

*own profit and behoof.* True, he may have possessed himself of servants without first asking the consent of the servants; and he may have often done this for his own benefit. But the moral law did not permit him to do this for his own benefit, but exclusively for the benefit of the parties whom he may have taken into his service. In this respect the Abrahamic or patriarchal system of servitude was very unlike the involuntary servitude in the southern part of the United States of America, where the negro has been brought by the hand of violence, and sold in a slave market without his consent with no view to the *benefit* of the slave himself, the aggrandizement of the master being the only consideration which deprived the negro of the wild freedom of Africa, and reduced him to the condition of an absolute slave—a chattel personal—in Georgia. The servants of Abraham were but his subjects, and were only slaves so far as a despotic government can render those who acknowledge allegiance to that government, slaves. The then condition of things demanded that the government should be despotic. It was necessary for the good of the whole that all the prerogatives of government should be vested in one man—that the administration of government should be controlled by one hand, directed by giant strength, a strong will and a powerful mind.

Another very observable difference between the patriarchal system of servitude and the involuntary servitude of the South, is that the members of the tribe of Abraham enjoyed *personal*, if not political, liberty. Under the regime of the former, the subject had a power over himself—over his own actions and destiny. The relation which he held to his master, or rather his sovereign, was that of a hired, rather than a *bond*, servant. The marital obligations were respected, and every domestic relation was duly regarded. In no case when a servant was bought or sold, was he separated from his wife or child, or when so separated, always in violation of the moral law which was intended to regulate slavery as well as every other relation or system, either political, commercial, social or domestic. In no case were slaves regarded as chattels personal—in no case were they raised for the public market, and whenever purchased they became members of the master's household, and were governed by the master as the sovereign rather than as their owner. The moral law justified this because the weakness of the servant and the strength of the master made it necessary and expedient for the good of all, that the servant should be under the guardianship, governance and *protection*—mark the word—*protection* of the master. The servant knew no other law—than the will of the master, and the master knew no superior, and was under no obligations save to govern his own people well—to

properly administer the affairs of his own little tribe or nation.

In the Southern States of America, the reverse of all this is true. In the first place, the marital relations are not properly regarded, and as a general thing the matter of the propagation of the race of negroes in accordance with the moral law, is with the master a secondary consideration. He desires that his family of servants should be increased, and is not much troubled as to whether the increase be in strict accordance with the moral law or not. The profit arising from the increase is the same, and he is satisfied. It is notoriously true, and painful to contemplate, that of all the most degraded nations on the face of God's earth, there is not to be found a people who of themselves are so utterly regardless of the marital obligations as the negroes of the South. The same cannot be said of the wild savage of America, the Hottentot of Africa, the wild man of Australia, or the rover of Arabia or Tartary. The Southern master is under the most sacred obligations, under the moral law, to diligently cultivate the morals of his servant; yet it is notoriously true that he looks to their morals only so far as his own interest may demand it. The slaves of the South, it must be confessed, are not habitual drunkards, but the reason for this is apparent. As drunkards they are not and cannot be profitable servants. But if intoxicating beverages were more easily and cheaply obtained, and drunkenness did not diminish the value of the labor of the slave, however much it might have the effect to demoralize him, the sobriety of the slave would be to the master a matter of minor moment. To the credit of Southern masters be it said, however, that there are many noble exceptions to this rule—but unfortunately these are only exceptions.

The slave of the Southern master enjoys no liberty, either personal or political. He is in many, if not all respects, a mere chattel—if not legally so. However much in violation of both the letter and spirit of the moral law, he is by custom and common usage, little if at all elevated above the condition of a beast. Like beasts of burden, he is raised for the exclusive use and behoof of the master—to be torn away, if the necessities or interest of the master require it, from every thing he holds dear in this life—from the home of his childhood—from father, mother, wife children, friends and acquaintances—from his native hills—from the purling brooks and rippling streams where in his early boyhood he was wont to bathe in wild, unrestrained playfulness, and carried to the slave market without a single fault to justify it, and be mercilessly sold to strangers.

With all these, and many other and equally striking differences between the Abrahamic or patriarchal system of servitude and the condition of slavery in the South, how can