

ANTI-SLAVERY EXAMINER.

THE
CHATTEL PRINCIPLE
THE ABHORRENCE OF
JESUS CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES;
OR,
NO REFUGE FOR AMERICAN SLAVERY
IN
THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY BERIAH GREEN.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
NO. 143 NASSAU STREET
1839

This No. contains 4½ sheets.- Postage under 100 miles, 7 cts.
over 100, 10 cts.

Please Read and circulate

ChatGTP 4 used to clean up an OCR scan of the pages
- March 2024

THE SON OF MAN IS COME TO SEEK AND TO SAVE THAT WHICH WAS LOST

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? In 1776 Thomas JEFFERSON, supported by a noble band of patriots and surrounded by the American people, opened his lips in the authoritative declaration: "We hold these truths to be SELF-EVIDENT, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness." And from the inmost heart of the multitudes around, and in a strong and clear voice, broke forth the unanimous and decisive answer: Amen-such truths we do indeed hold to be self-evident. And animated and sustained by a declaration, so inspiring and sublime, they rushed to arms, and as the result of agonizing efforts and dreadful sufferings, achieved under God the independence of their country. The great truth, whence they derived light and strength to assert and defend their rights, they made the foundation of their republic. And in the midst of this republic, must we prove that He, who was the Truth, did not contradict "the truths" which He Himself, as their Creator, had made self-evident to mankind?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? What, according to those laws which make it what it is, is American slavery? In the Statute-book of South Carolina thus it is written : "Slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners and

possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatever." The very root of American slavery consists in the assumption that law has reduced men to chattels. But this assumption is, and must be, a gross falsehood. Man and cattle are separated from each other by the Creator, immutably, eternally, and by an impassable gulf. To confound or identify men and cattle must be to lie most wantonly, impudently, and maliciously. And we must prove that Jesus Christ is not in favor of palpable, monstrous falsehood?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? How can a system, built upon a stout and impudent denial of self evident truth—a system of treating men like cattle—operate? Thomas Jefferson shall answer. Hear him. "The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to his worst passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy, who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances."* Such is the practical operation of a system, which puts men and cattle into the same family and treats them alike. And must we prove, that Jesus Christ is not in favor of a school where the worst vices in their most hateful forms are systematically and efficiently taught and practiced?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? What, in 1818, did the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church affirm regarding its nature and operation? 'Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system—it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of

others, whether they shall receive religious instruction; whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the gospel; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and friends; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of slavery; consequences not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence. The evils to which the slave is always exposed often take place in their very worst degree and form; and where not all of them occur, still the slave is Deprived of his natural rights, degraded as a human being, and exposed to the danger of passing into the hands of a master who may inflict upon him all the hardships and injuries which inhumanity and avarice may suggest. Must we prove that Jesus Christ is not in favor of such things?

Is Jesus Christ in favor of American slavery? It is already widely felt and openly acknowledged in the South that they cannot support slavery without sustaining the opposition of universal Christendom. Thomas Jefferson declared, 'I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever; that considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among possible events; that it may become practicable by supernatural influences! The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest.' And must we prove, that Jesus Christ is not in favor of what universal Christendom is compelled to abhor, denounce, and oppose; is not in favor of what every attribute of Almighty God is armed against?

YE HAVE DESPISED THE POOR

It is no straw man, with whom, in making out such proof, we are called to contend. Would to God we had no other antagonist! Would to God that our labor of love could be regarded as a work of supererogation! But we may well be ashamed and grieved to find it necessary to 'stop the mouths' of grave and learned ecclesiastics, who from the heights of Zion have undertaken to defend the institution of slavery. We speak not now of those, who amidst the monuments of oppression are engaged in the sacred vocation; who, as ministers of the Gospel, can 'prophecy smooth things' to such as pollute the altar of Jehovah with human sacrifices; nay, who themselves bind the victim and kindle the sacrifice. That they should put their Savior to the torture, to wring from his lips something in favor of slavery, is not to be wondered at. They consent to the murder of the children; can they respect the rights of the Father? But what shall we say of distinguished theologians of the North—professors of sacred literature at our oldest divinity schools—who stand up to defend, both by argument and authority, Southern slavery! And from the Bible! Who, Balaam-like, try a thousand expedients to force from the mouth of Jehovah a sentence which they know the heart of Jehovah abhors!

Surely we have here something more mischievous and formidable than a man of straw. More than two years ago, just before the meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, an article appeared in the Biblical Repertory, understood to be from the pen of the Professor of Sacred Literature at Princeton. This article made an effort to show that slavery, whatever may be said of any abuses of it, is not a violation of the precepts of the Gospel. We are informed that this article was industriously and extensively distributed among the members of the General Assembly—a body of men who, by a frightful majority, seemed

already too much disposed to wink at the horrors of slavery. The effect of the Princeton Apology on the southern mind has been most decisive and injurious, according to high authority. It has greatly contributed to turning the public eye away from the sin—from the inherent and necessary evils of slavery to incidental evils, which the abuse of it might be expected to occasion. And how few can be brought to admit, that whatever abuses may prevail nobody knows where or how, any such thing is chargeable upon them! Thus, our Princeton prophet has done what he could to lay the southern conscience asleep upon ingenious perversions of the sacred volume!

About a year after this, an effort in the same direction was jointly made by Dr. Fisk and Professor Stuart. In a letter to a Methodist clergyman, Mr. Merrit, published in Zion's Herald, Dr. Fisk expresses the following:

'But that you and the public may see and feel, that you have the ablest and those who are among the honestest men of this age arrayed against you, be pleased to notice the following letter from Prof. Stuart. I wrote to him, knowing his integrity of purpose, his unflinching regard for truth, as well as his deserved reputation as a scholar and biblical critic, proposing the following questions:

1. Does the New Testament directly or indirectly teach that slavery existed in the primitive church?
2. In 1 Tim. vi. 2, "And they that have believing masters," etc., what is the relation expressed or implied between "they" (servants) and "believing masters"? And what are your reasons for the construction of the passage?'

For April 1836. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met the following May, at Pittsburgh, where, in pamphlet form, this article was distributed. The following appeared on the title page:
PITTSBURGH: 1836

Printed for gratuitous distribution.

Question 3: What was the character of ancient and eastern slavery, especially regarding the (legal) power this relation gave the master over the slave?

PROFESSOR STUART'S REPLY
ANDOVER, 10th April, 1837

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Your letter is before me. A sickness of three months' duration (typhus fever), from which I have just narrowly escaped death and which still confines me to my house, makes it impossible for me to respond to your letter in detail.

The New Testament's precepts concerning the demeanor of slaves and their masters unquestionably recognize the existence of slavery. The inclusion of "believing masters" indicates that a directive to them on how to behave as masters acknowledges the potential continuity of the relationship, *salva fide et salva ecclesia* ("without compromising the Christian faith or the church"). Otherwise, Paul would have had no choice but to sever the tie immediately. He could not lawfully or rightly condone what is inherently sinful (*malum in se*).

Anyone questioning this should consider Paul's actions in sending Onesimus back to Philemon, with an apology for his escape, and instructing him to return as a servant for life. The

relationship existed and can exist. Its abuse is the essential and fundamental wrong. This does not mean the theory of slavery is correct. Indeed, "Love your neighbor as yourself" and "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" contradict it. However, once established and continued, the relationship is not a malum in se that demands immediate and violent severance at all costs. Thus, Paul did not advocate for such action.

1 Tim. vi. 2 conveys the idea that slaves, who are Christians with Christian masters, should not, because they are brothers in faith, neglect the reverence owed to them as masters. That is, the master-slave relationship is not automatically nullified among Christians. In fact, in such situations, servants should, a fortiori, fulfill their duties cheerfully. The responsibilities of the master regarding liberation are a different matter and not addressed here by the apostle.

It is well known to anyone familiar with Greek or Latin antiquities that slavery in pagan nations was often more absolute and less regulated than in Christian societies. In Greece and Rome, slaves were considered property, which settles any debate regarding their status. Their treatment, like today, depended on their masters' temperament. For a long time, masters had the power of life and death over their slaves. Over time, atrocious cruelties led to the mitigation of this power. By the apostle's era, it was at least as significant as in contemporary times.

After all the discussion and intensity on this subject that have been displayed, the core teachings of the Bible remain unchanged. Paul's conduct and advice still serve as reliable guides. He understood well that Christianity would ultimately eradicate slavery, as it indeed will. He also knew that it would eliminate monarchy and aristocracy from the earth, as it fundamentally promotes true liberty and equality. However, Paul

did not expect slavery or anarchy to be abolished overnight and provided precepts for Christians on how to conduct themselves in the interim.

With sincere and paternal regard,
Your friend and brother,
M. STUART.

This, sir, is a doctrine that will endure because it is grounded in Biblical teaching. Therefore, abolitionists are misguided. They have strayed from the path; to be successful, they must adopt a different stance and approach the subject from another angle.

Respectfully yours,
W. FISK.

SO THEY WRAP [SNARL] IT UP

What do we learn from this? That in the ecclesiastical structures formed under the apostles, slavery was accepted as a relationship that did not contravene the Christian faith—that such a relationship can similarly exist today; that 'the abuse of it is the essential and fundamental wrong;' and therefore, American Christians may possess slaves without bearing guilt or inflicting harm. Thus, according to Prof. Stuart, Jesus Christ does not condemn the 'peculiar institutions' of the South. If our brothers there do not 'abuse' the privilege of demanding unpaid labor, they are free to increase their slaves as they wish, without fear of displeasure from the Savior or jeopardizing their Christian integrity. Could any trader in human lives desire more freedom? And to these teachings, Dr. Fisk wholeheartedly agrees. He even advocates for it, urging his peers to acknowledge its significance and accept it as 'Bible doctrine,' suggesting that 'abolitionists are on the wrong path' and must 'take a different position' to prevail.

We refer to these distinguished names to illustrate that in arguing against the favor of Jesus Christ towards American slavery, we are not merely combating a trivial opponent. The unpleasant task of thoroughly examining Professor Stuart's letter, which we aim to address in time, has been set before us. Enough has been said to make it abundantly clear that American slavery finds its defenders and apologists within the northern pulpit, advocates who offer justifications and apologists, who fall behind few if any of their brethren in the reputation they have acquired, the stations they occupy, and the general influence they are supposed to exert.

Is it so? Did slavery exist in Judea, and among the Jews, in its worst form, during the Savior's time on earth? If the Jews held slaves, it would have been in direct and egregious violation of both

the letter and the spirit of the Mosaic Law. Anyone harboring doubts on this matter would do well to consult the discussion titled "The Bible against Slavery." Should someone, after a diligent and comprehensive review of that article, still believe that slaveholding was practiced during the ministry of Jesus Christ among the Jews and sanctioned by the authority of Moses, it would be greatly beneficial to the public for them to document their reasons and provide a detailed refutation of that Argument. Until such a refutation is presented, we find ourselves justified in maintaining, as we again assert, that if the Jews did hold slaves during the time of our Savior, they did so in clear and flagrant contravention of the Mosaic Law.

Could Christ and the Apostles encounter slaveholding among their countrymen—given that it was a blatant violation of the law they were bound by their mission and conviction to uphold and promote—without denouncing and condemning it?

We are informed that slavery, in its worst forms, was prevalent throughout the entire world, including Judea. According to ecclesiastics like Stuart, Hodge, and Fisk, who argue that slavery in itself is not inherently wrong, the term "worst" could only refer to "abuses" of this supposedly benign institution. Thus, slavery existed among the Jews, marred and dishonored by the "worst abuses" to which it is susceptible. These abuses in the ancient world, as described by Professor Stuart, included "horrible cruelties." Similarly, in our own time, such abuses have become so egregious as to compel a renowned observer—none other than the philosopher and statesman Thomas Jefferson—to declare that they had invoked the wrath of the Almighty against us. Amid these atrocities, the Savior, devoted to the betterment and salvation of the people, did not utter a single word of exposure or condemnation of such "horrible cruelties." He witnessed—the "covenant people" of Jehovah subjected to the most heinous

violations: infants torn from their mothers' arms, wives separated from their husbands, daughters sold at the market by their own fathers; he saw the Word of God denied to those most deserving of its enlightening and revitalizing influence; indeed, he saw men punished for seeking divine mercy—yet he offered no admonishment or rebuke. No expression of sympathy for the victims or indignation towards the perpetrators is recorded.

From the supposed silence of the Savior, when faced with slavery among the Jews, our theologians infer that it is compatible with Christianity. They assert that he witnessed it in its most atrocious forms; that is, he observed what Professor Stuart dares to call "horrible cruelties." However, what authority do these interpreters of the sacred texts have to label any form of slavery encountered by the Savior as "worst," or even as inherently evil? According to their logic— which they aim to impose on abolitionists as if to silence them—his silence should indeed silence them. They argue that no form of slavery should be criticized as bad or abusive, let alone described as "horribly cruel." Their interpretation provides a shield even for the most savage oppressors amidst their most lethal excesses.

THINK NOT THAT I AM COME TO DESTROY THE LAW, OR THE PROPHETS; I AM NOT COME TO DESTROY, BUT TO FULFILL

Why, then, did the leader of the new dispensation seem to lag behind the prophets of the old in a passionate and effective concern for suffering humanity? The forms of oppression they witnessed stirred their compassion and ignited their indignation. With pointed and powerful language, they exposed, denounced, and issued threats against such injustices. They could not tolerate those who exploited their neighbors' labor without wages and failed to compensate them for their work;* who laid "heavy burdens"† on others and shackled them with "the bands of wickedness"; who, by "hiding themselves from their own flesh," disavowed their kin. Expressions of piety coupled with the oppression of the poor were presented as the epitome of hypocrisy. The prophets declared that those guilty of such pretensions could only avoid the wrath of Jehovah through sincere repentance.

Yet, according to the ecclesiastics in question, the Lord of these prophets silently bypassed the very atrocities he commanded them to confront and condemn! Wherever he went, he encountered slavery in its most abhorrent forms—"horrible cruelties" that demanded his attention; yet, he offered no rebuke or warning. He saw "a boy given for a harlot, and a girl sold for wine, that they might drink," without exhibiting the slightest displeasure or any sign of disapproval!

To such disdainful and horrific conclusions lead the arguments that emanate from the realms of sacred literature and are imposed upon our congregations! According to these perspectives, Jesus Christ, rather than being the light of the world, is portrayed as having snuffed out the torches lit by His own prophets, plunging humanity into the profound darkness of a starless night. O Savior, in compassion for Your afflicted people, let Your temple no longer be desecrated as a "den of thieves!"

THOU THOUGHT I WAS ALTOGETHER SUCH AN ONE AS THYSELF

By overlooking the gravest forms of slavery that he encountered everywhere among the Jews, the Savior would appear inconsistent with His own mission. He was sent to proclaim good news to the poor, to heal the brokenhearted, to announce freedom for the captives, and to set the oppressed free, essentially heralding the year of Jubilee. From the very beginning of His earthly ministry, He aligned Himself with the impoverished, having nowhere to lay His head. He faced slander and scorn for His compassionate dealings with society's rejects, championed the cause of the widow against the merciless religious leaders who exploited her suffering, and, in picturing the final judgment, used care for the impoverished, the sick, and the oppressed as the criterion by which our love for Him would be measured.

To those who were poor, suffering, marginalized, and scorned, His arms were always open. They received His deepest compassion and unwavering love. He poured out His life for humanity, plunged into the utmost despair and subjected to the cruelest treatment, as slaves to the greatest of tyrants. And yet, our ecclesiastics suggest that this particular group of sufferers—who were degraded far beyond any other form of misery, forcibly expelled from the human family to live as lesser beings, subjected to abject cruelty without any wrongdoing, and whose cries of distress ascended continuously—was the one group the compassionate Savior supposedly disregarded. According to these interpreters of the Bible, occupying esteemed positions in theological scholarship, He coldly ignored them. Not a

stir of compassion, not a glance of empathy, not a word of comfort was offered by His gracious heart.

He pronounced woe on those who exploit widows, yet, it's implied, He remained passive before those whose livelihoods were built on creating widows and orphans. "O Savior, when will You silence such blasphemers!"

IT IS THE SPIRIT THAT GIVES LIFE

It appears that although, according to our Princeton professor, "the subject of slavery" is hardly mentioned by Christ in any of his personal teachings, He had a way of "addressing it." What was that? Well, "He taught the true nature, dignity, equality, and destiny of men," and "promoted the principles of justice and love." And according to Professor Stuart, the teachings provided by our Savior, "argue against" "the theory of slavery." Thus, what these ecclesiastical apologists for slavery deduce from the Savior's alleged silence is that He did not, in His personal teachings, explicitly apply His principles to this particular form of wickedness. For indeed, it must be wicked, something that the teachings of the Savior argue against, and which our Princeton professor assures us the principles of the gospel, if fully enacted, would swiftly eliminate. How remarkable it is that a teacher should "hardly mention a subject in any of his personal teachings," and yet advocate principles that have a direct and vital bearing on it! - to conduct in such a way as to justify the inference that "slaveholding is not a crime," yet at the same time support its "speedy extinction!"

Higher authority than that which sustains self-evident truth cannot exist. As forms of reason, they are rays from the face of Jehovah. Not only is their presence and power self-evident, but they also cast a strong and clear light around them, making other truths visible. Being luminaries themselves, their purpose is to enlighten. In every domain of thought, the sane mind bows promptly, gratefully, and fully to their authority. Through their authority, one explains, proves, and addresses whatever engages his attention and consumes his energies as a reasonable and reasoning being. For what, when thus engaged and most

successful, is the utmost he can accomplish? It is to make the conclusions he wishes to establish and communicate clear in the light of reason; in other words, to demonstrate that they are reasonable. He expects that those with whom he interacts will acknowledge the authority of principle and see whatever is exhibited in the light of reason. If they require him to go further, and, to convince them, do something more than show that the doctrines he maintains and the methods he proposes are in accordance with reason - are illustrated and supported by self-evident truths - they are clearly irrational. They have lost the use of reason and are not to be reasoned with; they belong in a madhouse.

COME NOW, LET US REASON TOGETHER, SAYS THE LORD

Are we to honor the Bible, which Professor Stuart quaintly calls "the good old book," by turning away from self-evident truths to receive its teachings? Can these truths be contradicted or denied therein? Do we search there for something to obscure their clarity, diminish their force, or reduce their authority? Do we hope to find something that could free us from the light and power of first principles? And what if we found what we were looking for—something that, directly or indirectly, expressly or impliedly, is prejudicial to the principles which reason, asserting our submission to its authority, makes self-evident? In that case, how should we regard the Bible? Could we still honor it as the book of God if it opposes the authority of reason? We evaluate the claims of the sacred volume to divine authority before the tribunal of reason. This is acknowledged the moment one begins to reason on the subject. What must reason do with a book that undermines the authority of its own principles and weakens the force of self-evident truths? Is not he, emphatically, the apostle of infidelity who, as a minister of the gospel or a professor of sacred literature, strives, with whatever ingenuity or semblance of piety, to elevate the Bible at the expense of reason? If such tactics succeed and such piety prevails, then Jesus Christ is "crucified afresh and put to an open shame."

"What does the Princeton professor say? Well, despite 'general principles,' and 'clear as we may think the arguments against DESPOTISM, there have been thousands of ENLIGHTENED and good men who honestly believed it to be of all forms of government the best and most acceptable to God.' Now, these 'good men' must have been in favor of despotism either because

of, or in spite of, their being 'enlightened.' In other words, the light, which they abundantly enjoyed, led them to favor despotism, where the Princeton professor warmly supported them, or they must have forced their way there despite its hallowed influence. Either in accordance with, or in resistance to the light, they became advocates of despotism. If in resistance to the light—and he says they were 'enlightened men'—what, as far as the subject we are now concerned with, becomes of their 'honesty' and 'goodness?' Good and honest resisters of the light, which was freely poured around them! Of such, what does Professor Stuart's 'good old Book' say? Their authority, where 'general principles' command the utmost respect, must be small indeed. But if in accordance with the light, they have become advocates of despotism, then despotism is 'the best form of government and most acceptable to God.' It is supported by the authority of reason, by the word of Jehovah, by the will of Heaven! If this is the doctrine that prevails at certain theological seminaries, it must be easy to account for the spirit they embody and the general influence they exert. Why did not the Princeton professor place this 'general principle' as a shield, heaven-wrought and reason-approved, over that cherished form of despotism which prevails among the churches of the South, and leave the 'peculiar institutions' he is so eager to defend, under its protection?"

What is the "general principle" that, regardless of the fate of despotism and its "honest" admirers and "enlightened" supporters, should universally and meticulously guide human governments? It is clear that, being capable of self-governance, humans are entitled to it. This is a specific application of an even more general principle, which can be considered self-evident: everything should be treated according to its nature. A mind that doubts this is likely incapable of rational conviction. Then, according to reason and the voice of Jehovah, humans must be treated as humans. What defines a human? What are his

distinctive attributes? The Creator has imprinted His own image upon humans. Within this are found the grand peculiarities of human character, from which springs his glory. Here, REASON reveals its laws. Here, the WILL enacts its dictates. Here lies the crown of IMMORTALITY. With such endowments, being in the image of Jehovah, isn't a person capable of self-government? And shouldn't he be treated as such? Within the sphere where the laws of reason place him, should he not act according to his own judgments—carry out his own volitions? Should he not enjoy life, revel in freedom, and pursue the path of blessedness as he sees fit?

If not, why was he so created and endowed? Why this mysterious, awful attribute of will? To be a source, profound as the depths of hell, of exquisite misery, keen anguish, insufferable torment! Was man, formed "according to the image of Jehovah," meant to be crossed, thwarted, counteracted; to be forced inward upon himself; to be the plaything of endless contradictions; to be driven back and forth forever between mutually repelling forces; and all, all at the discretion of another? How can man be treated according to his nature, as endowed with reason and will, if he is excluded from the powers and privileges of self-government—if "despotism" is unleashed upon him, to "deprive him of personal liberty, compel him to serve at the discretion of another," and with the power of "transferring" such "authority" over him and such claim upon him, to "another master"? If "thousands of enlightened and good men" can so readily support "despotism" as "the best of all governments and most acceptable to God," it is no wonder that the testimony of universal history is that "the whole creation groans and travails in pain together until now." Groans and labor pains must continue to be the order of the day across "the whole creation" until the scepter of despotism is broken, and man is treated as man—as capable of, and entitled to, self-government.

But what is the despotism whose horrid features our smooth professor attempts to obscure with a selection of cunningly chosen words and precisely crafted sentences? It is the despotism of American slavery, which crushes the very essence of humanity out of its victims, transforming them into mere cattle. At its touch, they are diminished from humans to objects. "Slaves," states Professor Stuart, "were property in Greece and Rome. That resolves all questions regarding their status." Indeed. And slaves in republican America are considered property; this simple, clear, and definitive point settles "all questions about their relation." So why did the Princeton professor bother crafting a definition that is both ingenious and inadequate, simultaneously subtle and misleading? Why indeed? Was he attempting to veil the injustices inflicted upon his mother's kin even from himself? If within the constructs of his mind, he could envisage slaves as something more than property, he was fully aware that a very different reality prevailed among the southern patriarchs. Why did he not describe the situation as it truly is, in clear, straightforward language and with honest intent, instead of using honeyed words and courtly phrases to ambiguously suggest something that might exist only in the realm of imagination?

FOR RULERS ARE NOT A TERROR TO GOOD WORKS, BUT TO THE EVIL

But are we, in upholding the principle of self-government, to overlook the unripe, neglected, or broken powers of any of our fellow men with whom we may be connected? Or ignore the strong passions, vicious propensities, or criminal pursuits of others? Certainly not. But in providing for their welfare, we must exert influences and impose restraints suited to their character. In exercising those prerogatives which the social aspect of our nature authorizes us to use for their benefit, we must see them as they truly are, not as things, not as cattle, not as merchandise, but as men, our fellow men—reflecting, however dimly and from however battered and broken a surface, the image of our common Father. And the great principle of self-government is to be the foundation upon which the entire structure of discipline under which they may be placed should be adapted. From the nursery and village school up to the workhouse and state prison, this principle should always and in all things be before our eyes, present in our thoughts, warm in our hearts. Otherwise, we insult God while despising and abusing His image. Yes, indeed; we remember that in applying the principle of self-government, numerous challenges and obstructions arise from wickedness on one hand and passion on the other. We are far from overlooking such difficulties and obstacles. But where are they to be found? Are weakness and wickedness, bad hearts and bad heads, confined to the lower strata of society? Alas, the weakest of the weak and the most wicked often occupy the highest places on earth, turning everything within their reach towards the foulest purposes. The very power they have usurped often becomes the chief instrument in their moral decline, inflaming their passions,

corrupting their hearts. It is well known that the possession of arbitrary power tends to make men shamelessly wicked and intolerably troublesome. And this is true whether they dominate over few or many. If you cannot trust a man with himself, how can you entrust him with control over his fellows? And flee from the inconveniences associated with self-government to the horrors of despotism?

THOU THAT TEACHEST A MAN SHOULD NOT STEAL, DO YOU STEAL?

Should the slaveholder, the most absolute and unashamed despot of all, be entrusted with the education and preparation of the very individuals he has degraded to the status of property, to prepare them to exercise the powers and enjoy the privileges of free people? Tragically, they have already experienced too much of the kind of "education" he can provide in his role as owner. It is from this relationship that their ignorance and vice, which some argue hinder their immediate emancipation, have sprung. He is the one who has blinded their eyes and weakened their powers. Can they expect enlightenment and empowerment from him, as if one could expect "grapes from thorns or figs from thistles"?

By agreeing to receive and use them as property, under laws that mock justice, he forfeited all claim to the esteem and confidence, not only of those he oppresses but of every person committed to human welfare. In choosing to be a slaveholder, he declared himself an adversary to humanity. The very act was an assault on human dignity. To suggest that he could prepare those he has systematically deprived of their rights, whom he has effectively stolen from themselves, for roles as free citizens is absurd and utterly illogical. It would be as senseless as appointing Burke, known for murdering to sell bodies for dissection, as the head of a hospital.

What have our slaveholders been doing over these past two hundred years? They have been "educating" their human chattel, but how? According to Thomas Jefferson, "The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of

the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other." Is this the preparation for the responsibilities and rights of American citizenship?

Will prolonging this dehumanizing process lessen its evils? In 1818, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church unanimously testified to the myriad ways slavery is detrimental to mental and moral development, stating that these consequences are real and often manifest in the worst forms possible. Even if not all these evils occur, the slave is still robbed of their natural rights, degraded, and at risk of suffering under a master who may subject them to the worst expressions of cruelty and greed.

Is this the condition in which some wish to keep the enslaved, even if just a bit longer, to supposedly prepare them for restoration to their rightful status?

AND THEY STOPPED THEIR EARS

The methods of discipline under which, as slaveholders, the Southerners now place their human chattel, they, with one consent and in great wrath, forbid us to examine. The statesman and the priest unite in the assurance, that these methods are none of our business. Nay, they give us distinctly to understand, that if we come among them to take observations, make inquiries, and discuss questions, they will dispose of us as outlaws. Nothing will avail to protect us from speedy and deadly violence! What inference does all this warrant? Surely, not that the methods which they employ are happy and worthy of universal application. If so, why do they not take the praise, and give us the benefit of their wisdom, enterprise, and success? Who, that has nothing to hide, practices concealment? "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." Is this the way of slaveholders? Darkness they court—they will have darkness. Doubtless "because their deeds are evil." Can we confide in methods for the benefit of our enslaved brethren, which it is death for us to examine? What good ever came, what good can we expect, from deeds of darkness?

Did the influence of the masters contribute anything in the West Indies to prepare the apprentices for enfranchisement? Nay, verily. All the world knows better. They did what in them lay, to turn back the tide of blessings, which, through emancipation, was pouring in upon the famishing around them. Are not the best minds and hearts in England now thoroughly convinced, that slavery, under no modification, can be a school for freedom?

We say such things to the many who allege, that slaves cannot at once be entrusted with the powers and privileges of

self-government. However this may be, they cannot be better qualified under the influence of slavery. That must be broken up from which their ignorance, and viciousness, and wretchedness proceeded. That which can only do what it has always done, pollute and degrade, must not be employed to purify and elevate. The lower their character and condition, the louder, clearer, sterner, the just demand for immediate emancipation. The plague-smitten sufferer can derive no benefit from breathing a little longer in an infected atmosphere.

In thus referring to elemental principles, in thus availing ourselves of the light of self-evident truths, we bow to the authority and tread in the footsteps of the great Teacher. He chided those around him for refusing to make the same use of their reason in promoting their spiritual welfare as they did in promoting their temporal welfare. He made it clear to them that they need not look beyond themselves to form a just estimation of their position, duties, and prospects, as standing in the presence of the Messiah. "Why, EVEN OF YOURSELVES," he demands of them, "do you not judge what is right?" How could they, unless they had a clear light and an infallible standard within them, whereby, amidst the relations they sustained and the interests they had to provide for, they might discriminate between truth and falsehood, right and wrong, what they ought to attempt and what they ought to eschew? From this pointed, significant appeal of the Savior, it is clear and certain that in human consciousness may be found self-evident truths, self-manifested principles; that every man, studying his own consciousness, is bound to recognize their presence and authority, and in sober earnest and good faith to apply them to the highest practical concerns of "life and godliness." It is in obedience to the Bible that we apply self-evident truths and walk in the light of general principles. When our fathers proclaimed these truths and, at the hazard of their property, reputation, and life, stood up in their defense, they paid homage to

the sacred Scriptures—they honored the Bible. In that volume, not a syllable can be found to justify the form of infidelity that, in the abused name of piety, reproaches us for practicing the lessons which “nature teaches.” These lessons, the Bible requires us reverently to listen to, earnestly to appropriate, and most diligently and faithfully to act upon in every direction, and on all occasions.

Why, our Savior goes so far in doing honor to reason, as to encourage men universally to evaluate the characteristic peculiarities and distinctive features of the Gospel in the light of its principles. “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.” Natural religion—the principles which nature reveals, and the lessons which nature teaches—he thus makes a test of the truth and authority of revealed religion. So far was he, as a teacher, from shrinking from the clearest and most piercing rays of reason, from diverting the attention of those around him from the import, bearings, and practical application of general principles. And those who would have us escape from the pressure of self-evident truths, by resorting to the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, whatever airs of piety they may assume, do foul dishonor to the Savior of mankind.

And what shall we say of the Golden Rule, which, according to the Savior, comprehends all the precepts of the Bible? “Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.”

According to this maxim, in human consciousness, universally, may be found: 1. The standard whereby, in all the relations and circumstances of life, we may determine what Heaven demands and expects of us. 2. The just application of this standard is practicable for, and obligatory upon, every child of Adam. 3. The qualification requisite to a just application of this

rule to all the cases in which we can be concerned is simply this—to regard all the members of the human family as our brethren, our equals.

In other words, the Savior here teaches us that in the principles and laws of reason, we have an infallible guide in all the relations and circumstances of life; that nothing can hinder our following this guide but the bias of selfishness; and that the moment, in deciding any moral question, we place ourselves in the room of our brother before the bar of reason, we shall see what decision ought to be pronounced. Does this, in the Savior, look like fleeing self-evident truths?—like decrying the authority of general principles?—like exalting himself at the expense of reason?—like opening a refuge in the Gospel for those whose practice is at variance with the dictates of humanity?

What then is the just application of the Golden Rule—a fundamental maxim of the Gospel, giving character to, and shedding light upon, all its precepts and arrangements—to the subject of slavery? That we must "do to" slaves as we would be done by, AS SLAVES, the RELATION itself being justified and continued? Surely not. A little reflection will enable us to see that the Golden Rule reaches farther in its demands, and strikes deeper in its influences and operations. The natural equality of mankind lies at the very basis of this great precept. It obviously requires every man to acknowledge another self in every other one. With my powers and resources, and in my appropriate circumstances, I am to recognize in any child of Adam who may address me, another self in his appropriate circumstances and with his powers and resources. This is the natural equality of mankind; and this the Golden Rule requires us to admit, defend, and maintain.

WHY DO YOU NOT UNDERSTAND MY SPEECH? EVEN BECAUSE YOU CANNOT HEAR MY WORD

They greatly misunderstand and severely misrepresent this doctrine, who attribute to it the absurdities and harms that any "leveling system" would inevitably produce. In all its aspects, implications, and outcomes, it stands in direct opposition and robust antagonism to such a system. EQUALITY OF RIGHTS, the doctrine proclaims; and this necessarily facilitates a diversity of condition. In other words, every child of Adam has, from the Creator, the inalienable right to utilize, within reasonable bounds, his own capabilities and to deploy his own assets, as per his own decision; the right, while he acknowledges his societal obligations, to advance his personal well-being as he sees fit. But note, his OWN abilities and assets, and NOT ANOTHER'S, are thus irrevocably placed under his command. The Creator grants every individual the freedom, in whatever actions he undertakes, to express HIMSELF, and not another. Here, no individual is lawfully permitted to impair or impede another. The weak may not obstruct the strong, nor may the strong oppress the weak. Every person may maximize his potential, within his own appropriate domain. Now, as there is boundless variety in the innate talents, natural circumstances, and lawful gains among people, so in exercising each HIMSELF, within his own domain, following his own preferences, the diversity in human conditions can be nearly boundless. Thus, the principle of equality of rights paves the way for a diversity of circumstances.

But with all this variety of nature, means, and condition, considered individually, the children of Adam are bound together by strong ties that can never be dissolved. They are mutually

united by the social aspect of their nature. Hence mutual dependence and mutual claims. While each is inalienably entitled to assert and enjoy his own personality as a man, each sustains to all and all to each, various relations. While each owns and honors the individual, all are to own and honor the social aspect of their nature. Now, the Golden Rule distinctly recognizes, places its demands upon, and extends its obligations to, the whole nature of man, in his individual capacities and social relations. What higher honor could it do to man, as an individual, than to constitute him the judge, by whose decision, when fairly rendered, all the claims of his fellows should be authoritatively and definitively disposed of? "Whatsoever YOU WOULD" have done to you, so do ye to others. Every member of the family of Adam, placing himself in the position here pointed out, is competent and authorized to pass judgment on all the cases in social life in which he may be concerned. Could higher responsibilities or greater confidence be reposed in men individually? And then, how are their claims upon each other herein magnified! What inherent worth and solid dignity are ascribed to the social aspect of their nature! In every man with whom I may have to deal, I am to recognize the presence of another self, whose case I am to make my own. And thus, I am to address whatever claims he may urge upon me.

Thus, in accordance with the Golden Rule, mankind are naturally brought, in the voluntary use of their powers and resources, to promote each other's welfare. As his contribution to this great object, it is the inalienable birthright of every child of Adam, to consecrate whatever he may possess. With exalted powers and large resources, he has a natural claim to a correspondent field of effort. If his abilities are small, his task must be easy and his burden light. Thus, the Golden Rule requires mankind to mutually serve each other. In this service, each is to exert himself—employ his own powers, lay out his own resources, improve his own opportunities. A division of labor is the natural

result. One is remarkable for his intellectual endowments and acquisitions; another, for his wealth; and a third, for power and skill in using his muscles. Such attributes, endlessly varied and diversified, proceed from the basis of a common character, by virtue of which all men and each—one as truly as another—are entitled, as a birthright, to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Each and all, one as well as another, may choose his own modes of contributing his share to the general welfare, in which his own is involved and identified. Under one great law of mutual dependence and mutual responsibility, all are placed—the strong as well as the weak, the rich as much as the poor, the learned no less than the unlearned. All bring their wares, the products of their enterprise, skill, and industry, to the same market, where mutual exchanges are freely effected. The fruits of muscular exertion procure the fruits of mental effort. John serves Thomas with his hands, and Thomas serves John with his money. Peter wields the axe for James, and James wields the pen for Peter. Moses, Joshua, and Caleb, employ their wisdom, courage, and experience in the service of the community, and the community serves Moses, Joshua, and Caleb, in furnishing them with food and raiment, and making them partakers of the general prosperity. And all this by mutual understanding and voluntary arrangement. And all this according to the Golden Rule.

What then becomes of slavery—a system of arrangements in which one man treats his fellow, not as another self, but as a thing—a chattel—an article of merchandise, which is not to be consulted in any disposition that may be made of it; a system which is built on the annihilation of the attributes of our common nature—in which man does to others what he would sooner die than have done to himself? The Golden Rule and slavery are mutually subversive of each other. If one stands, the other must fall. The one strikes at the very root of the other. The Golden Rule aims at the abolition of THE RELATION ITSELF, in which slavery

consists. It lays its demands upon everything within the scope of human action. To "whatever MEN DO," it extends its authority. And the relation itself, in which slavery consists, is the work of human hands. It is what men have done to each other—contrary to nature and most injurious to the general welfare. THIS RELATION, therefore, the Golden Rule condemns. Wherever its authority prevails, this relation must be annihilated. Mutual service and slavery—like light and darkness, life and death—are directly opposed to, and subversive of, each other. The one the Golden Rule cannot endure; the other it requires, honors, and blesses.

LOVE WORKS NO ILL TO HIS NEIGHBOR

Similar to the Golden Rule is the second great commandment— "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." A certain lawyer, who seems to have been keen on applying the doctrine of limiting human obligations, once asked the Savior to define the scope of the term "neighbor." "And who is my neighbor?" The parable of the Good Samaritan clarified this matter, demonstrating that every person we can reach with our sympathy and assistance is our neighbor, entitled to the same regard we have for ourselves. Can slavery, as a relationship, be maintained in accordance with such obligations? Is it then an act of love—such love as we have for ourselves—to strip a child of Adam of all the rights and privileges that are his inalienable birthright? To dim his reason, crush his will, and trample on his immortality? To strike at the core of his being, breaking the heart of his heart? To cast him out of the human family and treat him as chattel—as an object in the possession of an owner, a beast under the lash of a driver? All this, aside from anything incidental and extraordinary, is inherent to the relationship in which slavery, as such, exists. All this—whether well-fed or poorly fed, underworked or overworked, clothed or naked, caressed or kicked, whether idle songs escape his thoughtless tongue or "tears be his meat night and day," affectionately cherished or cruelly murdered; all this is FUNDAMENTALLY INTEGRATED INTO THE RELATIONSHIP ITSELF, by which every slave, AS A SLAVE, is segregated from the rest of the human family. Is it an act of love to subject our "neighbor" to the oppressive burden, the lethal power of such a relationship?—to apply the murderous steel to the very essence of his humanity?

YOU THEREFORE APPROVE AND DELIGHT IN THE DEEDS OF YOUR FATHERS; FOR THEY KILLED THEM, AND YOU BUILD THEIR SEPULCHERS

The slaveholder may vehemently deny that any such thing is attributable to him. He may assert with confidence and earnestness that he is not responsible for the societal state in which he finds himself. Slavery existed before his birth; it was his inheritance. His slaves are his property by birthright or will. But why deceive himself? Why allow the cunning and rapacious spiders, which in the very sanctuary of ethics and religion spin webs from their innards to ensnare him with their flimsy sophistries—and consume him, body, soul, and assets? He must understand, and one day will acknowledge with shame and dread, that whoever holds slaves is personally accountable for entering into that relationship, whether by choice or reluctance. The relationship is not involuntarily imposed. What if Elizabeth endorsed John Hawkins in capturing Africans? What if James, Charles, and George opened a market for them in the English colonies? What if modern lawmakers have "framed mischief by law," legalizing man-stealing and slaveholding? What if your ancestors, preparing for their final reckoning, left you the ownership of the "neighbors" they treated as livestock? What of all this, and anything more drawn from the history of the dreadful process by which men are "deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be chattels personal"? Can all this compel you to add the final touch—to secure the process of slave-making by participating, without which none of it would have begun? The slaveholder is the core of the entire system. Without him, the

chattel principle is but a lifeless abstraction. Without him, charters, markets, laws, and wills are mere hollow forms. And does he think to evade responsibility? Indeed, kidnappers, slave drivers, and lawmakers are merely his agents. He is the culpable party. He should take heed.

But what can he do? Refrain from laying hands on his "neighbor's" throat. Reject the completion and endorsement of the process by which the chattel principle is enacted. Stand firm against derision, reproach, and opposition. Even if poverty clutches him with its skeletal grip, and persecution unleashes its venom; come what may—scorn, exile, or flames—he must steadfastly refuse. Better to face the spite and hatred of men than the wrath of Heaven. "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell."

Professor Stewart acknowledges that the Golden Rule and the second great commandment "decide against the theory of slavery, as being inherently wrong." What, then, is their relevance to the specific precepts, institutions, and practices authorized and recommended in the New Testament? They encapsulate and broadly describe all such directives. No biblical command that enforces our mutual duties can exceed or fall short of these mandates as they apply to particular relationships, occasions, and conditions. Neither in the Old Testament nor the New do prophets or laws advocate anything outside the scope of the Golden Rule and the second great commandment. Whatever they prohibit cannot be required by any other command, and whatever they mandate cannot be forbidden.

What, then, is the intent of someone who sifts through the sacred texts seeking permissions or directives that might exempt

him from the Golden Rule? What must be the nature of his objectives, methods, and spirit to compel such a search in the Bible? Can he harbor good intentions or be rightly engaged? Is his mindset conducive to understanding the Bible, to making its teachings clear and acceptable?

What does it say about his view of God, to scour His word for blatant inconsistencies and serious contradictions? To suggest inconsistent laws or contradictory commands from Jehovah—permissions conflicting with prohibitions, general directives clashing with specific arrangements? What must be the moral standing of any institution that the Golden Rule opposes and the second great commandment condemns? It must be inherently evil, whether recently established or long-standing. Regardless of its form, presentation, or variation, at all times, its essence, distinct from its circumstances and beyond its incidents, must be deemed SINFUL.

THINK NOT TO SAY WITHIN YOURSELVES, WE HAVE ABRAHAM FOR OUR FATHER

In addressing the precepts and exhortations with specific relevance to the subject of slavery, it's critically important, indeed absolutely essential, to observe the context from the correct vantage point. Our position must be grounded in a central point, among the general maxims and foundational precepts, the known circumstances, and characteristic arrangements of early Christianity. Otherwise, our exploration will lead to incorrect views and erroneous conclusions. We cannot overemphasize the importance of grasping the overall features and dominant spirit of the New Testament's institutions and arrangements. Consider the flawed conclusions we might reach if we mistakenly apply current social norms of our country, assumed to be endorsed by the Savior among early Christians. For example, the notion that wealth, status, and talents should modify our obligations towards, and our treatment of, others. Or the idea that those suffering from poverty, illness, engaged in menial labor, or possessing unappealing features should be excluded from the beneficial and uplifting effects of intelligence and refinement, thus forming a separate class relegated to society's lowest tier. What if we were to erroneously compare the financial resources lavished upon American churches with those of early Christians, or assume they enjoyed similar influence, elegance, and splendor? Or imagine them having comparable stature and extensive influence in politics and literature, controlling high places of learning and power?

If we proceed with our studies and frame our arguments, explain words and interpret language under such misconceptions,

what could the outcome possibly be? How valid would our conclusions be? What trust could be placed in any guidance we might offer? Isn't this precisely the approach taken by defenders and apologists of slavery when considering the impact of early Christianity on it? They might unwittingly attribute to the early churches the characteristics, relationships, and conditions of contemporary American Christianity, and amidst this profound darkness and confusion, begin to interpret the language and explain the practices of the New Testament!

SO THAT YOU ARE WITHOUT EXCUSE

Among the teachings our Savior provided, which broadly impact the issue of slavery, is the lesson where he establishes the true standard of greatness. He corrected his disciples' ambitions by illustrating the only acceptable means through which aspirations for prominence should be fulfilled, thereby defining the essence of genuine greatness. "You know that those who are considered rulers over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be slave of all." Essentially, despite the common belief propelled by human selfishness and pride that greatness is to command service from others—implying our superiority grants us entitlement to others' labor—the Savior directed us towards a contrasting path. True superiority obliges us to a broader scope of exertion and necessitates from us greater service. We achieve greatness not through dominance but through utility. The principle "might gives right" transforms under his instruction to mean a right to enrich others' lives, by seizing every chance and exerting every effort to serve them compassionately, diligently, and tirelessly. The greater the individual, the more devoted, reliable, and beneficial the servant.

The Savior explicitly demonstrated how to apply this teaching. He encouraged us to use every opportunity and capability, even through humble acts, to benefit mankind. To vividly illustrate this principle and inspire us, he himself performed the humblest service by washing his disciples' feet, positioning himself as the least of servants. He emphasized that honoring our relationship to him as our Master, and finding personal fulfillment, can only be achieved by following his example. How could slavery

exist under the guidance of such a doctrine, exemplified so powerfully? Was it while washing the disciples' feet that our Savior endorsed the notion of one person treating another as property?

The apostle Paul views refusing to earn one's livelihood through productive labor as a significant wrongdoing. He reminded the Thessalonian Christians that, besides fulfilling his ministerial duties, he labored with his hands to provide for himself. He highlighted a rule upheld by apostolic authority: "If anyone will not work, neither shall he eat." With utmost seriousness and authority as a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, he instructed those neglecting productive labor to "work quietly and eat their own bread." What implications does this have for slavery? Could slavery endure in a society where everyone consumes only what they have personally produced—where laziness is such a severe fault that it merits starvation as a penalty? How could unpaid labor be justified, utilized, or necessary? Wouldn't each individual in such a community be expected to contribute to the common good, leading naturally to mutual assistance and mutual provision?

The same apostle, in addressing another church, describes the rightful source from which the means of generosity should stem. "Let the one who stole steal no longer; but instead let him labor, doing something useful with his own hands, that he may have something to share with those in need." Let this directive, as if from the mouth of Jehovah, be spread throughout South Carolina. Let it be universally accepted and implemented. Let thieves return what they have stolen to the rightful owners, cease stealing, and begin to "labor, working with their hands," for both necessary and benevolent purposes. Could slavery, under these circumstances, continue to exist? Certainly not! Rather than demanding unpaid labor from others, everyone would be actively engaged not only in providing for their own needs but also in

gathering resources, "that he might have to share with" those in need. Slavery would have to vanish, entirely and forever.

In outlining how his ministers should be supported, the Savior set forth a general principle with a clear and significant impact on the issue of slavery. He emphasized that while they work for the good of others, "the worker deserves his wages." He thus linked labor with rightful compensation. Anyone who provides the former is entitled to the latter, evidently under a mutual agreement and a voluntary arrangement. For the notion that I can compel you to work for me under any conditions I decide, logically opens the door for you, in turn, to compel me to provide whatever compensation you demand for any service you opt to provide. Hence, slavery, even as involuntary servitude, is fundamentally undermined. Even a Princeton professor seems to view it as a breach of the principle connecting labor with wages.

The apostle James extends this principle to the rights of manual laborers—those who plow the fields and reap the harvests. He admonishes the wealthy elites who exploit labor without fair compensation to anticipate sorrow and despair, assuring them that the grievances of the cheated laborers have reached the ears of the Lord of Hosts. As a consequence of their oppression, their wealth will rot, and their garments will become moth-eaten; their gold and silver will tarnish, and the corrosion will testify against them, consuming their flesh like fire. In essence, they have amassed wealth for judgment in the last days, facing a future so bleak it should indeed make them weep and tremble. Were these admonitions heeded, would not "the South" erupt into "weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth"? What else are its wealthy doing but systematically depriving laborers of their earnings, as these laborers exhaust themselves out of fear, toiling in their fields and producing their comforts? Can any encouragement or justification for maintaining the so-called "peculiar institution,"

which they proudly call the foundation of the republic, be found in James's words?

In the New Testament, we find the universal command, "Honor all men." This broad directive entitles every expression of humanity to protection and respect. The violation of any human right is, therefore, a dishonor to humanity and breaches this command. In light of such obligations, how should slavery be viewed? Are those men honored, who are forcibly removed from the human community and subjected to the profound degradation and indescribable horrors of being treated as property? Can individuals be held as slaves while simultaneously being honored as human beings?

The extent to which we must adhere to this command can be deduced from the guidance James offers regarding the conduct within religious gatherings. He prohibits showing "favoritism" in these settings. "My brothers and sisters," he admonishes, "do not hold the faith of our glorious Lord Jesus Christ with favoritism. For if a man wearing a gold ring and fine clothing comes into your assembly, and a poor man in shabby clothing also comes in; if you pay attention to the one wearing the fine clothing and say, 'Sit here in a good spot,' but say to the poor man, 'Stand there' or 'Sit at my feet,' have you not discriminated among yourselves and become judges with evil thoughts?" Favoritism is a sin, making one guilty of violating the law. Therefore, religious gatherings should be governed by the principle that every person's value is determined not by external circumstances but by their moral character. Gold rings and fine clothing should not entitle anyone to preferential treatment in the church, nor should the shabby attire of a poor person exclude them from any role they are otherwise qualified to fill. To contravene this, in theory or practice, is to degrade a person below the status of an object, committing sin and transgressing the law.

Slavery institutionalizes "favoritism," categorically demeaning individuals not just for "shabby clothing," which may hide their scarred bodies, but far worse, it inflicts the deepest disdain based on birth or skin color. Shabby clothing might result from various personal circumstances and sometimes reflect character traits. However, no one can be accountable for the circumstances of their birth or their skin color. To judge or value someone based on these uncontrollable factors is to engage in "favoritism" in its most egregious form and with the most harmful consequences. It is unjustly rewarding or punishing individuals for aspects over which they have no control, thereby muddying the waters of justice by blurring moral distinctions. Thus, according to the New Testament, slavery, which relies on such aggravated and intolerable "favoritism," cannot stand. Furthermore, the practice in many churches of relegating worshippers with darker skin to segregated seating contradicts this principle, revealing a profound, senseless, and morally reprehensible bias.

Nor are we allowed to limit this principle to religious assemblies alone. It is intended to permeate all of social life. Even in environments rich with plenty, intelligence, and refinement, the poor are to be welcomed with particular favor. "When you give a dinner or a supper," said Jesus, "do not invite your friends, or your brothers or sisters, or your relatives, or your rich neighbors; if you do, they may invite you back and so you will be repaid. But when you give a banquet, invite the poor, the crippled, the lame, the blind, and you will be blessed. Because they cannot repay you, you will be repaid at the resurrection of the righteous."

Thus, in the most exalted circles of social life—be it the parlor, the drawing room, or the salon—special attention should be given, in every preparation, to the comfort and enrichment of those least capable of affording even the simplest acts of hospitality.

For these individuals, generous provisions must be made, regardless of the exclusion of our kin and affluent neighbors. And for a good reason: while such gatherings mean little to the latter, they hold immense potential for good for the former, uplifting their spirits, encouraging their hearts, and imbuing them with life, hope, and joy. When the affluent and the impoverished come together in celebration, they mutually benefit; the wealthy are reminded of moderation, temperance, and caution, while the impoverished are encouraged towards industry, foresight, and contentment. The reward for such inclusivity is both substantial and certain.

Jesus Himself provided a profound and illustrative example of this teaching through His actions. He regularly associated with those marginalized by society, dining with outcasts, surrounded by tax collectors and sinners. When criticized by the self-righteous as a radical and disruptor, He clarified that His actions were demanded by His mission—to seek the lost, to heal the sick, to console the afflicted; in essence, to provide precisely those benefits that the diverse needs of humanity necessitated. In His expansive compassion, there was room for everyone, especially those shunned by the narrow-hearted. The gospel He preached leaves no one behind, least of all, those ostracized by a self-centered world.

Can slavery, in any form, align with such a gospel—a gospel that commands us to lift up the downtrodden and extend our deepest sympathies to those least favored by the world, even in the highest echelons of social interaction?

Those "in bonds" are explicitly highlighted as deserving our special attention. Their plight is presented as a direct application of the Golden Rule, as one of its many actionable expressions. We are instructed to offer them the same compassionate concern we would desire for ourselves were we the ones enchained. The

enslaved, due to their treatment based on birth and complexion—factors beyond their control—endure a persecution of extraordinary cruelty. For reasons unrelated to their actions but merely their creation, they bear chains. This is persecution in its purest form.

How can one see the slave as another self, empathize with their suffering, and remain indifferent to their plight? Especially, how can one, moved by such empathy, side with the oppressor? Could anyone, embodying the mindset the gospel nurtures, enslave another or keep them in bondage? The teachings of the gospel naturally challenge and undermine every manifestation and system of slavery.

The New Testament's descriptions of the church offer enlightening insights on the issue of slavery. In one passage, we find, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." Here, the principle of human equality is vividly articulated: "You are all one;" emphasizing our shared humanity, our equal footing, and our individual freedom to such an extent that distinctions become irrelevant in the unity found in Christ.

This principle, apparent through reason, is affirmed with divine authority. "In Christ Jesus, you are all one." The inherent equality of humanity is integral to the gospel message because—

Every member of the human family is encompassed in this principle. Regardless of gender, status, ethnicity, or condition, all are equally entitled to its promises. Christianity eradicates the superficial distinctions stemming from birth, status, gender, and ethnicity while preserving and sanctifying natural differences. The gospel does not negate gender differences, oppose labor specialization, or undermine national identity. It elevates women to stand alongside men, liberates laborers from oppression by ensuring fair compensation, and fosters mutual respect and affection between diverse ethnic groups. In doing so, it levels the societal playing field, enabling everyone to freely utilize their abilities and resources, and unites all within a single, loving community. This was the transformative impact and outcome of early Christianity as depicted by the apostle. "Behold the picture!" Does it resemble American slavery, which, by its nature, disrupts the unity among brethren?

"Where the Spirit of the Lord is," declares the same apostle, reflecting on the church's state and relationships, "there is liberty." Where, then, can we sincerely discern the presence and acknowledge the evident power of this Spirit? In settings where individuals cannot choose their employment, determine their sustenance, select their associates, or enjoy the fruits of their labor? Where personal relationships and even destiny are utterly controlled by others? Where freedom to enjoy family life is restricted? Where, in every aspect of life, individuals are legally treated as devoid of rational thought, immortal value, or will? Is the Spirit of the Lord present where liberty is scorned, vilified, and subjected to betrayal and persecution? Could the apostle have witnessed the fruits of the Lord's Spirit within a church that

justifies slavery, sustains itself through slavery, and advances its missions by exploiting slavery? Let the Spirit exert His influence, assert His authority, and exercise His power, and slavery would cease immediately and forever.

In numerous instances, the apostle James refers to Christianity as "the law of liberty," suggesting it is fundamentally a system under which liberty is not only safeguarded but also thrives. It's a framework where liberty is explicitly defined, vigorously advocated, and securely protected. As the law of liberty, how could it possibly align with the law of slavery? This law's influence is evident wherever reason's light permeates, manifest in the discomfort and perceived degradation of the enslaved and the guilt and remorse experienced by slaveholders, who often defend their stance with reluctance and desperation. This law empowers humanity against oppression, ensuring "every yoke is broken" where it is followed.

These references to the New Testament offer a broad overview of the early church and the foundational principles it was built upon. These principles relate as much to the history of Christianity as they do to Christian character, with history focused on character development. What is Christian character if not the tangible manifestation of Christian principles? These principles are the essence that gives life to character. Thus, principles serve as both the measure and the means to interpret character. Christian history, filled with the church's institutions, practices, and experiences, showcases how these principles have been actualized in the world. These narratives are intricately linked to Christian principles, embodying their application and revealing their impact.

In Christianity, then, we find a comprehensive guide on its aims, institutions, and practices, showing how it ought to behave,

act, and endure in a world rife with sin and suffering. There's an inherent congruence between the principles God reveals and the directives, institutions, and practices He endorses, negating any discrepancy between principle and practice that would suggest divine inconsistency. Can the Savior, who establishes that our place within the church is determined by our propensity to serve others, condone practices that violate the rights and diminish the well-being of others through slavery? Does He, who exemplifies and mandates the provision of mutual service, allow for the exploitation of others as mere commodities? Is it conceivable that He, who advocates for self-sufficiency and generosity, would tolerate the enrichment of some through the unremunerated labor of others?

Christianity, as "the law of liberty," starkly contrasts with any form of slavery. Aligning practice with principle eradicates slavery, underscoring a divine governance where practice reflects principle, a standard by which all actions are judged. In interpreting historical accounts and biblical references, recognizing this seamless integration of principle and practice under God's rule is crucial. Principles delineate the expected practice, and what principle deems unacceptable is unequivocally condemned by God, destined to be eradicated. Hence, if slavery existed in Christianity's early days, it did so outside the faith's influence and approval.

In the challenging environment where the early church sought to benefit humanity, the conditions of its foundation greatly aided early Christians in grasping and implementing the gospel's tenets. The Master, born into obscurity, living in poverty, and dying a death marked by humiliation, demonstrated through his life—his association with society's outcasts, his acceptance of support from women, and entrusting his mother to a disciple's care on the cross—the extent of his impoverishment and the contempt he

faced. Could such a one, "despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows, familiar with suffering," endorse oppression or approve of those who exploited the impoverished?

The lives of the apostles further illustrated the principle that "the disciple is not above his master." Were they grand ecclesiastics, flush with wealth, dazzling in splendor, indulgent in luxury? Did they seek prominence, exploiting and oppressing the congregation to secure their own positions of authority? Were they slaveholding bishops? Or did they sustain themselves through unjust gains and blood money? Such conclusions cannot be drawn from the descriptions provided by Paul, who documented their plight: "Up to this moment we hunger and thirst, we are poorly clothed, beaten, and homeless. We labor, working with our own hands. When cursed, we bless; when persecuted, we endure; when slandered, we respond kindly. We have become the scum of the earth, the refuse of the world, right up to the present time." Could individuals of such character and in such circumstances endorse or tolerate slavery? With such convictions, they WOULD NOT; under those conditions, they COULD NOT. Faced with "trouble, hardship, and persecution," enduring famine, nakedness, danger, and violence, regarded as sheep led to slaughter, they would be out of place in the grandeur of a plantation house or a slave market.

The general body of believers likely experienced conditions no better than those of the apostles. While the apostles may have faced the brunt of opposition, reproach, and persecution, scorn and contempt were likely common to all Christians. It's hard to believe that the broader Christian community would shy away from sharing in the hardships faced by their leaders, or that while the apostles engaged in manual labor and endured societal disdain, the lay believers would enjoy affluence, ease, and honor, disdainful of physical labor and living off the proceeds of unpaid

labor. However, we need not rely solely on inference and speculation. Paul explicitly states the divine strategy: "But God chose the foolish things of the world to shame the wise; God chose the weak things of the world to shame the strong; and God chose the lowly things of this world and the despised things—and the things that are not—to nullify the things that are." This selection highlights God's preference for uplifting those deemed insignificant or powerless by worldly standards, further distancing Christian practice and ethos from any endorsement of or complicity with slavery.

The composition of the early churches was not a mere happenstance but a deliberate divine choice, part of God's wise and gracious providence. This divine selection aligned with the spread of Christianity, emphasizing that God often concealed His glory from the educated and influential, revealing it instead to the humble and the ordinary. The gospel resonated most with the common people, while not many of the worldly wise, mighty, or noble were called.

The apostle Paul's description highlights individuals often disregarded by society—the foolish, weak, base, and despised—demonstrating the gospel's profound impact on those considered the lowest in human estimation. These individuals, whose hearts were touched and transformed by the gospel, were embraced by Paul as brothers and sisters in Christ.

It's acknowledged that slaves were present in Corinth and included among those the apostle describes as part of the church's makeup. Notably, a significant group within the church was referred to as "THINGS WHICH ARE NOT"—essentially regarded as non-entities in society, stripped of human rights and treated as mere property, reflecting the dire situation of those living under the dehumanizing conditions of chattel slavery.

The apostle also mentions the "deep poverty of the Macedonian churches" to motivate the Corinthians towards generosity. Despite their own poverty, Macedonian believers were eager to contribute to the needs of the saints in Jerusalem. This illustrates that early Christians, familiar with hardship and societal disdain, were advised against taking on family responsibilities due to the challenges of their times.

How did these early Christians treat one another? Did the few who were considered wise, mighty, or noble use their status to oppress others within their community? Absolutely not. Instead, in communities where apostolic influence was strongest and their practices most praised, Christians treated one another with deep mutual affection and generosity, to the extent that they were described as having everything in common. The notion of owning slaves or treating fellow members as commodities was entirely alien to these communities. The fundamental Christian recognition of every individual's humanity and brotherhood rendered any form of slavery or dehumanization incompatible with their shared life and faith.

The appeal of the kneeling bondman, "Am I not a man and a brother," must here have met with a prompt and powerful response.

The criteria by which our Savior evaluates the character of His professed followers illuminate the essence of the Gospel. In a particular instance, an individual asks Jesus, "What good deed must I do to have eternal life?" After reminding him of his societal obligations, the individual, claiming to have fulfilled his duties towards others, inquires, "What do I still lack?" Jesus quickly identifies the fundamental flaw in his character: "If you want to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give to the poor, and you will

have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me." From this, we deduce:

This test is universally applicable. It's unreasonable to assume that Jesus would impose an unduly harsh trial, especially on a commendably kind inquirer, regarding something as crucial as eternal life. This challenge seems to be a direct application of the second greatest commandment and, thus, is relevant to all under its guidance. Those unable to meet this challenge, due to a fundamental flaw in their character, would, like the inquirer Jesus addressed, be deemed unfit for the kingdom of heaven.

At a minimum, Jesus is demanding our unselfish and earnest commitment to human welfare, particularly that of the poor. We're expected to align ourselves with them by "selling what we have" for their benefit—in essence, utilizing our abilities and resources to improve their lives. This was Jesus' approach; if we fail to align and cooperate with Him in this respect, can we truly consider ourselves His disciples? Considering this in relation to slaveholders, rather than "selling what they have" to assist the poor, they purchase the poor, exploiting their labor under harsh conditions for personal luxury, or they sell the poor to fund religious missions.

Regarding the final judgment scenes Jesus describes, what criteria will determine our character and the consequent eternal outcomes? A surprising standard will be revealed to both the righteous and the wicked. The most marginalized human being—a "stranger" suffering under oppression, destitute, hungry, and sick—will stand alongside the divine Judge as His representative. "Glory, honor, and immortality" will be bestowed on those who recognized and aided their Lord in these suffering individuals. Conversely, "tribulation, anguish, and despair" will afflict anyone who neglected or mistreated them. Within our

country, who best embodies the role of our final Judge's representatives? Every aspect of Jesus' portrayal accurately applies to our enslaved fellow citizens.

They are the LEAST of his brethren.

They are subject to thirst and hunger, unable to command a cup of water or a crumb of bread.

They are exposed to wasting sickness, without the ability to procure a nurse or employ a physician.

They are emphatically "in prison," restrained by chains, goaded with whips, tasked, and under keepers. Not a wretch groans in any cell of the prisons of our country, who is exposed to a confinement so rigorous and heart-breaking as the law allows theirs to be continually and permanently.

And then they are emphatically, and peculiarly, and exclusively, STRANGERS - strangers in the land which gave them birth. Whom else do we constrain to remain aliens in the midst of our free institutions? The Welsh, the Swiss, the Irish? The Jews even? Alas, it is the negro only, who may not strike his roots into our soil. Everywhere we have conspired to treat him as a stranger - everywhere he is forced to feel himself a stranger. In the stage and steamboat, in the parlor and at our tables, in the scenes of business and in the scenes of amusement - even in the church of God and at the communion table, he is regarded as a stranger. The intelligent and religious are generally disgusted and horror-struck at the thought of his becoming identified with the citizens of our republic - so much so, that thousands of them have entered into a conspiracy to send him off "out of sight," to find a home on a foreign shore! - and justify themselves by openly alleging, that a "single drop" of his blood, in the veins of any human creature, must

make him hateful to his fellow citizens! - That nothing but banishment from "our coasts," can redeem him from the scorn and contempt to which his "stranger" blood has reduced him among his own mother's children! Who, then, in this land "of milk and honey," is "hungry and athirst," but the man from whom the law takes away the last crumb of bread and the smallest drop of water? Who "naked," but the man whom the law strips of the last rag of clothing? Who "sick," but the man whom the law deprives of the power of procuring medicine or sending for a physician? Who "in prison," but the man who, all his life, is under the control of merciless masters and cruel keepers? Who a "stranger," but the man who is scornfully denied the cheapest courtesies of life - who is treated as an alien in his native country? There is one point in this awful description which deserves particular attention. Those who are doomed to the left hand of the Judge, are not charged with inflicting positive injuries on their helpless, needy, and oppressed brother. Theirs was what is often called a negative character. What they had done is not described in the indictment. Their neglect of duty, what they had NOT done, was the ground of their "everlasting punishment." The representative of their Judge, they had seen hungered and they gave him no meat, thirsty and they gave him no drink, a stranger and they took him not in, naked and they clothed him not, sick and in prison and they visited him not. Inasmuch as they did NOT yield to the claims of suffering humanity - did NOT exert themselves to bless the meanest of the human family, they were driven away in their wickedness. But what if the indictment had run thus: I was hungered and ye snatched away the crust which might have saved me from starvation; I was thirsty and ye dashed to the ground the "cup of cold water," which might have moistened my parched lips; I was a stranger and ye drove me from the hovel which might have sheltered me from the piercing wind; I was sick and ye scourged me to my task; in prison and you sold me for my jail-fees - to what depths of hell must not those who were convicted under such charges be consigned! And

what is the history of American slavery but one long indictment, describing under ever-varying forms and hues just such injuries! Nor should it be forgotten, that those who incurred the displeasure of their Judge, took far other views than he, of their own past history. The charges which he brought against them, they heard with great surprise. They were sure that they had never thus turned away from his necessities. Indeed, when had they seen him thus subject to poverty, insult, and oppression? Never. And as to that poor friendless creature, whom they left unpitied and unhelped in the hands of the oppressor, and whom their Judge now presented as his own representative, they never once supposed, that he had any claims on their compassion and assistance. Had they known, that he was destined to so prominent a place at the final judgment, they would have treated him as a human being, in spite of any social, pecuniary, or political considerations. But neither their negative virtue nor their voluntary ignorance could shield them from the penal fire which their selfishness had kindled.

Now amidst the general maxims, the leading principles, the "great commandments" of the gospel; amidst its comprehensive descriptions and authorized tests of Christian character, we should take our position in disposing of any particular allusions to such forms and usages of the primitive churches as are supported by divine authority. The latter must be interpreted and understood in the light of the former. But how do the apologists and defenders of slavery proceed? Placing themselves amidst the arrangements and usages which grew out of the corruptions of Christianity, they make these the standard by which the gospel is to be explained and understood! Some Recorder or Justice, without the light of inquiry or the aid of a jury, consigns the negro whom the kidnapper has dragged into his presence to the horrors of slavery. As the poor wretch shrieks and faints, Humanity shudders and demands why such atrocities are endured. Some "priest" or "Levite," "passing by on the other side," quite self-possessed and all-complacent,

reads in reply from his broad phylactery, "Paul sent back Onesimus to Philemon!" Yes, echoes the negro-hating mob, made up of "gentlemen of property and standing" together with equally so-called gentlemen reeking from the gutter; "Yes—Paul sent back Onesimus to Philemon!" And Humanity, brow-beaten, stunned with noise and tumult, is pushed aside by the crowd! A fair specimen this of the manner in which modern usages are made to interpret the sacred Scriptures!

Of the particular passages in the New Testament on which the apologists for slavery especially rely, the Epistle to Philemon first demands our attention.

This letter was written by the Apostle Paul while a "prisoner of Jesus Christ" at Rome.

Philemon was a benevolent and trustworthy member of the church at Colossae, at whose house the disciples of Christ held their assemblies, and who owed his conversion, under God, directly or indirectly to the ministry of Paul.

Onesimus was the servant of Philemon; under a relation which it is difficult with accuracy and certainty to define. His condition, though servile, could not have been like that of an American slave; as, in that case, however he might have "wronged" Philemon, he could not also have "owed him aught." The American slave is, according to law, as much the property of his master as any other chattel; and can no more "owe" his master than can a sheep or a horse. The basis of all pecuniary obligations lies in some "value received." How can "an article of merchandise" stand on this basis and sustain commercial relations to its owner? There is no person to offer or promise. Personality is swallowed up in American slavery!

How Onesimus found his way to Rome it is not easy to determine. He and Philemon appear to have parted from each other on ill terms. The general character of Onesimus, certainly, in his relation to Philemon, had been far from attractive, and he seems to have left him without repairing the wrongs he had done him or paying the debts which he owed him. At Rome, by the blessing of God upon the exertions of the apostle, he was brought to reflection and repentance.

In reviewing his history in the light of Christian truth, he became painfully aware of the injuries he had inflicted on Philemon. He longed for an opportunity for frank confession and full restitution. Having, however, parted with Philemon on ill terms, he knew not how to appear in his presence. Under such embarrassments, he naturally sought the sympathy and advice of Paul. His influence on Philemon, Onesimus knew, must be powerful, especially as an apostle.

A letter on behalf of Onesimus was therefore written by the apostle to Philemon. After such salutations, benedictions, and thanksgiving as the good character and useful life of Philemon naturally drew from the heart of Paul, he proceeds to the object of the letter. He admits that Onesimus had behaved ill in the service of Philemon; not in running away, for how they had parted with each other is not explained; but in being unprofitable and in refusing to pay the debts which he had contracted. But his character had undergone a radical change. Thenceforward, fidelity and usefulness would be his aim and mark his course. And as to any pecuniary obligations which he had violated, the apostle authorized Philemon to put them on his account. Thus, a way was fairly opened to the heart of Philemon. And now, what does the apostle ask?

He asks that Philemon would receive Onesimus. How? "Not as a servant, but above a servant." How much above? Philemon was to receive him as "a son" of the apostle—"as a brother beloved"—nay, if he counted Paul a partner, an equal, he was to receive Onesimus as he would receive the apostle himself. So much above a servant was he to receive him!

But was not this request to be so interpreted and complied with as to put Onesimus in the hands of Philemon as "an article of merchandise," carnally, while it raised him to the dignity of a "brother beloved," spiritually? In other words, might not Philemon, consistent with the request of Paul, have reduced Onesimus to a chattel, AS A MAN, while he admitted him fraternally to his bosom, as a CHRISTIAN? Such gibberish in an apostolic epistle! Never. As if, however, to guard against such folly, the natural product of mist and moonshine, the apostle wanted Onesimus raised above a servant to the dignity of a brother beloved, "BOTH IN THE FLESH AND IN THE LORD;" as a man and Christian, in all the relations, circumstances, and responsibilities of life.

It is now easy to determine with definiteness and certainty in what sense the apostle in such contexts uses the word "brother." It describes a relation inconsistent with and opposite to the servile. It is "NOT" the relation of a "SERVANT." It elevates its subject "above" the servile condition. It raises him to full equality with the master, to the same equality on which Paul and Philemon stood side by side as brothers; and this, not in some vague, undefined, spiritual sense, affecting the soul and leaving the body in bonds, but in every way, "both in the FLESH and in the Lord." This matter deserves particular and earnest attention. It sheds a strong light on other lessons of apostolic instruction.

It is greatly to our purpose, moreover, to observe that the apostle clearly defines the moral character of his request. It was

fit, proper, right, suited to the nature and relation of things—a thing which ought to be done. On this account, he might have urged it upon Philemon in the form of an injunction, on apostolic authority and with great boldness. The very nature of the request made it obligatory on Philemon. He was sacredly bound, out of regard to the fitness of things, to admit Onesimus to full equality with himself—to treat him as a brother both in the Lord and as having flesh—as a fellow man. Thus, the inalienable rights and birthright privileges of Onesimus, as a member of the human family, were defined and protected by apostolic authority.

The apostle preferred a request instead of imposing a command, on the grounds of CHARITY. He would give Philemon an opportunity of discharging his obligations under the impulse of love. To this impulse, he was confident Philemon would promptly and fully yield. How could he do otherwise? The thing itself was right. The request respecting it came from a benefactor, to whom, under God, he was under the highest obligations. That benefactor, now an old man and in the hands of persecutors, manifested a deep and tender interest in the matter and had the strongest persuasion that Philemon was more ready to grant than he to entreat. The result, as he was soon to visit Colossae and had commissioned Philemon to prepare a lodging for him, must come under the eye of the apostle. The request was so manifestly reasonable and obligatory, that the apostle, after all, described compliance with it by the strong word "obedience."

Now, how must all this have been understood by the church at Colossae—a church, doubtless, made up of such materials as the church at Corinth, that is, of members chiefly from the humblest walks of life. Many of them had probably felt the degradation and tasted the bitterness of the servile condition. Would they have been likely to interpret the apostle's letter under the bias of feelings friendly to slavery? And put the slaveholder's

construction on its contents? Would their past experience or present sufferings—for doubtless some of them were still "under the yoke"—have suggested to their thoughts such glosses as some of our theological professors venture to put upon the words of the apostle? Far otherwise. The Spirit of the Lord was there, and the epistle was read in the light of "liberty." It contained the principles of holy freedom, faithfully and affectionately applied. This must have made it precious in the eyes of such men "of low degree" as were most of the believers, and welcome to a place in the sacred canon. There let it remain as a luminous and powerful defense of the cause of emancipation!

But what saith Professor Stuart? "If any one doubts, let him take the case of Paul's sending Onesimus back to Philemon, with an apology for his running away, and sending him back to be his servant for life."

"Paul sent Onesimus back to Philemon." How did this occur? Was the apostle, then a prisoner in Rome, able to apprehend the fugitive and forcibly present him to an indifferent and deceitful judge for the authority to send him back to Colossae? Did he rush his victim away from a complacent magistrate, to be transported under chains and lashes back to the harsh field of unpaid labor from which he had fled? If the apostle had acted like some teachers in American churches, he might have, as a professor of sacred literature in one of our seminaries or a preacher to affluent congregations in our cities, agreed to further the "special" interests of a beloved brother who owned slaves. However, the respected advocate for truth and liberty was himself restrained in the imperial city, awaiting his martyrdom. He wrote a letter to the church in Colossae, typically gathering at Philemon's house, and another letter to that generous disciple, entrusting them to Onesimus. This was the manner in which Onesimus was returned to his master.

When a slave escapes from a master in Georgia and finds refuge with a Connecticut doctor of Divinity—who had publicly stated his indifference to the enslavement of others—under this clergyman's guidance, Caesar becomes a Christian. Filled with love for the son he has won over to the gospel, the doctor decides to send him back to his master. He writes a letter, hands it to Caesar, and instructs him to return to the foundation of our republican institutions. What would any Caesar, who has ever felt the weight of slavery's chains, do? As he departs from his spiritual father, it wouldn't be surprising to hear him question himself, "Should I voluntarily return to the man who, like a thief, tore me from my mother's embrace?—for whom I've sweated under unpaid labor?—whose cruelty marked my body and scarred my limbs?—who denied me any enlightenment?—who claimed honors that only my Creator and Redeemer deserve? Why should I return? To be cursed, struck, and sold? To be led into temptation, torn apart, and ruined? I cannot discard myself like this—cannot plunge into my own ruin."

"Who has ever heard of a fugitive voluntarily returning from American oppression? Do you think the doctor and his friends could convince one to carry a letter back to the patriarch from whom he had escaped? And are we to believe this of Onesimus?"

'Paul sent Onesimus back to Philemon.' On what occasion? 'If,' writes the apostle, 'he has wronged you, or owes you anything, charge it to my account.' Conscious of his duties, Onesimus was willing to 'restore' whatever he had taken. He intended to honestly settle his debts. This resolution was warmly endorsed by the apostle, who was prepared, regardless of the cost, to support his young disciple in fulfilling this commitment. He assured Philemon of this in terms that were both clear and strong. Herein lies one reason for Paul's decision to send Onesimus back to Philemon.

Imagine if a fugitive slave of the Reverend Dr. Smylie of Mississippi were to return to him with a letter from a New York doctor of divinity, offering such a promise. How would the reverend slaveholder react? 'What do we have here?' he exclaims. 'If Cato has not been honest in his financial dealings with you—if he owes you anything—charge it to my account.' Such ignorance of Southern institutions! What mockery it is to speak of financial transactions between a slave and his master! The slave himself, along with all he possesses, is considered merchandise. What could he possibly owe his master? A farmer might bet with his mule, allowing the animal to win a peck of oats. But seriously, who would regard this as a financial transaction?"

"TO BE HIS SERVANT FOR LIFE!' From which part of the epistle could the expositor have derived a thought so soothing to tyrants and so repugnant to every individual who values human dignity? From this phrase, perhaps: 'For maybe he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him forever.' But how should he be received? As a servant, our commentator hastily concludes. Yet, what did the apostle actually write? 'NOT now as a servant, but above a servant, a beloved brother, especially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord.' Who gave the commentator the authority to ignore the word 'not' and its negating power? According to Paul, Philemon was to welcome Onesimus 'not as a servant;' however, according to Stuart, he was to be received 'as a servant!' If the professor were to apply the same interpretive approach to the writings of abolitionists, he would see no difference between his views and theirs, effectively disappearing. This 'harmonization' would be as straightforward as it is potent. He merely needs to interpret their rejections as acceptances, and their acceptances as rejections.

Imagine if Professor Stuart had a son living in the South. His slave, having stolen money from his master, escapes. He runs

to Andover, seeking sanctuary among the 'sons of the prophets.' There, he finds his way to Professor Stuart's residence, offering any service the professor might need during a dangerous illness 'from typhus fever.' He proves to be an exceedingly diligent, skilled, and loyal nurse. Night and day, he tirelessly works to be of use to the esteemed patient. He anticipates every need and, with utmost sensitivity and care, seeks to alleviate every discomfort. He earns a special place in the heart of his revered charge. Moved by the divine spirit, the gentle demeanor, and the compliant attitude displayed beside the sickbed, Archy converts to Christianity. A new bond now unites him and his recovering mentor. As soon as he is capable, the professor sends Archy back to the South with a letter to Isaac Stuart, Esq.

"My Dear Son,

With a hand weakened by a distressing and dangerous illness from which I am slowly recovering, I write to you on a subject that lies very close to my heart. I have a request to make, one that our mutual relationship and your strong obligations to me, I believe, will make you eager to fulfill. Although I refer to it as a request, what I ask is, by its very nature and according to the principles of the gospel, obligatory upon you. Therefore, I could assertively demand what I now earnestly request. But I am aware of your generosity, magnanimity, and Christ-like nature, and how you will "do even more than I ask"—I, your own father, an old man, nearly spent from numerous efforts for the benefit of my family and my country, now just recovering, emaciated and weakened, from the edge of the grave.

I write on behalf of Archy, whom I have come to regard with the affection of a father, and whom, indeed, I nearly overlooked in my illness. I would have gladly kept him close, as an Isaac to me, for his soothing voice, skillful care, and tireless attention to my

needs often reminded me of you. However, I chose to offer you the opportunity to demonstrate the goodness of your heart voluntarily. Had I kept him with me, you might feel as though you were coerced into granting what I trust you will give freely. His temporary absence from you could pave the way for his permanent presence with you—not as a slave, heaven forbid, but as someone far above a slave. Did I say 'superior'? Take him into your bosom as a beloved brother, for I acknowledge him as a son and regard him as such in all aspects of life, both as a man and a Christian. 'Receive him as you would me.' And to ensure nothing prevents you from fulfilling my request immediately, I hereby commit, without referring to your many and significant obligations to me, to reimburse you for every cent he took from your drawer. You will, no doubt, make any preparations needed for my comfort during my visit with minimal delay, especially once you know that I intend to visit you as soon as I am able to undertake the journey."

And what if Dr. Baxter, in discussing this letter, were to publicly declare that Professor Stuart, of Andover, regarded slaveholding as lawful; and that 'he had sent Archy back to his son Isaac, with an apology for his running away' to be held in perpetual slavery? With what propriety might not the professor exclaim: 'False, every syllable is false. I sent him back, NOT TO BE HELD AS A SLAVE, but to be recognized as a dear brother, in all respects, under every civil and ecclesiastical relation. I instructed my son to receive Archy as he would me. If this does not equate to a demand for his complete and honorable freedom, based on natural obligation and Christian principle, then I do not know how to formulate such a demand.'

I am well aware that my analogy may not fully encapsulate the situation to which it is applied. Professor Stuart lacks apostolic authority. Isaac Stuart is not a prominent member of a church, which, like the early churches, largely consisted of what

the world views as the dregs of society—'the offscouring of all things.' Moreover, slavery in Colossae does not appear to have been supported by such barbarous practices and horrific laws as those that disgrace the South.

But it is time to consider another passage which, in our opinion as well as in the views of Dr. Fisk and Prof. Stuart, holds the highest degree of authority and is highly instructive on the matter at hand. 'Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, so that the name of God and His doctrines are not blasphemed. And those who have believing masters should not despise them because they are brethren; but rather serve them because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit.' - 1 Tim. vi. 1-2. The following exposition is by ELIZUR WRIGHT, JR.:

'This word [ἀντιλαμβάνομαι] has been so uniformly overlooked by commentators, that we feel compelled to diverge from our excellent translators in rendering the phrase 'partakers of the benefit.' They seem to have overlooked the preposition's nuance, which suggests reciprocity rather than mere participation. They have rendered it as if it were παραλαμβάνω (2 Tim. ii. 6). Had the apostle intended that sense, he would have used the latter verb or one of the more common ones, like κοινωνός, κοινωνία, etc. (See Heb. iii. 1, and 1 Tim. v. 22, where the same concept is applied in the phrase, 'neither be partaker of other men's sins'). The primary sense of ἀντιλαμβάνομαι is to take in return, to reciprocate. Hence, when used in the middle voice with the genitive, it implies assisting or contributing towards the entity expressed by that genitive. This is the sole sense in which the word is used in the New Testament. (See Luke i. 51, and Acts xx. 35). If true, the word ἀντιλαμβάνομαι does not denote the benefit conferred by the gospel, as our common version suggests, but the well-doing of the servants, who continue to serve their believing

masters, now not under the yoke of compulsion. This term is used elsewhere in the New Testament only once (Acts iv. 3) concerning the 'good deed' done to the impotent man. The straightforward meaning of the clause, unobscured by the common interpretation, is as follows: The apostle addresses two classes of servants, providing specific instructions for each. Both classes, in Professor Stuart's view, were slaves—a presumption that begs the very question in dispute. The term 'servant' is generic, as used by the sacred writers. It encompasses all manners of service rendered for the benefit of others, regardless of their status, from that of an apostle opening the path to heaven, to the humble act of washing 'one another's feet.' It is a general term that includes every office pertinent to human relations and Christian character."

A significant connotation identifies the manual laborer, who, in the division of labor, is designated for tasks requiring muscular exertion. Since these efforts primarily involve the body's powers—powers shared by humans and animals alike—the manual laborer's domain has often been viewed as lowly and humble. Given that intellectual prowess is esteemed above physical strength, manual laborers have historically been vulnerable to oppression in myriad forms and to varying degrees. Through cunning, intrigue, and persuasive speech, a small elite has, by means of widespread and influential conspiracies, commandeered society's resources, distancing themselves from the humble worker. This has led to the laborer's dependency on them and subjected him to numerous injustices. These injustices have progressively diminished his wages, until, in the plight of millions, deceit and force have stripped him of everything, erased his name from human records, and, by placing a yoke upon his neck, relegated him to labor among beasts as a slave. Reducing a servant to this state entails profoundly monstrous abuses—attacks that strike at the very essence of humanity, piercing the heart itself. How, then, can Professor Stuart justify

using the term 'servants,' which encompasses a broad spectrum of meanings even within the realm of manual labor, to exclusively denote 'slaves,' particularly when discussing diverse groups? Such a stance could not have been derived from principles of humanity, philosophy, or hermeneutics. Is it then acquired through an affinity with oppressors?

Indeed, the term 'as many' suggests the introduction of a specific class now under discussion. It implies that believing masters would not neglect their duty towards, nor fail to encourage the reciprocal, voluntary service of those who had once been subjugated. The text then shifts focus to another group, signified by a term that naturally introduces a new and distinct subject.

The first group is described as 'under the yoke'—a yoke they were advised by the apostle to escape if possible. If escape was not feasible, they were to respect their master—acknowledging his authority, fulfilling his demands, and advancing his interests insofar as they could without compromising their Christian integrity. This was to avoid blasphemy and prevent non-Christian masters from vilifying the name of God and the gospel. They were cautioned against provoking the ire of their masters, over whom, as defenseless victims, they might have no control.

Not all servants addressed by the apostle were 'under the yoke,' a term typically associated with beasts of burden and slaves. He distinguishes these from another category of servants who had 'believing masters.' Possessing a 'believing master' was tantamount to being freed from 'the yoke.' These servants were urged not to despise their masters—a needless injunction if their masters were slaveholders who viewed them as property and treated them as mere tools or 'articles of merchandise.' Such a

stance was incompatible with faith, which 'breaks every yoke' and unites masters and servants in brotherhood. As brethren, they were placed on equal footing, where, within their respective roles, they could freely and beneficially engage, contributing to their mutual well-being. Here, servants might be warned against overstepping their roles, adopting a haughty demeanor, looking down on their masters, and thereby shirking or neglecting their duties. On the contrary, they should exemplify enterprise, loyalty, diligence, and utility—particularly since their masters were 'worthy of their trust and affection,' their allies in righteous conduct.

Such, then, is the relationship between those whom Professor Stuart views as Christian masters and Christian slaves—the relationship of 'brethren.' This relationship, by excluding 'the yoke,' inherently grants freedom, positioning them side by side on the shared ground of mutual service. Despite this change, both continue, for convenience's sake, to use the familiar terms by which they were previously known, reflecting their roles of providing and receiving employment, respectively. This approach was the guidance Timothy was expected to offer as a Christian minister. But can such teachings be considered supportive of slavery?

Moreover, what basis, according to the Princeton professor, defines the relationship between these masters and servants? It is 'perfect religious equality.' In every aspect—duties, rights, goals, interests, and future prospects within the Christian domain—servants are as liberated as their masters. The range of their abilities, the freedom of their actions, the support they receive, and the achievements they can aspire to are identical. In this context, the servant-master dynamic imposes no limitations, creates no complications, and results in no harm. This implication of 'perfect religious equality,' as granted by the Princeton professor to servants in relation to their masters, is significant. Could the

master, then, in his efforts to realize the full potential of his creation and redemption, freely explore his own capabilities, connections, and opportunities? So could his servants. Was he free to 'study to show himself approved unto God,' to conform to His will and submit to His authority as the ultimate guide for love and action? So were they. Was he free to observe the Sabbath and attend religious gatherings? So were they. Was he free to honor family, marital, and parental relationships, deriving from them a source of motivation and joy? So were they. In all areas of interest and effort, they could employ their talents, exercise their influence, seize their chances, and utilize their assets as freely as he could, in glorifying God, benefiting humanity, and securing eternal rewards for themselves. Granting perfect religious equality to the American slave would satisfy even the most ardent abolitionist. Such equality would, like the breath of the Almighty, dissolve the final link of servitude. Would those who have promoted the Pittsburgh pamphlet to support slavery dare to test this theory?

The epistle to the Colossians offers a pertinent passage for consideration: 'Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God. And whatever you do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that from the Lord you will receive the reward of the inheritance; for you serve the Lord Christ. But he who does wrong will receive for the wrong which he has done, and there is no partiality. Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that you also have a Master in heaven.'

It's natural to observe:

In maintaining their mutual relationship, both masters and servants were to act in accordance with divine governance principles. Servants were to perform their duties in sincere obedience to the Lord, under whose authority and reward they operated. Similarly, masters were held accountable to the same Lord and law, with both parties equally free and obligated to study and apply the governing standards.

The foundation of the governance they were subjected to was righteousness—strict, stern, and impartial. Factors such as birth, wealth, or social status were inconsequential. Both master and servant were hastening towards a judgment where partiality would neither be feared nor hoped for. There, any wrongdoer, irrespective of social rank, would face consequences aligned with their actions.

Under this divine governance, servants were expected to obey universally and wholeheartedly, faithfully fulfilling their duties regardless of the master's presence. Conversely, the master was to adhere to JUSTICE AND EQUALITY in dealings with servants. Such directives starkly contrast the institution of slavery, which is inherently at odds with God's governance, embodies egregious partiality, undermines justice and equality, and is essentially a system of wrongdoing.

"Servants, be obedient to those who are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. With goodwill doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatever good anyone does, he will receive the same from the Lord, whether he is bond or free. And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your

Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with Him."

Without reiterating previously made expositions of similar passages, it may suffice to say:

The relationship of the servants to their master was meant to foster heartfelt attachment, necessitating an affectionate service from them.

This relationship demanded perfect reciprocity of benefits, rooted in mutual goodwill and properly expressed. Thus, "THE SAME THINGS," in principle and substance, were expected to be reciprocated, embodying mutual service without implying the chattel principle.

Servants were expected not to be negligent or deceitful, while masters were explicitly instructed to "FORBEAR THREATENING." The very nature of slavery, reliant on threats to instill fear, contradicts this directive. Remove threats, and the chattel principle collapses.

This relationship was to mirror the principles of divine governance, where partiality is impermissible, directly countering the chattel principle inherent in American slavery. The New Testament's precepts, once fully adhered to, would satisfy any abolitionist by undermining the very foundation of slavery.

According to Professor Stuart, the New Testament acknowledges the slavery relationship without contravening Christian faith or ecclesiastical principles. However, this interpretation overlooks the New Testament's emphasis on "justice and equality" as the relationship's cornerstone, fundamentally opposed to the chattel principle. Paul's teachings

elevate the servant to a status equal to the master, safeguarded by justice, yet Professor Stuart perceives only the owner-slave dynamic, a perspective that distorts his interpretation even within the realm of divine justice.

"It is remarkable," asserts the Princeton professor, "that there is not even an exhortation in the apostolic writings to masters to emancipate their slaves, much less is it presented as an imperative and immediate duty." Indeed, it would be quite astonishing if the apostles were guilty of such a significant omission. And yet, it's not something the Princeton professor can confidently claim. He acknowledges that kindness, mercy, and justice were mandated with a clear reference to divine governance. Without favoritism, they were to emulate God in dispensing justice, embodying the roles of kind and merciful "brethren." Where would such directives lead them? Could they fall short of restoring to every individual their natural, inalienable rights? Of taking steps to redress injustices, alleviate suffering, elevate character, and improve the lot of the downtrodden and oppressed, especially if by their own actions? Would it be kind, merciful, or just to maintain the bonds of slavery on their innocent, unresisting brethren? Would this uphold the Golden Rule or obey the second greatest commandment from "their Master in Heaven"?

Could the apostles have championed the cause of liberty more effectively than by advocating the principles, sentiments, and behaviors that form the essence of freedom, its very root and productive seed?

The Princeton professor himself, in the very document that the South has embraced and extolled as a biblical justification of "the peculiar institution," contends that "the GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE GOSPEL have eradicated slavery across much of

Christendom"—"that CHRISTIANITY HAS ELIMINATED BOTH POLITICAL AND DOMESTIC BONDAGE WHEREVER IT HAS PREVAILED, that it mandates fair compensation for labor, champions the mental and intellectual advancement of ALL classes of people, denounces ALL violations of marital or parental rights, and demands not just that free scope be given to human betterment but that ALL appropriate MEANS be utilized towards that end." It is indeed "remarkable" that while Christ and His apostles never explicitly called for the liberation of slaves, they established such "general principles" that have led to the dismantling of domestic slavery throughout much of Christendom; that while Christianity does not "urge" emancipation as a compulsory and immediate duty, it erects an insurmountable barrier around every family unit, safeguards the rights of husbands and fathers, ensures fair wages for every worker, and prioritizes the moral and intellectual development of all societal segments, promoting broad freedoms and employing all feasible methods toward these ends. This is not merely "remarkable," but paradoxical. Affirming and denying, warming and cooling, all in the same argument! And yet, these assertions stand out in what is considered a shrewd, inventive, and persuasive defense of slavery!"

In his letter to the Corinthian church, the Apostle Paul provides another lesson of instruction, expressing his views and feelings on the subject of slavery. "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Were you called while a servant? Do not worry about it; but if you can gain your freedom, make use of it rather. For the one who is called in the Lord while a servant is the Lord's freeman; likewise, the one who is called while free is Christ's servant. You were bought with a price; do not become the servants of men."

In explaining and applying this passage, it is proper to suggest:

That it could not have been the apostle's objective to bind Corinthian converts to the stations and employments in which the gospel found them. For he exhorts some of them to escape, if possible, from their present condition. In a servile state, "under the yoke," they ought not to remain unless compelled by stern necessity. "If you can gain your freedom, use it rather." If they should prefer freedom to bondage and exert themselves to escape the latter for the sake of the former, how could their masters, in keeping with the gospel's claims and spirit, hinder or discourage them? Could a person be considered a "brother" if he kept "the yoke" upon their neck, which the apostle suggests shaking off if possible? And if such masters had been members of the Corinthian church, what inferences must they have drawn from this exhortation to their servants? Would the apostle have regarded slavery as a Christian institution or looked complacently on efforts to introduce or maintain it in the church? Would they not have expected a stern rebuke if they refused to aid in the cause of freedom?

While they were to use their freedom, if obtainable, they should not give themselves up to ceaseless anxiety, even on such a subject. "The Lord is no respecter of persons." They need not fear that their "low estate," to which they had been wickedly reduced, would prevent them from enjoying God's gifts or His favor. He would respect their rights, soothe their sorrows, and pour into their hearts the spirit of liberty. "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman." Thus, they should confidently trust in Him.

The apostle, however, forbids them to acquiesce in the servile relation so as to act inconsistently with their Christian obligations. They belonged to their Savior, purchased by His blood. Their great objective, therefore, should be to render Him a hearty and effective service. They should allow no one, regardless of who

they might be, to interfere with their relationship with their Redeemer. "You were bought with a price; do not become the servants of men."

With his focus on the passage just quoted and explained, the Princeton professor asserts that Paul represents this relation—the relation of slavery—as of comparatively little account. And he applies this—otherwise it would be irrelevant—to American slavery. Does he then regard it as a trivial matter to be subjected under the slave laws of this republic, which grimly and fiercely exclude the victim from almost every means of improvement, field of usefulness, and source of comfort, making him, along with his wife and children, "the servant of men"? Could such a relation be acquiesced in, consistent with the apostle's instructions?

To the Princeton professor, we recommend a practical examination of the implications of the passage in question on American slavery. His concern for the unity and prosperity of the ecclesiastical organizations, which in various forms and under different names, unite the southern with the northern churches, will make the experiment resonate with his sentiments. Let him, then, proceed to Georgia as soon as his convenience allows. No religious teacher from any free state is likely to receive as general and as warm a welcome there. To mitigate the tension caused by the doctrines and movements of the abolitionists in the southern mindset, let him, with all possible speed, gather masters and their slaves. Now, Rev. Mr. Savage, of Utica, New York, had not long ago a frank conversation with a gentleman of high standing in the literary and religious world from a slaveholding state, where the "peculiar institution" is upheld with great fervor and maintained with iron rigor. Mr. Savage was assured that the Princeton professor had, through the Pittsburgh pamphlet, contributed most effectively to convincing the "whole South" that slaveholding is

inherently right—a system to which the Bible gives countenance and support.

In an extract from an article in the Southern Christian Sentinel, a new Presbyterian paper established in Charleston, South Carolina, and inserted in the Christian Journal for March 21, 1839, we find the following paragraphs from the pen of Rev. C. W. Howard, and, according to Mr. Chester, ably and freely endorsed by the editor. "There is scarcely any diversity of sentiment at the North upon this subject. The great mass of the people, believing slavery to be sinful, are clearly of the opinion that, as a system, it should be abolished throughout this land and throughout the world. They differ as to the time and mode of abolition. The abolitionists consistently argue that whatever is sinful should be instantly abandoned. The others, by a strange sort of reasoning for Christian men, contend that though slavery is sinful, yet it may be allowed to exist until it shall be expedient to abolish it; or, if in many cases, this reasoning might be translated into plain English, the sense would be, both in Church and State, slavery, though sinful, may be allowed to exist until our interest will suffer us to say that it must be abolished. This is not slander; it is simply a plain way of stating a plain truth. It does seem the evident duty of every man to become an abolitionist, who believes slavery to be sinful, for the Bible allows no tampering with sin.

"To these remarks, there are some notable exceptions to be found in both parties in the church. The South owes a debt of gratitude to the Biblical Repertory, for the guarded argument in defense of the position that slavery is not forbidden by the Bible. The writer of that article is said, without contradiction, to be Professor Hodge of Princeton—HIS NAME OUGHT TO BE KNOWN AND RESPECTED AMONG YOU, my brethren, for in a land of anti-slavery men, he is the ONLY ONE, as far as I know, who has

dared to vindicate your character from the serious charge of living in the habitual transgression of God's holy law."

Let all men, whom it may concern, recognize and acknowledge that slavery is deemed a Christian institution. With his Bible in hand and focused on the relevant passages, he dedicates himself to educating the slaves around him. "Let not your hearts be overwhelmed with sorrow or consumed by anxiety. Your condition of servitude does not exclude you from the paternal care of Him 'who is no respecter of persons.' Freedom is indeed preferable. If you can break free from 'the yoke,' then cast it off. Meanwhile, rejoice in the knowledge that 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty;' that the gospel places slaves and masters on a perfect religious equality, so that every Christian is 'the Lord's freeman.' And for your encouragement, remember that Christianity has eliminated both political and domestic servitude wherever it has been freely practiced. It mandates fair compensation for labor; it advocates for the moral and intellectual advancement of all people; it denounces any violations of marital or parental rights. In essence, it requires not just that human improvement be unimpeded but also that all appropriate measures be taken to achieve this goal." Let your lives honor your relationship with your Savior. He purchased you with His own blood and deserves your deepest affection and most diligent service. "Do not become servants of men." Let no earthly system hinder you, as citizens of the kingdom of heaven, from maximizing your abilities and opportunities. Would such a concerted and sincere effort calm the unrest in the South and extinguish the escalating discord throughout the republic, thereby strengthening the Union?

"It is universally recognized," states the Princeton professor, "that at the time of Jesus Christ's arrival, slavery in its most severe forms was widespread across the globe. The Savior encountered it in Judea." To claim He found it in Judea introduces

ambiguity. Many practices were present "in Judea" that were not typical of or endorsed by the Jews. It is contested that while Gentiles living among them might have owned slaves, this practice was not characteristic of the Jewish people. How could the professor assume as fact something whose verification is crucial to the argument and necessary for the validity of his conclusions? Why use an ambiguous statement to lead his trusting readers to a stance they could not defend under scrutiny?

We do not fault the Savior for any lack of wisdom, goodness, or bravery for not "tearing down the wall of separation between Jews and Gentiles" before the appointed time. While this division existed, He could not, in line with the redemption plan, freely teach the Gentiles. He might have done so under exceptional circumstances, but His primary focus was on "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The question of the appropriateness of this strategy is not the point of contention between the Princeton professor and us.

When examining whether the Jews owned slaves during the time of our Savior's earthly life, the following considerations are of utmost importance:

Slaveholding is inconsistent with the Mosaic economy. For evidence of this, we refer our readers to the previously mentioned tract among other arguments of varying relevance and strength. In all external relations and visible arrangements of life, the Jews, during our Savior's ministry among them, appeared to scrupulously observe the institutions and practices of the "Old Dispensation." They distanced themselves from anything associated with Samaritans and Gentiles. From idolatry and slaveholding—twin vices prevalent among heathens—they seem to have been effectively separated as a result of a painful discipline.

Therefore, while John the Baptist, with notable fidelity and power, acted as a reprover among the Jews, he found no reason to echo and apply the condemnations of idolatry and slaveholding used by his predecessors. Could he, the greatest of the prophets, have been less affected by "the yoke" than Isaiah was, or less bold and definitive in condemning the sin of oppression in its most detestable and harmful forms?

The Savior did not hesitate to directly apply His principles to forms of oppression observed among the Jews. These principles, wherever freely enacted, have led to the abolition of domestic bondage, as even the Princeton professor acknowledges. Had slavery been prevalent within our Savior's ministerial realm, it would contradict His character not to denounce it. The oppression by haughty ecclesiastics, selfish children of their parents, and spiritual advisors of widows elicited from Him severe reprimands and stern condemnations. How would He have responded to tyranny that turned wives into widows by selling their husbands in markets, and their children into commodities rather than orphans?

Domestic slavery was clearly incompatible with the prevalent manual labor among the Jews. In Acts of the Apostles, we learn that Paul, arriving in Corinth from Athens, met Aquila and his wife Priscilla, tent-makers by trade. This anecdote leads commentators to discuss Jewish public sentiment and practices regarding manual labor. According to various sources, Jews valued teaching their children a trade, even those with learning or wealth. It was customary for Jewish teachers to combine labor with law study, a practice supported by high Rabbinical authority. Thus, even Paul, educated under Gamaliel, practiced tent-making. This culture of labor, evident even in wealthy families like Zebedee's, makes the existence of slavery amongst a people engaged in manual work implausible. Adopting Jewish maxims

and habits in the South would see the end of the "peculiar institution."

New Testament allusions to the lowest classes and most servile jobs among the Jews further hint at the incompatibility of slavery with Jewish life. Society's outcasts were compared not with slaves but with Samaritans and publicans. The parable of the prodigal son describes a wealthy Jewish family with numerous servants, yet these were hired servants, illustrating the lowest known menial positions in Jewish society were not slaves but hired labor.

Considering these points—Mosaic economy's inconsistency with slavery, John the Baptist's silence on "the yoke," the Savior's opposition to oppression without directly witnessing chattel slavery, the Jewish culture of manual labor, and the description of the lowest societal roles as hired servants—it becomes clear that slavery was incompatible with every aspect of Jewish society during the era. The stance taken by the Princeton professor in the face of the abolitionist struggle against southern slaveholders is notably remarkable. He intervenes in the heated debate, suggesting slaveholding is not against God's law, despite the Savior's non-condemnation of slavery in its worst forms, and the sacred writers' silence on the matter. By offering a definition of slavery he views as compatible with righteousness, he challenges the abolitionist stance that American slavery is inherently sinful and must be immediately abolished, earning gratitude from the slaveholding South for his efforts.

A few questions, succinctly posed, may not be out of place here:

Was the form of slavery that our professor declares innocent the same form observed by our Savior in Judea? He would certainly not concede this. According to him, the slavery in

Judea was of the "worst" kind. How, then, does he rationalize the alleged silence of the Savior—a silence that encompasses both the essence and the form of the institution and its "worst" abuses?

Is the form of slaveholding, which the Princeton professor suggests Christianity justifies, identical to the form that abolitionists are so determined to abolish? Let's compare:

<p>Christianity, as interpreted by Professor Hodge, supposedly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Enjoins fair compensation for labor.● Insists on the moral and intellectual improvement of all classes of men.● Condemns all violations of marital or parental rights.● Requires that freedom for human improvement be allowed.● Mandates the use of all suitable means to advance mankind.● Has abolished domestic bondage wherever it has been freely practiced.	<p>Contrastingly, the American system of slavery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Renders compensation impossible by treating the laborer as property.● Explicitly prohibits its victims from learning to read, even preventing them from understanding the names of their Creator and Redeemer.● Illegally denies the existence of conjugal and parental relationships.● Bars any attempts by countless individuals to better their character, condition, and future.● Imposes severe penalties for educating the most disadvantaged.● Perpetuates domestic bondage wherever it is unchallenged.
---	--

Now, it is the form of slavery practiced within the American system that abolitionists oppose. They are unaware of any form of slavery that aligns with Professor Hodge's depiction of Christian requisites. It has never come to their attention, and, naturally, has never stirred their emotions or prompted their actions. What, then, should they make of the criticisms and rebukes that the Princeton professor distributes? Let those with the time and inclination defend the straw man he fervently attacks. The abolitionists are preoccupied with a different matter. They confront a system of oppression that is corrupt in theory and destructive in practice to both Church and State; it is against this that they are resolved to fight until, by the righteous judgment of Almighty God, it is cast into the bottomless pit.

How can the South feel defended by any protection that may be extended over such SLAVERY as might be deemed compatible with what the Princeton professor describes as the requisites of Christianity? Is this THE form of slavery defined by their laws and upheld by their actions? "Fair compensation for labor," "marital and parental rights," "free scope," and "all suitable means" for the "moral and intellectual improvement of all classes of men;" are these goals reflected in the slaveholding statutes of the South? It is widely recognized that such requisites are fundamentally at odds with the principles of American slavery, directly undermining its foundation. What benefit, then, has the Princeton professor, with all his creativity and zeal, offered to the "peculiar institution"? Their appreciation must indeed be uniquely defined if they can thank him for placing their "domestic system" beneath the weight of Christian demands that would inevitably crush it utterly.

Moreover, what is the impact of the Christian requisites that Professor Hodge cites on his own definition of slavery? "All the concepts that necessarily form the definition of slavery include

deprivation of personal liberty, the obligation of service at the discretion of another, and the transferable nature of the authority and claim of service of the master."

According to Professor Hodge's account of the requisites of Christianity:

- The laborer is motivated by fair compensation.
- Freedom must be provided for his moral and intellectual improvement.

However, according to Professor Hodge's definition of slavery:

- The laborer is compelled to serve at the discretion of another.
- He is deprived of personal liberty—the very essence of improvement—leaving him without control over his intellect or morals.
- His rights as a husband and father are supposedly to be protected.
- Yet, the master's authority and claims can separate him from his family, potentially placing an ocean between them, and denying them each other's presence indefinitely.

Christianity, then, requires the abolition of the type of slavery that Professor Hodge so cunningly defines. It was fortunate for the peace between the respective parties that he positioned his definition far from the requisitions of Christianity. Had he brought them closer, their natural and invincible antipathy would have erupted into open and exterminating warfare. But why should we linger on an argument grounded in gross and monstrous sophistry? It can only mislead those who wish to be misled. The lovers of sunlight are unlikely to venture into the professor's dungeon. Those with something to hide, seeking

darkness, will find it there to their heart's content. The time will soon come when upright and reflective minds in the South will be astonished at the blindness that could embrace such protection as the Princeton argument offers to the slaveholder.

But Professor Stuart must not be overlooked. In his celebrated letter to Dr. Fisk, he states that "Paul did not expect slavery to be ousted in a day." Did not expect! So what! Are the requisitions of Christianity adapted to the expectations that might have arisen in any quarter and on any ground of human consciousness? And are we to interpret the gospel's precepts by Paul's expectations? The Savior commanded all men everywhere to repent, even though "Paul did not expect" human wickedness, in its ten thousand forms, to be ousted in any community "in a day." Expectations are one thing; requisitions are quite another.

Meanwhile, as expectation lingered, Paul gave precepts to Christians regarding their demeanor. Indeed, he did. What character were these precepts? They must have been in harmony with the Golden Rule. According to Professor Stuart, this "decides against the righteousness of slavery" even as a "theory." Thus, Christians were required, without respect of persons, to do justice to each other—to maintain equality as common ground for all to stand on—to cherish and express in all their interactions the tender love and disinterested charity that one brother naturally feels for another. These "ad interim precepts," if obeyed, will undoubtedly eradicate slavery, "root and branch," at once and forever.

Professor Stuart reassures us that "Christianity will ultimately certainly destroy slavery." Of this, we have not the slightest doubt. But how can he harbor a conviction and make a prediction so contradictory to the doctrine he maintains, that "slavery may exist without violating the Christian faith or the church?" What then? Is Christianity intent on destroying an ancient

and cherished institution that neither harms her character nor condition? Why not correct its abuses, purify its spirit, and, by imbuing it with her own beauty, preserve it as a living trophy of her reformatory power? How did it come to be discovered that, in her onward progress, she would trample down and destroy what was in no way harmful to her? This approach is aggressively assertive. Far be it from the Judge of all the earth to overwhelm the innocent and guilty in the same ruin! In support of Professor Stuart, in the crude and scarcely covert attack he makes upon himself, we argue that Christianity will certainly destroy slavery because of its inherent wickedness, its malignant temper, its deadly effects, and its unyielding and insolent opposition to the authority of God and the welfare of man.

"Christianity will ultimately destroy slavery." Ultimately! What does this ominous word signify? To what distant limit of time, shrouded in the future's darkness, does it refer? Tell us, O watchman on the hill of Andover. Nearly nineteen centuries have passed in this world of wrong and outrage—yet we quiver in the presence of a form of slavery whose breath is poison, whose bite is death. If even one incident of slavery were to afflict the prophet, who wrote "ultimately" with such detachment, for just a single day, how quickly would he cry out in his first hour of torment, "How long, O Lord, HOW LONG!" The agony of seeing a wife or daughter on the auction block, with every bid striking his heart like a groan of despair, would offer little solace in the tepid prediction from some indifferent prophet comfortably settled in Zion, that "ULTIMATELY Christianity will destroy slavery." As the hammer falls, and his beloved, helpless and miserable, is taken away to places of legalized corruption, his heart turns to stone, and his plea fades, "HOW LONG, O Lord, HOW LONG!"

"Ultimately!" In what context does Professor Stuart convince himself that Christianity will end slavery? As American

citizens, under what era's scepter do we live, that we have relinquished the rights of freemen? Do we not have the authority to speak and act, wielding the powers bestowed by the principle of self-governance, without seeking permission from any priest or politician, north or south? Can we fully utilize the freedom guaranteed by divine ordinances and our country's Constitution? Is Christianity not already on the highest ground possible in this nation, founded on the equality of mankind, where each Christian, intimately linked to the state, exercises supreme political rights and enjoys profound privileges? In a republic where the collective voice of half the church members could demand and achieve the abolition of slavery, what is Christianity waiting for to decisively crush the chattel principle underfoot? Her victory over slavery is only delayed by the widespread corruption and defection within her "sacramental host." Let her voice be heard, her power wielded, and the "ultimately" of the dark spirit of slavery will swiftly be replaced by the "immediately" of the Avenger of the Poor.