

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

JANUARY, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

1. *Address of the Southern members of Congress to their constituents, Washington City, Jan. 1849.*
2. *Lecture on the North and the South, delivered before the Young Men's Mercantile Library Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, January 16th, 1849: by ELWOOD FISHER. 8vo. pp. 24.*
3. *Mussey's review of Fisher, on the North and the South. Cincinnati: 1849. 8vo. pp. 98.*
4. *Practical Hints on the comparative cost and productiveness of the culture of Cotton, and the cost and productiveness of its manufacture. Addressed to the Cotton planters and capitalists of the South. By CHAS. T. JAMES. Providence: 1849. 12mo. pp. 68.*

We cannot repress a sigh from our very heart, as we take up the pen to discuss the subject of these publications. Its magnitude and difficulties are enough to make any mind serious and even sad. We are almost ready to despair, too, of a satisfactory and peaceful settlement of the questions it involves. The conviction that the season for discussion has passed, and the time for action come, is also growing upon us. We have scarcely a hope that aught we shall say, will influence the result so much as a

hair's breadth. When was the voice of reason or argument ever heard or heeded in such clamour and strife of ambition, pride, passion, avarice, fanaticism, and revenge? Nevertheless it may be our duty to speak. The martyr at the stake should with his last breath bear witness for God and truth, even though, by the madness of his murderers, not a whisper of his voice should be heard. And if in this contest the South is to be a victim, let her do honour to her own convictions by a faithful testimony to the truth which it has been given her to understand and uphold.

We intimated that the time for discussion has well nigh gone by. The strife of argument has been hotly waged for some twenty years. The south has met her assailant on every field of debate, political, moral, and religious. And if any thing has ever been proved and demonstrated again and again, it is THE LAWFULNESS OF SLAVERY, whether judged by the divine word of Holy Scripture, or tested by the conclusions of human reason. At least this is our conviction. So clear and triumphant do we consider the argument on the side of the South, that where it has failed to convince, we believe further discussion to be useless. We would as willingly argue with men who deny the evidence of their senses. We have gone with our opponents to the inspired word of God, and proved beyond the possibility of sober denial, that though slavery existed at least from the time of Abraham, there is not, from first to last, so much as an implied condemnation or prohibition of it; and not only so, but that God gave laws for its regulation, recognised its existence, and *expressly authorized* the Israelites to procure slaves of their heathen neighbors.—In the New Testament our defence is impregnable. It regulates the institution of slavery, and thus by fair implication authorizes its existence; commands slaves to be obedient to their masters, and submissive to punishment; and rebukes those who teach otherwise. We are well aware of the miserable evasions by which our anti-slavery friends try to break the force of these facts. But unworthy of serious answer, they awaken only our compassion. We really pity men who are driven to the necessity of using such

subterfuges, and yet will not honour themselves by yielding to conviction.

Out of the field of scriptural evidence, and on the ground of natural law and justice, our defence has been equally successful. It has been repeatedly proved that every distinct society, or community of men, has the right to organize and arrange its own civil, social, and political institutions, and the relations between its members; to deny civil and social equality to any class, when such equality would be incompatible with the well being of the state; and to deprive of all political rights and of liberty, to imprison, or to put to death, those whose citizenship, liberty, or life would endanger the rights, property, or lives, of the community. The exercise of this right does not always require conviction of crime against the persons on whom it is exercised. This is proved by the acknowledged right to deny political privileges to females and minors; to restrict the right of suffrage to those who possess a prescribed amount of property or of education, and to natives; to bind minors in servitude to their parents; and to arrest vagrants and compel them to earn an honest livelihood. If the South, then, judges the civil and social equality, and personal liberty of the blacks, incompatible with the well being, rights, property or lives of the community, she has the right to deny them that equality and liberty—in other words to keep them in a state of slavery. All that is incumbent on her to justify her exercise of the right before God and men, is to show good and sufficient reason for judging their equality and liberty to be inconsistent with her welfare. This she has done, over and often, though it needs no proof. If any think that the well being, property, rights and lives of the South would *not be* endangered by elevating the negroes to civil equality, or even by releasing them from the bonds of slavery, we shall not waste time on their madness.

Again, it has been proved that the maxim, "*partus sequitur ventrem*"—or that the offspring inherits the status of the parent, is a law of nature, reason, religion, and providence, and that *no man has any rights* but those to which he is born, or which belong to that condition in which God places him by the hand of his providence.

One of these rights undoubtedly is to improve his condition, or the right to acquire other rights, *provided* he can do so without violating the rights of others. He that is born a slave, therefore, has no right to liberty, and can acquire none, so long as the right of his master to his service stands in the way. That may be forfeited under certain conditions—it may be resigned—or it may be sold to the slave—when he justly and rightly becomes free.

It has been further shown that there is nothing in the relation of master and slave, contrary to natural law and justice. This has been demonstrated by a correct *definition* of slavery. Nothing more is necessary in order to show that it may be lawful and just, than simply to state clearly *what it is*. A great deal of the confusion and fanaticism in connection with the discussion of the subject has grown out of the want of noting *the thing* which constitutes the essential characteristic of slavery. In the minds of many it is the exact correlative of *tyranny*. Others consider it the same thing as regarding and treating men as *things*, chattels, brutes. Some have defined it as "*involuntary or compulsory labour*;" but besides the vagueness of the words involuntary, or compulsory, this definition does not distinguish slavery from the bondage of minors and apprentices. Others describe it as "*labour without compensation*." This definition is not only open to the same objection, but it is palpably, undeniably, and outrageously false. The labour of our slaves is not "without compensation." On the contrary we affirm they are better paid than the labouring class in any country in the world. And it is curious to hear the same men one-while abusing us because, as they assert, we "keep back the hire of the labourers who reap our fields," and then at another time abusing the institution because slave labour is more expensive and less profitable than free labour! How could it be so if we did not *pay* more for it? But the slave is paid for his labour. He has secured to him *an annuity for life*—which annuity includes a sufficiency of wholesome food and clothing, a home and shelter, medical attendance, all these in sickness and in old age, a decent burial when dead, and provision for his wife and children

if he chooses to marry. These are also secured to him under all contingencies of failure of crops or markets, revulsions of trade, or bankruptcy of his owner. The moment the latter is unable to render this compensation, the law takes his slave out of his hands, and commits him to another who is able. If he is able, and refuses to fulfil his obligation, the law, by adequate penalties, enforces his duty. To define slavery, therefore, as unpaid labour, is, as we said, plainly and outrageously false. And all the heart-breaking pictures of wretched men and women toiling out life, in sweat and blood, for the profit of cruel oppressors, and without remuneration, drawn to kindle the indignant sympathies of the world, are just so many fables. And all the pious anathemas heaped on the South for eating the bread of unrequited toil, are gratuitous and unmerited abuse, vented in blind, unreflecting fury. Some have no better sense than to reply that what is given to support the slave is only a part of the produce of his own labour, while the owner appropriates the greater part to his own use. But this is equally true of free labour. A white man hired at the North for a day, or a month, or a year, is paid out of the proceeds of his own labour. He receives, too, only a part of its profits, while the employer reserves the remainder for himself. No man expects to pay a labourer the full amount of the produce of his work. Whenever wages equal, or exceed, the value of the labour, employers cease at once to hire. The advantage the slaves possess is, that whatever may be the profits of their labour their wages are unvaried. If their labour produce nothing, yet their pay is secured. We are personally acquainted with a small plantation, the owner of which will be obliged to appropriate six hundred dollars this year for the support of the slaves, over and above the proceeds of their industry. This, too, is not an unusual circumstance. If, then, the difference between the remuneration of the slave and the profits of his labour is occasionally larger than would seem just, this compensates for it. Sometimes he receives more than he earns. Always his pay is certain, secured against all contingencies, and without anxiety, or painful fears and apprehensions of his own. If it be said that the annual appropriation for

the slave is less than the value of a year's labour, we reply he performs less work than a hired white man, and is entitled to less. If it be said that he receives a less proportion of the proceeds of his labour, we reply that is not always the case—Sometimes he receives all the proceeds, and even more—and if he does receive a smaller share than hired labourers, it is compensated for by his support in sickness and old age.

The essential characteristic of slavery is *the right of the master to the labour of the slave for life*, or as long as he is physically able to labour. This constitutes it slavery. This circumstance, that the right of the master extends through the life of the slave, and this only, is the specific difference between that and hired labour, or the bondage of minors and apprentices. This is that "*property in man*" about which so much indignant eloquence has been evoked from the lips of unthinking zealots. The right of one man to the labour of another is confessedly just and lawful in the case of hired operatives, minors and apprentices. And it can never be shown that the mere circumstance that this right extends over the whole time of life, converts it into a sin and outrage. If I may lawfully possess a claim to the service of another for a year, there is evidently nothing in the relation itself to make it unlawful to hold such a claim for a longer time. The right of the master to the labour of the slave for life is all the *property* he has in him. Neither the soul nor the body of the slave is the property of the master. It is not so in fact, or in law. I can maim, burn, eat, or kill the body of my *ox*, for that is my property. But I can do neither with the body of my slave; if I do, the law of the land arrests and punishes me as a trespasser on the rights and property of another. By the laws of the South, the slaves are regarded and protected as *persons*, and *not as things*, the outcries of blind philanthropy to the contrary notwithstanding—not as persons having *all* the rights of white men, but yet as persons, as *men*; whom to maim is a felony, and to kill with malice aforethought is murder in the first degree. What our laws hold and treat as a chattel, or *thing*, is the right to the slave's labour. This is of course a species of property,

the tenure of which must necessarily be regulated by law. Man's wisdom has divided property into the two classes of real estate and personal property, or chattels personal, with different laws for the regulation of each. In defining, therefore, the nature of property in slaves, our laws simply refer it to the second class,—or declare that it shall be regulated by the laws which regulate personal property. This is a very different thing from treating them as brutes and things. The law of Louisiana classifies this property with real estate, and subjects it to the same regulations; and it would be just as reasonable to say that treats them as dirt, or bricks and mortar. It is true that our laws in their phraseology speak of the "slaves," and not of the simple right of the owner to their labour; but this is for the sake of convenience, and the whole tenor and spirit of our legislation prove that slaves themselves are regarded as persons, and the right to their labour only as personal property, or *a thing*.

This definition of the nature of slavery wipes off all that reproach which is heaped on us for "buying" and selling men and women, and "trading in the souls and bodies of human beings." We do not buy and sell their bodies or souls, but simply *the right to their labour*. This right is plainly transferable; and if it be lawful to hold it, it is to buy or sell it. The powers of the master over the person of the slaves is given in order to secure the benefit of his right to their labour. For this purpose he has power to control their place, and to compel them to labour by corporeal punishment, which does not endanger life or limb. The master is not, an irresponsible tyrant, a petty absolute monarch, but, *quoad hoc*, an administrator of law, legally authorized to enforce his own right. And this office is committed to him, because this is by far the most convenient, efficacious, and beneficent plan to secure it. There is not one master in ten thousand who would not punish his slave more leniently than a magistrate or court of law for the same offence. His power is not irresponsible and unlimited: nor is it in very many cases exercised with unnecessary severity. The interest of the master himself, the force of public opinion, in the vast majority of cases religious and moral principles, and in others fee-

lings of common humanity which are not wholly wanting in the worst, restrain the hand of cruelty, even where the laws do not. And as to the current misrepresentations of Southern inhumanity towards our slaves, we only reiterate our positive, indignant denial.

We do not intend what we have said to be taken as all we have to say in defence of slavery. We mean simply to indicate some of the points which we consider to have been proved, and to declare our conviction that property in our slaves is a right which has been righteously acquired, and is lawfully held, justly enforced, and for the most part properly guarded, and humanely exercised. In all these respects we consider our opponents beaten most completely, and the South full justified before God and men. And indeed it would appear from the signs of the times, that the argument against slavery on religious and moral grounds is about to be given up. The controversy is becoming a political contest—a struggle for power on the part of the north—and the great argument against slavery now insisted on, is its *bad economy*, its injurious effects on the wealth and physical prosperity of the country.

The address of the southern Members of congress to their constituents presents the political aspect of the subject. Mr. Fisher's lecture is an able defence of the economy, or profit, of slavery. Mr. Mussey's pamphlet is an attempt to repute the argument and conclusions of Mr. Fisher. And we propose to present from these and other sources the leading facts in connection with both these points.

We have long been satisfied that the opposition to slavery is not chiefly, or generally, the result of moral or religious conviction. With some it may be so, but they constitute a small fraction of its force. It is partly the fruit of a growing political radicalism which, ever and anon, lifts its fearful form in all the free states—a radicalism which flourishes in every civilized country of the world except the Southern states of this Union—which we believe to be an inevitable result of modern civilization where slavery does not exist—which wages reckless war with all the sacred rights and holy institutions of mankind,

and aims to level down to its own degradation all that is above it—and against which we honestly believe slavery to be our only safeguard and defence. This party opposes slavery, not, as it pretends, because the slaves are oppressed, but because the masters are exalted. Its zeal is not for the slaves, but against the masters. Mr. Mussey, (no friend of the south, however,) indicates the secret of the opposition on the part of others, in these remarks. "The northern farmer or mechanic, who pays for his daily bread and his manly pride, or has bought independence by the sweat of his own brow,—who fares less sumptuously every day—if he contrast his own condition with that of the luxurious planter, cannot help feeling that there is some natural injustice in this state of inequality." "He sees only negro slavery as the agent of this whole distinction; and it is not long before he feels—he *knows*—that slavery is politically a curse, and slaveholding morally a crime." One source, then, of opposition to slavery is a mean envy. This we have long believed, but would not have ventured publicly to assert, had it not been done for us by one of themselves, a zealous advocate, too, of the glory and "manly pride" of the North.

But a chief cause of the anti-slavery feeling is to be found in our political history. One ground of this lies in the article of the Constitution which allows the South votes for three fifths of the slaves in our delegation to the Congressional House of Representatives. This the Northern demagogues rant and rage about continually as grossly unjust and unequal, until their uninformed hearers are ready to shoulder arms, march to the Capitol and by force drive home our delegates. And yet this article of the Constitution was solemnly agreed to by all the Northern States, when they formally ratified and adopted it. Besides, do not our Northern friends see that if our slaves were emancipated, instead of having a vote for only three-fifths of them, we would have a vote for *all*? So that our power in Congress would be actually and largely increased instead of lessened. This article was in fact a concession on the part of the South and not on the part of the North. We have a vote for only a portion of our inhabitants, while they have a vote for all theirs. Another ground of com-

plaint against the South is that of eleven Presidents of the Union, only three (leaving out Gen. Harrison) have been taken from the North; and in sixty-four years, (including Gen. Taylor's term,) only twelve have been filled by northern Presidents.* This is the cause of no little bitterness among the people of the North against the South. We will not say that they have no reason to be angry with us, if we have been able to furnish greater and better men for the office of our chief magistracy. But we do say, it is somewhat curious, that, when Southern Presidents have been elected by Northern votes, they should complain of it. But what has, perhaps, irritated the North still more, is the fact that the South has in most cases succeeded in carrying the measures and principles she has advocated in our federal legislature. These things, however absurd it may be, have kindled envy and animosity in the North against the South. We have never met a Northerner who could speak of them with any

* The following table shows how some of the principal federal offices have been divided between the north and south, from the commencement of the government to March 4th, 1849. The figures denote the number of years during which these offices have been filled by citizens of each section. The short presidential term of Gen. Harrison, and some fractions of years, have been omitted, and Gen. Taylor's term is not included:

	Northern	Southern.
Presidents,	12	48
Vice Presidents,	40	20
Chief Justices,	11	48
Secretaries of State,	20	40
do of Treasury,	46	14
do of War,	34	25
do of Navy,	40	19
Postmaster General,	35	25
Attorneys General,	20	39
Speakers of House of Representatives,	28	37

In the sixteen Presidential elections, 3456 electoral votes have been cast, 1945 by Northern States, and 1511 by Southern States; 790 votes have been given by the North for Northern candidates, and 1190 by the South for Southern candidates, 1155 by the North for Southern candidates, and 321 by the South for Northern candidates.

It will be observed from this table that all the most important offices—those demanding the highest talent, influence, and weight of character, have been for the most part filled by Southern men. Thus the President, the Chief Justice, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, have been, during the greater part of the existence of the government, selected from the South. And *these* are the officers chief in dignity and importance. These having been taken from the South, the others inferior and secondary, have been generally Northern men.

equanimity. Though seldom alluded to in our public controversies, yet they are used at home by Northern demagogues, and fanatics, and political aspirants, to inflame the minds of the people, and unite them in opposition to the South and Southern institutions. Even Dr. Channing demeaned himself to say that the South exerts "a disproportionate share of influence on the confederacy," and to use it as an argument against the admission of Texas. The South is represented as having engrossed all the public offices, honours and emoluments, passed all their own measures, and ruled over the subject North with despotic sway. The latter is urged to unite, assert their supremacy, throw off the hateful tyranny, and rule as they have been ruled. And the plain, direct way in which to carry their object is to insist on no further extension of slavery—no more slave States—so that the South may be reduced to a feeble and helpless minority. Here is one secret of the anti-slavery and free-soil excitement. One of the abolition delegates openly declared on the floor of Congress, in a moment of triumph, that it is "a struggle for power." Arguments against slavery on moral, religious, and economical grounds are used as pleas and pretences, but they are nothing more. Devilish ambition steals the livery of heaven and adopts the language of Canaan to cloak its designs and conceal the accent of its diabolic tongue. But nothing could be more unjust than the wrath of the North against us in reference to our political ascendancy. If the South has won the honours, the North has gathered all the spoils. It is notorious that by far the greater part of the patronage of the general government has been bestowed on the North; and where the South has received one dollar for harbors, rivers, other internal improvements and public works, the North has taken thousands. And if the South has succeeded in carrying most of her legislative measures, the North has carried those which tended to her pecuniary advantage and to the loss and ruin of the South. The North has flung away the empty eclat of place, and the seat of profitless office, but true to her native instinct has grasped with both hands the gains and rewards.

We should not overlook another cause of the anti-slavery movement, perhaps as potent as any. It is what

Mr. Fisher calls "the fearful struggle of Northern labour for subsistence." It is a well known fact, that in countries where slavery does not exist, and the system of so called free labour or hired service prevails, that the inevitable tendency and result is to reduce the wages of the labourer down to a bare subsistence, when he receives in return for his labour only enough to support life. When things get to this point, pauperism and starvation come in like a flood. Times will occasionally arise, from interruptions of business and scarcity of employment, when the labouring class will not receive enough for their subsistence. This is the case with the older and more populous countries of Europe. And as the labouring class constitute a large portion, if not the majority, in every community, oftentimes hungry and famished for bread, they will rise in fearful convulsions to threaten and overturn the laws and institutions of the State. Hence the Chartism of England, the Red republicanism and socialism of France, the radicalism of Germany, and the starvation, crime, and rebellion of Ireland. The newness and extent of our Northern States have heretofore caused such demand for labour, and consequently high wages, that they have so far escaped this calamity. But they are rapidly approaching it. The natural increase of population, and the vast immigration from Europe, are crowding them with labourers. Wages are tending downwards to the point of bare support. A "fearful struggle for subsistence" has commenced. The only remedy is *more room*, larger territory, more new lands. White labour cannot, or will not, compete with black labour. At any rate experience has proved that they cannot coexist to any considerable extent. Hence the general expulsion of free blacks from the workshops of the North, the jealousy and riots between the two classes in Northern cities, and even the laws against coloured mechanics, slave or free, in at least one Southern State. Out of these facts grows a great deal of the opposition to slavery among the people of the North. Hence the cry "no more slave territory"—and "free soil." Hence the general fixed determination of the North to confine slavery to its present limits, and to take ALL our lately acquired territories for their own use.

We find, therefore, the great elements of opposition to

slavery, in a growing radicalism ; a feeling of inequality and disadvantage, or mean envy ; political ambition ; and competition of labour. And herein lies its strength and our danger. Religious fanaticism might be despised. False philanthropy is a harmless folly. Neither of them ever subverted a great civil institution, or much influenced the state of society. But among the elements we have mentioned are natural instincts and universal passions which move nations, and overturn empires. They are gathering to a head against the South, and combining for a contest in which they will neither stay nor spare till they win the prize.

But when men have determined on a great work of wrong and injustice they are never at a loss for a holy pretext to excuse it. Accordingly, anti-slavery has set forth various pleas to justify the wholesale robbery it has purposed. Our ears have been so long stunned with the cry against "the *evil* of slavery," that the South had almost come to acknowledge it herself. But when we undertake to examine the matter and ask what is meant by "the *evil* of slavery," where is it, and what? we honestly declare we cannot find it. Is it meant that to hold a slave is a sin? Conscience and our Bibles tell us it is not. Is it meant that we trespass on any natural or just right of the slave? Common sense, reason, and nature testify and prove that we do not. Is it meant that a great deal of sin is committed in connection with the institution? We admit it, but what does that prove? There is a great deal of sin committed in connection with government, and even with the Church. Is it said these evils are inseparable from slavery? So are they, in the present condition of human nature, in the case of government and the Church. Does slavery injure the negroes in any respect, physical, intellectual or religious? We point to what they were when brought from Africa, and what they are now. The benefit of slavery to them has been immense, in all these particulars. They have unquestionably improved far beyond any example of history. And this single fact, the rapid, constant advance of our slaves, physically, intellectually, and morally, is unanswerable proof against the clamour of abolition about the degrading, injurious, and oppressive nature of the institution. It has

improved and elevated the negro in every respect. It is said that there is a great deal of ignorance, vice, and superstition among them. So there is, but there is less than at first, and it is steadily decreasing. So there is in the labouring class of every country. Is it meant that it would be better for the negroes to have their freedom? Look at Hayti, Jamaica, the free blacks of the North, and hear one loud, emphatic, *no*. Is it meant that it would be better for every one to be free, rich, and happy? So it would, but the millenium has not come yet. Is it meant that slavery dooms the black race to perpetual ignorance and depression, without the possibility of raising their position? That remains to be proved. So far it has steadily improved them, and where the process will stop, none can tell. It has to be proved in the second place, and that against all experience, that emancipation will elevate and improve them. And it has to be proved, in the third place, that the negro race is capable of such improvement as will qualify it to live on terms of equality with the white—a question, the negative of which is entirely compatible with the doctrine of the unity of the human race. A Northern Review, which has often ably defended the South, in a late article, which grieved us to the heart, has asserted that the South has enacted laws for the express purpose of keeping the negroes in ignorance and degradation, in order to keep them slaves. This we flatly deny. The laws which are referred to were passed to protect the South from the wild and wicked efforts of Northern incendiarism—not to shut out the light of truth and religion from the minds of the slaves, but to exclude the entrance of falsehood and delusion—to preserve them as well as ourselves from the attempts of madmen, which would have plunged all into barbarism and ruin. We repel such charges with indignation, and appeal to our past history, and present efforts, to prove the general disposition to instruct, improve, and christianize the slaves. We ask again, therefore, wherein consists “the *evil* of slavery?”—Ah! we have found it, at last. Here it is—slavery is *bad economy*. It impoverishes the country where it exists. It is a foe to the wealth of the State. It consumes and destroys the resources of the South. It has covered our land with old fields, depopulated the old slave States, and re-

duced them to poverty. It would therefore be a sin and a shame to extend this withering, wasting curse to the fair and fertile vallies of New Mexico and California.

We had been so long accustomed to hear the prosperity of the North, and the comparative poverty and decay of the South, asserted without contradiction, that we had begun to take it for granted. Our hearts have often bled within us when we passed by the forsaken red hills of South Carolina and Georgia, and thought of the green meadows, and smiling farms, of New-England, skirting every stream, and gleaming on every mountain side of her happy land. Still we have always suspected that things are not exactly as they seem. And it has often been our duty and pleasure to repel the charge of a want of energy, industry, and thrift in the South. We owe to Mr. Fisher an able defence of our dear home and dearer institutions, as to this point, based on the facts and figures of history. His lecture is an admirable specimen of clear, concise, cool argumentation. We have observed in it not a single indication of prejudice, or bias of feeling. He reasons not like a partizan, except it be a partizan of truth and justice. In these respects he is in pleasing contrast with his antagonist, Mr. Mussey, whose fierce but feeble defence of Mr. Webster, flings at "the democracy" and at "abstractionists," one-sided misrepresentations, sarcasms, and abuse, betray the weakness of his cause and the prejudice of his opinions. He has satisfactorily answered Mr. Fisher on some minor points, but leaves the main conclusions unimpeached, and makes admissions fatal to his argument. The force of much of his reasoning may be judged from the fact, that in reply to Mr. Fisher's statement of the much greater longevity of persons engaged in agriculture, he triumphantly adduces the still greater longevity of *paupers* in an alms house! A man who can be guilty of this patent folly, commits suicide on all his own reasoning. His essay is much longer as well as much weaker than Mr. Fisher's, and may be considered only the first attempt of an over zealous advocate to answer him. We are sorry to see Mr. M. condescend to that old shift of a weak argument, in trying to stigmatize his opponents as "metaphysicians," and "abstractionists." It is unworthy even of him.

The first object of Mr. Fisher's Lecture is to show that "the South is greatly the superior of the North in wealth, in proportion to the number of their citizens respectively." This he does by a comparison of wealth and population, derived from the census returns taken by the General Government, and other authentic sources. We shall sum up the principal facts and results which he thus obtains. When the Constitution of the United States was adopted, the North and South were very nearly equal in population, territory, commerce, and wealth. From that time up to the year 1816, the South *took the lead* of the North in commerce and manufactures, while in 1815 the property of the South averaged \$312 per individual, and the property of the North only \$240. Thus for twenty five years after our present government was organized, the South excelled the North in all these respects. Since 1816 the Federal Government abandoned the plan of raising its income by direct taxation, and resorted to a tariff of duties on foreign imports. From that period the commerce and manufactures of the South have not prospered, but it is an error to suppose that therefore she has had a decline in general prosperity. Compare for example Massachusetts, the pride of Northern wealth and prosperity, with Maryland. In 1840 the average property of a free person, in the latter, was \$531,—in the former only \$406—Maryland, in proportion to her population, being about 25 per cent the richer. New York is boasted of as the very grandest product of free institutions, while Virginia is constantly referred to as a melancholy example of the evil of slavery. But the average wealth of Virginia is \$758 for every free white person, while that of New York is only \$260, or a little more than one-third as much. Virginia is perhaps the richest community in the world. In Kentucky the average value of property is \$456; in Ohio it is only \$276. Thus it is manifest that the slaveholding States, which have been regarded as the victims of poverty and ruin, are much richer than those free States which have been considered the most flourishing communities the world ever saw. If you deduct the value of the slaves from the property of these Southern States, their average wealth will still remain larger than that of the Northern. If you deduct the

value of the slaves, and also count them as persons, and give them a share of property, still we have the same result, the average wealth of the South is greater. "So that in no aspect of the question whatever, is there any foundation in fact, for the popular delusion, that the Southern States, or any of them, are either now or heretofore, or likely to be hereafter, inferior to their Northern neighbours in wealth,—but the reverse." Such, at least, is the testimony of official documents on the subject—the highest authority that exists.

Mr. Fisher next proves that the South is not only richer, but that its wealth is more equally distributed, and secures more comfort. This he does by a comparison of statistics between Virginia and Kentucky, and New York and Ohio, which shows that the two former contain more freeholders, build more houses during a year, and use more pleasure carriages, in proportion to their population, than the two latter. Again, in determining the comparative comfort of two communities, the quantity and quality of food they consume is a well established criterion.—By this test the superiority of the South is manifest. Virginia produces and consumes much more than Ohio or New York, in proportion to her population, of animal food, wheat and Indian corn, the most substantial and costly materials of food. New York is resorting to the potato, the cheapest and least wholesome food, and in Massachusetts the production of the finer sorts of bread-stuffs is rapidly declining.

But having proved the superior wealth and comfort of the South, we wish to know the causes and reasons of it. The original methods of acquiring wealth were conquest and commerce. Later, manufactures were added. England has combined the three, and acquired wealth without a parallel. But a great increase of commerce and manufactures results in collecting large masses of people in towns and cities, which causes great inequality, depravity, increase of want, and crime—consequences fatal to liberty, prosperity, and independence. Where this system exists, the attractions of cities continually draw to them wealth and population, and so aggravate the evil which disgraces civilization, and will, in the end, destroy it. This undue tendency to city life was first successfully

encountered and conquered by the institution of slavery. This, for the first time in the history of the world, has made agriculture so profitable and attractive as to render rural life the favourite of wealth, and the abode of elegant manners and refined taste. Agriculture is more productive than commerce or manufactures, and requires less labour and skill. The fecundity of nature can never be equalled by art. A grain of wheat, when sown, will produce a hundred fold. But no fabric of the loom, or cargo of a ship, can have its value so increased without much more labour and skill. Besides, the farmer holds the subsistence, and consequently the property of his fellow men, in his power. They are dependent on him for food and clothing, the first necessities of life, and he will make his own terms. This power, in the hands of agriculture, can rule the world. In wars, between agricultural and commercial nations, the former have generally conquered. Thus Athens was overcome by Sparta, Greece by Macedon, Carthage by Rome. Even in England, whose commerce and manufactures are so extensive, agriculture still retains pre-eminence in wealth and political power, though it includes only one-third of the population. The agriculture of the South controls an extraordinary portion of the food and clothing which the world consumes, and hence makes a corresponding increase in wealth. Again, living in towns and cities is far more expensive, and injurious to morals, health, and life, and consequently less favourable to the accumulation of wealth. It is true there is a greater display of wealth in the city, but this very fact proves the extravagance of city life, and is a cause of real poverty. It is true also that the average wealth of the inhabitants of cities exceeds that of the rest of the State. But this wealth is not the product of city employments. It is brought there by those who seek the trade of the city, because they cannot acquire large fortunes in a country where there is no slavery.

If it be said that the Northern States are more populous, and if the average wealth of their individual citizens is less, the aggregate wealth of the State is greater, this is of no consequence to the argument. The great question is as to the general comfort and prosperity of the

people, as affected by their peculiar institutions and pursuits. The population of Ireland, and therefore her aggregate wealth, is much greater than of any of our States; and yet her people die, by thousands, of starvation.

It is said that the system of the South is depopulating, and the country thinly settled. If it be meant that her system is incompatible with a dense population, it is true, but not to be regretted. It has been shown that the concentration of people in large towns and cities, is not desirable. Large farms and plantations are also necessary to the prosperity and improvement of agriculture. Experience has proved that a dense population, and the consequent minute subdivision of land, is fatal to agricultural improvement. Witness Ireland, a part of Scotland, and France, where under the most favourable circumstances for the prosperity of agriculture, the average value of land is only five or six dollars per acre,—less than in Virginia. The fact that many planters in the older slave States, find it more profitable to remove to the new lands in the West, than to renovate the old at home, and accordingly emigrate, is a proof of their thrift and enterprise.

Mr. Fisher further proves that the white population has had a larger increase at the South than at the North.—Since 1820 it has been about 65 per cent in the former, and about 60 per cent in the latter. This refutes another imputation very current at the North against the South. It is said that slavery degrades labour, and therefore, as the white people of the South refuse to work, and live in idleness, they become dissipated and vicious. This cannot be so, for prevailing vice is fatal to the increase of population. There is another striking fact. The vices of society affect chiefly *males*, young men and boys. If, therefore, the South is more immoral than the North, it would appear in the deficit of the male population. But the reverse is the fact. The excess of males at the South, above the females, is much larger in proportion than at the North. Massachusetts has several thousand more females than males. The temptations and vices of Northern cities destroy their men, while the rural habits and domestic influences of the South preserve them.

Another important consideration in estimating the condition of a country, is the number of its paupers, or persons supported by charity. In the whole State of New York, there was in 1844 one pauper for every seventeen inhabitants; in 1847 about one person out of every five, in New York city, was dependent, more or less, on charity. In Massachusetts one person out of every twenty, is a constant or occasional pauper. In these two States pauperism is increasing ten times faster than wealth or population. It includes large numbers of able bodied men, who cannot, or what is worse, will not earn a subsistence. It is a mistake to suppose that the paupers of the North are furnished by the foreign immigrants. They do not supply more than their due proportion. This year, 1849, New York, according to the estimate of the Governor, required \$400,000 to support her beggars.

This fearful curse and terrible burden is not felt at the South. We have scarcely one pauper for each county, and beggary is unknown, except by a few strolling foreigners.

Again, compare the North and South as to public crime. Official documents prove that there are four times as many criminals in proportion to the white population in New York, as in Virginia; and twice as many in Massachusetts and in all the New England States together. There are twenty-five per cent more in Ohio, according to population, than in Kentucky. One-half of the criminals of the latter came from the single county in which Louisville, her principal town, is located, and one-third of the whole number were born in free States. So much for the Northern States, old and new, as compared with the Southern in crime. "The results are uniformly and largely in favour of the South." If we look at the large cities of the North, the amount of crime is still greater, and truly appalling. In Boston one out of every fourteen males, and one out of every twenty-eight females, is arrested annually for criminal offences. In New York the proportion is about the same. There are more criminals in the single city of New York, than in all the Southern States together. In the New York penitentiaries, there are 254 women. In the penitentiary of Kentucky, there is not one. It may be supposed that a

large proportion of criminals, at the North, are found among European emigrants. But facts do not prove it to be so.

Moreover, while the South has been more secure than the North from individual crime, it has been still more exempt from social disturbances, riots, and mobs.* And it is remarkable that this country and Brazil, the only two nations on this continent where slavery prevails, are the only two that have succeeded in establishing firm and prosperous, social and civil institutions.

Such are the leading facts and conclusions of Mr. Fisher's Lecture. We have no doubt that further and more careful investigation would require us to modify some of them, and perhaps reject a few. But we believe them to be substantially true and irrefutable. The North, however, will probably treat them with contempt, and the South itself receive them incredulously. They will be summarily disposed of by the short argument of an appeal to the senses. It will be said that it is only necessary to look with the outward eye, at the face of the two sections, to see their fallacy. The whole aspect of the North is one of prosperity and wealth—crowded and well cultivated farms—comfortable, handsome dwellings—flourishing towns and cities—multiplied and prosperous manufactories—public works, and internal improvements, and all those visible demonstrations which betoken general prosperity and abounding wealth. While on the other hand the South presents a sparse population, exhausted and forsaken lands, ill-cultivated plantations, rude and often dilapidated dwellings, few manufactories, rail roads, or canals, and no large cities. These, it is insisted, are facts patent and plain to every man's observation; and too conclusive to be set aside by "metaphysics" and

* There is scarcely a mail that arrives that does not bring the tidings of a spirit of insubordination and contempt of order in Baltimore and Philadelphia, to which we may add New York and Boston. The Boston Journal has the following:

"Outrages upon person and property are, we regret to say, becoming quite frequent in this and the neighboring cities and towns, so that it is absolutely unsafe to walk abroad at a late hour in the evening. Incendiarism is rife also, and scarcely a night passes without one or more incendiary fires within a short circuit around Boston." Since 1836 the riots in Philadelphia have cost the city about a quarter of a million of dollars.

"abstractions." And thus the world goes on grasping at the lies of sense, while it discards the lessons of experience, truth, and reason. The wealth of the North makes a greater show to the eye, because it is concentrated on a smaller space, while that of the South is extended and dispersed over a greater proportional area. That which, at the North, is heaped up on one square mile, is spread at the South, over two, or five, or ten. The labour which is here extended over five acres, is there concentrated on one. The natural result is a greater appearance of wealth at the North, but it is appearance only. If the dwellings of the North are generally better, it is partly because the climate of the South, fortunately, does not require them to be so costly and comfortable,—partly because the same climate causes them more rapidly to lose their good looks, and to decay,—and partly because the dense population, and constant inspection of close neighborhood, naturally beget more taste, rivalry, and expense in such things, at the North.

Some of the apparent evidences of prosperity, at the North, are proofs of its real poverty. It is the excess of population, low remuneration of labour, and demand for bread—that "fearful struggle for subsistence," which has brought its barren hills into cultivation, compelled the expensive renovation of old lands, stimulated every branch of manufactures, and even created a literature. It is because thousands want wealth, that they write and publish. The South, driven to no such extremity, lacks the needful stimulus to literary exertion, and prefers the greater luxury of reading. It is the same cause which has extended the commerce of the North. Poverty at home drives people abroad. And it must be extreme to induce so many to endure the hardships and low wages of sailor life. The spirit of enterprise and adventure, no doubt, has its influence. But labour is a curse. All men feel it to be so, and nothing but a hard necessity makes it to be borne. In a few cases, avarice, ambition, lust for the position and power which wealth gives, perhaps habit and education, may induce men to toil after they have gained a competency. And in Literature, a genuine love for it sometimes secures its cultivation. But it is necessity which governs the mass, puts them into the harness,

and drives them to the end. It is just because a competence is so general, and so easily secured at the South, that her industry has not been forced to develope itself in so many directions as that of the North. Go into the plain home of a Southern farmer. His house, perhaps, is not carpeted—the fresh air pours in through a hundred unnoticed crevices; and marks of carelessness and waste meet you on every hand. But the truth is, he is not compelled to be careful. He wastes because he has abundance. He throws more meat and bread to his dogs, than a similar family at the North would have the means to eat themselves. He does not shut out the cold wind, because more of it never blows than is good for his health and comfort. His income is not spent in expensive furniture, because he has not a dozen curious neighbours to look at it every day, to envy or be envied; and perhaps the want of society has, in some cases, prevented the formation of a taste for such things. But his barns and larder are filled with plenty. His children never cry for bread, and even his slaves learn to waste and squander in their abundance.* He exhausts and forsakes his land in one place, because he can obtain new fields with less expense than he can renovate the old. He does not save his rags, nor sweep his hen-coop, for his family does not need such economising, and he can bestow his time and labour more profitably. His home is not like that of his Northern brother, burnished as bright and nice as a new pin; but he has ten times the substantial necessities and comforts of life. In the residences of our wealthy planters, however, constituting a very large class of the population, there are as much comfort and splendor, and as many of the elegant luxuries of the civilized world, as can be found any where. Mr. Fisher says:

“The South exhibits the remarkable phenomenon of an agricultural people, distinguished above all others of the present day, by the elegance of their manners, and the intellectual tone of their society.”

It is true the South is far behind in railroads, canals, turnpikes, bridges and such internal improvements. One

* The practice is said to be a very common one in New England, for labourers to board at tables from which meat is excluded; as being beyond the means of the lodgers.

reason is that she has more navigable rivers than the North. Less mountainous, her natural roads are more level, and require less improvement. The country generally is nearer the sea-coast. And the sparseness of population has also contributed to prevent these public works. They require a thickly settled country, great condensation of wealth, and abundance of cheap labour. The South has neither, and we rejoice in it. If, as we believe, she has developed her internal improvements as rapidly as the principles which govern the economy of such works authorize in her circumstances, she has justified her industry and enterprise. That she has not done wisely in neglecting manufactures we cordially admit, and deeply regret. But happily her own misfortunes and the infatuated measures of the North are rousing her attention to her duty and interest in this particular. To invite attention to it, we have named the Essay of Mr. James at the head of this article. Though apparently written to benefit a particular enterprise, it demonstrates clearly the profits of cotton manufactures, the facilities which the South possesses for their establishment, and the best method for their management. We do not believe the South can ever equal the North in the variety and extent of her manufactures. Our circumstances, institutions, policy, and dispositions forbid it, and we are glad of it. Fortunately our necessities will not probably force it upon us. But there can be no question but that the greatest advantages would result from the increase of this branch of industry at the South. It would divert capital and labour from the overstocked branches of agriculture, lessen the quantity and raise the price of our cotton in foreign markets, give employment to white mechanics and labourers, keep at home thousands of dollars annually paid to foreign and Northern manufactories, as facts and experiments prove yield a large profit to those embarked in it, and go far to arrest the folly of Northern fanatics. Let them hem in slavery to its present limits. They will lay upon us the dire hand of necessity. In fifty years we will manufacture at home every pound of cotton we produce. Then woe to them! The immediate and rapid extension of manufactures at the South will make them feel their danger, and touch them, where they were never touched in vain—

in their gains. Every factory erected in the South will be a wall of rock against their unjust and infatuated purposes.

The South is continually reproached with a want of industry, energy, and enterprise, and this is charged on the institution of slavery. But can any one believe her industry would be more productive if her negroes were free? Undoubtedly it would be more so, if they were all enlightened, moral and Christian. But it seems to be forgotten that they are semi-barbarians, and at best only half christianized. And herein lies one great fallacy of anti-slavery reasoning. It is perpetually charging on *slavery* evils social, moral, economical, and religious, which so far as they exist are not due to slavery, but to the existence in our midst of three millions of semi-savage and half civilized Africans. This is the great burden and evil of the South, and truly it is in some respects a tremendous calamity. But *slavery* is its remedy—the only one possible—the one necessary, right, just, and good. It not only goes far to deliver the South from the evil of such a population, but as we have said has rapidly civilized and christianized these barbarians.

There is one fact which acquits the industrial energy of the South of all the opprobrium which has been heaped upon it. The skill and industry, which in sixty years have raised the production of cotton from nothing to twelve hundred and fifty millions of pounds per annum, need no defence. In 1834 the number of cotton bales produced in the South, was 1,254,000; in 1848 it was 2,700,000. Thus in fourteen years the enterprise of the South more than doubled the amount of this immense production. The Englishman McCulloch, says the increase and extent of this branch of agricultural industry is without a parallel in the history of the world. It speaks for itself, and ought at once to silence every assertion of our imbecility and indolence. Let it be remembered, too, that enormous production is the result of Southern skill and enterprise applied to the management of labourers who for the most part are half savages. The merit may be fairly claimed, of having accomplished so much, by the agency of the most indolent, stupid, and unproductive, of all races. For an example of Southern enterprise and industry look at

the Cherokee county of Georgia. Ten years ago it was a wilderness. Now it is the home of a comfortable industrious people, sprinkled all over with thriving villages, embosoming in every valley beautiful and productive farms, with neat and commodious dwellings, and not without its rail roads and manufactories.

In one respect the industry of the South is defective. It is not inventive and adventurous. It confines itself too much to one channel, and to old methods. Its energies have been directed too exclusively to one branch of production. It has overdone the cultivation of cotton, and neglected other important and profitable employments of labour. This is owing partly, no doubt, to the peculiar genius of the Southern mind, and partly to the great profit of the cotton culture, and the ease with which it is pursued. The labour of our slaves can be much more easily applied to agriculture than to any thing else. Cotton is its most profitable product in the greater part of the South. Naturally, therefore, that has absorbed nearly all our attention. Necessity, the mother of invention, has not been laid on us. But it is beginning to be; and the result is seen in our multiplying various branches of manufactures and mechanics. And if the North does not wish to convert the South, and that speedily, from a buyer into a seller—from a customer into a competitor, let her not compel us to divert our capital and labour into new channels. What we have done in cotton we can do in other things. We have all the minerals the North has, and more beside. We can produce all the bread stuffs and animals we require, and have abundance to sell. We can produce also the Irish potato, when we need it, Mr. Mussey to the contrary notwithstanding. And we can manufacture our own cotton and wool. We can do it at less cost than the North can, and after a while just as skilfully.* We have a longer sea coast, harbors and seaports, and all the materials for commerce and shipping. When necessity requires it we shall have sailors. We do not wish to make an extensive change in our system. But if we

* At a recent exhibition of the Franklin Institute, at Philadelphia, the "drillings, sheetings, and shirtings," from the Graniteville Factory in South Carolina, took the first premium. The "shirtings" of the Charleston Cotton Factory were awarded a premium at the same exhibition, and pronounced to be of a quality that would compare with any manufactured in New England.

mnst, we can and will. We are beginninng already. Let the North pursue the course she has pursued and the course she threatens, and the result is inevitable. There are natural laws which rule in the progress of nations and in defiance of man work out their necessary effects.

Another ground on which some oppose the extension and perpetuity of slavery is, what they believe to be its injurious effects on the intellectual, moral and religious condition of the country. The proportional number of persons who cannot read, is greater at the South than it is at the North. This is easily explained by the sparseness of population where these persons are found, which renders a system of free schools impossible. And we would be willing, at any time, to compare even these unfortunate citizens of the South, in point of morals and intelligence, with the lower class in the North, or in free, enlightened England. The North produces a multitude of books and authors: the South, few or none. We have given one reason for this difference. The South, however, reads and studies books, if she does not make them. So far as our observation extends, there is a larger proportion of standard works in literature and science bought and read at the South than at the north. The activity, ardor and enterprise of the Southern mind, impel to action, rather than to the tedious toil of authorship. When a great mind is given to us, the open field of politics, or of professional life, is far more inviting than the student's sickening and solitary cloister. But where has Southern intellect and learning been brought into contact with Northern, and found wanting? Not on the arena of Federal politics. For there, by the complaints of the North, we are blamed for winning all the offices, honors, and influence. How have we done it? Not by superior numbers; we have always been in the minority—not by greater union and cooperation; we have been constantly divided—not by arts of mean trickery and corruption; our politicians will hardly be charged with more of these than others—not by boldness and violence; for our Northern friends are not cowards. How, then, if not by the force of superior talent, eloquence, and statesmanship? The North is overflowing with clergymen, and the South exceedingly destitute. Yet in two or

three years, four prominent Presbyterian churches in Northern cities have invited Southern ministers to their pulpits. We would not be permitted to say that they were pleased with mere oratorical display without sense and learning. We need only refer to the military history of the country, for a comparison of Southern and Northern genius in that line. Mr. Mussey draws quite a lively picture of Southern talent, in contrast with the cool, thorough, logical, learned North. We thank him for the amusement it furnished us. It is well drawn, and, no doubt, from life. We could put our hands on examples which illustrate it exactly. But we can select as many which would just reverse his description. It is too long to quote, and, like all general classifications of character, fallacious and deceptive. Such characteristics are, usually, caricatures. The truth of Mr. Mussey's may be judged from one portion of it. He says—"if we follow them both, the Northern and the Southern, from the scenes of their rudimental instruction to the colleges, where the higher acquirements for maturer minds are inculcated—to Harvard or Yale—the patient and laborious student, the critical linguist, the mathematician, the natural philosopher, the essayist,—these are from the North; the star of the literary club, the declaimer, the forensic speaker, the light of the social circle—these are from the South." This may be true of Harvard and Yale, where an exceedingly small proportion of the students are from the South—where those who are sent from the South are quite young men, from sixteen to twenty years of age, who have to contend with students from twenty to thirty—and, generally, sons of wealthy parents who feel but little stimulus towards the toil of laborious study. We were personally acquainted, for a few years, with another eminent Northern college, where the proportion of students from the South was greater than it is at Harvard or Yale, and where Northern and Southern talent was brought into fairer competition. Here, though we say it who should not, the results were very different. The Southern students were not only the declaimers and literary stars, but they were the mathematicians, linguists, metaphysicians, and philosophers. Though greatly inferior in numbers, they took most of the honors given for

scholarship, as well as those given for literature and eloquence. In one class, the largest, at that time, ever graduated at the institution, only a third of which were Southerners, they filled the *five* highest grades of scholarship, and took *all the honors*. It may be said that the Southern mind matures sooner than the Northern, and that, therefore, a college course is no test. But to this we reply, that Northern students are, generally, much older. We take no pleasure in these comparisons. They are somewhat odious, and of little advantage. But if we have become fools in glorying, "ye have compelled us."

As to the comparative morality of the free and slave States, the statistics of public crimes, furnished by Mr. Fisher, are very largely in favour of the latter. With respect to those vices which cannot be brought under the cognizance of Courts of Law, we confidently believe Southern morals to be equally superior. We know the impression at the North is almost universal that the South is the very hot-bed of all ungodliness, impiety, and uncleanness. But this impression is not founded on any sufficient information, or any intimate knowledge of the state of Southern society. When the attempt is made to confirm it by facts and authentic observation, it will be time enough to meet and disprove it with equal evidence to the contrary. We oppose to it our impressions in favour of the South—the oft repeated assertion of the equal comparative purity, propriety, and order of our social state—and our indignant denial of the slanderous misrepresentations of Southern morals. At any rate, from all we can learn of the morality of Northern society, we are well content to remain as we are—a slaveholding people, and invite the world to compare us with our neighbours. Our sins are not few or small. But if we are to be stoned, let it be by those who are themselves without sin.

How is it in the matter of religion? In proportion to our population, have we not as many churches, ministers, and members as the North? Are they not as consistent in their walk, as pure in doctrine, and as rigid in discipline? Are not our Sabbaths as well observed, and our Bibles as much revered? Where have been the greatest and most dangerous religious apostasies? In

free New England is the stronghold of Unitarianism, with its train of soul-destroying German follies. The great apostacy in the Presbyterian church, was in the North.—There, too, is the only soil in which Universalism has flourished. We never saw a preacher of that heresy at the South, who was not a Northern man. The few Unitarians and Universalists at the South, are nearly all imported from the same quarter. We have a good many infidels, as every part of the world has, but they have never been able to form a body and an organization with us, as they have at the North. It is notorious, too, that gross religious fooleries and fanaticism, such as Mormonism and others of its class, spring up and prosper there, but do not exist and cannot succeed in the South. The want of a dense population, with its attendant circumstances, may partly account for these facts; but then, *that* is to be ascribed to the existence of slavery. Besides, the sparseness of population renders it more difficult to affect them by the institutions of the Gospel. So that the present religious condition of the South has been secured under this great disadvantage.

We do not wish to be understood as justifying *every thing* connected with Southern slavery,—as maintaining it to be the best conceivable state of human society,—or as denying that any evil results from it. Any man might be justly reckoned mad, who would take such positions with regard to any institution in the world. The question is not as to what, in the general, or at the North, is the best form of civil and social institutions; but what is best here, at the South, under present circumstances? We have three millions half savage Africans, interspersed through all the South, who have never been any thing but slaves. What shall we do with them? That is the momentous question. Would freedom be to them a blessing and benefit? Are they competent to enjoy it? Would it make them better, happier, or more useful? Granting it would be better for them to be emancipated, would it be better for the six millions of whites? Granting that it is better for the North to be free from slavery, it is still a question whether it would be so for the South. Granting that slavery is an injury to the wealth, morals, civilization, and religion of a country, it does not follow but that

in the peculiar situation of the Southern States, it has been an advantage in all these respects. And it is still a further question whether emancipation would prevent that injury—or rather, we should say, it is not a question. It is palpably plain that three millions of semi-barbarians intimately mixed with the people of the South, would be an intolerable curse, in any relation but that of slaves.—But why, we are asked, do you not adapt your system to their gradual civilization? We reply again, our system is having that effect as rapidly and as successfully perhaps as possible. The main hindrances have been forced on us by the madness of abolitionists. But we reply further that we believe the negro race is incapable of an improvement which will qualify it to live on terms of equality with the white. At any rate such a result is not attainable within a period which it is practicable to foresee, or to provide for. The only alternative is an entire separation of the two races, or *slavery*. The first is impossible. The second becomes a sacred and solemn duty—just, and right, and good.

With such convictions it is not surprising that the South should be deeply grieved and alarmed by the measures of the North, as depicted in the address of the Southern members of Congress. This address is a calm but solemn and resolute declaration of the rights and duties of the South. It sets forth the chief aggressions of the North, perpetrated and threatened with their fearful consequences to the Southern States, if not arrested.—The rights of the South, to the service of the slaves, was guaranteed by the Constitution. It expressly provided, for example, that if a slave escape, and take refuge in a free State, he shall be delivered up on claim of his owner. Nothing could be more express than this provision. It was unanimously adopted by the Convention which framed the Constitution, solemnly ratified by the free States when they adopted it, and has been confirmed by repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. And yet it is openly resisted and violated, and in effect nullified and abrogated, by the free States. An attempt to recover a fugitive slave, is met with resistance in every form; resistance from the laws of the free States, from Judges and Magistrates, and when these fail, from mobs,

force, and violence. A master cannot regain possession of his slave without the hazard of insult, heavy pecuniary loss, imprisonment, and even of life itself. A citizen of Maryland was killed in an effort to enforce his claim to a slave, under this provision. Some of the free States have gone so far as to pass laws making it a penal offence for any officer or citizen of those States to assist in executing this article of the Constitution. The subject, therefore, assumes the grave aspect of a flagrant violation of the Constitution—of the fundamental terms, conditions, and provisions, under which the Union was formed.

Citizens of the North have moreover pursued, for fifteen years, a system of measures with the avowed design and tendency to subvert the institutions of the South, and rob us of the peaceful possession and benefit of our property. By the constant agitation of the subject, petitions to Congress, circulation of inflammatory and seditious publications in the South and among the slaves, combinations and societies to promote abolition, secret organizations to aid the escape of slaves, and secret emissaries in the South itself, they have endangered the domestic tranquillity, property, lives, and the very existence of the South. We hold that if we have the right to own slaves, as guaranteed to us by the Constitution, and sanctioned by the North itself, we have the right to hold them in peace and quietude, free from disturbance, direct or indirect. Such aggressions, between independent nations, would be justly considered as cause for war. And if any State cannot or will not restrain its citizens from such trespass on the safety of another, it becomes itself responsible. When the Union and Confederation of the States is taken advantage of, the more successfully to perpetrate it, it rises from an injury to an outrage, and adds to injustice a violation of good faith. And when the Union and the Constitution fail to secure the ends for which they were established, one of which was "*to ensure domestic tranquillity*," they cease to be not only desirable and useful, but binding and obligatory. This last is the point to which the South is in danger of being driven—reluctantly, sorrowfully, and in despair. But on the head of her cruel and infatuated adversaries will lie the shame and the guilt.

The wrongs we have mentioned might have been borne. We would have contended against them, as best we could. But the lust of power, and the spirit of aggression have invaded our Federal legislation; and Congress, our last protector, threatens to become the engine of our oppression, and the agent of our ruin. The House of Representatives have entertained propositions denying the right of property in slaves; to prohibit slavery, and the selling and buying of slaves in the District of Columbia; to admit slaves to vote on the question of their own emancipation; and to abolish slavery in all the forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other public buildings belonging to the United States, including of course those within the slave States. Some of these propositions obtained a majority in the House, and all of them were sustained by a large number of votes. Congress passed a bill prohibiting slavery in the territory of Oregon. And as that institution did not exist there, and certainly never would, why was such a bill enacted unless as a wanton, unnecessary exercise of power, to insult and degrade the South? And now to crown and consummate the whole, as the next act of injustice and oppression, the North unanimously avows its fixed resolve to prohibit slavery in every part of the new territory acquired from Mexico, to prevent the formation of any more slave States, and thus virtually to rob the South of all share in that large and valuable country, to exclude our citizens from its settlement, and appropriate ALL of it, to the last inch, to their own use. We solemnly declare this to be a wrong and an outrage unparalleled in the history of Christian nations, and protest against it in the name of all honor, justice, right, and good faith. It is useless to say these territories are open to our occupancy, if we choose to enter them without our slaves. We cannot enter them unless we can take our property with us. Of what value would the land be without the labour necessary to cultivate it? To exclude our property and labour, is in effect to exclude us. In the war with Mexico, by which these territories were acquired, the South contributed far more than her full share of men, to say nothing of money. With little more than half the white population of the North, she furnished about double the

number of volunteers. Her soldiers, to say the least, bore an equal part in the dangers of every campaign, and rendered equal service on every field of battle. On all principles of right, equality, and justice, therefore, she is entitled to participate fully in the results of the contest.—But now she is forbidden to place her profane feet on the soil won by the valour, and wet with the blood, of her gallant sons.

Our Government is a confederation of distinct, sovereign, and independent States. To them the Territories belong as common property. The States are joint owners and co-partners: and each is entitled to its proportional share of the common property. It is a fundamental principle in our Constitution, that the States are equal in rights and dignity. Therefore, for one portion of the confederacy to appropriate to itself the whole of a common property, is an act of robbery. It subverts the basis, and destroys the very nature and character, of the Union. It annihilates the equality of the confederates, and sinks the excluded portion to the condition of inferiors and *subjects*. The North may think slavery the wickedest and worst institution that ever disgraced humanity. But they formed the Union with us when we were slaveholders, recognised the right of slavery, and guaranteed us equal rights in the confederacy, notwithstanding. And now to make slavery a pretence for this wholesale plunder, is a flagrant and barefaced violation of honour, justice, good faith, and constitutional rights.

The South, and particularly Mr. Calhoun, who is understood to have written the Address, have been charged with wishing Congress to extend slavery. But this document takes the ground that Congress has the right neither to restrict nor to extend that institution. It would be as unjust and unconstitutional for Congress to discriminate in favour of the South, as against it. Congress is bound to hold an even, impartial way—dealing fairly, justly, and equally with every portion of our great republic. What we contend for is, that Congress should let the matter alone—should not prohibit us from entering the territories of the United States, because we are slaveholders—that our property should not be excluded while that of others is admitted—that we should not be in fact

disfranchised of a privilege in our own country which is allowed to all others, citizens and foreigners, without discrimination as to character, profession, or colour—any body, every body, may freely enter and remain, we only being excluded. The position of the South is defensive. We have insisted on no positive act to which the North objects. The celebrated Missouri compromise was adopted by the almost unanimous vote of the North. We were willing to extend the line it established between the free and slave States, to the Pacific Ocean, and abide by it. The North refused, and repudiated its own compromise. We proposed to let the whole matter alone, and leave it to be decided by the territories themselves, when they came to form State Constitutions and seek admission to the Union. The North refused that. We offered to leave the right of slavery in the territories, to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. The North refused that; what more can we do? The North will agree to no compromise, make no concession. Her unbridled lust demands all, every thing. The lion's share will not content her. The remembrance of the past, hallowed by so many tender and glorious associations in the history of our common country,—the solemn compacts of the Constitution,—the earnest appeals of the South to her honour, her justice, her generosity, and her brotherly kindness,—all seem powerless to arrest her purpose. The value of the prize has awakened her remorseless avarice, and she resolves, eager and insatiable, to seize the whole. We quote from Mr. Fisher:

“When the North American colonies confederated for resistance to Great Britain, the territorial area of the Southern portion of them was 648,202 square miles—that of the Northern only 164,081, or about one-fourth as large. Virginia alone had, by Royal charter, the whole Northwestern territory in her limits, and during the war had confirmed her title by the patriotism and valour of her own citizens—who rescued even Illinois from British power. But before the present Constitution was formed, Virginia, with a magnanimity almost infatuated, had ceded to the confederacy, for the formation of free States, the whole Northwestern territory, now constituting the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, containing 261,681 square miles, and making the territory of the free States rather

more than that of the slaveholding. The object of this cession and the ordinance of 1787 was to equalize the area of the two sections. The acquisition of Louisiana in 1803, added 1,138,103 square miles to our territory, of which, by the Missouri compromise, the South obtained only 226,013 square miles, or about one-fifth—the other four-fifths, notwithstanding it came to us as a slaveholding province, were allotted to the North, which thus had acquired more than 700,000 square miles of territory over the South. Florida and Oregon were acquired by the treaty of 1819, by which the South got 59,268 square miles, and the North 341,463, making the North about 1,000,000 of square miles the most. In 1845 Texas was annexed, which added only 325,520 square miles to the South, even if all Texas were included. In 1848 we obtained 526,078 square miles more in the territories of New Mexico and California. And now the North claims the whole of this also—and not only this but half of Texas besides, which would make the share of the North exceed that of the South nearly 1,500,000 square miles—a territory about equal in extent to the whole valley of the Mississippi, and leaving the South only about 810,812 square miles, while the North retains 2,097,124, or nearly three-fourths of the whole! And this, too, when the South contributed her full share of the men and money by which the whole territory was obtained. In the Revolutionary war the South furnished an average of 16,14 men in each year, and the North 25,875, which nearly corresponds with their respective number of citizens, and that, too, although the war was waged chiefly against the large cities of the North—cities being in war the most tempting and the most vulnerable points of attack. In the war with Mexico the South supplied two-thirds of the volunteers which constituted three-fourths of the entire force employed. The revenue by which these wars have been supported, the public debt paid, and the price for the territory furnished, has been raised chiefly by duties which have notoriously operated designedly and incidentally to promote the industry and capital of the North, and to oppress those of the South.

“If, after all this, the South should submit to be plundered of her share of the territory now in dispute, when, as an agricultural people, she requires her full proportion, she would be recreant to her interests, her power, her right, her honour, and her fame—recreant to her history and her destiny.”

There is another view of this subject, which is well calculated to excite the greatest alarm in the South. By a provision of the Constitution, a majority of three fourths

of the States can alter and amend it at their pleasure.—The effect of excluding the South from all share in the territories, will very soon be to create more than that majority of free States. We shall then be in a helpless and hopeless minority. The Constitution will no longer furnish the shadow of protection to our rights and institutions. The free States will possess the power to modify and change it at their will. They can so amend it as to give Congress the power, at once, to abolish slavery in the Southern States themselves, and at a single blow to demolish every trace of its existence. This is the dreadful issue to which the course of the North directly tends. We cannot doubt such is the ultimate design of many anti-slavery leaders. And we call on the South, earnestly and solemnly, to contemplate the gulf to which they are driven. It is an abyss without a bottom, and dark as the pit of hell; full of all calamities, and resounding with the cries of despair. Some may think the question of excluding slavery from the territories, not worth a national struggle. In itself it may be so. But in its consequences it involves all we value. If carried by the North, it will undoubtedly lead to the extermination of that institution where it now exists. The way to accomplish this is plain and easy. The North, in fixed and unscrupulous determination, has entered on that way.—It may be thought that her sense of justice, or at least her humanity and mercy, will prevent the consummation of so dire a purpose. We point to the past, and ask what ground does that afford for such a hope. He little understands the nature of fanaticism, and the love of power, who thinks to limit their excess by the claims of justice or mercy. It is a fact, too, that the controlling political power of the North is falling into the hands of its increasing mass of ignorant, debased, radical, and corrupt populace, who are insensible to such motives, and know no boundary to their violence but the want of power. They are deeply infected with radicalism and the doctrines of French communism. They are oppressed with want and toil, and sore distress. They are driven by all the passions of human nature in its worst estate.—They are inspired with all the energy of Anglo-Saxon

blood. They have scented the prey, and pitiless as famished wolves, they have sprung to the chase.

There is another aggression threatened by the North, which we should not overlook. That is, to prohibit what they call the internal slave trade—or the transfer of slaves from one slave State to another. This is proposed to be done under cover of that clause of the Constitution which authorized Congress to forbid “the migration or importation” of slaves after 1807. Northern men have the folly, or wickedness, to contend that under the word “migration,” is included all removal of slaves from one State to another. Argument against such perversion is plainly useless. Mr. Madison, the highest possible authority, in a letter to Mr. Monroe in 1820, wrote: “I have been truly astonished at some of the doctrines and declarations to which the Missouri question has led; and particularly so at the interpretation of the terms ‘migration or importation.’” “Judging from my own impressions, I should deem it impossible that any one who was a member of the general Convention could favour an opinion that the terms did not *exclusively* refer to migration and importation *into the United States*.” This will strike every candid mind as the true meaning of that clause. And to make it the ground of prohibiting the free transfer of slaves within the United States, would be a wresting of it as monstrous as it would be glaring. Yet this extremity of anti-slavery outrage is seriously advocated, and will probably be soon attempted. The object is by crowding the slaves together where they are to render them valueless, and thus to hasten emancipation.

We have now given the leading topics and suggestions of the Address, with occasional thoughts of our own. If any of our readers have not perused it for themselves, we earnestly entreat them to do so as soon as possible. Calm and dispassionate in manner, eminently Southern and patriotic in spirit, and free from all bias of party, it contains matter well worth the attention of every citizen of the South. It is signed by forty-eight members of Congress, of both political parties, and comes in the imposing form of a solemn warning from those we have appointed to be the guardians of our rights and interests.

The South is often blamed for its violence and ultra-

ism on this subject. But it is easy for those whose interests are not so vitally concerned, to preach to us of calmness and sobriety. Let not the madman, scattering firebrands, arrows, and death, exhort his neighbours to be cool and quiet. Our domestic tranquility, our property, our civil institutions, our lives, our very existence as bodies politic and social, are endangered. Our rights under the Constitution, our political equality, our independence, and finally our right to govern ourselves, are at stake. And the people who thus peril every thing we value as men, rebuke our indignation and even our anxiety. Is it for the children of those who, rather than submit to a paltry tax unjustly imposed, dissolved the political bonds which united them with England, and warred for independence to the death, to exhort us to be patient and quiet under injustice and oppression? The spirits of their fathers rise from a hundred battle fields to chide into silence their degenerate sons. Suppose the South had the majority in Congress, and were to proclaim her intention to establish slavery in every portion of the new territory. What would be the feeling of the North, from Maine to Iowa? one of indignation, scorn, and defiance. Those who talk to us of calmness and moderation, now, would then be quick to repel injustice with fierce and resolute resistance. And most righteously. They would be unworthy of the name of American freemen, and deserve to be oppressed and degraded, if they could do otherwise. We are accused of most atrocious sin and crime in holding slaves, and in our treatment of them stigmatized as infamous, held up to the contempt of the world, refused Christian communion, excluded from pulpit and sacramental table, and harassed by an agitation which threatens with dread and disturbance every home and fireside in our land—and yet we are reproved for being too sensitive and excited. Our secure and peaceful homes are transformed into magazines of explosive combustibles, and while our brethren fling into them firebrands, they tell us to be calm and still. Every attempt to resist, or even remonstrate, is regarded as little less than treason, and clamoured down as tending to bring about *disunion*. The South loves the Union, and will not dissolve it till driven to the last extremity. But

when it fails to secure the ends for which it was established, when its fundamental terms and principles are annulled, when it is no longer upheld in justice and equality, when it becomes the source of wrong and oppression and danger, it cannot and ought not to be maintained. The South has endured much, and will endure more, to preserve it. But to expect her to sacrifice to that every thing she values, is too much. They are the enemies of the Union, who disregard its conditions and compacts—who make it subservient to the interests of a section—who use it to annoy and endanger a portion of the confederacy—who compel us either to dissolve it, or to submit to measures which we deem unjust, unconstitutional, and utterly ruinous to our welfare. The South will gladly make concessions if any are made to her. She will consent to any fair and honourable compromise. We know her mind and spirit, when we say this. She does not wish the North to dishonour herself by yielding to any act of injustice, or unfair demand. But tamely to let herself be dragged to the precipice which lies before her, we believe in our conscience she ought not, and trust she never will. When the alternative is presented either to be hurled from its brink, or risk the horrors of disunion, we cannot long debate which of the two to choose. Either is fearful to think of. But it is better to perish, if perish we must, contending for our rights, than to die like cowards, basely submitting to wrong. If they would hear us we would implore our Northern brethren to pause, ere they consummate their purposes. We could even pray them with tears, that we may be spared the dreadful necessity about to be imposed upon us. Do they think we have not the spirit of American freemen, nor even the instincts of men? We know the North is accustomed to regard the remonstrances and warnings of the South as empty bravado. But if we have not utterly mistaken the feelings of our people, there is truth and meaning in the language they utter on this subject. In this matter we have no party or division. We are of one mind and one heart. The first ebullition of excitement has passed away, and we have settled down in the firm resolve of men who are ready to act. We are in fact calm and quiet at last, but it is the tranquillity of those who are prepared

and determined. We do not mean to threaten. We understand the temper of the North too well to attempt that. But we wish them to understand the posture of the South—not to be deceived by appearances—not to argue from the past—not rashly to involve us in a struggle which must end in our common dishonour and ruin. We wish we could disabuse their minds of another mistake. It is commonly supposed at the North, that there is a large party at the South secretly opposed to slavery. This is a grand delusion. We do not believe there is a man of us who doubts the lawfulness and expediency of the institution, under present circumstances. We know of none. There are some who do not think it the best possible condition of society—who if they could with a wave of the hand transform the state of things at the South, changing the negroes into intelligent, christian freemen, and translating them to Africa, and preserving the white population from the disastrous results of such a revolution, would do it tomorrow. But these mere theoretical views leave them still practically defenders of slavery. And when the worst comes to the worst, even these will be found heart and hand with their own brethren against the world.

There are some who will find fault with the appearance of such an article as the present in the pages of this Review. We have honest and honoured brethren at the North who will tell us we ought to pour oil on the troubled waters. Our object is peace; but we frankly declare it is peace on terms of right and justice. We know not how to obtain it but by making known the convictions, feelings, and determinations of the South. If these are understood we have a faint hope they will be respected. There are times when the duties of the citizen and the duties of a Christian blend and combine—when even the Minister of religion must assert his political rights and the rights of his country. At certain junctures patriotism and religion become one and the same. Such was the case in the days of our revolution. Such we solemnly believe to be the case now. Not to speak out for the South, not to act with her and for her, not to identify ourselves with her in this question, would in our view be as recreant to our duties as Christians, as it would be to our obligations as citizens. And we can assure both North

and South that the religious communities of these Southern States will in this controversy make common cause with their fellow citizens. We have not found a dissenting voice or a wavering heart among them all. They are ready.—In fact the Christian people of the South, *are the South*—they constitute the great mass and body of the people—they embrace the greater part of the wealth, influence, and intelligence of the country—it is their rights, property, lives, and cherished institutions which are endangered. They are ready, therefore, to risk all to save all. They are ready to take the front rank in the time of need. They are ready in the name of the Lord, with a conscience void of offence, and with prayers for those who vilify and wrong them, to do all their country can expect of faithful citizens. And in connection with this point we wish, plainly but kindly and respectfully, to suggest to a portion of our Southern fellow-citizens what we regard as a very important consideration. We are sorry to know that in a few instances, well meant efforts of Southern Christians to teach our slaves the doctrines and duties of the Gospel, have met with discouragement and opposition. We admit the South has a right to be jealous and watchful on this subject. But certainly when such attempts are made by Southern men, fully identified in conviction, sympathy, and interest with the South, they have a right to the confidence of the community. Nothing could be more destructive to the union, harmony, and strength of the South, or more dangerous to the permanence of slavery, than to alienate the minds of Southern Christians from that institution, or to bring their religious convictions into conflict with the policy of the South. But this will be the inevitable result of preventing or obstructing their efforts to christianize our slaves. Under all their imperfections, and under all the differences of denominations, lie a deep conviction of sacred duty, and an earnest desire, to preach the Gospel to every creature. They feel that their obligations to God, paramount to all others, imperatively require them fully and faithfully to teach religion to the slaves. They believe not only that the Bible sanctions slavery, but that the tendency of its teaching is to make the slaves more docile, obedient, faithful, contented and profitable. Wherever the experiment has been fairly made by competent persons,

(and they can point to examples,) such has been the result. They are ready to maintain the rights of the South, therefore, against any and every aggression, but they insist, they must insist, they feel bound by the highest and holiest principles which govern the hearts of men to insist on their right to christianize the slaves. While they guide their plans and efforts within the laws and statutes of the country, they cannot consent to be hindered or forbidden. Any attempt for this purpose would instantly bring convictions of duty as Christians into collision with their position as defenders of slavery. It would place them in a dilemma where they must sacrifice either their conscientious and religious convictions, or their attachment to a civil institution. And it needs no prophet to tell us the result when the religion of a people is arrayed against a political and social establishment. For the sake, therefore, of our common country and common interests, we entreat our fellow citizens to be tender and cautious in this matter—to respect the conscience of Southern Christians—to confide in the fidelity of the Southern Churches to Southern rights and institutions. They have studied this subject in all its bearings. They are anxious to do their duty both to God and to their country, and earnestly desire that their obligations in these two respects should not be made incompatible. They pledge their lives, and fortunes, and sacred honor to the South. And in return they ask that no measures on the part of their fellow citizens shall compel them to choose between opposition to slavery and unfaithfulness to conscience and to God. We have thought it best to say this much, and to say it plainly. It is important for us to understand each other. We must respect the sentiments and feelings, every party of all the others. There must be reciprocal concessions, and indulgence, and moderation, and tenderness. Discord and divisions among ourselves will be suicidal. The day of our doom will have come, when we meet each other in a strife of conscience or of interest.

We are sorry to confess that a very few persons seem to believe that to give the institutions and blessings of the Gospel to the slaves, will destroy slavery,—that it will so enlighten and improve them as to lead to speedy and successful insurrection. We can regard this as nothing

less than infidelity, and it lands us at once in the conclusion that Christianity and slavery are incompatible. If the Gospel be true, then it is best for all men,—will make any and every class better and happier,—and all men ought to have it. If it be inconsistent with our institutions, then either it is false, or they are wrong; and we must give up the Bible, or condemn slavery. Hence resolved to maintain slavery at all hazards, these men denounce every effort to teach the negroes the duties and doctrines of the Gospel. They are at one extreme and the abolitionists at another. Make the masters Christians, say the abolitionists, and they will not hold slaves. Make the slaves Christians, say the infidels, and they cannot be kept in slavery. Between these two the Churches of Christ in the South take their stand. With the Bible, the word of invincible and eternal truth, will they overcome both the one and the other. From the fury and madness of abolition, they calmly appeal to the word and to the judgment seat of the divine master. Against the unbelief of infidelity they oppose the faith and fruits of the Gospel. If the arguments of reason, the dictates of common sense, the facts of experience, and the truths of Scripture, prevail nothing with the blindness of the first or the doubts of the second, they can only take their place by the cross of our great God and Saviour, and proclaim their unchangeable witness, their immovable purpose—saying to abolition, “if the Gospel *will* abolish slavery, be content! we are doing all we can to abolish it, for we are doing all we can to make master and slave Christians,”—and to infidelity, if *religion* will destroy slavery, so be it! “Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.”

Here we lay down our pen, wearied, and withal sad, even as when we began. We have written in sober earnest, oft-times with a trembling and anxious heart, always in sincerity and in the fear of God—whether with wisdom and understanding, we cannot tell. We have handled topics and principles which involve the destiny of nations, the laws of nature and Providence, and the high interests of Christ's kingdom in the world. We have touched upon subjects which move the deepest and strongest feelings of our

heart. We shall not be surprised, therefore, if we have spoken unadvisedly with our lips. We have desired to do good—to our whole country, North and South,—our common, our great, our happy country. But what our writing shall avail we know not. We commit it to the charity of our readers, and to the favour of God.

ARTICLE II.

Narrative of the United States Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea, by W. F. LYNCH, U. S. N. Commander of the Expedition. With Maps and numerous Illustrations. Philadelphia, Lea & Blanchard, 1849, 8vo.

It is a favourable indication in the present fluctuating condition of the world, that so many persons, not invested with Ecclesiastical dignity, are found directing their attention to subjects vitally connected with the interests of Christianity. In the wide field of research necessary to be explored, in order to the establishment and illustration of the truths of the Bible, the Clergy are not left to labour alone. The Almighty has wisely raised up those who are more competent to the tasks which they have assigned themselves, and who must be free from the charge of priestcraft and design. To the stores of Oriental and Biblical Literature, to the discussions of the *questiones vexatæ* in theological controversy, and to the treatises on experimental and practical piety, the laity of both sexes have added, and we trust will continue to add, invaluable contributions. And if we are to credit the statements of a contemporary,* high attainments in the department of Biblical Literature, are, in England at least, “an actual bar to advancement in the Church.” And thus a most potent obstacle is thrown in the way of devoting the talents of the Clergy to this important branch

* North British Review, May No. 1849, p. 99.