

NO SLAVERY IN NEBRASKA--NO SLAVERY IN THE NATION--SLAVERY AN OUTLAW.: ..

Liberator (1831-1865); May 12, 1854; 24, 19; American Periodicals

pg. 0_1

NO SLAVERY IN NEBRASKA--NO SLAVERY IN THE NATION--SLAVERY AN OUTLAW.

SPEECH OF GERRIT SMITH, ON THE NEBRASKA BILL,

In the U. S. House of Representatives, April 6, 1854.

So, Mr. CHAIRMAN, the slavery question is up again! Up again, even in Congress! It will not keep down. At no bidding, however authoritative, will it keep down. The President of the United States commands it to keep down. Indeed, he has, hitherto, seemed to make the keeping down of this question the great end of his great office. Members of Congress have so far bounded themselves, as to pledge themselves on this floor to keep it down. National political conventions promise to discontinue, and even to resist, the agitation of slavery, both in and out of Congress. Commerce and politics are as afraid of this agitation as Methelah was of the ghost of Biququo; and many titled divines, taking their cue from commerce and politics, and being no less servile than merchants and demagogues, do what they can to keep the slavery question out of sight. But all is of no avail. The slavery question will not mind them. To repress it in one quarter, is only to have it burst forth more prominently in another quarter. If you hold it back here, it will break loose there, and rush forward with an accumulated force, that shall amply revenge for all its detention. And this is not strange, when we consider how great is the power of truth. It were madness for man to bid the grass not to grow, the waters not to run, the winds not to blow. It were madness for him to assume the mastery of the elements of the physical world. But more emphatically was it madness for him to attempt to hold in his puny fist the forces of the moral world. Canute's folly, in setting bounds to the sea, was wisdom itself, compared with the so much greater folly of attempting to subjugate the moral forces. Now, the power which is, ever and anon, throwing up the slavery question into our unwilling and affrighted faces, is truth. The passion-blinded and the infatuated may not discern this mighty agent. Nevertheless, Truth lives and reigns for ever; and she will be, continually, tossing up unsettled questions. We must bear in mind, too, that every question which has not been disposed of in conformity with her requirements, and which has not been laid to repose on her own blessed bosom, is an unsettled question. Hence, slavery is an unsettled question; and must continue such, until it shall have fled far ever from the presence of liberty. It must be an entirely unsettled question, because, not only is it not in harmony with truth, but there is not one particle of truth in it. Slavery is the baldest and biggest lie on earth. In reducing man to a chattel, it denies that man is man; and, in denying that man is man, it denies that God is God—for, in His own image made He man—the black man and the red man, as well as the white man. Distorted as are our minds by prejudice, and shrivelled as are our souls by the spirit of caste, this essential quality of the varieties of the human family may not be apparent to us all. Were we delivered from this prejudice and this spirit, much of the darkness which now obscures our vision would be scattered. In proportion as we obey the truth, are we able to discern the truth. And if all that is wrong within us were made right, not only would our darkness give place to a cloudless light, but, like the angel of the Apocalypse, we should stand in the sun.

But to my argument. I am opposed to the bill for organizing the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas, which has come to us from the Senate, because, in the first place, it insults colored men, and the Maker of all men, by limiting suffrage to white men. I am opposed to it, because, in the second place, it limits suffrage to persons who have acquired citizenship. The man who comes to us from a foreign land, and declares his intention to make his home among us, and acts in harmony with such declaration, is well entitled to vote with us. He has given one great evidence of possessing an American heart, which our native could not give. For, whilst our native became an American by the accident of birth, the emigrant became one by choice. For, whilst our native may be an American, not from any preference for America, the emigrant has proved that he prefers our country to every other.

I am opposed to the bill, in the third place, because it is so drawn as to convey the deceptive idea, (I do not say intentionally deceptive,) that the bill recognizes the doctrine of non-intervention. I call it deceptive idea; for, in point of fact, the bill does not recognize the doctrine of non-intervention. It dictates to the territories the form of their government, and denies to them the appointing of their principal officers. The bill is itself, therefore, the most emphatic intervention. One-hundredth as much intervention on the part of the Federal Government with a State Government, would be condemned as outrageous and intolerable intervention.

But I must be frank, and admit that, if the bill did really recognize the doctrine of non-intervention, I should still be opposed to it—say, and for that very reason. This whole doctrine of Congressional non-intervention with our territories I regard as perfectly absurd. Congressional intervention with them is an imperative and unavoidable duty. The reasoning to this end is simple and irresistible. The people of the United States acquire a territory. Being theirs, they are responsible for its conduct and character; and, being thus responsible, they not only have the right, but are absolutely bound, to govern the territory. So long as the territory is theirs, they can no more abdicate sovereignty over it, than a State can abdicate sovereignty over one of its counties. But the people of the United States govern through Congress; and hence, in respect to what is the people's, there must be Congressional intervention. In the nature of the case, this must be so. But the Constitution also shows that it must be so. The Constitution declares the fact of the government of the nation by itself; and it also recognizes the fact of the government of a State by itself. But nowhere does it so much as hint at the government of a territory by itself. On the contrary, it expressly subjects the regulation of government of territories to Congress, or, in other words, to the whole people of the United States.

I add, incidentally, that in the light of the fact of the American people's responsibility for the conduct and character of their territories, it is absurd to claim that New Mexico and Utah are to be exempt from slavery

because the Mexican Government had abolished slavery. Whether there can be legal slavery in those territories turns solely on the character of the Constitution—turns solely on the question whether that paper is anti-slavery or pro-slavery. Again, in the light of this same fact, we see how absurd it is to claim that there could, under the continued force of the French or Spanish laws, be slavery in the territory of Louisiana, after we had acquired it. If, after such acquisition, there was, or could be, legal slavery in the territory, it was solely because the Constitution—the only law which then attached to the territory—authorized it. What if, when we acquired the territory, there had been in it, among the creatures of French, or Spanish, or other law, the suttee, or cannibalism—would it not have been held that these abominations were repugnant to the Constitution, and, therefore, without legal existence? Certainly.

I spoke of the Constitution as the only law which attaches to our territories. I was justified in this, because it is the only law of the people of the United States, when they are taken as a whole or a unit. When regarded in sections, they have other laws also. The people of a State have the laws of their State, as well as the laws of their nation. But, I repeat it, as people of the United States, when viewed as one, have no other law than the Constitution. Their Congress and Judiciary can know no other law. The statutes of the one and the decisions of the other must be but applications and interpretations of this one organic law.

Another incidental remark is, that it is wrong to charge the opponents of this bill with denying and dishonoring the doctrine of 'popular sovereignty.' Holding, as we do, that to the people—the whole people—of the United States belong both the land and the sovereignty of their territories, we insist, that to shut them out from governing their territories, would be to deny and dishonor the doctrine of 'popular sovereignty.' It is the friends of the bill, who, provided it is, as they claim, a bill for non-intervention, are to be charged with violating the doctrine of 'popular sovereignty,' and the principles and genius of democracy. I close, under this head, with saying, that should real non-intervention obtain in regard to these territories, it would be a very great and very astonishing change from our present policy. The inhabitants of a territory have no vote in Congress. Nevertheless, real non-intervention would vest them with the exclusive disposal of important affairs, which are now at the exclusive disposal of Congress. It would compensate them for their present political disabilities with an amount of political power greatly exceeding that enjoyed by an equal handful of the people of a State.

To prevent misapprehension of my views, I add, that I am not opposed to making inhabitants of the territory officers of the territory. As far as practicable, I would have none other than its officers. But, whilst the territory is the nation's, all its officers should be acknowledged to be officers and servants of the nation.

I proceed to say, that I am opposed to this bill, in the fourth place, because it looks to the existence of slavery in these territories, and provides safeguards for it. In other words, Congress does, by the terms of the bill, open the door for slavery to enter these territories. The right of Congress to do so I deny. I deny it, however, not because the compromise of 1820 denies it. Believing that compromise to be invalid, I cannot honestly claim any thing under it. I disclaim all rights under it, for the simple reason, that a compromise conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity can impart no rights—for the simple reason, that a compromise which annihilates rights cannot create rights. I admit that the compromise of 1820 conceals the indestructibility of manhood north of the line of 36 30, excepting in Missouri. But, on the other hand, it atones for this concession to truth and justice by implicitly leaving men south of that line, and in Missouri, to be classed with brutes and things. I admit, too, that they who are enjoying the share of slavery under this compromise, and who, now that freedom was about to enter into the enjoyment of her share under it—I admit, I say, that they are stopped from joining me in pronouncing the Missouri compromise invalid. They must first surrender their share under the compromise—they must first make restitution to Freedom—ere they can, with clean hands and unblushing faces, ask her to forego the enjoyment of her share. 'But this condition is impracticable!' will some of my hearers say? O, no! nothing is impracticable, that is right. Exclude slavery from Missouri and Arkansas for thirty-four years, and then freedom and slavery will be on an equal footing, and they can make a new bargain. [Laughter.]

Nor do I deny the right of Congress to open the door for slavery into these territories, because the compromise of 1850 virtually denies it. I say that compromise virtually denies it, because it distinctly and unequivocally recognizes the compromise of 1820. The compromise of 1850 is as rotten as the compromise of 1820, and as incapable of imparting rights. And here let me say, that I rejoice to see the pro-slavery party pouring express contempt on the compromise of 1820, and virtual contempt on the compromise of 1850. And why should not all men pour contempt upon these compromises, and upon all other compromises, which aim to 'split the difference' between God and the devil? [Great laughter.] By the way, we have striking proof, in the instance of this bill, that, in the case of such compromises, God's share and all are, in the end, very likely to be claimed for the devil. [Renewed laughter.]

I have said on what grounds it is not that I deny the right of Congress to open the door for slavery into these territories. I will now say on what ground it is. I deny it on the ground that the Constitution, the only law of the territories, is not in favor of slavery, and that slavery cannot be set up under it. If there can be lawful slavery in the States, nevertheless, there cannot be in the territories.

In the fifth and last place, I am opposed to the bill, because it allows that there may be slavery in the States which shall be formed from these territories.

Hitherto, when the slavery question has been brought up in Congress, it has been alleged, (I say not how truly or untruly,) that the anti-slavery party has brought it up, and for the purpose of checking slavery. But, now, it is confessedly, on all hands, brought up by the pro-slavery party, and for the purpose of extending slavery. In this instance, the pro-slavery party is, manifestly, the instrument which Truth has wielded to subvert her purpose of re-awakening the public mind

to the demands and enormities of slavery. Most sincerely do I rejoice that the pro-slavery party is responsible for the present agitation.

A MEMBER. I do not admit that it is.

Mr. SMITH. Strange! Here is a movement for the immense extension of slavery. Of course, it is not the work of the anti-slavery party. And if the honorable member who has just interrupted me is authorized to speak for the pro-slavery party, it is not the work of that party either. I took it for granted that the pro-slavery party did it. But, it seems it did not. It puts on the innocent air of a Macbeth, and looks me in the face, and exclaims: 'Thou canst not say I did it!' [Laughter.] Well, if neither the anti-slavery party, nor the pro-slavery party, did it, who was it, then, that did it? It follows, necessarily, that it must be the work of the Lord, or the devil. [Laughter.] But it cannot be the work of the Lord—for the good book tells us: 'Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty'—liberty, not slavery. So, this Nebraska business must be the work of the devil. [Great laughter.] But, logical as is this conclusion, I am, nevertheless, too polite to press it. I prefer to repudiate the alternative that puts the responsibility on the Lord or the devil, and to return to my original assertion, that the pro-slavery party, and not the anti-slavery party, is responsible for the present agitation. Do not understand that I would not have the anti-slavery party agitate. I would have it agitate, and agitate, and agitate for ever. I believe that the agitation of the elements of the moral world is as essential to moral health, as is the agitation of the elements of the physical world to physical health. I believe in the beautiful motto, 'The agitation of thought is the beginning of truth.' I was very happy to hear the honorable gentleman of Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] express his faith and pleasure in agitation. Not less happy was I to hear the honorable gentleman of North Carolina [Mr. CLINGMAN] approve of the discussion of slavery. Such good abolition doctrine from such surprising sources was very grateful to me. Perhaps these gentlemen will continue to move forward in that blessed upward way, on which they have happily entered; and, perhaps, ere the session shall close, they will have reached that table-land of abolition, on which it is my privilege to stand. Let me assure them, for the purpose of cheering them onward, that, when they arrive there, they shall not lack my warm greetings, and the cordial grasp of my hand. [Great laughter.] Sir, you must permit me to indulge some hope of the conversion of these gentlemen. Indeed, when I heard the honorable gentleman of North Carolina speak of himself as 'an independent'—as a party of one—as in that lone condition in which he had so recently heard me say that I find myself—was I not at liberty to imagine that he was throwing out a sly, delicate hint to my ear, that he would like to 'join teams' with me, and so make up a party of two? [Repeated roars of laughter.] I do not forget, that, at the close of his speech, he said some very hard things against us naughty abolitionists. But how could I be sure that he did not say these hard things for no other purpose than to blind all around him, save, of course, my own apprehensive, because kindred and sympathizing, spirit, to that fraternal union with me, which I have supposed his heart was then meditating?

I said, a little while ago, that I rejoice that the pro-slavery party is responsible for the present agitation. I add, that I am half reconciled to this attempt to extend the dominion of slavery, because it affords us so inviting an opportunity to inquire into the title of slavery. If my neighbor tries to rob me of my farm, he, at least, affords me an occasion for inquiring into the tenure by which he holds his own farm. Freedom having been driven by slavery, until she has surrendered to her pursuer nine new States, and until slavery claims, as we see in the present bill, equal right with herself to overspread all the unorganized territory of the nation, it is, in my judgment, high time for her to stop, and to turn about, and to look slavery in the face, and to push back the war,—and, to drive the aggressor to the wall, provided she shall find that slavery, in all its progress and history, is nothing but an aggression upon liberty and law, and upon human and divine rights; and that, in truth, it has no title to any existence whatever, on any terms whatever, any where whatever. This is a proper stage of my argument for saying, that we all know enough of freedom and slavery to know, that they cannot live together permanently. One must conquer the other. American slavery lacks but two things to make sure of her victory over American liberty: and, from present indications, she is determined to lack them no longer. One of these two things is its conceded right to overspread all our unorganized territory; and the other is its conceded right to carry slaves through the free States. Let slavery succeed in these two respects—let the bill we are now considering become a statute; and let the final decision in the Lemmon case* sustain the claim to carry slaves through the free States—ay, and even to drive coffles of slaves through them, whip-in-hand; thus breaking down the public sentiment of those States against slavery, and debauching and wasting it, by familiarizing it with the demands and exhibitions of slavery;—and then, I admit, the way will be clear for slavery to make a quick and easy conquest of liberty.

I, again, acknowledge my partial reconciliation to this attempt of slavery to get more—this bold push for all that is left, so far as unorganized territory is concerned. We have now the best of opportunities for trying the title of slavery, not only to more—but, also, to what it already had. And, now, if slavery shall come off as badly as the dog, who, in opening his mouth to seize another piece of meat, lost, in the deceitful and shadow-casting stream, the piece he already had, it will have no one to blame for its folly but its own voracious self. It should have been content with the big share—the lion's share—which it already had.

But to return from this digression. I said, that I am opposed to the bill, because it allows that there may be slavery in the States which shall be formed from these territories. Why, however, should I be, therefore, opposed to it? I will, without delay, come to the reason of my opposition. My time, being so precious,

* Mr. Lemmon was emigrating, some eighteen months ago, with his slaves, from Virginia to Texas. The vessel touched at New York; and a judicial decision in favor of the claim of the slaves to freedom was promptly obtained, on the ground that the State of New York had abolished slavery. The State of Virginia is now intent on getting this decision reversed.

because so limited, I will waste none of it in apologies, circumlocutions, or skirmishes. But I will, at once, 'take the bull by the horns,' and declare that I deny the right of Congress to look to the existence of slavery in the States that shall be formed within these territories, because I deny that there can be constitutional slavery in any of the States of the American Union—future States, or present States—new or old. I hold that the Constitution not only authorizes no slavery, but permits no slavery; not only creates no slavery in any part of the land, but abolishes slavery in every part of the land. In other words, I hold that there is no law for American slavery.

I had not intended a moment's further delay in entering upon my argument to prove, that the Constitution calls for the suppression of all American slavery. But I must, before entering upon it, beseech the Committee to hold no other member of Congress responsible for it. Let the reproach of this argument—of this foolish argument, if you please—of this insane argument, if you prefer that epithet—fall on myself only. Blame no other member of Congress for it. I stand alone. I am the first, and perhaps I shall be the last, to declare within these walls, that there is no law for slavery. I say that I stand alone; and yet, I am not alone. Truth is with me. I feel her inspirations. She glows in my soul; and I stand in her strength.

[Mr. Smith proceeds to argue, at considerable length and with unusual ability, that slavery in this country is an illegal institution; that it finds no support or countenance in the U. S. Constitution—commending to members of Congress the arguments of William Goodell and Lyander Spooner on this subject; but as the readers of THE LIBERATOR are familiar with Mr. S's treatment of this view of the case, and as we are obliged to curtail his speech on account of its great length, we omit this portion of it.]—Ed. Lib.

I must say a few words to protect what I have said from the misapprehension that I counsel trampling on all wrong legislation. I am very far from giving such counsel. No wrong legislation, that is at all endurable, would I resist. And I add, that I would be patient with almost every degree of wrong legislation, provided it is legislation in behalf of what is lawful, and of what it is competent to legislate upon. Imprisonment for debt is wrong legislation—very wrong and very cruel legislation. But, inasmuch as the relation of debtor and creditor comes within the cognizance of the legislature, I will not treat such legislation as void. The legislature has a right end in view. It is to help the creditor get justice. Its error consists in selecting wrong means to this end, and in putting a wrong remedy into the hands of the creditor. I am to treat this action of the legislature as a mistake—and a mistake which I am not to go beyond the limits of persuasion to seek to correct. The paying of one's debt is justice—is law. Enactments to enforce this justice and this law may, some of them, be improper—such as compelling payment by the terrors of imprisonment. But, as they are enactments to enforce justice, and what is itself law, I must be very slow to denounce them as no law. So, too, if my Government declare war against a nation, I am not to treat the Government, nor the declaration, however unjust it may be, with contempt. I must remember, that Government has jurisdiction of national controversies, and that the redress of national wrongs is justice—is law. Government may err in its modes of redress. It may resort to the sword, when it should confine itself to the exertion of moral influence. The cause, nevertheless, which it is prosecuting, may be one of unmingled justice. Like every good cause, it may itself be law, and, therefore, Government would not be chargeable with impertinence and usurpation for taking it in hand. But, how different from all this is, when Government sets up slavery! In that case, the subject matter of its action is, most emphatically, not law. In that case, most emphatically, it has gone beyond its province. To Government belongs the adjustment of the relations between creditor and debtor; and it is for government to dispose of national controversies. But when Government undertakes the crime and absurdity of turning men into things—of chattelizing, instead of protecting, a portion of its subjects—it is, then, as far out of its place as it can be. To such an outrage, no submission is due. It is to be resisted, at every hazard. To trample upon such lawlessness is to be law-abiding, instead of law-breaking. To rebel against such a Government is not to be revolutionary and mobocratic. The Government itself is the revolutionary and mobocratic party. If the decree should go forth from our Government, that our Irish population be murdered, the decree would, of course, be trodden under foot. But who denies that it should be as promptly and indignantly trodden under foot, were it a decree for their enslavement?

My argument to show that there is not only no law for AMERICAN SLAVERY, BUT THAT THERE CAN BE NO LAW, EITHER FOR AMERICAN, OR ANY OTHER SLAVERY, IS ENDED. It is in place, however, to say, that the recognition, by the American people, of slavery as law, is, of itself, sufficient to account for their loss of reverence for law. This reverence is, necessarily, destroyed by the habit of confounding sham law with true law—by the habit of accepting, as law, the mere forms of law, where justice, truth, reason, and every element which goes to make up the soul of law, is lacking. This reverence must soon die out of the heart of the people, who treat, as law, that which they know is not law; who, in the holy and commanding name of law, buy and sell, or sanction the buying and selling, of their fellow-men; and who, in all their life, live out the degrading lie, that so monstrous and diabolical a thing as slavery is entitled to the shelter and honor of law. This reverence is little felt by those who yield to the absurdity, that law and nature are opposite to each other, and that whilst, by nature, a man is an immortal, by law, he may be but a thing. It is little felt by those who regard law as a mere conventionalism, which may be one thing in one place, and another in another; one thing at one period, and another at another. They, and they only, have adequate and adoring conceptions of law, who believe that it is one with nature, and that it is the same in every part of the earth, in every period of time, and 'eternal in the heavens.' They, and they only, have such conceptions, who, instead of regarding law as synonymous with all the enactments of foolish and wicked men, identify it with unchangeable and everlasting right.

How, for instance, can the American people perceive the beauty and preciousness of law, whilst recognizing,

as law, the fugitive slave act?—and whilst stigmatizing and persecuting the handful of men who have the integrity and the bravery to resist it? Why should not that handful fly as swift to the rescue of their brother, who is in peril of being reduced to slavery, as to the rescue of their brother who cries—'Murder'! Ten thousand enactments for murder would not hinder them in the latter case. Ten thousand enactments for slavery should not hinder them, in the former. In each case, the rescue would be not by a mob, but from a mob.

It has now been shown that the American Government has authority, both inside and outside of the Constitution—as well in natural and universal law, as in conventional and national law—to sweep away the whole of American slavery. Will it avail itself of this authority to do this work? I ask not whether Government will show pity to the slave—for I look not to Government to be pitiful to the slave, or to any other man. I look to Government for sterner qualities than pity. My idea of a true Government is realized only in proportion as the Government is characterized by wisdom, integrity, strength. To hold even the scales of justice among all its subjects, and between them and all other men, and to strike down the hand that would make them uneven—this, and this only, is the appropriate work of Government.

I asked whether the American Government will abolish slavery. I confess that my hope that it will is not strong. The slave-owners have the control of this nation, and I fear that they will keep it. It is true, that they are a comparative handful in the vast American population; and that, numbering only three hundred thousand, their calling themselves 'the South' is an affectation as absurd and ridiculous as it would be for the manufacturers of the North to call themselves 'the North,' or the rumblers of the North to call themselves 'the North.' It is true, that their interests are alien as well from the interests of the South as from the interests of the North, and that slavery is the deadly foe, as well of the white population of the South as of its black population. Nevertheless, in the present corrupt state of the public sentiment, the slave-owners are able to control the nation. They are mighty by their numbers. Divided they may be in every thing else—but they are undivided in their support of slavery. The State and the Church are both in their hands. A bastard democracy, accommodated to the demands of slavery, and tolerating the traffic in human flesh, is our national democracy; and a bastard Christianity, which endorses this bastard democracy, is the current Christianity of our nation. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—ideas so prominent in a true democracy and a true Christianity—are quite foreign to our sham democracy and our sham Christianity. American religion is a huge hypocrisy. Whilst to the immeasurable sinfulness of that system which forbids marriage and the reading of the Bible, and which markets men as beasts, it is blind as a bat, it, nevertheless, draws down its stupid face, and pronounces the shuffling of the feet to music to be a great sin. The different States of Christendom, as they advance in civilization and the knowledge of human rights, are, one after another, putting away slavery. Even the Bey of Tunis puts away this most foul and guilty thing; and says that he does so, 'for the glory of mankind, and to distinguish them from the brute creation.' But America, poor slavery-ridden and slavery-cursed America, retrogrades. Whilst other nations grow in regard to human rights, she grows in contempt for them. Whilst other nations rise in the sunlight of civilization, she sinks in the night of barbarism. Her Congress sets up slavery in her very Capital. Her Congress regulates and protects the coastwise trade in slaves. Her Congress wages unprovoked and plundering wars for the extension of slavery. Her Congress decrees that slaveholders shall have the range of all America in which to reduce men, women and children to slavery. And her President, who calls slavery an 'admitted right,' was shameless enough to say, in his Inaugural, that the Fugitive Slave Act, which his predecessor was shameless enough to sign, should be 'cheerfully enforced.' In short, the Federal Government is now, and long has been, at work, more to uphold slavery than to do any thing else, or even all things else. The great slave-catcher! the great watch-dog of slavery!—these are its most fitting names, in its present employment and degradation. And, yet, notwithstanding all this devotion of the Federal Government to slavery, and the iron determination of the slave-owners that the power of the whole nation shall be exerted to uphold it; there, nevertheless, can be no remonstrance from the North against slavery, which is not immediately followed by the truthless and impudent reply, that the North has nothing to do with slavery! That the American people and American government have fallen to what they are, is not to be wondered at. It is but the natural and necessary result of their having fostered and fed, for more than half a century, the monster slavery. Time was, when we might have crushed this monster. But now, it has crushed us. It has corrupted us to such an extent, that there is scarcely a sound spot left in us, at which to begin to rally opposition to it. On no cheaper condition than this can slavery be clung to. If we will be slaveholders—and such are the Northern as well as the Southern people—for, if the slave-owners are at the South, the people of the North are, nevertheless, more emphatically, because more efficiently, the slaveholders, than are the people of the South—if, I say, we will be slaveholders, we must take the evil consequences upon our own understandings and hearts, and not be surprised at them. Men cannot bind the degrading chain of slavery around their brothers, without at the same time binding and degrading themselves with it.

How melancholy upon our country, and, through her, upon the world, has been the influence of American slavery! In the beginning of our national existence, we were the moral and political light-house of the world. The nations 'which sat in darkness saw the great light,' and rejoiced. Sad to say, we were the first to dim that light! The principles which we then enunciated electrified the nations. Sad to say, we were ourselves the first to dishonor those principles! Nothing, so much as American slavery, has gathered darkness upon that light. Nothing, so much as American slavery, has brought disgrace upon those principles. All other causes combined have not stood so effectually in the way of the progress of republicanism, as the glaring inconsistency of our deeds with our professions. In the house of her friends, Liberty has received her deepest stab. All our boasts and falsehoods to the contrary notwithstanding,

there is no Government on the face of the earth so quick as our own to dread and to oppose popular movements in behalf of liberty and republicanism. On our Government, more than all other causes put together, rests the responsibility of the stopping of the Revolution in the Spanish American States. We were wont to say, that the people of those States were incompetent to perfect that Revolution. This is a piece of our hypocrisy. The instructions of our Government, and the discussions in our National Legislature, in regard to the Congress of Panama; our threat of war against Colombia and Mexico, if those States persevered in carrying forward the Revolution; and, above all, our base supplication to Russia and Spain to join us in stopping the wheels of that Revolution; prove conclusively, that though our lying lips were for liberty, our hearts, all the time, were concerned for the protection of slavery. And, in the case of Hayti—how deadly, from first to last, has been the enmity of our Government to the cause of liberty and republicanism! To learn the extent of that enmity, we must not confine our eyes to the haughty and persevering refusal of our Government to recognize the Independence of Hayti. We must look at other things also, and especially at the servile compliance of our Government with the impudent and arrogant demand of Napoleon to carry out his plan of starving the Haytiens into submission.

Our Government made a display of sympathy with the European Revolutions of 1848. But who is so stupid as to accord sincerity to that display, when he recollects that the very first fruit of the very first of these Revolutions was the unqualified abolition of all French slavery—and a part of that slavery in the neighborhood of our own? So eager was our Government to appear to be on the side of Hungary, that it sent out a ship for Kossuth. But, long ere he had reached our shores, and, especially, whilst he was making his speeches in England in behalf of the equal rights of all men, our government found out that it had got more than it contracted for. Kossuth's principles were too radical. Their scope was quite too sweeping. They no more spared slavery than any other form of oppression. Yet, Government could not stop Kossuth on his way. Having started for America, he must be suffered to come to America. But how great his disappointment, on his arrival! 'He came unto his own, and his own received him not.' The poor man was willing to compromise matters. A thousand pities that he was. He was willing to ignore slavery, and to go through the whole length and breadth of the land, seeing, in every man he met, nothing else than a glorious freeman. Alas, what a mistake! The policy of the government to 'give him the cold shoulder' was fixed; and no concessions or humiliations on his part could suffice to repeal it. Kossuth left America, and he left it, no less abundantly than painfully convinced, that America is one thing in the Declaration of Independence, and another in what has succeeded it; one thing in her professions, and another in her practice. Will Mazzini need to come to America to learn this lesson? And, if he comes, will he stoop to repeat Kossuth's mistakes? Thank God! Mazzini has already identified himself with the American abolitionists. May he find himself rewarded by their cordial identification of themselves with the oppressed of Europe!

I confessed that my hope is not strong that the American Government will abolish American slavery. Far otherwise would it be, however, did none but slave-owners justify slavery. They would soon be converted, were it not that the mass of the American people fall in with them, and flatter them, and cry peace, when there is no peace. This is our great discouragement in the case. The advocates of total abstinence are not discouraged; they would be, however, if they found the mass of the sober justifying drunkards, and telling them that drunkenness is right.

I said, at an early stage of my remarks, that the present attempt of slavery to clutch all the unorganized territory of the nation affords a favorable opportunity to freedom to push back the war into the realm of slavery. I, however, did not add, that the opportunity would be improved. Nor do I add it now—for I am far from certain that it will be. For many years, I have had scarcely any better hope for American slavery than that it would come to a violent and miserable end. Their habit of courting and worshipping the Slave Power, and of acquiescing in its demands, has corrupted and paralyzed the American people to such a degree as to leave little room to hope that they will bring slavery to a peaceful and happy termination. I confess some little hope of such termination has been kindled in me by this new, surprising, and enormous demand of the Slave Power. I confess, that I have thought it possible that this demand might arouse a spirit which could be appeased by nothing short of the overthrow of the whole system of slavery. Should, however, such a spirit be aroused, I fear it will not pervade the masses, but will be confined to a few. It is true that meetings are held all over the free States to protest against the passage of this Bill, and that the press of those States is almost universally against it. But neither in the meetings nor in the press do I see repentance. They abound in indignation toward perfidy—but they reveal no sorrow of the North for the crimes of the North against liberty. On the contrary, the meetings and the press do well nigh universally justify the Compromise of 1820, and, in the great majority of instances, the Compromise of 1850, 'Fugitive Slave Act' and all. Even in sermons preached against the Nebraska Bill, I have seen the Fugitive Slave Act justified. Now, the idea that they who can approve of either of these Compromises, and especially that they who can, possibly, acquiesce in the chasing down men, women and children, for the purpose of casting them into the pit of slavery—the idea, I say, that such persons will perseveringly and effectively resist slavery, and do faithful battle for its overthrow, is, to my mind, simply absurd. They, and they only, are to be relied on for such service, who so loathe slavery, that they would rather perish than do any of its biddings, come those biddings from Congress, or from any other sources.

Am I bid to strengthen my hope by looking at the rapidly multiplying abolitionists? I do look at them; and this cheering sight is all that, under God, keeps my hope alive. But I fear that they are too late. I fear that the disease is past cure. And I fear, too, that, even if we are yet in time to kill the Demon of Slavery, our false and pro-slavery education makes us so, hesitating and timid in his terrific presence, that we shall not wage direct, deep, and fatal war upon him,

but shall waste our energies, and our only and swiftly passing away opportunity, in ineffectual skirmishes and disgraceful doings. A few abolitionists are consistent; and, were they not so few, they would be formidable; they know no law for any fraud; and, therefore, they will not know it for the most stupendous fraud. They know no law for any oppression; and, therefore, they will not know it for the most sweeping oppression. Such abolitionists are Garrison and Phillips, Goodell and Douglass. But most abolitionists implicitly, if not directly, tacitly if not openly, acknowledge that slavery can have, and actually has, rights; and they are as respectful to these supposed rights as if the subject of them were one of the greatest earthly blessings, instead of one of the greatest earthly curses.

It is true, that there is a political party in our country organized against slavery, and that it numbers some two hundred thousand voters, among whom are some of the noblest men in the land; and yet, I look well nigh with as much sorrow as hope to that party; for, so long as it recognizes slavery as law, I fear that, notwithstanding its high and holy purposes, it will do scarcely less to sanction and uphold slavery than to reprove and cast it down. Again, so long as this party is swayed by such words of folly and delusion as 'SLAVERY SECTIONAL: FREEDOM NATIONAL,' its admissions in favor of slavery cannot fail to go far to outweigh all its endeavors against slavery.

A law for slavery! What confessed madness would it be to claim a law for technical piracy, or a law for murder? But what piracy is there so sweeping and desolating as slavery? And, as to murder, who would not rather have his dearest friend in the grave—ay, in the grave of the murdered—than under the yoke of slavery?

'SLAVERY SECTIONAL: FREEDOM NATIONAL!' And, therefore, according to the friends of this motto, the nation, as such, must not concern itself with the great mass of slavery, because that great mass, instead of being spread over the whole nation, exists only in sections of it. Not less foolish would it be to neglect the small-pox, because it is only in sections of the city that it prevails. Indeed, it would not be less mad to leave the fire unextinguished, because, as yet, it rages but in sections of the city. Slavery, if not extinguished, is as certain to spread, as is the fire, if not extinguished. The past attests this; and the present exhibits very glaring proof of it. If we would save the city, we must put out the fire. If we would save the nation, we must put out slavery—ay, put it out in all the nation. I said that slavery is now spreading. It may not go literally into Nebraska and Kansas, either now or ever. Nevertheless, slavery will be spreading itself over our country, at least, in its influence and power, so long as the nation forbears to uproot it.

'SLAVERY SECTIONAL: FREEDOM NATIONAL!' A poor flag would 'Murder sectional: Anti-Murder national!' be to go forth with against murder. But not less poor is the other to go forth with against slavery. Very little inspiration could be caught from either. Nay, would not their limited toleration of the crimes neutralize their influence against the extension of the crimes? How unlike to these poor words would be, 'NO MURDER-ANY WHERE!' 'NO SLAVERY ANY WHERE!' Under such earnest and honest words, men could do battle with all their hearts. But, under the other, they are laughed at by the enemy; and should be laughed at by themselves.

There is a political party at the North, called the Liberty Party. It aims to go for every political truth, and to realize the idea of an every way righteous civil Government. It is a little party. Its handful of members are scarcely more numerous than were the primitive disciples, who were gathered in the upper room at Jerusalem. That little party will not disown what I have said on this occasion. Every other party will. That little party has, already, lived some fifteen years. It will continue to live. Perhaps it will not grow. Perhaps it will. The 'little cloud, like a man's hand,' may yet spread itself over the whole heavens. Of this much, at least, do I feel certain, that no party of essentially lower or other principles than those of the Liberty Party, will suffice to bring down American slavery. Happy country this—happy North—happy South—if the present aggressive movement of the Slave Power shall result in bringing triumphant accessions to the Liberty Party!

My fear that the American Governments, State or National, will not abolish slavery, is, in no degree, abated by the fact, that several European Governments have, in the present generation, abolished it. It must be remembered, that those Governments were exterior to, and independent of, the Slave Power; and that they were not trammelled by slaveholding constituencies. It is true, that slavery in Mexico was abolished by the Government in Mexico; and that slavery in the South American States was abolished by the Governments in those States. But it is also true, that all this was done to promote the success of their Revolution, and their deliverance from the Government of Spain. I doubt not that even we, closely as we cling to slavery, would, nevertheless, abolish it, if urged to do so by the exigencies of war.

To hope that, because the English Government abolished slavery, our Governments will also, is unwise, in another point of view. Comparatively disentangled with slavery as was England, slavery, nevertheless, exerted well-nigh enough power over her Government to prevent its successful action against slavery. The party in the interest of slavery was barely defeated.

Let me not be misunderstood. Let me not be supposed to fear that American slavery will not come to an end. My fear is, that it will not be brought to an end by Government. I have no fear that it will not be abolished. It will be abolished—and at no distant day. If the Governments fail to abolish it, it will abolish itself. The colored people of this nation, bond and free, number four millions, and are multiplying rapidly. They are all victims of slavery; for if the free are not in the *umbra*, they are, nevertheless, in the *penumbra*, of slavery. Hence, then, as well as by identity of race, they are bound together by the strongest sympathy. Moreover, if not carried along as rapidly as others, nevertheless, they are carried along in the general progressive knowledge of human rights. Such being the case, it is not to be supposed that they can be held in their present condition for ages longer. They will deliver themselves, if they are not delivered. He must be blind to history, to philosophy, to the nature of man, who can suppose that such a system as American slavery can have a long life, even in circumstances most favorable to its continuance. In the most benighted portions of the earth, the victims of such a system would, in process of time, come to such a sense of their wrongs, and their power also, as to rise up and throw off the system. But that, here, such a system must be hurried to its end, is certain. For, here, it is entirely out of harmony with all the institutions around it, and with all the professions of those who uphold it. Here it is continually pressed upon by ten thousand influences adverse to its existence. Nothing, so much as American slavery, stands in the way of the progress of the age. A little time longer, and it must yield to this progress, and be numbered with the things that were. The only question is, whether it shall die a peaceful or a violent death; whether it shall quietly recede before advancing truth, or resist unto blood.

God forbid that American slavery should come to a violent end. I hold, with O'Connell, that no revolution is worth the shedding of blood. A violent end to American slavery would constitute one of the bloodiest chapters in all the book of time. It would be such a reckoning for deep and damning wrongs—such an outbursting of smothered and pent-up revenge—as living man has never seen. Can this catastrophe be averted? Perhaps it cannot. Perhaps God will not let off this superlatively wicked nation on any easier terms than a servile war—a war, we must remember, that will be very likely to bring within its wide sweep, the whole black population of this continent and the neighboring islands—a population already numbering some ten or twelve millions. Perhaps, since we would be a nation

of oppressors, He will let the oppressed smite the oppressors. Perhaps, since we would be a bloody nation, He will give us 'blood, even unto the horse-bridles.' There will be no such catastrophe, however, if the North and the South, equal sinners in the matter of slavery, shall hasten to mingle the tears of their penitence; to say from the heart, 'We are verily guilty concerning our brother; and to join their hands in putting away their joint and usurped sin.

I shall be blamed for having treated my subject in the light of so severe a morality. It will be said, that economical views of it would have been more suitable and statesmanlike; and that I should have dwelt upon the gains to the slaveholder, and the gains to the country, from the abolition of slavery. I confess that, had horses and oxen been the subject of my speech, the field of economy would have been wide enough for the range of my thoughts, and the course of my argument. But I have been speaking of men—of millions of immortals: and I have been claiming that Government should lift them up out of their chattelhood and their association with brutes; and I could not disparage the dignity, and so sully the glory, of their manhood, as to claim the performance of this high and holy duty, in the name of money. When I see my fellow-man reduced to a slave, I demand his deliverance, simply because he is a man. I cannot so wrong his exalted nature and my own, and the Great One who made us in his own image, as to argue that money can be made by such deliverance. I would as soon think of making a calculation of pecuniary gains my argument in dissuading from the crime of murder.

In saying that I would not suffer the duty of delivering the slave to turn upon the question of pecuniary gains and economical advantages, I utter no peculiar doctrine. Who would suffer it thus to turn, in any case, where he regards such victims as men? But, with me, all men are men. Are the skin and the mind of my fellow-man dark? 'A man's a man, for a' that.' I still recognize him as a man. He is my brother, and I still have a brother's heart for him. Suppose the Government of Pennsylvania had, the last week, reduced all the white people of Pennsylvania, who have light hair, to slavery. Would Congress let the present week expire without seeking their release? No! Would Congress stoop to ply that Government with arguments drawn from political economy, and to coax it with prospects of gain? No! no!—a thousand times no! It would demand their release, and it would demand it, too, not in virtue of feeble arguments and humble authority, but, Ethan Allen-like, in the name of God Almighty and the Congress.

I shall be blamed for not having brought out a plan for getting rid of slavery. I confess that I have no other plan for getting rid of it but its abolition—its unconditional, entire, and immediate abolition. The slave is robbed of his manhood, of himself, and, consequently, of all his rights. There is no justice then—there is no God then—if the restoration of his rights and his restoration to himself can be innocently conditioned on any thing, or innocently postponed.

I shall be especially blamed for not having proposed compensation. I do not repudiate—I never have repudiated—the doctrine of compensation. Compensation for his services and his sufferings would be due from the slaveholder to the slave; but, clearly, no compensation for his restored liberty would be due from the slave to the slaveholder. I admit, however, that a great debt would be due, from the American people, both to the slaveholder and the slave. The American people are responsible for American slavery. It is the American people who, in the face of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, as well as of religion and reason, God and humanity, have made themselves the responsible enslavers of millions. Departed generations of slaves have gone to the bar of heaven with this accusation upon their lips; and nothing short of the repentance of the American people can prevent its being carried there by the present generation of slaves. There is, then, a great debt due from the American people to the American slaves. But they owe one to the slaveholders also. Men become slaveholders, and continue slaveholders, and extend their investments in human flesh, on the faith of the professions, legislation and policy of the American people, and, I may add, on the faith of the Constitution and religion of the American people, as that people interpret their Constitution and religion. Again, non-slaveholders, as well as slaveholders, feed and clothe themselves upon the cheap (cheap, because extorted and unpaid for) products of slave labor. They enrich their commerce with these products; and, in a word, they unite in making slavery the cherished and overshadowing interest of the nation. Now, for the American people, in these circumstances, to abolish slavery, and refuse to pay damages to the slaveholders, would be a surprise upon the slaveholders full of bad faith. For the American people to share with the slaveholders in the policy and profits of slaveholding, and then terminate it, and devote the whole loss of its termination on the slaveholders, would be well-nigh unparalleled injustice and meanness. If I have encouraged and drawn men into wickedness, I am, it is true, not to stand by them in their wickedness—for of that both they and I are to repent; but I am to stand by them in their loss, and share it with them. The English people gave to the masters of eight hundred thousand slaves a hundred millions of dollars. I would that the American people, after they shall have abolished American slavery, might give to the masters of four times that number of slaves, four times the hundred millions of dollars; and, far more, would I that they should provide liberally for the humbler and cheaper, but infinitely more sacred needs of the emancipated. 'Then,' my now darkened and guilty country! 'shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thy health spring forth speedily; and thy righteousness shall go before thee: the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward.'

I am well aware that, in reply to my admission, that the American people should thus burden themselves, it will be said that slavery is a State, and not a National concern, and that it is for the State Governments, and not for the National Government, to dispose of it. I certainly do not deny, that if slavery can be legalized in our country, it must be under the State Governments only. Nevertheless, I hold that every part of American slavery is the concern of every part of the American people, because the whole American people and the American Government have, though in defiance of the Constitution, made it such. And, as they have made it such, the *denationalizing* of slavery (as the phrase is with the Independent or Free Democrats) is not the whole duty to which we are called. We will not have done our whole duty, when we shall have abolished all the slavery which exists within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress. For slavery, under the State Governments also, has been fostered and established by the whole American people and the American Government: and I add, by the way, that, had it not been so fostered and established, there would, at this day, have been no slavery in the land!

If John Smith has built a distillery; and if he has, also, encouraged his neighbors to build half a dozen more; and, especially, if he has patronized and profited by the half dozen distilleries; then, his work of repentance is not all done when he has broken up his distillery:—and, none the more is it all done, because it was contrary to law that he had a part in getting up and sustaining the half dozen distilleries. The *de-Smithing* of all this distillation, and of all the drunkenness, that has resulted from it, obviously fails to cover the whole ground of his duty, unless, indeed, as is proper, the *de-Smithing* is interpreted to mean the breaking up of all these distilleries and their resulting drunkenness. 'So, too, the *denationalizing* of slavery, unless it be thus broadly and justly interpreted, falls short of the measure of the duty of the nation. The nation, whether constitutionally or unconstitutionally, has built up slavery; and, therefore, the nation should pay to end it.

I said, that I shall be blamed for speaking unwisely on the subject of slavery. I add, that I shall be blamed

for speaking on it at all. To speak against slavery in any manner, and, especially, in the national councils, is construed into hostility to the Union, and hostility to the Union is, in the eye of American patriotism, the most odious of all offences—the most heinous of all crimes.

I prize the Union, because I prize the wisdom, courage, philanthropy and piety of which it was begotten. I prize it, because I prize the signal sufferings and sacrifices which it cost our fathers. I prize it, because I prize its objects—those great and glorious objects that prompted to the Declaration of Independence; that were cherished through a seven years' war; and that were then recited in the Preamble of the Constitution, as the objects of the Constitution. I prize it, for the great power it has to honor God and bless man. I prize it, because I believe the day will come when this power shall be exerted to this end.

Now, surely, opposition to slavery cannot be hostility to such a Union. Such a Union is not assailed, and cannot be endangered, by opposition, however strenuous, to slavery, or to any other form of oppression, or to any other system of iniquity. To attack what is good is to be hostile to such a Union. To attack what is evil is to befriend it.

Nevertheless, the opposition is persisted in, that to attack slavery is to attack the Union. How are we to account for this persistence in this absurd position? It is easily accounted for. The position is not absurd. There are two Unions. There is the Union of early times—that which our fathers formed, and the most authentic record of the formation of which, and of the spirit and objects of which is to be found in the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution. This is the Union openly based on the doctrine of the equal rights of all men. This is the Union, the avowed purpose of which is 'to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty.' Then, there is the other Union—the Union of later times—of our times—manufactured, on the one hand, by Southern slaveholders, and, on the other, by Northern merchants and Northern politicians. The professed aims of this new Union are, of course, patriotic and beautiful. Its real, and but thinly disguised aims, are extended and perpetual slavery, on the one hand, and political and commercial gains on the other. The bad character of this new Union is not more apparent in its aims than in its fruits, which prove these aims. Among these fruits are Union Safety Committee Resolutions; Baltimore platforms; pro-slavery pledges of members of Congress; Resolutions of servile Legislatures; contemptible Inaugurals, in which, now a Governor, and now a President, go all lengths for slavery; and, above all, or rather, below all, Union-saving and slave-catching sermons of devil-deluded and devil-driven Dictors of Divinity. To this list is now to be added the stupendous breach of faith proposed in the Bill before us. This Bill, which lays open all our unorganized territory to slavery, is a legitimate fruit of the new Union. The consecration of all the national territory to freedom, sixty-five years ago, was the legitimate fruit of the old Union. Which is the better Union? By their fruits ye shall know them.

Now, the matter is not explained by saying that this new Union is but a misinterpretation of the old. Misinterpretation cannot go so far as to change the whole nature of its subject. No, it is not a misinterpretation; but it is distinctly and entirely another Union, with which its manufacturers are endeavoring to supplant the Union given to us by our fathers:—and this supplanting Union is as unlike the precious gift, as darkness is unlike light, as falsehood is unlike truth.

When, then, we, who are laboring for the overthrow of slavery, and for the practical acknowledgment of the equal rights of all men, are charged with hostility to the Union, it is, indeed, pretended by those, who make the charge, and for the sake of effect, that we are hostile to the original and true Union. Our hostility, nevertheless, is but to the conjured up and spurious Union. Our only offence is, that we withstand the base appeals and seductive influences of the day. The only cause for the abundant reproach which has befallen us is, that, in our honesty and patriotism, we still stand by that good old Union, which is a Union for justice and liberty; and that we bravely oppose ourselves to those artful and wicked men, who would substitute for it a Union for slavery, and place and gain; and who are even impudent enough to claim, that this trumpeted Union is identical with that good old Union. Yes, wicked, artful, impudent indeed must they be, who can claim that this dirty work of their own dirty hands is that veritable work of our fathers, which is the glory of our fathers.

I have done. Methinks, were I a wise and good man, and could have the whole American people for my audience, I should like to speak to them, in the fitting phrase which such a man commands, the words of truth and soberness, remonstrance and righteousness. And yet, why should I?—for, in all probability, such words would be of little present avail. The American people are, as yet, in no state 'to hear with their ears and understand with their heart'—for 'their heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing.' Yet awhile, and he who should speak to them such words, would, like Lot, 'seem as one that mocked.' This is a nation of oppressors—from the North to the South—from the East to the West—and, what is more, of strong and successful oppressors; and, hence, there is but little room to hope that she will listen and repent. This nation holds, in the iron and crushing grasp of slavery, between three and four millions, whose poor hearts writhe and agonize no less than would ours, were their fate our fate. And yet, she is not content even with these wide desolations of human rights and human happiness. On the contrary, she is continually seeking to extend the horrid realm of slavery. It is not enough that she purchased Louisiana, and gave up by far the most valuable part of it to slavery: nor that she purchased Florida, and gave up all of it to slavery: nor is it enough, that there is so much reason to fear that the mighty and sleepless efforts to overspread with slavery the whole territory of which she plundered Mexico, will prove extensively, if not, indeed, entirely successful. Nor is it enough, that there is imminent danger that Nebraska and Kansas will be wrested from freedom, and added to the domain of slavery and sorrow. All this is not enough to satisfy the desire of this nation to extend the reign of slavery. Her gloating and covetous eyes are constantly upon the remainder of Mexico; upon Cuba, St. Domingo, and other 'islands of the sea.' All these she is impatient to scourge with that most terrible of all forms of oppression—American slavery.

Said I not truly, then, that there is but little ground to hope for the repentance of this nation? Must she not be well-nigh dead to every conceivable attempt to bring her to repentance? But she will not be so always. The voices of truthful, tender, faithful admonition, now unheard or despised by her, will yet reach her heart. She may, it is true, (Heaven spare her from the need of such discipline!) have, first, to pass through foreign wars, and servile wars, and still other horrors. But the day of her redemption—or, in other words, of her broken-hearted sorrow for her crimes—(for such sorrow is redemption, whether in the case of an individual or a nation)—will, sooner or later, come. And when that day shall come, the moral soil of America, watered with the tears of penitence, shall bring forth fruits to the glory of God and the welfare of man, rivalling in abundance, and infinitely surpassing in preciousness, the rich harvests of her literal soil. In that day, our nation shall be worthy of all that God and good men have done for her. Her material wealth, surpassing that of any other nation, shall be no greater than her moral wealth: and her gigantic and unmatched power shall be only a power to bless.

What I have just said is, indeed, but prophecy—and the prophecy, too, of an ignorant and short-sighted man: and it may, therefore, never be fulfilled. My anticipations of a beautiful and blessed renovation for my beloved country may never be realized. She may be left to perish, and to perish for ever. What then?

Must I cease my efforts for her salvation? Happily, I am not dependent on prophecy for the interpretation of my duty, nor to sustain my fidelity, nor to encourage the opening of my lips. I am cast upon no such uncertainty. I am to continue to plead for my country, and to feel assured that I do not plead in vain. If prophecy is all uncertain, nevertheless, there are certainties, gracious certainties, on which it is my privilege to rely. I know, that in the Divine Economy, no honest discharge of the conscience, and no faithful testimony of the heart, shall be suffered to go unrewarded. I know, that in this perfect and blessed Economy, no sincere words in behalf of the right are lost. Time and truth will save them from falling ineffectual. To time and truth, therefore, do I cordially commit all that I have said on this occasion; and patiently will I wait to see what uses time and truth shall make of it.