

THE FREE NEGRO IN SLAVERY DAYS

BY BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

THE THIRD ARTICLE IN THE STORY OF THE NEGRO

SOME time in the fall of 1828, Benjamin Lundy, the Quaker abolitionist, met by accident, in a Boston boarding-house, a young man by the name of William Lloyd Garrison, who was then publishing a total abstinence newspaper, the *National Philanthropist*. The next year, after returning from a visit to a colony of emancipated slaves which he had succeeded in settling in the island of Hayti, Lundy announced in his paper that William Lloyd Garrison had joined him at Baltimore, Maryland, and would henceforth be associated with him in the publication, at that city, of the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, the first abolition newspaper in the United States.

This meeting of Benjamin Lundy and William Lloyd Garrison and their subsequent association in Baltimore mark the point in time when the agitation for the emancipation of the Negro was transferred from the Southern to the Northern States, and slavery became, for the first time, a National issue. After the Southampton uprising, in 1831, the abolition societies which up to that time had existed in different parts of the South almost wholly disappeared. With the exception of a few individuals like Cassius M. Clay, who as late as 1845 published an anti-slavery weekly, the *True American*, at Lexington, Kentucky, there was no public opposition to slavery in any of the Southern States.

Opposition to slavery, though silenced in the South, never wholly ceased there, and the evidence of its existence was the free Negro. In spite of the efforts that were made to limit and check emancipation of the slaves, the number of free Negroes continued to increase in the Southern as well as the Northern States, and the existence of this class of persons was the silent protest of the Southern slaveholder against the system which he publicly defended and upheld.

Under the conditions of slavery, the position of the free Negro was a very uncomfortable one. He was in a certain sense an anomaly, since he did not belong

to either class. He was distrusted by the white people and looked down upon by the slaves. In spite of this fact, individual slaveholders—sometimes by providing in their wills for the emancipation and transportation of their slaves to a free State or to Liberia, sometimes by permitting individual slaves to buy their own freedom—were constantly adding to the number of "free persons of color." Among the most illustrious of those who freed their slaves were George Washington, John Randolph, and Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, author of the famous *Dred Scott* decision.

When a master liberated his slaves by will, it was frequently with the explanation, expressed or understood, that he believed slavery was morally wrong. When he allowed them to buy their own freedom, it was a practical recognition that the system was economically a mistake, since the slave who could purchase his own freedom was one whom it did not pay to hold as a slave. This fact was clearly recognized by a planter in Mississippi, who declared that he had found it paid to allow the slaves to buy their freedom. In order to encourage them to do this, he devised a method by which they might purchase their freedom in installments. After they had saved a certain amount of money by extra labor, he permitted them to buy one day's freedom a week. With this much capital invested in themselves they were then able to purchase, in a much shorter time, a second, a third, and a fourth day's freedom, until they were entirely free.

A somewhat similar method was sometimes adopted by certain ambitious freedmen for purchasing the freedom of their families. In such a case the father would purchase, for instance, a son or a daughter. The children would then join with their father in purchasing the other members of the family. It was in this way, I have been informed by Mr. Monroe Work, who is at present a teacher at Tuskegee, that his grandfather purchased

his wife and ten of his children, including Mr. Work's father. The grandfather, Henry Work, after securing his own freedom, went first to Cincinnati, and then to Decatur, Michigan, where he owned a farm, and on this farm he and his children earned the money to purchase one by one the other members of the family. How much it cost the family to free itself in this way Mr. Work says he was unable to learn. He knows, however, that his father sold at one time for \$1,400. When Henry Work died, there were still three of his children in slavery whom he had not been able to redeem. Ex-President Gibson, of the Negro State of Liberia, told me that his father purchased himself and most of the other members of the family in installments and transported them to Liberia. Two sons, who did not care to go back to Africa, were left in slavery in this country, but with the understanding that after a certain time they were to become free.

In this and other ways, in spite of the fact that there were at this time something like 30,000 fugitives in Canada and 20,000 colonists in Africa and elsewhere, the number of free Negroes in the United States increased from 59,466 in 1790 to 434,495 in 1860. This was about ten per cent of the whole Negro population at that time. Of these free Negroes considerably more than half—262,000—were in the Southern States. In the South, the three States of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina contained by far the largest number of the "free citizens of color," as they were sometimes called. At the census of 1860 the slave population of Maryland was something like 87,000 and the number of free Negroes was 83,942. From 1830 to 1860 the slave population of Maryland decreased nearly 16,000, while the population of free Negroes increased something over 31,000.

In estimating the number of slaves who were, in one way or another, given their freedom by their masters, some account should be taken of those who were, for one reason or another, re-enslaved. A free Negro might be sold into slavery to pay taxes or to pay fines, and in Maryland free Negroes might be sold into perpetual slavery for the crime of entering

the State. In 1829 the practice of selling any free Negro who could not account for himself, in order to pay the jail fines, had become such a scandal as to attract public attention.

There were other means by which a considerable number of free Negroes were re-enslaved. The practice of kidnapping, in spite of severe laws against it in all the Southern States, was carried on to a very great extent. In his book on the domestic slave trade, Professor Collins, of Claremont College, Hickory, North Carolina, estimates that the number of free Negroes kidnapped and sold into slavery "must have ranged from a few hundred to two or three thousand," and he adds, "it appears quite certain that as many were kidnapped as escaped from bondage, if not more."¹

A disposition to free slaves for personal considerations of one kind or another began at a very early period. In York and Henrico Counties, Virginia, as far back as the middle of the seventeenth century we find records of the emancipation of Negro slaves. For example, Thomas Whitehead, of York, emancipated his slave John, and bequeathed to him, among other things, two cows and the use of a house and as much ground as he could cultivate. He further showed his confidence in the discretion and the integrity of this Negro slave by appointing him guardian of Mary Rogers, a ward of Mr. Whitehead. He also made him trustee of her property, but the court refused to allow him to fill either one or the other of these positions.² Another instance recorded about this time was that of John Carter, of Lancaster, Virginia, who was one of the largest slaveholders in the colony. He gave freedom to two of his Negro slaves who were married to each other. To each he gave a cow and a calf and three barrels of Indian corn. He also instructed his heirs to allow them the use of convenient firewood, timber, and as much land as they could cultivate. He provided that the two daughters of this couple should receive their liberty when they reached their eighteenth year, and, as a provision for them when they reached

¹ "The Domestic Slave Trade of the Southern States," by Winfield H. Collins, M. A., p. 94.

² "Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century," by Philip A. Bruce, Vol. II, p. 123.

that age, he gave each a yearling with its increase, which was to be permitted to run with the cattle of his wife after his death.¹

In the interval between 1635 and 1700, although the Negro slaves were few in number, and most of the labor was performed by white servants, there were a number of persons of African blood in the colony of Virginia who raised themselves to positions of some importance. Several of them were able to write at a time when there were very few schools and education was a decided luxury. Several had obtained patents to land. For instance, in 1654, one hundred acres of land in Northampton County were granted to Richard Johnson, a Negro, and in the description of this tract reference was made to the contiguous estates of John Johnston and Anthony Johnson, both Negroes. There are in the records of Northampton County, also, evidences that a suit was begun by Anthony Johnson for the purpose of recovering his Negro servant.

During the early years of slavery the free Negroes seem to have had about the same rights under the law that other free persons had, except, as I have already stated, they were not allowed to hold persons of white blood as bond-servants. It appears that, until after the Revolution, Negro freemen were allowed to vote in every State except Georgia and South Carolina. Between 1792 and 1834 the four bordering States Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky denied the suffrage to the Negro. In North Carolina, Negroes who paid a public tax took part in the election until 1835, when a new Constitution excluded them from the suffrage. New Jersey took away the suffrage of the Negro in 1807, Connecticut in 1814, and Pennsylvania in 1838. New York, in 1821, required from Negroes an unusually high property qualification.²

These changes were all evidences of the steady growth in the United States, both North and South, of a caste system which excluded the Negro from the ordinary privileges of citizenship exclusively upon the ground of his color. In 1803 Ohio demanded a bond of five hundred dollars for Negroes who came into the

State. A Negro, even though a free man, could not at that time testify in a case in which a white man was a party, and Negroes were not admitted to the public schools. Similar provisions were made by Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa when they became States. Illinois prohibited the entrance of Negroes to the State at any time. In 1833 Judge Daggett, of Connecticut, twenty-four years before the Dred Scott decision, held that a free Negro was a person and not a citizen. That was in the trial of the case against Prudence Crandall, the young Quakeress who had established a school for Negroes in Canterbury, Connecticut, contrary to a law which provided that no school could be established for colored people who were not inhabitants of Connecticut.

The effect of the agitation for abolition seems to have been that the condition of the free Negroes grew steadily worse, particularly in the Southern States. In some of these States they were forbidden to sell drugs, in others they might not sell wheat and tobacco, and in still others to peddle market produce or own a boat was against the law. In several States it was against the law for a free Negro to cross the State line; in others, a slave who was emancipated was compelled immediately to leave the State.

Notwithstanding the hardships and difficulties under which the free Negro population labored both in the North and in the South, those who have had occasion to study the local history of the Southern States have found that the number of Negroes who had succeeded in making some impression upon their community, either by their native qualities or by their success in business, was more considerable than is usually imagined. Solomon Humphreys, for instance, after purchasing his freedom, became a well-known business man in Georgia. Benjamin Lundy found at San Antonio a Negro who, after purchasing his own freedom and that of his wife and family, had become the owner of several houses and lots.¹

The number of free Negroes in North Carolina was considerable because, in spite of the rigorous laws against the

¹ "Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century," Bruce, Vol. II, p. 124.

² Hart's "Slavery and Abolition," pp. 53, 83.

¹ Cf. Hart's "Slavery and Anti-Slavery," p. 90.

free colored people, conditions were more lenient than those of any other Southern State. The result was that many free Negroes crossed into North Carolina and settled, undisturbed, in the northern and southern counties. Speaking of this class of people, Professor John Spencer Bassett says:

They were well-diggers, shoemakers, blacksmiths, fiddlers, hucksters, peddlers, and so forth. Besides, they were easily called in to help the whites on occasions of need. There were a very few who accumulated money, and some of these became slave-owners. Although it was against the law for them to come into the State, their arrival was tolerated both because the law was recognized as severe and because their services were wanted in the community. Many of them had Indian blood in their veins, and when such was the case, they were a little distant toward the slaves. . . . I have been speaking of free Negroes who lived in the country districts. In towns they fared better and accumulated wealth.¹

Professor Bassett gives an account of several free Negroes of whom he had been able to obtain records, who were citizens of New Berne, Craven County, North Carolina. One of the men to whom he refers was John C. Stanley, the son of an African-born slave woman, who was liberated by the General Assembly under the petition of Mrs. Lydia Stewart, his mistress. Because he got his start in the barber business he was generally known as "Barber Jack." He became the owner of several plantations, on which he employed sixty-four slaves of whom he was the owner, and as many more bound free Negroes. He had three sons, John, Alexander, and Charles. John became an expert bookkeeper, and was employed in that capacity by a prominent firm. John C. Stanley amassed a fortune—or what was supposed to be a fortune in those days—of something like \$40,000. Speaking of some of the other successful Negroes of whom he was able to obtain the records, Professor Bassett says:

Many of the free Negroes were in circumstances of independent thrift, and from many parts of the State I have had evidence that some Negroes were slaveholders. In New Berne especially there were a number of such thrifty colored men. Notable among these was John Good. He was a son of his

¹ Johns Hopkins University Studies: "Slavery in the State of North Carolina," by John Spencer Bassett, p. 43.

master, and for a long time a slave. When the master died, his two surviving children, who were daughters, had but little property besides this boy, John, who was a barber. John took up the task of supporting them. He boarded them in good houses and otherwise provided for them well. His faithfulness won him many friends among the best citizens, and when both of his mistresses were married, these friends united to persuade the owners to liberate him as a reward for his services. . . . There were other thrifty and notable free Negroes in the same place, as, for example, John Y. Green, a carpenter and contractor; Richard Hazel, a blacksmith of means; Albert and Freeman Morris, described as "two nice young men," and thoroughly respected, tailors by trade; and Scipio, slave of Dr. Hughes, who was a blacksmith and owner of a livery stable. Another was Fellow Bragg, a tailor, who was thoroughly conscientious, and so good a workman that prominent people were known to move their custom to the shops at which he was employed in order that he might work on it. Most of these men moved to Cincinnati sooner or later. What became of them I do not know. The conditions here recorded for New Berne were not unusual for North Carolina towns in general. Everywhere there were usually a number of prosperous free Negroes. Most of them were mulattoes, not a few of them were set free by their fathers, and thus they fell easily into the life around them.¹

Among the descendants of the free colored people of New Berne, North Carolina, with whom I am personally acquainted is the Hon. John P. Green, who was for twelve years a justice of the peace in Cleveland, Ohio, four years a member of the Ohio House of Representatives, two years a member of the State Senate, and for nine years at the head of the Postage-Stamp Distribution Bureau of Washington, filling in the intervals of his public service with practice at the Cleveland bar. His father was a master tailor in New Berne, and a member of a family of free colored people whose traditions go back something more than one hundred years.

Charles W. Chesnutt, author of "The Conjure Woman" and other popular stories of Southern life, descended from free colored people in Fayetteville, North Carolina. Mr. Chesnutt informs me that a colored man by the name of Matthew Leary is still remembered in Fayetteville who before the war was the owner of considerable land, a number of slaves, a brick store in the business part

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

of the town, and a handsome residence in a good neighborhood. His sons gained some prominence in North Carolina during the Reconstruction era. Matthew Leary, Jr., went into politics and afterward became a clerk in one of the Government offices in Washington. A younger brother, Hon. John S. Leary, was the first colored man in North Carolina to be admitted to the bar, of which he remained a respected member until he died, at Charlotte, N. C. He was, I understand, at one time a member of the North Carolina Legislature.

Another of the successful free colored people of North Carolina was James D. Sampson, who began life as a house carpenter, and became in the course of time a man of considerable wealth and some local distinction. I have been informed that the Legislature passed a bill granting his family special privileges which were not permitted to other free people of color. His children, John, Benjamin, and Joseph, were all educated in the North. Benjamin graduated from Oberlin College, and afterward became a teacher at Wilberforce, Ohio. John P. Sampson published, at Cincinnati, during the war the *Colored Citizen*. After the war he was commissioned by General Howard to look after the colored schools established by the Freedmen's Bureau in the Third District of North Carolina. He was elected treasurer and assessor of Wilmington, and was a candidate for Congress, but was defeated because of the fact, it is said, that his father had been the owner of slaves before the war. While it was true that James D. Sampson owned a number of slaves, it is said that many, if not all of them, were held in trust in order to secure them practical freedom. Recently, George M. Sampson, a grandson of James D. Sampson, visited Tuskegee. He is now a teacher in the State Normal School at Tallahassee, Florida.

There is no reason to believe that the colored people of North Carolina made more progress in a material way than they did in some of the other States in the South. For instance, in the city of Charleston, South Carolina, there was a colony of "free persons of color" who were proud of the fact that they sprang from a generation of free ancestors going back to

before the Revolutionary War. In the list of taxpayers in the city of Charleston for 1860 the names of three hundred and sixty "persons of color" whose property was assessed in that year are given. They owned real estate which was valued for taxation at \$724,570. Of these three hundred and sixty taxpayers, one hundred and thirty owned slaves, aggregating three hundred and ninety in number. The largest number of slaves held by a colored person was fourteen. In this list of "persons of color" thirteen are classed as Indians, but it is quite certain that these so-called Indians were largely mixed with Negro blood. Like so many other communities, there were Indians in Charleston who had been but partially absorbed by colored people with whom they had been associated.

In 1860 the population of Charleston was 48,409, of whom 26,969 were white, 17,655 slaves, and 3,785 were "free persons of color." It would appear from the figures given that these free colored people probably owned, including slaves, a million dollars' worth of property. Among the slaves held by colored people of Charleston were a number who were actually free men and only nominally slaves. For instance, Richard Holloway, who was a prominent man among the free colored people in Charleston, owned Charles Benford, who was his friend, and with him one of the leaders in the Methodist Church at that time. The circumstances were these: Charles Benford had arranged with his white master to purchase his freedom, but at that time the laws were such that it was difficult for a master to free his slaves, particularly if the slave purchased his own freedom. In order to get around this law, Charles Benford asked his friend Richard Holloway to purchase him, Benford himself furnishing the money for the purchase.

There were a number of other slaves held in trust by the free colored people of Charleston. The wealthiest family in Charleston among the free colored people were the Westons. They had among the various members of the family taxable property to the amount of \$80,000. They also owned thirty-six slaves, nine of whom they held as trustees. It is said that the number of slaves held by St.

Philip's Church, which was the aristocratic church of the city, amounted to somewhat over one hundred. These consisted for the most part of slaves who had actually bought their freedom and whom the church held in trust.

Of the free colored people of Louisiana, of whom there were a very considerable number before the war, many were slaveholders and large owners of land. There were a number of settlements of Creole Negroes, as they were called, in various parts of Louisiana. When Frederick Law Olmsted visited that State in 1853, he visited one of these settlements in the neighborhood of Natchitoches. The information which he obtained in regard to these people was to the effect that they were "honest and industrious and paid their debts quite as promptly as the white planters, and were, as far as any one could judge, good citizens in all respects"! One of them, he learned, had lately spent \$40,000 in a lawsuit, and it is believed that they were increasing in wealth. Several of these colored planters were worth four or five hundred thousand dollars. The little town of Washington, near Opelousas, in St. Landry Parish, was formerly called Negroville, from the number of free Negroes living in that village. A number of them, according to Olmsted, were wealthy and thriving. They owned some of the best cotton and sugar plantations.

"An intelligent man whom I met at Washington," he said, "who had been traveling most of the time for two years in the plantation districts, told me that the free Negroes in the State in general, so far as he had observed, were equal in all respects to the white Creoles. Much the larger part of them were poor, thriftless, unambitious, and lived wretchedly, but there were many opulent, intelligent, and educated. The best house and most tasteful grounds that he had visited in the State had belonged to a nearly full-blooded Negro—a very dark man. He and his family were well educated, and, though French in their habitual tongue, they spoke English with a liberal tongue, and one much more eloquent than most of the liberally educated whites. They had a private tutor in their family, and owned, he thought, a hundred and fifty slaves."

It is near here, in the adjoining parish of St. Martin, that my friend Paul Chretien lived. His father was a free colored man who made his money in the neighborhood of Calcasieu, but afterward returned to St. Martin and built himself a beautiful home there, in which his son, whose name I have mentioned, is now living.

A considerable portion of the Negro population of Mobile, Alabama, at the present day are the descendants of these Creole Negroes, whose freedom was guaranteed to them by the French treaty which transferred Louisiana to the United States in 1803. There is an island in Mobile Bay, about twenty miles below the city, Mon Louis Island, which is owned by the descendants of two families. The lower end of the island was settled by veterans of the Revolutionary War, who lived to a great age; the upper part of the island was settled by a man known as Captain Jack Collins, but his real name was Maximilian Collins, who settled on this island in 1808. He left a large tract of land to his descendants, with the injunction that they should sell none of it; it has remained in their hands up to the present time, and there has grown up there, as a result, a little patriarchal colony made up of the descendants of the free Negro Captain Jack and the descendants of his slaves. The oldest living descendant of this patriarch is the widow of the late Belthair Durette, who had seventy-two grandchildren and fifty-two great-grandchildren, ninety-seven of whom are living in this community of Mon Louis.

I have mentioned here several cases which indicate that even in the South, and before the Civil War, the Negro had made some progress along material lines. It is impossible to tell, of course, how much property these people possessed. But the aggregate value of the property of the 262,000 free Negroes in the South in 1860 has been estimated at something like twenty-five millions of dollars. I should judge, from what I have been able to learn, that that was a low estimate.

The question might very well be asked, considering the success that individuals were able to achieve before the war, why it was that the great mass of the Negro people who were free did not do better.

In reply to that I might say that there were the same reasons and others why the Negro should not get on or succeed that there were why the class known as the "poor whites" in the South did not succeed. If the conditions of slavery operated to keep the poor white man in a low stage of civilization, they certainly operated to keep the free Negro in a still lower stage.

Not only did the free people of color have to meet all the difficulties to which I have referred, but it was against the law for them to meet together in any large number in order to co-operate to improve their condition. The great benefits of co-operation, which go so far to extend to the mass of individuals the benefits which are obtained by a few, were denied them.

In spite of this fact, in Charleston, Baltimore, Washington, New York, and in other places where there were large numbers of free Negroes, little societies for mutual helpfulness were established. For instance, in 1790 there was formed in Charleston what was known as the "Brown Fellowship Society." This society was started at the suggestion of the director of St. Philip's, of which a number of free Negroes were members. Besides cultivating a spirit of fellowship among its members, it sought to provide school privileges for their children and to provide relief and extend aid to worthy persons of their color. One of the first things they did was to purchase a burial lot for their dead. This organization befriended helpless orphans; one of these orphans was the well-known Bishop Daniel A. Payne, the founder of Wilberforce University. This organization still maintains its existence, and celebrated a few years ago its centennial. The records have all been preserved, and one of the most interesting of these is that which commemorates, in a formal way, the expulsion of one of its members on suspicion of having assisted in kidnapping and selling into slavery a free colored man. The success of this first organization led to the establishment of other similar organizations. The Humane and Friendly Society was established in 1802; the Friendly Union, in 1813; and later still, the Friendly Moralist and the Brotherly Association and the Unity and Friendship. Each of these

had its own burial plot and system of mutual benefit.

After the attempted conspiracy of Denmark Vesey in 1822 all these organizations came under suspicion, and there was a time when they were kept up under the greatest difficulties, but they never ceased to exist. There were similar organizations, as I have said, in several of the larger cities of the South. Frederick Douglass, while living in Baltimore, attended one of these societies, known as the "East Baltimore Mutual Improvement Society." This society was formed by a number of free colored young men who, like Frederick Douglass, were engaged as ship-calkers. In this organization he frequently took prominent part, although, being a slave, he would naturally have been excluded. He has said that the society of the young men he met there aided him considerably in completing the education that he had already begun in secret. As Baltimore probably had more free colored people at the time than any other city, with the exception of Washington, it was natural that there should be a large number of these societies of a literary and mutual benefit and benevolent character. Baltimore, in fact, seems to have been the home of the Negro mutual benefit societies, many of which, now in existence, date back to 1820.

The New York African Society, for mutual relief, which has been in existence for over a hundred years in New York City, held its first meeting in a colored school house in Rose Street in 1808, nearly twenty years before the final emancipation of the slaves in New York State. Although it has not increased its membership in recent years, this society has become, I understand, comparatively wealthy as a result of its earlier investments. The first property owned by this society was on Baxter Street, not far from the spot that afterward became notorious under the name of Five Points. It was purchased in 1820 for \$1,800, and when it was sold later the funds were used to purchase a five-story flat at No. 43 West Sixty-sixth Street and another building at No. 27 Greenwich Avenue, both of which the society still owns.

In Maryland these beneficial organizations were especially exempt from the

general prohibition against public meetings of free colored people. In other places in the Southern States there was no such exemption, and, although the law was usually got around in some way or other, not infrequently members of these organizations were arrested, fined, and sometimes sent to prison. Frederick Law. Olmsted records one such instance in Washington, D. C., in the first chapter of his "Journey in the Seaboard Slave States."

He says :

The colored population voluntarily sustain several churches, schools, and mutual assistance and improvement societies, and there are evidently persons among them of no inconsiderable cultivation of mind. Among the police reports of the city newspapers, there was lately (April, 1855) an account of the apprehension of twenty-four "genteel colored men" (so they were described) who had been found by a watchman assembling privately in the evening, and been lodged in the watch-house. The object of their meeting appears to have been purely benevolent, and, when they were examined before a magistrate in the morning, no evidence was

offered, nor does there seem to have been any suspicion that they had any criminal purpose. On searching their persons, there were found a Bible, a volume of Seneca's "Morals," "Life in Earnest," the printed constitution of a society the object of which was said to be "to relieve the sick and bury the dead," and a subscription paper "to purchase the freedom of Eliza Howard," a young woman, whom her owner was willing to sell at \$650. I can think of nothing that would speak higher for the character of a body of poor men, servants and laborers, than to find, by chance, in their pockets just such things as these.¹

Nothing contributed more to keep the free Negroes from making greater advancement than they did during the period of slavery than the fact that they were not allowed to organize and unite their efforts for their own improvement in any large way. On the other hand, nothing has more prevented and held back the progress of the colored people since slavery than the fact that they have had to learn how to unite their efforts in order to improve their condition.

¹ "Journey in the Seaboard Slave States," by Frederick Law Olmsted, pp. 14-15.