

TERMS.

The Recorder is published every Saturday, and is sent to subscribers at Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

of the slave freely to enjoy the blessings of moral and intellectual cultivation, and the privileges of domestic society, are manifestly conflicting rights.

I may go farther, and observe, that by the will of the Creator certain subordinate and temporary relations are established among human beings.

ber of the society, for all the wrong which the society binds itself to uphold and render perpetual.

that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him; and the result of this searching invariably is, that, at least in the judgment of the neighbor's party, the first becomes last and the last first.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN REFLECTOR. TO THE REV. RICHARD FULLER D. D. LETTER II.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—In my last letter I took notice of some incidental topics alluded to in your letter on domestic slavery.

In your letter it is stated that 'the thing affirmed and denied is, that slavery is a moral evil,'

It may perhaps be proper to state that I have never expressed my views of slavery in the form to which you have alluded.

You remark, it is affirmed that 'slavery is a moral evil.'

You define slavery to be 'an obligation to labor for the benefit of the master, without the contract or consent of the slave.'

I do not really see how these two rights can be separated. Either the right of the master to oblige the slave to labor without his consent,

Or to state the matter in another form. The right of the master over the slave, and the right

It has seemed to me that much of the misunderstanding which has existed on this subject has arisen from the want of attention to this obvious distinction.

Let us endeavor calmly to consider both of these meanings of the phrase 'moral evil.'

In the first sense, when it is affirmed that slavery is not a moral evil, we assert, that to hold a man in slavery as it has been above explained is right, that it violates no law of God, and is at variance with no moral relation existing between man and man.

I suppose that 'God, of one blood, made all men that dwell upon the earth,—that we are all partakers of the same nature, as we are all the children of one common parent.'

I believe that every human being is endowed with an immortal soul, and that he is placed in the present state of probation, a candidate for everlasting happiness or everlasting woe.

But more than this. Every human being is a fallen creature. He is a sinner against God, and is exposed, for his transgressions, to the condemnation of everlasting death.

The hills were formed, the fountains opened, Or the sea with all its roaring multitude of waves;

To present this subject in a simple light. Let us suppose that your family and mine were neighbors. We, our wives and children, are human beings in the sense that I have described, and, in consequence of that common Creator, are subject to the law, 'thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'

Again, suppose my neighbor offers me money, and I, for the sake of this money, transfer some of these children to him, to oblige them 'to labor for his benefit, without their contract or consent.'

I will offer but one more supposition. Suppose that any number, for instance one half of the families in our neighborhood, should agree to treat the other half in the manner that I have described.

A law in this case is merely a determination of one party, in which all unite, to hold the other party in bondage; and a compact by which the whole party bind themselves to assist every individual of themselves to subdue all resistance from the other party, and guaranteeing to each other that exercise of this power over the weaker party which they now possess.

Now I cannot see that this in any respect changes the nature of the parties. They remain, as before, human beings, possessing the same intellectual and moral nature, holding the same relations to each other and to God, and still under the same unchangeable law, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'

There is, however, one point of difference, which arises from the fact that this wrong has been established by law. It becomes a social wrong.—The individual, or those who preceded him, may have surrendered their individual right over it to the society.

I have thus endeavored as clearly as possible to illustrate my views upon the question, is slavery a moral evil?

It may perhaps be proper for me here to state, once for all, that in these remarks and those that may follow, I speak as the organ of no party and of no sect. I belong to none. I am not and I never have been connected with any abolition society, and I believe that I have read as much on one side of the question as on the other.

I am, my dear brother, yours with every sentiment of regard,

THE AUTHOR OF THE MORAL SCIENCE.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN REFLECTOR. TO THE REV. FRANCIS WAYLAND, JR. D. D. LETTER II.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—The issue now before us regards the essential moral character of slavery, and on such a question I am strongly disposed to pass by all ethical and metaphysical dissertations, and appeal at once to the only standard of right and wrong which can prove decisive.

It is, then, the clear responses of the sacred oracles to which we must after all appeal. But as we may rest assured that no science, truly so called, will be found opposed to revelation; and as I abhor and abjure the blasphemy which would charge the Bible with countenancing sin; I shall suspend what still appears to me (with deference) to be the unequivocal argument from the Scriptures, until I examine the logic usually employed on this subject—my principal object being to vindicate the inspired volume from having, at any time or place, permitted and regulated a crime of the darkest malignity.

Now, in order to clear away rubbish, and arrive at once at the point, let me remind you that it is simply the essential character of slavery which we are discussing; and that slavery is a term whose meaning can be clearly and easily defined. Slavery is bondage. It is (to give Paley's idea in other language) the condition of one to whose service another has a right, without the consent or contract of the servant.

The proposition adduced by you is only a modification of another which has so often been urged; viz: that man cannot be made a subject of property; as to which who but sees that the whole perplexity arises from a confusion of terms?

The affirmants mean, that it is wrong to treat human beings as brutes and inanimate chattels; which is self-evident. Those who support the negative intend only, that one man may have a just right to the services of another, and that this right may be transferable; which is also self-evident.