconciled to giving it up. I only mention this fact to show that there are physical causes at work which combine with those of a moral sort to overthrow slavery. And the influence of the cause just mentioned is not so distant as some suppose.

The fact, too, of the great numbers of the slaves in some portions of the slave-holding states, and their rapid increase, will not be without an influence upon prudent men, who will not be insensible to its probable future consequences.

To all other influences must be added, my Lord, that of the experiment which the British nation is now making in their West India Islands. If that experiment should succeed, it will have a great influence upon the question in the United States. We wait for the complete developement of that experiment with great interest. If it should appear that the slaves when set free in masses do well, are industrious, quiet, fond of knowledge, and capable of discharging the duties of citizens so far as to become, with safety, a constituent part of the free population, that fact will have a great effect in reconciling our southern people to the idea of giving liberty to their slaves.

But, as I have already stated, this is a work which will require many years. Prejudices, numerous and long cherished, must be overcome. Those who have never owned slaves, and who have not grown up in the midst of them, can have no correct idea of either the nature or the strength of these prejudices. That those who have held slaves and governed them all their lives, and who have been influenced by prejudices, which have descended from generation to generation, should at once become reconciled to the idea of not only setting their slaves free, and thus losing what they consider their property—perhaps their all—but also of seeing these same slaves become entitled to every privilege of freedom which they themselves enjoy, however desirable, is yet the most improbable of all moral or political changes. My Lord, this great work must be gradually done. Precipitate measures will not advance it; they will retard it. I know, indeed, that this view of the subject will not suit the *fiat-justitia* men. They must attempt to act out the most plausible but yet the most specious and dangerous opinion (for it is not worthy of being called a *principle*) that ever was advanced,—*that whatever ought to be done can be done*. Such men are too apt to disregard the manner of doing good, and to attempt it *per fas aut nefas*. But no great and good changes of a political or social character have yet taken place in our world which did not require much time. Even those grand religious and moral ameliorations which, more than any other changes, have been effected by the direct interposition of a Divine agency, have been brought about gradually. Why is this? Because God does not choose to deal with men as blocks of stone, but as rational beings, and therefore employs a system of influences which will overcome their prejudices,

enlighten their understandings, and rightly move their affections and wills. And I am the more reconciled—not to slavery itself—but to a gradual destruction of it, by the firm belief which I have, that the condition of the slaves is steadily becoming ameliorated. Without doubt there are cases of infamous cruelty and oppression. But as a general thing, I believe that slavery is becoming every year mitigated in its rigours. Vast numbers of the slaves are members of our churches, especially of the Methodist and Baptist churches, which greatly predominate in the slave states over the other denominations, and are exerting a salutary influence. The African negroes, who are generally much more ignorant than the natives, are of course disappearing, as there are no more importations, and the whole slave population is gradually and perceptibly rising in intelligence and fitness for freedom. Is there not something here that is hopeful? I am bound to say here, however, that whatever may be the ameliorations of the condition of the slaves, I am far from agreeing with those who, without knowledge, assert that their condition is better than that of the free negroes in the free states. With the exception of some worthless coloured people about our large cities, I believe that their condition in our free states is greatly preferable to that of the slaves generally. That the condition of the slaves is more comfortable than that of the free coloured people in the slave states I can readily believe, and for reasons which are too obvious to need to be stated here.

Much has been said in Europe, my Lord, by way of ridicule, respecting the apparent inconsistency between the grand political principles which we profess to hold and the existence of slavery among us. I firmly believe, my Lord, and it is the boast

of Americans, that the great principles of human right were more thoroughly discussed and established, and more luminously exhibited to the world by our fathers of the revolution,—that is to say, in the quarter of a century which elapsed from 1765 to 1790,—than they ever had been in all preceding time. And I believe that the true principles of human government were then more fully discovered and developed than in all preceding ages. We, as Americans, believe these principles to be true. We do believe that “all men are born free, and equal.” Does the existence of slavery among us prove that we do not? Not at all.* It only proves that we have not yet carried our principles fully into effect. We have, indeed, done so as it regards foreign political dominion. But by reason of many difficulties we have not carried these principles fully into operation in relation to slavery. Still I hesitate not to affirm that there is not an intelligent and virtuous man among us who does not firmly believe the great principle, cited above, to be a correct one. There is not one such man among us who does not believe slavery to be wrong; and there is not one intelligent and virtuous man among us who either desires or expects that slavery will be perpetual. But then the carrying of these principles into effect, in regard to our slaves, will demand time. For my part I rejoice that our principles are what they are. They are indeed in advance of our

* It is, in reality, the belief of the principle referred to that creates the greatest obstacle to the emancipation of the slaves amongst us. We cannot emancipate them without soon admitting them to all the rights of citizens. For this they are not prepared; and to this the prejudices of the slaveholder are greatly opposed. We cannot do as the British government does with the slaves of the West India Islands—set them free, but give them after all but few of the dearest privileges of freemen. Our republican principles forbid this. With us every freeman, whether rich or poor, white or black, must enjoy all the advantages of citizenship, including the right to vote, and eligibility to office.

practice ; but they will yet bring up our practice into a delightful conformity.

Such I am persuaded are the opinions of our slaveholders themselves. But what I have long deeply deplored, in regard to them, is that they do not themselves attempt to bring forward some measure for getting rid of slavery, instead of sitting down in despondency, and saying that nothing can be done.* I believe very differently. I believe that if gradual abolition were commenced in each southern state, (as was done in Pennsylvania,) in the course of time the evil would be removed. Let the coloured people, as they become free, be hired ; let them have the opportunity of acquiring property ; let them, under proper restrictions, become entitled to all the privileges of citizens, as is the case in almost all the free states. The result would be, in time, that they would form a large part of the constituent free population, and in the parts where their numbers are very great, become owners of the soil,—the whites selling out to them, and retiring to the other portions of those states, or to other states. That this course is practicable, I have not a doubt ; nor have I a doubt that it will eventually be adopted. Certainly no better presents itself, unless it is to transport them in mass, which I always have believed to be impracticable, on account of many obstacles—the least of which is the want of money. I know that this plan will not be received with approbation, at present. Much time will be required

* It is proper to remark, that it is the opinion of many excellent men in the southern states that the time has not yet arrived for attempting this work. They say, and with much reason, that the causes which are now in operation will, in time, prepare the minds of the slaveholders for this happy change ; and that until they are more fully influenced by those causes, and prepared to act, it is useless, or rather injurious to urge the subject upon them. *This*, rather than despondency or apathy, is the true cause why southern philanthropists have not come forward with some plan for abolishing slavery amongst them.

to overcome prejudice. I need hardly add, however, that this plan has nothing to do with the ridiculous doctrine of *amalgamation*. That doctrine has no necessary connexion with this plan, and forms no part of my theory.

But, my Lord, we do not despair. This is a great work—the greatest work, I will say, of the kind which the world has ever witnessed. It was a small affair for you to abolish slavery in your distant colonies, in which but few, comparatively, of your citizens were personally or directly interested, and many of them residing in those colonies, and, of course, having neither a vote nor a direct influence in your elections. It would have been another sort of thing if slavery had existed amongst you in Great Britain and Ireland; if, for instance, nearly one half of your citizens had held slaves, and which constituted the greater portion of their wealth; and if, above all, your form of government were such that none but the slaveholding portion of the population had any right, by your charter, to legislate over the subject, or even to touch it. Had this been the case, you would not have been half-way towards the abolition of slavery. Indeed I wonder that you were so long in doing what you have done, or rather commenced. It is well that you have done what you have. But you do not deserve a great deal of praise for it. We have done more. Although our general government has no direct control over the subject; yet, since our independence, eight of the original thirteen states have become free from slavery, and now fourteen in all are in the same condition, and the prospect is good with regard to several others.

Had our general government direct control over the subject of slavery, I am very confident that this greatest of evils would soon come to an end. But

by our constitution all interference in this subject is forbidden to the general government, and its control is placed in the hands of the individual states. And we cannot think of breaking down our constitution in order to get rid of slavery. We shall, my Lord, pursue a better course. We shall adhere to the constitution,—and when the time comes that we can change our constitution, in a *constitutional* manner, to effect this great work, then such a change will be made, if necessary, with perfect safety. And here I would remark that it is not a valid argument against what I have just said, to urge the existence of slavery in the district of Columbia; for many reasons (growing out of the continuance of slavery in Maryland and Virginia, which states surround the district) have led the congress to delay any action on that subject until those states, which would be so much affected by that step themselves, begin to move towards the abolition of slavery within their limits. I do not say that these reasons have been sufficient, but I mention the fact to show, that there *are* special reasons which have influenced that body to pursue the course which it has done. Perhaps it will be seen in the end that this course has not been so unwise as some have supposed. As to the *internal slave trade*, as it is called, and which has been so often denounced, I believe that it is a subject over which congress has no control. My Lord, no man knows better than your Lordship the force of inveterate prejudice. It will require time for the Americans to overcome it, in regard to slavery. But I will venture to assure your Lordship that it will not require more time to do away the remainder of slavery in the United States than it has done to enable the advocates of reform in Great Britain to make even the small degree of progress which they have made. How long, my Lord, have

your Lordship and others been engaged in endeavouring to effect a reform in the *penal code* of your country? And yet after the lapse of more than half a century—I might say, of a whole century—since noble attempts began to be made to amend that code, there remain in it until this day, and are likely to remain in it for many a year to come, not a few statutes against crimes so wholly disproportionate to the offences which they are intended to punish, that they ought to be a disgrace to any civilized nation under the heavens! I know that your Lordship has so viewed them, and that you have made the most unremitting efforts to have them repealed or modified. Others did the same before your Lordship's day; but how slow the progress which has been made! The reason for this progress being so slow is to be found in the fact that the abuses to be reformed existed *among* you in Great Britain—they were not in distant colonies. And as to the prejudice of our white people against the blacks, I doubt whether it is much greater than is that of the highest and wealthiest classes in England against the poor. I have seen hundreds of coloured children and adults in our Sunday-schools occupying as good a part of the room as the white scholars. I have seen thousands of them in our churches, occupying the galleries, or a part of the church below. And I have been present in our churches when the coloured members took their turns in coming to the communion table, or were commingled with the other members. Is there any greater equality than this between the higher and lower classes in England? I believe that there is not. I am not finding fault, however; I am only stating facts. I am no advocate for amalgamation of the rich and the poor, or the white and the

black. Nor do I suppose that entire equality of intercourse between them is possible, or conducive to their mutual happiness. The good sense of people, all the world over, when left to itself, will seek equality in marriage as well as in all the intercourse of life.

In the foregoing part of this letter I have given you, my Lord, a brief but true account, as I believe, of what has been done in my country to abolish slavery, and of the prospects of the final achievement of this noble object. Give us your sympathy, your encouragement, your commendation when we deserve it,—and even your censure, in the gentlemanly and proper way in which I know that your Lordship will always give it, if you give it at all. Correspond, if you think proper, with our leading men. They will receive it well. But above all, conduct well the example which you are setting us in your West India experiment. Do not give us your money, nor offer to do it. We do not need it for any purpose. I should blush to ask a shilling from an Englishman to promote any object in the United States; and I am always ashamed when I hear of any one else doing so. I have strong hopes that our general government will take up the subject of buying out the slavery which still exists amongst us. Free from debt, it is fully able to do it.

My Lord, the subject of slavery as it exists among us in the United States, is a domestic one, and can be best managed by our own citizens. This remark coincides fully with what was uttered by your Lordship at the Anti-slavery meeting, to which I referred at the commencement of this letter. It will certainly be far from profitable for you to send men to lecture us on this subject. I consider it a real

calamity to the cause that any thing of this kind has been done. I do not doubt the good intention of the measure, but its wisdom.

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget.

No man has a *right* to come to us on any such errand. No foreigner has a right, as I understand the matter, to go into another land and interfere with the political arrangements which exist there. He may do so, but he has no *right* to do so. A minister of the gospel has the right, by divine command, to go into any part of the world, to proclaim salvation to men, to call men to repentance towards God, and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ. And so long as he confines himself to the great object of his mission, no government on earth has a right to hinder him. His great object is to reconcile men to God, and prepare them for heaven, though the indirect influence of his preaching will undoubtedly undermine many of the political and social evils which may exist. Yet his great object is to preach the gospel, and so long as he imitates his blessed Master and the apostles, in this respect, he keeps within the divine warrant. But when he travels out of it to attack political arrangements, he ceases to stand on the ground upon which his divine commission places him. If fifty or one hundred ministers of the gospel in England choose to go to the United States to preach the gospel, they have a right to do so, and if good men, they will be well received. But if they go to preach a crusade against slavery, they cannot go upon their divine commission as ministers of the gospel, and cannot claim any special *right* to do so. Such aid we do not need. There is talent enough, energy enough, money enough, and I trust, with God's blessing,

wisdom enough in the United States, to do all that man can do to accomplish this great work.

If, my Lord, we were to send agents from the United States, where I have not found one man, within the last ten years, (and where I believe there are very few such men,) advocating a union of church and state, or who does not think that such a union is exceedingly injurious to the interests of religion, and that by making a deviation from the faith of the state in some sort a political offence, it has been the real cause of all the religious persecution in the world—to deliver lectures all over England against the union of church and state which exists among you, and to take part with those who are labouring to destroy your established church,—what would your Lordship think of such a procedure? They might be ministers of the gospel, and claim that they had a right to do so, and that they were preaching within the divine warrant of their office when they preached against the oppressions of the established church. Would your Lordship believe that they had any such right? Did their Master or his apostles set them such an example? What would you think of such a course? You would pronounce it to be an *impertinent interference*.

I claim for my country, my Lord, the honour of having passed the first law to abolish the slave trade. It was also the first to denounce the punishment of death against any of its citizens who might be found engaged in that trade, and placed that crime upon the same footing with that of piracy. I regret, however, that the government of the United States has not yet become willing to yield to the request of the British government, and enter into an arrangement by which suspected vessels of either nation might, under certain circumstances,

be searched, in order to break up more effectually the existing slave trade. I am not without hope that this point may yet be yielded by the American government. The *right of search* is, however, a point on which the Americans are more sensitive than any other. They will be reluctant to concede it for any purpose. That they will never submit to its *enforcement* by any other nation, I am entirely confident. That day, my Lord, has gone by for ever !

My Lord, it is possible that my country may be called to pass through many and severe trials, as a punishment for our sins as a people. We certainly merit them from a holy and just God. But my hope is that He who conducted our fathers to that wilderness, and has thus far watched over us and granted us great prosperity, will still deign to guide us by his wisdom and holy providence. A foreigner who reads our party newspapers would often be ready to expect the speedy dissolution of our union. But let him go amongst us; let him witness the cheerful and prompt submission of our people to the results of the ballot-box; let him contemplate our admirable system of public schools, continually spreading into new states,—our hundreds of academies,—our seventy or eighty colleges,—our numerous theological, medical, and law schools,—our twelve hundred newspapers,—eight or ten thousand temperance societies, with a million and a half of members,—our 15,000 or 20,000 Sunday-schools, with their libraries, and a million of scholars, and taught by 120,000 of the best men and women among us,—an evangelical ministry of not less than eleven thousand preachers of the gospel,—the Bible placed in almost every family,—and all our other benevolent operations,—and he will then see much to encourage him. Still our reliance must be on God and

his blessing, and I think that this is the steady and growing conviction of Christians amongst us.

The greatest source of danger to our *union* is unquestionably the existence of slavery amongst us. Another is the rapid increase of our population, which is now fifteen millions, and which in twenty-five years more will probably be thirty millions! What gigantic efforts must be made by the friends of religion and education to increase the means of religious and literary instruction as rapidly as the increase of population. But I believe that it will be done. A third source of danger to us is the immense emigration to our shores from Europe, which is pouring into our country annually thousands of ignorant, and poor corrupt foreigners. The greater portion of our paupers, drunkards, and criminals, are from foreign lands. But we hope, with God's blessing, to stem the dreadful torrent.

And here, my Lord, I will say a word respecting the instances of riot and disorder which have recently occurred in the United States. It is this—whilst I am ready to admit that a spirit of insubordination, which by a sort of sympathy has spread over the country, does certainly exist, yet I must assert that the accounts of it have been grossly exaggerated. The special courts which have been held for punishing those who were engaged in the insurrections of the slaves, in one or two states, are according to the laws of those states. The proceedings against the gamblers, in a few instances, have been violent and illegal, as have been the summary punishments inflicted on those who were engaged in disseminating seditious publications, as they have been called. These proceedings are deplorable. But they have been far less extensive and serious than many have supposed from reading the accounts in the newspapers. And I am satisfied, from ex-

tensive knowledge of my country, that these excitements and petty tumults will soon pass away. The good sense of the people will every where frown down all these things speedily. Indeed, whilst writing this letter, I have received information that these things are fast disappearing. Amongst a people who are not governed by soldiers and bayonets, such things may be expected occasionally. But they will be only temporary, and the laws will soon recover their proper sway.

A better acquaintance with the peculiar but simple structure of the general government of the United States, as well as the powers of the state governments; of the subjects over which the former may legislate, and of those which are reserved to the legislation of the latter, would enable foreigners to understand why it is that the American nation, as such, ought not to be blamed for the existence of slavery in some of the states. I was astonished, my Lord, upon my first visiting England, at the great ignorance, even among very well-informed people, of American affairs, which I found to exist. Almost nothing seems to be understood—neither geography, history, manners, laws, nor structure of government. I have often been asked what language is spoken there! And this question has not been asked with regard to the aborigines, but to the present inhabitants of that land. But I suppose that I ought not to have been astonished. Much, indeed, has been written by Englishmen respecting America, and a good deal by visitants from the continent of Europe. But with the solitary exception of the "*Democratic en Amerique*," by M. Tocqueville, nothing, absolutely, has been written by a foreigner which approaches to an accurate delineation of our political organization. Many of these writers have very confidently thought that

they understood it perfectly. But they were mistaken. They have all said much that is true of manners, &c., so far as they saw them in the circles in which they revolved, and much that is erroneous when employed for general description. This is the character of what has been written by Messrs. Fearon, De Roos, Stuart, Fidler, M'Gregor, Ouseley, Hall, Hamilton, &c. &c., and by such ladies as Frances Wright, Mrs. Butler, and Mrs. Trollope. Some of these works are written with considerable talent, and some in a good spirit; but they all so abound in errors that they wrongly inform about as much and as often as they inform correctly. Col. Hamilton's is by far the best as it regards our political institutions. The recent work of Drs. Reed and Matheson, though not free from mistakes, is by far the best work that has appeared in Europe, in regard to the religious, moral, and literary state and prospects of that country. It neither gives, nor professes to give, any information deserving of mention respecting the physical resources of the country, or its political organization.

My Lord, could Mr. O'Connell have understood our political organization when he denounced, as he did at the Anti-slavery meeting, and as he has done on some subsequent occasions, the Americans *en masse*, as "liars, hypocrites, traitors to honour? &c. &c. I was astonished, my Lord, to hear such language from Mr. O'Connell, whose talents I have always greatly respected, and who I little thought could descend to the use of such ungentlemanly epithets, to say the least of them. I confess, indeed, that I was too much amused with the perfectly ridiculous rant and violence of the learned gentleman to be *angry* at his denunciations. Besides, I thought them too little worthy of regard to be viewed with any other feeling than that of regret

at the injury which they would do to the cause of abolition in the United States. But I understand that Mr. O'Connell is only an *eleventh-hour* man in the Anti-slavery cause, and I suppose that he feels that it is incumbent on him to establish his sincerity and zeal by an uncommon amount of violence. As to the proclamation which he seemed to issue to his Irish subjects in America, to renounce slavery instantly and join the Anti-slavery Society upon the pain of his great displeasure, it is to be hoped that they will pay reverent heed to it, and render prompt obedience. With regard to his pronouncing the Americans unworthy of being received into equal society in Europe, and especially his expression of a determination not to admit them to his house except they are non-slave-holders, and members of the Anti-slavery Society, I do not know what to say. It surely must be considered by them all a sad calamity to be thus put beyond the pale of good society, and especially to be debarred from *his* hospitality. And how they will be able to survive it, I will not undertake to predict.

But seriously, my Lord, what good can Mr. O'Connell expect to accomplish by such unjust speeches? They cannot be defended but upon the infernal principle that the "end justifies the means,"—a principle not unknown to St. Ignatius Loyola, but which was invented by another personage, long before his day. Mr. O'Connell, I understand, has complained that his speech was not correctly reported. But I have seen no report of it which was at all equal in scurrility to what he actually said. But I must take leave of the learned member for Dublin, and in doing so, cannot forbear suggesting to him that a little more accurate knowledge of the political organization of the United States might enable him to speak more correctly about that

country; and that if he has not leisure to read any large tomes on the subject, I hope he will allow me to recommend to his perusal a little work of great celebrity among our children—Peter Parley's Geography of the United States—from which he will be able to learn at least the number and the names of our states.

My Lord, I am deeply pained at the language of taunt with reference to slavery in my country, which I have noticed in some of the public meetings, as well as in some of the publications in England. "Let America follow our good example as she has followed our bad," is flippantly said. I hope that we shall do it. But if I were disposed to indulge in retort, I might say, that reproach and abuse for the existence of slavery amongst us do not come with good grace from *Englishmen*, who were the authors of it. I might say that it is quite too soon for England to abuse other nations for the existence of slavery whilst she has yet scarcely washed from her forehead the deep and bloody stain of her own oppressions of the African race. I would say that my own country will one day, I am confident, be able to reply to England, "The serpent which you placed in our cradle, and heedless of our infant cries, taught to twine itself around our limbs, and strike its poison into our veins, has at length been strangled, and the young Hercules who has thus triumphed over your wicked device, rejoicing in victory, will ever henceforth take the lead of you, and the world in every path of great and glorious achievement." I would ask also the author of "Spiritual Despotism," who tauntingly speaks of our political institutions as the *Republicanism* which "endures slavery," how long it is since monarchy ceased to endure it? I would tell him that slavery was banished from fourteen republican states in my

own country, and from eight other republics on the American continent, before a single monarchy on the whole earth could be induced to raise the standard of freedom. I would tell him that mankind have had to see the spectacle of the republics of the New World rising up to free themselves from the slavery with which the monarchies of the Old World had cursed them, before a single monarchy could be persuaded to take a step in this humane enterprise.

But no, my Lord, I will not indulge in rancorous feelings. I cannot do it. And if I could, *England* would be the last country on the earth against which I would say a word, unless it were unavoidable in the defence of my own. No: I honour England, and I bless God for what he has done for England: the land of my fathers: the land of the great and the good: the land of Bibles, and of a pure religion, and of associations to diffuse them through the wide world. I cannot speak lightly of England—long the sole depository of civil and religious liberty in the world. In arts and science and religion the benefactor of mankind, as she has often been the defender of their rights. I cannot abuse England. Sooner “let my right hand forget its cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.”

With regard to my own country, I say from the bottom of my heart, “With all thy faults I love thee still;” and with my last, parting breath, I hope to pray, *Esto perpetua!* My Lord, why should not England and America cherish the kindest feelings towards each other, and, leaving the domestic affairs of each to its own management, seek to do each other good, and not injury? Let there be no other rivalry than that of each striving to do the most good. The two nations are but one people, speaking the same language, possessing the same

religion, having governments similar in fundamental principles, and are only *separated* by an ocean. Whilst you exert your influence throughout the Eastern World, we are spreading your language and whatever good we have derived from you over the half of the New. Both are raised up by Providence to stand together as a barrier against infidelity and superstition in the religious world, and despotism in the political. Let every tongue and every hand be employed to render our continued influence, great, good, glorious!

I am, my Lord,

Your Lordship's humble Servant,

AN AMERICA N

Calis. C