Annotation

By the 1820s more than 100 antislavery societies were in existence, most advocating for resettlement of blacks in Africa—based on the belief that African Americans were an inferior race that could not coexist with white society. This belief was shared by Abraham Lincoln.

Many southerners justified slavery on social and economic grounds, following South Carolina Senator John Calhoun in calling it a "positive good." Others pointed to the example of Nat Turner, a well-treated, literate slave who instigated a rebellion in 1831 that resulted in the massacre of nearly sixty white men, women, and children before his capture, and the deaths of almost two hundred blacks at the hands of white mobs. To those who feared the emancipation of slaves because of the possibility of retaliation such as Turner's, slavery was indeed the "wolf by the ears," to use Jefferson's expression, that could not be safely let go.

While the morality and legality of slavery remained under heated debate, considerations of the economics of slavery, its impact on human civilization and progress, and the personal experience of both slaves and slaveholders led the opposing sides to drift further away from resolving what had become a sectional crisis (north versus south). In this lesson we will explore the wide-ranging debate over American slavery by presenting the lives of its leading opponents and defenders and the views they held about America's "peculiar institution."

Part 1 ➔ Biographies of Slavery's Opponents and Defenders
In a pair, you and a partner will compare and contrast the life stories of some prominent examples of slavery's opponents and defenders by going to the following websites to obtain information about their lives. A matrix for recording answers to your questions about each viewpoint has been provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer the questions below for each person to the right</th>
<th>William L. Garrison</th>
<th>Frederick Douglass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When and where was he born?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was he born into poverty or wealth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How educated was he?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where and how did he obtain his education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hardships did he endure, if any?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did he achieve national prominence/fame/celebrity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did he stand for in the debate over slavery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did he die?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biography Matrix for Slavery’s Defenders

**Websites**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Answer the questions below for each person to the right</strong></th>
<th><strong>John C. Calhoun</strong></th>
<th><strong>James Henry Hammond</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When and where was he born?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was he born into poverty or wealth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How educated was he?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where and how did he obtain his education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hardships did he endure, <em>if any</em>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did he achieve national prominence/fame/celebrity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did he stand for in the debate over slavery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did he die?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Biography Matrix for Slavery Opponents:

**Websites**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Answer the questions below for each person to the right</strong></th>
<th><strong>Angelina Grimke</strong></th>
<th><strong>Catherine Beecher</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When and where was she born?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was she born into poverty or wealth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How educated was she?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where and how did he obtain her education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hardships did she endure, <em>if any</em>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did she achieve national prominence/fame/celebrity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did she stand for in the debate over slavery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did she die?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Biography Matrix for Slavery Opponents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer the questions below for each person to the right</th>
<th>Henry Highland Garnet</th>
<th>Sojourner Truth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When and where was s/he born?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was s/he born into poverty or wealth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How educated was s/he?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where and how did s/he obtain his/her education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hardships did s/he endure, if any?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did s/he achieve national prominence/fame/celebrity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did s/he stand for in the debate over slavery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did she die?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sojourner Truth: [http://www.sojournertruth.org/Library/Archive/LegacyOfFaith.htm](http://www.sojournertruth.org/Library/Archive/LegacyOfFaith.htm) (Her Life)
Published weekly in Boston, *The Liberator* was the most important and longest-running newspaper of the abolitionist movement. The opening editorial below was written by Garrison, who served as editor from January 1831 to December 1865. Promising to be “as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice,” Garrison’s editorial marked the first time in American history that a white newspaper had publicly denounced slavery and advocated for immediate and full manumission (freedom). As such, *The Liberator* was the main voice of “immediatism,” the doctrine supported by the radical wing of the abolitionist movement.

Garrison represented the radical end of the abolitionist spectrum. He believed in the dissolution (break up) of the Union—an event that would eventually lead to slaves escaping the south because the north would no longer be bound by the Fugitive Slave Act. He also believed that the U.S. Constitution was a pro-slavery document, and could only support peaceful methods. His approach to emancipation stressed nonviolence and passive resistance, and he attracted a vocal following.

**Moral suasion** was used as an argument to end slavery. Many abolitionists (e.g. William Lloyd Garrison) felt that thinking people who were basically good people in America could be persuaded by argument that slavery was wrong; that it was wrong for moral reasons; that it was wrong for religious reasons; that the ideals on which the nation was founded were perverted by the institution of enslavement.

During my recent … [travels] for the purpose of … [discussing] the subject of slavery, every place that I visited gave fresh evidence of the fact, that a greater revolution [was needed] in the free states -- and particularly in New-England -- than at the south. I found … apathy more … [in the North] than among slave owners themselves. Of course, there were individual exceptions … This state of things … did not dishearten me. I [am] determined, at every hazard [danger], to [yell] emancipation … [to] the nation… Let southern oppressors tremble … let their northern apologists tremble -- let all the enemies of the persecuted blacks tremble.

Assenting to the "self-evident truth" maintained in the American Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights -- among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," I shall strenuously contend for the immediate enfranchisement of our slaves. In Park-street Church, on the Fourth of July, 1829, in an address on slavery, I … [unthinkingly supported] … the popular but pernicious [destructive] … [idea] of gradual abolition. I seize this opportunity to make a full and unequivocal recantation [withdrawal of support], and thus publicly to ask pardon … [from] my God, … [from] my country, and … [from] the poor slaves, for having … [been] so full of … injustice and absurdity…My conscience in now satisfied.

I am aware, that many object to the severity of my language; but is there not cause for severity? I will be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject, I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation. No! no! Tell a man what he is, and demand it of him. I will not excuse -- I will not retreat a single inch -- AND I WILL BE HEARD. The apathy of the people is enough to make every statue leap from its pedestal, and to hasten the resurrection of the dead.

It is pretended, that I am retarding [slowing] the cause of emancipation by the coarseness of my invective [harsh language] … The charge is not true…my influence, -- is felt at this moment to a considerable extent, and shall be felt in coming years -- not perniciously [destructively to abolition], but beneficially -- not as a curse, but as a blessing; and … [time will prove] that I was right.

---

**William Lloyd Garrison on the Morality and Legitimacy of Slavery under the U.S. Constitution - “On the Constitution and the Union” (From the Liberator) December 29, 1832**

… On the adoption of the Constitution…We pronounce it the most bloody … arrangement ever made by men for the continuance and protection of a system of the most atrocious villainy exhibited on earth. Yes—we recognize the compact [agreement], but with feelings of shame … It was a compact formed at the sacrifice of the bodies and souls of millions of our race [humans], for the sake of achieving a political object—[a]…monstrous coalition to do evil …Such a compact was, in the nature of things and according to the law of God, null and void from the beginning. No body of men ever had the right to guarantee the holding of human beings in bondage. Who … were the framers of our government, that they should dare confirm and authorize such high-handed villainy—such a flagrant robbery of the inalienable rights of man… They were men, like ourselves—as fallible, as sinful, as weak, as ourselves. …It was not valid then—it is not valid now. Still they persisted in maintaining it — and still do their successors, the people of Massachusetts, of New-England, and of the twelve Free States, persist in maintaining it. A sacred compact! a sacred compact! What, then, is wicked …?

This, then, is the relation in which we [Free States] stand to the holders of slaves at the south, and this is virtually our language toward them—“Go on, most worthy associates, from day to day, from month to month, from year to year, from generation to generation, plundering two millions of human beings of their liberty and the fruits of their toil [work]—driving them into the fields like cattle—starving and lacerating [cutting] their bodies—selling the husband from his wife, the wife from her husband, and children from their parents—spilling their blood— withholding the bible from their hands and all knowledge from their minds—and kidnapping annually sixty thousand infants, the offspring of … shame! Go on, in these practices—we do not wish nor mean to interfere … and
although we ourselves stand prepared to die, rather than submit even to a fragment of the intolerable load of oppression to which we are subjecting them…

People of New-England, and of the Free States! Is it true that slavery is no concern of yours? Have you no right even to protest against it, or to seek its removal? Are you not the main pillars of its support? How long do you mean to be answerable to God and the world, for spilling the blood of the poor innocents? Be not afraid to look the monster SLAVERY boldly in the face. He is your implacable foe—the vampire who is sucking your life-blood—the ravager of a large portion of your country, and the enemy of God and man. Never hope to be a united, or happy, or prosperous people while he exists. He has an appetite like the grave—...and an influence as dreadful as the corruption of death. Awake to your danger! the struggle is a mighty one—it cannot be avoided—it should not be...

It is said that if you agitate this question, you will divide the Union. … the fault will not be yours. You must perform your duty, faithfully, fearlessly and promptly, and leave the consequences to God: that duty clearly is, to cease [stop]…giving … protection to southern kidnappers. Let them separate, if they can muster courage enough—and the liberation [freeing] of their slaves is certain. Be assured that slavery will very speedily destroy this Union, if it be let alone; but even if the Union can be preserved by treading upon the necks, spilling the blood, and destroying the souls of millions of your race, we say it is not worth a price like this, and that it is …criminal for you to continue the present compact (i.e. support the constitution).

Focus Questions:

1. How does Garrison feel about the future of the “compact?” (compact = the union, the constitution, the country existing as a north and south)?
2. What does he claim to be the condition of the slaves?
3. How many races does he think there are? Briefly explain.
4. What reasons does Garrison give against the system of slavery?
5. Why does Garrison no longer agree with a “gradual abolition” of slavery?
6. How does Garrison defend the “severity” of his language in arguing for abolition?
7. Why does he not agree with those who argue that his severe language in condemning slavery actually slows the progress toward emancipation?
By 1852, Douglass had converted from the **moral suasionist** strategies of abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, to political boliticism and the possible uses of violence to overthrow slavery. Douglass was struggling financially; his newspaper, *Frederick Douglass' Paper*, survived only on philanthropy, and he could hardly support his growing family on meager lecturers' fees. At the time, the place of a radical black abolitionist in America's future was altogether uncertain. In these circumstances Douglass crafted a speech in response to the invitation of the Rochester Ladies Antislavery Society. As was the tradition in black communities of New York state, Douglass insisted on speaking on the 5th and not the 4th of July. Before nearly 600 people who paid the 121/2c admission, Douglass rose as orator of the day after a reading of the Declaration of Independence by a local minister.

Moral suasion was used as an argument to end slavery. Many abolitionists (e.g. William Lloyd Garrison) felt that thinking people who were basically good people in America could be persuaded by argument that slavery was wrong; that it was wrong for moral reasons; that it was wrong for religious reasons; that the ideals on which the nation was founded were perverted by the institution of enslavement. What the abolitionists didn't realize was how deeply embedded in the social, economic, and political structure slavery was. They didn't realize how powerful the slaveocracy was. And they didn't realize how much racism had embedded the fabric of American life.

He who could address this audience without a quailing sensation, has stronger nerves than I have. I do not remember ever to have appeared as a speaker before any assembly more shrinkingly, nor with greater distrust of my ability, than I do this day. A feeling has crept over me quite unfavorable to the exercise of my limited powers of speech. The task before me is one which requires much previous thought and study for its proper performance. I know that apologies of this sort are generally considered flat and unmeaning. I trust, however, that mine will not be so considered. Should I seem at ease, my appearance would much misrepresent me. The little experience I have had in addressing public meetings, in country school houses, avails me nothing on the present occasion.

The papers and placards say that I am to deliver a Fourth of July Oration. This certainly sounds large, and out of the common way, for me. It is true that I have often had the privilege to speak in this beautiful Hall, and to address many who now honor me with their presence. But neither their familiar faces, nor the perfect gage I think I have of Corinthian Hall seems to free me from embarrassment.

Fellow citizens, pardon me, allow me to ask, why am I called upon to speak here today? What have I, or those I represent, to do with your national independence? Are the great principles of political freedom and of natural justice, embodied in that Declaration of Independence, extended to us? and am I, therefore, called upon to bring our humble offering to the national altar, and to confess the benefits and express devout gratitude for the blessings resulting from your independence to us?

Would to God, both for your sakes and ours that an affirmative answer could be truthfully returned to these questions! Then would my task be light and my burden easy and delightful. For who is there so cold that a nation's sympathy could not warm him? Who so obdurate [not easily persuaded] and dead to the claims of gratitude that would not thankfully acknowledge such priceless benefits? …

But such is not the state of the case. I say it with a sad sense of the disparity between us. I am not included within the pale of this glorious anniversary! Your high independence only reveals the immeasurable distance between us. The blessings in which you, this day, rejoice are not enjoyed in common. The rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity … bequeathed by your fathers is shared by you, not by me. The sunlight that brought light and healing to you has brought stripes and death to me. This Fourth of July is yours, not mine. You may rejoice, I must mourn. To drag a man in fetters into the grand illuminated temple of liberty, and call upon him to join you in joyous anthems, were inhuman mockery and sacrilegious irony. Do you mean, citizens, to mock me by asking me to speak today? …

What, to the American slave, is your Fourth of July? I answer: a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciation of tyrants, brass-fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade and solemnity, are, to Him, mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is not a nation on the earth more guilty of practices more shocking and bloody than are the people of the United States at this very hour.

Go where you may, search where you will, roam through all the monarchies and despoticisms—of the Old World, travel through South America, search out every abuse, and when you have found the last, lay your facts by the side of the everyday practices of this nation, and you will say with me that, for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival.
Ever since he first met Garrison in 1841, the white abolitionist leader had been Douglass' mentor. But the views of Garrison and Douglass ultimately diverged. Garrison represented the radical end of the abolitionist spectrum. He believed in the dissolution (break up) of the Union – an event that would eventually lead to slaves escaping the south. He also believed that the U.S. Constitution was a pro-slavery document.

In 1851 Douglass announced at a meeting in Syracuse, New York, that he did not assume the Constitution was a pro-slavery document, and that it could even "be wielded in behalf of emancipation." Douglass also no longer advocated the dissolution of the Union, since it would isolate slaves in the South. This led to a bitter dispute between Garrison and Douglass that, despite the efforts of others such as Harriet Beecher Stowe to reconcile the two, would last into the Civil War, and lead the Douglass beginning publication of his own publication *The North Star*.

Source: pbs.org

Focus Questions:

1. How does Douglass feel about the “celebration” of the 4th of July? Explain Thoroughly.
2. Discuss the role of former slaves in abolition. What factors encouraged/challenged slaves/former slaves in participating in the movement?
3. Why did Douglass break with Garrison in 1851, and how did his stance on Abolition and the constitution change?
4. How would Douglass answer this question: What are the shortcomings of Garrison’s methods of abolitionism?
If we concede [give in] an inch, ... our ranks would be so broken that ... resistance would be impossible... The subject is beyond the jurisdiction of Congress - they have no right to touch it in any shape or form, or to make it the subject of deliberation or discussion... As widely as this ... spirit [abolitionism] has spread, it has not yet infected this body [the south], or the great mass of the intelligent and business portion of the North; but unless it be speedily stopped, it will spread ... till it brings the two great sections of the Union into deadly conflict... A large portion of the Northern States believed slavery to be a sin, and would consider it as an obligation of conscience to abolish it if they should feel themselves in any degree responsible for its continuance... ... the non-slaveholding States ... in the course of a few years ... will be [filled] by those who will have been taught to hate the people and institutions of nearly one-half of this Union [the slave-holding south], with a hatred more deadly than one hostile nation ever entertained towards another. ... we must become, finally, two people. It is impossible ... if the present causes are permitted to operate unchecked, that we should continue under the same political system. Abolition and the Union cannot coexist. As the friend of the Union I openly proclaim it, - and the sooner it is known the better... We of the South will not, cannot, surrender our institutions. To maintain the existing relations between the two races... is indispensable [important] to the peace and happiness of both. ... But let me not be understood as admitting, even by implication, that the existing relations between the two races in the slaveholding States is an evil: - far otherwise: I hold it to be a good, as it has thus far proved itself to be to both, and will continue to prove so if not disturbed by ... spirit of abolition. I appeal to facts. Never before has the black race of Central Africa, from the dawn of history to the present day, attained a condition so civilized and so improved, not only physically, but morally and intellectually. In the meantime, the white or European race has not degenerated. It has kept pace with ... other sections of the Union where slavery does not exist. ... I appeal to all sides whether the South is not equal in virtue, intelligence, patriotism, courage ... But I take higher ground. I hold that in the present state of civilization, where two races of different origin, and distinguished by color, and other physical differences, as well as intellectual, are brought together, the relation now existing in the slaveholding States between the two, is, instead of an evil, a good - a positive good... there never has yet existed a wealthy and civilized society in which one portion of the community did not... live on the labor of the other... Compare his [the slave] condition with the ... poor houses in the more civilized portions of Europe - look at the sick, and the old ... slave, on one hand, in the midst of his family and friends, under the kind ... care of his master and mistress, and compare it with the ... wretched condition of the pauper in the poorhouse [back in Europe]. ... I turn to the political; and here I fearlessly assert that the existing relation between the two races in the South, against which these ... fanatics [the abolitionists] are waging war, forms the most solid and durable foundation on which to rear free and stable political institutions. It is useless to disguise the fact. There is and always has been in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts us from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and which explains why it is that the political condition of the slaveholding States has been so much more stable and quiet than that of the North.

1. How does Calhoun feel about the future of the “compact?” (compact = the union, the constitution, the country existing as a north and south)?
2. What does he claim to be the condition of the slaves?
3. How many races does he think there are? Briefly explain.
4. What reasons does Calhoun give in support of the system of slavery?
In all social systems there must be a class to do the menial duties, to perform the drudgery of life. That is, a class requiring but a low order of intellect and but little skill. Its requisites are vigor, docility [obedience], fidelity[loyalty]. Such a class you must have, or you would not have that other class which leads progress, civilization, and refinement. It constitutes the very mud-sill of society and of political government; and you might as well attempt to build a house in the air, as to build either the one or the other, except on this mud-sill. Fortunately for the South, she found a race adapted to that purpose to her hand. A race inferior to her own, but eminently qualified in temper, in vigor, in docility, in capacity to stand the climate, to answer all her purposes. We use them for our purpose, and call them slaves…

The Senator from New York said yesterday that the whole world had abolished slavery. Aye, the name, but not the thing; all the powers of the earth cannot abolish that… for the [northern] man who lives by daily labor, and scarcely lives at that, and who has to put out his labor in the market, and take the best he can get for it; in short, your whole hireling class of manual laborers and "operatives," as you call them, are essentially slaves. The difference between us is, that our slaves are hired for life and well compensated; there is no starvation, no begging, no want of employment among our people, and not too much employment either. Yours are hired by the day, not cared for, and scantily compensated, which may be proved in the most painful manner, at any hour in any street in any of your large towns. Why, you meet more beggars in one day, in any single street of the city of New York, than you would meet in a lifetime in the whole South. We do not think that whites should be slaves either by law or necessity. Our slaves are black, of another and inferior race. The status in which we have placed them is an elevation. They are elevated from the condition in which God first created them, by being made our slaves. None of that race on the whole face of the globe can be compared with the slaves of the South. They are happy, content, unaspiring, and utterly incapable, from intellectual weakness, ever to give us any trouble by their aspirations. Yours are white, of your own race; you are brothers of one blood. They are your equals in natural endowment of intellect, and they feel galled by their degradation. Our slaves do not vote. We give them no political power. Yours do vote, and, being the majority, they are the depositories of all your political power. If they knew the tremendous secret, that the ballot-box is stronger than "an army with banners," and could [join together], where would you be? Your society would be reconstructed, your government overthrown, your property divided… You have been making war upon us to our very hearthstones. How would you like for us to send lecturers and agitators North, to teach these people this, to aid in combining, and to lead them?

**Focus Questions:**

1. According to Sen. Hammond, what has existed in all civilized societies?
2. What does Sen. Hammond mean by “the very mud-sill of society and of political government”? In other words, who are the mudsill? Explain.
3. Why does Sen. Hammond believe southern slaves have a better life than northern “slaves”?
4. Why does Sen. Hammond believe slaves exist in the North as well as the South? Who are these “slaves”?
5. According to Sen. Hammond, why is the South more civilized than the North? In other words, why is Southern slavery acceptable, whereas the northern version is not?
6. What does Hammond say to threaten the Northern elite in the Senate?
Born a slave in Maryland, Garnet issued his “call to rebellion” in 1843, and immediately stirred up controversy in both white and black abolitionist circles over the use of violence in the antislavery movement. Delivered at the Negro Convention in Buffalo, New York, Garnet argued that slaves should use violence when necessary in their dealings with masters and other white oppressors. Debated vigorously at the convention, Garnet’s resolution advocating violence was defeated by a narrow margin after leading delegates including Frederick Douglass opposed it on the grounds that it was too militant.

… We [free blacks] have been contented in sitting still and mourning over your [slaves] sorrows, earnestly hoping that before this day your sacred liberty would have been restored. But, we have hoped in vain. Years have rolled on, and tens of thousands have been borne on streams of blood and tears, to the shores of eternity. While you have been oppressed… nor can we be free while you are enslaved. We, therefore, write to you as being bound with you…

Slavery has fixed a deep gulf between you and us [free black and slave], [but] …the oppressor's power is fading, and you, every day, are becoming better informed, and more numerous…

Two hundred and twenty seven years ago, the first of our injured race were brought to the shores of America. They came not with glad spirits to select their homes in the New World. They came not with their own consent, to find an unmolested enjoyment of the blessings of this fruitful soil. The first dealings they had with men calling themselves Christians, exhibited to them the worst features of corrupt and sordid hearts; and convinced them that no cruelty is too great, no villainy and no robbery too abhorrent for even enlightened men to perform, when influenced by avarice [greed] … Your intellect has been destroyed as much as possible, and every ray of light they have attempted to shut out from your minds. The oppressors themselves have become involved in the ruin. They have become weak…

The colonists threw the blame upon England. They said that the mother country entailed the evil [slavery] upon them, and that they would rid themselves of it if they could. The world thought they were sincere, and the philanthropic pitted them. But time soon tested their sincerity.

In a few years the colonists grew strong, and severed themselves from the British Government. Their independence was declared, and they took their station among the sovereign powers of the earth. The declaration was a glorious document…When the power of Government returned to their hands, did they emancipate the slaves? No; they rather added new links to our chains. Were they ignorant of the principles of Liberty? Certainly they were not…[No one person] has … more right to the full enjoyment of his freedom than the other….and … They endeavor to make you as much like brutes as possible. When they have blinded the eyes of your mind when they have embittered the sweet waters of life then, and not till then, has American slavery done its perfect work.

TO SUCH DEGRADATION IT IS SINFUL IN THE EXTREME FOR YOU TO MAKE VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION. The divine commandments you are in duty bound to reverence and obey. If you do not obey them, you will surely meet with the displeasure of the Almighty. He requires you to love him supremely…The… condition in which you are placed, does not destroy your … obligation to God. You are not certain of heaven, because you suffer … in a state of slavery, where you cannot obey the commandments ……Your condition does not absolve you from your moral obligation. The diabolical injustice by which your liberties are cloven down, NEITHER GOD, NOR ANGELS, OR JUST MEN, COMMAND YOU TO SUFFER FOR A SINGLE MOMENT. THEREFORE IT IS YOUR SOLEMN AND IMPERATIVE DUTY TO USE EVERY MEANS, BOTH MORAL, INTELLECTUAL, AND PHYSICAL THAT PROMISES SUCCESS…

Brethren, the time has come when you must act for yourselves….You can plead your own cause, and do the work of emancipation better than any others. The nations of the world are moving in the great cause of universal freedom, and some of them at least will, ere long, do you justice. The combined powers of Europe have placed their broad seal of disapprobation [moral disapproval] upon the African slave trade. … Look around you, and behold the bosoms of your loving wives heaving with untold agonies! Hear the cries of your poor children! Remember the stripes your fathers bore. Think of the torture and disgrace of your noble mothers. Think of your wretched sisters, loving virtue and purity, as they are driven into concubinage [relations with their masters] and are exposed to the unbridled lusts of incarnate devils. Think of the undying glory that hangs around the ancient name of Africa— and forget not that you are native born American citizens, and as such, you are justly entitled to all the rights that are granted to the freest. Think how many tears you have poured out upon the soil which you have cultivated with unrequited toil and enriched with your blood; and then go to your lordly enslavers and tell them plainly, that you are determined to be free. Appeal to their sense of justice, and tell them that they have no more right to oppress you, than you have to enslave them. Entreat [implore] them to remove the grievous burdens which they have imposed upon you, and to remunerate [compensate] you for your labor. Promise them renewed diligence in the cultivation of the soil, if they will render to you an equivalent for your services. Point them to the increase of happiness and prosperity in the British West Indies since the Act of Emancipation. Tell them in language which they cannot misunderstand, of the exceeding sinfulness of slavery, and of a future judgment, and of the righteous retributions of an indignant God. Inform them that all you desire is FREEDOM, and that nothing else will suffice. Do this, and for ever after cease to toil for the heartless tyrants, who give you no other reward but stripes and abuse. If they then commence the work of death, they, and not you, will be responsible for the consequences. You had better all die - die immediately, than live slaves and entail your wretchedness upon your posterity. If you would be free in this
generation, here is your only hope. However much you and all of us may desire it, there is not much hope of redemption without the shedding of blood. If you must bleed, let it all come at once—*rather die freemen, than live to be slaves.*

…In 1822, Denmark Veazie [Vesey], of South Carolina, formed a plan for the liberation of his fellow men. In the whole history of human efforts to overthrow slavery, a more complicated and tremendous plan was never formed. He was betrayed by the treachery of his own people, and died a martyr to freedom. Many a brave hero fell, but history, faithful to her high trust, will transcribe his name on the same monument with Moses, Hampden, Tell, Bruce and Wallace, Toussaint L'Ouverture, Lafayette and Washington. That tremendous movement shook the whole empire of slavery. The guilty soul thieves were overwhelmed with fear. It is a matter of fact, that at that time, and in consequence of the threatened revolution, the slave States talked strongly of emancipation. But they blew but one blast of the trumpet of freedom and then laid it aside. As these men became quiet, the slaveholders ceased to talk about emancipation; and now behold your condition today! Angels sigh over it, and humanity has long since exhausted her tears in weeping on your account!

The patriotic Nathaniel Turner followed Denmark Veazie [Vesey… and future generations will remember him among the noble and brave.

Next arose the immortal Joseph Cinque, the hero of the Amistad. He was a native African, and by the help of God he emancipated a whole ship load of his fellow men on the high seas. And he now sings of liberty on the sunny hills of Africa and beneath his native palm trees, where he hears the lion roar and feels himself as free as that king of the forest.

…Noble men! Those who have fallen in freedom's conflict, their memories will be cherished by the true hearted and the God fearing in all future generations; those who are living, their names are surrounded by a halo of glory.

Brethren, arise, arise! Strike for your lives and liberties. Now is the day and the hour. Let every slave throughout the land do this, and the days of slavery are numbered. You cannot be more oppressed than you have been—–you cannot suffer greater cruelties than you have already. Rather die freemen than live to be slaves. Remember that you are FOUR MILLIONS!

…Let your motto be resistance! resistance! RESISTANCE! No oppressed people have ever secured their liberty without resistance…

**Focus Questions:**

1. Thoroughly explain [i.e. explicate, expunge] Garnet’s suggestion as to how slaves should resist their bondage and why. (Start with their 1st arrival to the New World to present day 1843).
2. Which past slave revolts does he mention and why?
3. Why was it rejected by the Negro Convention in Buffalo, and who was a major voice against Garnet?
Angelina wrote her first tract, *Appeal to the Christian Women of the South* (1836), to encourage southern women to join the abolitionist movement for the sake of white womenhood as well as black slaves. To her mind, slavery harmed white womanhood by destroying the institution of marriage. Marriage was destroyed when white men fathered their slaves' children. To publicly discuss such a delicate subject caused uproar. In 1837, Angelina published *An Appeal to the Women of the Nominally Free States*, and afterwards (with her sister Sarah) went on a tour of Northern churches to campaign against slavery and in favor of women's rights. They came under attack by Catharine Beecher, a prominent commentator on the position of women in society who argued that women should remain in the domestic sphere. In response, Angelina wrote several letters to Beecher that were later published as *Letters to Catherine Beecher*, in which she vigorously defended her right to speak out in favor of causes like abolition. In 1838, Sarah wrote *Letters on the Equality of the Sexes* to argue that the rights of African-Americans and women were linked together.

...slavery has done its deadliest work in the hearts of our citizens. Do you ask, then, "what has the North to do?" I answer, cast out first the spirit of slavery from your own hearts, and then lend your aid to convert the South. Each one present has a work to do, be his or her situation what it may, however limited their means, or insignificant their supposed influence. The great men of this country will not do this work; the church will never do it. ...

As a Southerner I feel it is my duty to stand up here to-night and bear testimony against slavery. I have seen it -- I have seen it. I know it has horrors that can never be described. I was brought up under its wing: I witnessed for many years its demoralizing influences, and its destructiveness to human happiness. It is admitted by some that the slave is not happy under the worst forms of slavery. But I have never seen a happy slave. I have seen him dance in his chains, it is true; but he was not happy. There is a wide difference between happiness and mirth. Man cannot enjoy the former while his manhood is destroyed, and that part of the being which is necessary to the making, and to the enjoyment of happiness, is completely blotted out. The slaves sometimes are mirthful. When hope is extinguished, they say, "let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." [Just then stones were thrown at the windows from outside, -- a great noise without, and commotion within.] What is a mob? What would the breaking of every window be? What would the levelling of this Hall be? …evidence that we are wrong, or that slavery is a good and wholesome institution? What if the mob should now burst in upon us, break up our meeting and commit violence upon our persons -- would this be anything compared with what the slaves endure? No, no: …I thank the Lord that there is yet life left enough to feel the truth, even though it rages at it -- that conscience is not so completely seared as to be unmoved by the truth of the living God.

Many persons go to the South for a season, and are hospitably entertained in the parlor and at the table of the slave-holder. They never enter the huts of the slaves; they know nothing of the dark side of the picture, and they return home with praises on their lips of the generous character of … [the slaveholders]. Or if they have witnessed the cruelties of slavery, by remaining silent spectators they have naturally become callous -- an insensibility has ensued which prepares them to apologize even for barbarity. *Nothing but the corrupting influence of slavery on the hearts of the Northern people can induce them to apologize for it;* and much will have been done for the destruction of Southern slavery when we have so reformed the North that no one here will be willing to risk his reputation by advocating or even excusing the holding of men as property. The South knows it…

…I feel that all this disturbance is but an evidence that our efforts are the best that could have been adopted, or else the friends of slavery would not care for what we say and do. The South knows what we do. I am thankful that they are reached by our efforts. Many times have I wept in the land of my birth, over the system of slavery. I knew of none who sympathized in my feelings -- I was unaware that any efforts were made to deliver the oppressed [i.e. abolition] -- no voice was heard …Oh, how should I have rejoiced to know that such efforts as these were being made…

I fled to the land of Penn; for here, thought I, sympathy for the slave will surely be found. But I found it not. The people were kind and hospitable, but the slave had no place in their thoughts… I therefore shut up my grief in my own heart… I thought there was no hope; that the wicked would go on in his wickedness, until he had destroyed both himself and his country… What will it … [take] to expose to the gaze of strangers the horrors and pollutions of slavery, when there is no ear to hear nor heart to feel and pray for the slave…But how different do I feel now! Animated with hope, nay, with an assurance of the triumph of liberty and good will to man, I will lift up my voice like a trumpet, and show this people their transgression, their sins of omission towards the slave, and what they can do towards affecting Southern mind, and overthrowing Southern oppression.

…If you are on what you suppose to be neutral ground [regarding slavery], the South look upon you as on the side of the oppressor. …slavery -- that curse of nations - God swept Egypt with … destruction, and punished Judea … because of slavery. And have we any reason to believe that he is less just now? -- or that he will be more favorable to us than to his own "peculiar people?"

…. The current is even now setting fast against them [slaveholders…A few years ago…the South felt secure, and with a contemptuous sneer asked, "Who are the abolitionists? The abolitionists are nothing?" … [Mob again disturbed the meeting – for the third time.]
We often hear the question asked, “What shall we do?” Here is an opportunity for doing something now. Every man and every woman present may do something by showing that we fear not a mob, and, in the midst of threatenings … by opening our mouths …

To work as we should in this cause, we must know what Slavery is. Let me urge you then to buy the books which have been written on this subject and read them, and then lend them to your neighbors. Give your money no longer for things which pander to pride and lust, but aid in scattering "the living coals of truth" upon the naked heart of this nation, -- in circulating appeals to the sympathies of Christians in behalf of the outraged and suffering slave. …

Women of Philadelphia! Allow me as a Southern woman, with much attachment to the land of my birth, to entreat you to come up to this work. Especially let me urge you to petition. Men may settle this and other questions at the ballot-box, but you have no such right; it is only through petitions that you can reach the Legislature. It is therefore peculiarly your duty to petition. Do you say, "It does no good?" The South already turns pale at the number sent. They have read the reports of the proceedings of Congress, and there have seen that among other petitions were very many from the women of the North on the subject of slavery. This fact has called the attention of the South to the subject. How could we expect to have done more as yet? Men who hold the rod over slaves, rule in the councils of the nation: and they deny our right to petition and to remonstrate against abuses of our sex and of our kind. We have these rights, however, from our God. … The fact that the South look with jealousy upon our measures shows that they are effectual. There is, therefore, no cause for doubting or despair, but rather for rejoicing.

It was remarked in England that women did much to abolish Slavery in her colonies… One petition two miles and a quarter long … [was]… presented…When the women of these States send up to Congress such a petition, our legislators will arise as did those of England, and say, “When all the maids and matrons of the land are knocking at our doors we must legislate.” Let the zeal and love, the faith and works of our English sisters quicken ours -- that while the slaves continue to suffer, and when they shout deliverance, we may feel the satisfaction of having done what we could.

Focus Questions:

1. What should the role of women be in the abolitionist movement? Explain. (include Beecher)
2. What actions does she think need to be taken?
3. How did growing up in the South affect Grimke’s views of slavery?
4. Explain the statement “There is a wide difference between happiness and mirth.”
5. What is Grimke’s response to the constant mob disturbances of the meeting? (i.e. stones thrown at the window).
6. What surprised Grimke upon her arrival to the North, and why is she currently hopeful?
7. According to Grimke, for what reasons do Northerners accept or remain quiet on the subject of Southern slavery?
8. Why is neutrality on the issue of slavery undesirable?
9. How does Grimke use the example of England?
MY DEAR FRIEND,

Your public address to Christian females at the South has reached me, and I have been urged to aid in circulating it at the North. I have also been informed that you contemplate a tour, during the ensuing year, for the purpose of exerting your influence to form Abolition Societies among ladies of the non-slave-holding States.

Our acquaintance and friendship give me a claim to your private ear; but there are reasons why it seems more desirable to address you in a more public manner.

The object I have in view is to present some reasons why it seems unwise … for ladies of the non-slave-holding States to unite themselves in Abolition Societies; and thus, at the same time, to exhibit the inexpediency of the course you propose to adopt.

I do not suppose there is one person in a thousand, at the North, who would dissent from [anti-slavery] principles. They would only differ in the … doctrine of gradual emancipation, while Abolitionists would call it the doctrine of immediate emancipation…

[First] The … the Abolition Society is … a voluntary association in one section of the country, designed to awaken public sentiment against a moral evil existing in another section of the country, and the principal point of effort seems to be, to enlarge the numbers of this association as a means of influencing public sentiment. The principal object of your proposed tour, I suppose, is to present facts, arguments, and persuasions to influence northern ladies to enroll themselves as members of this association…

[many] Abolitionists … have drawn inferences, which appear to be not only illogical, but false. Because individuals in their own community have aroused their fellow citizens to correct their own evils, therefore they [incorrectly] infer that attempts to convince their fellow-citizens of the faults of another community will lead that community to forsake their evil practices.

The second reason I would urge against joining the Abolition Society is, that its character and measures are not either peaceful or Christian in tendency, but they … tend to generate party spirit… [disunion] and angry passions.

The best way to make a person like a thing which is disagreeable, is to try in some way to make it agreeable; and if a certain class of persons is the subject of unreasonable prejudice, the peaceful and Christian way of removing it would be to endeavor to render the unfortunate persons … of this class, so useful, so humble and unassuming, so kind in their feelings, and so full of love and good works, that prejudice would be supplanted [replaced] by complacency in their goodness, and pity and sympathy … If the friends of the blacks had quietly set themselves to work to increase their intelligence, their usefulness, their respectability, their meekness, gentleness, and benevolence, and then had appealed to the pity, generosity, and Christian feelings of their fellow citizens, a very different result would have appeared. Instead of this, reproaches, rebukes, and sneers, were employed to convince the whites that their prejudices were sinful… This tended to irritate the whites, and to increase their prejudice against the blacks…Then, on the other hand, the blacks extensively received the Liberator, and learned to imbibe the spirit of its conductor [i.e. William Lloyd Garrison].

It is a known law of mind that first seen in the nursery and school, afterwards developed in society, that a person is least likely to judge correctly of truth, and least likely to yield to duty, when excited by passion.

It is a law of experience, that when wrong is done, if repentance and reformation [i.e. regret and improvement] are sought, then love and kindness, mingled with remonstrance [forceful argument], coming from one who has a right to speak, are more successful than rebuke [criticize, admonish] and scorn …

In the nursery, if the child does wrong, the finger of scorn, the taunting rebuke…will make the young culprit only frown with rage, and perhaps repeat and increase the injury. But the voice of maternal love, or even the gentle remonstrances of an elder sister, may bring tears of sorrow and contrition [deep and genuine feelings of doing wrong].

It is the maxim then of experience, that when men are to be turned from evils, and brought to repent and reform, those only should interfere who are most loved and respected, and who have the best right to approach the offender. While on the other hand, rebuke from those who are deemed obtrusive will do more harm than good.

It is another maxim of experience that such dealings … should be in private, not in public. The moment a man is publicly rebuked, shame, anger, and pride of opinion, all combine to make him defend his practice, and refuse either to own himself wrong, or to cease from his evil ways.

The Abolitionists have violated all these laws of mind and of experience, in dealing with their southern brethren. Their course has been most calculated to awaken anger, fear, pride, hatred, and all the passions most likely to blind the mind to truth, and make it averse to duty.

It is the grand feature of the Divine … that there should be different stations of superiority and subordination, and it is impossible to annihilate this beneficent [good] and immutable [undisputable] law. On its first entrance into life, the child is a dependent on parental love, and of necessity takes a place of subordination and obedience. As he advances in life these new relations of superiority and subordination multiply. The teacher must be the superior in station, the pupil a subordinate. The master of a family the superior, the domestic a subordinate—the ruler a superior, the subject a subordinate. Nor do these relations at all depend upon superiority either in intellectual or moral worth. However weak the parents, or intelligent the child, there is no reference to this, in the immutable law. However incompetent the teacher, or superior the pupil, no alteration of station can be allowed. However unworthy the master or worthy the servant, while their mutual relations are such that demand subordination, no change in station as to subordination can be allowed. In fulfilling the duties of these relations, true dignity consists in conforming to all those relations that demand subordination, with … cheerfulness.

When … In this arrangement of the duties of life, Heaven has appointed to one sex the superior, and to the other the subordinate station, and this without any reference to the character or conduct of either. It is therefore as much for the dignity as it is for the interest of females, in all respects to conform to the duties of this relation…while woman holds a subordinate relation in society to the other sex, it is not because it was designed that her duties or her influence should be any the less important, or all-pervading. But it was designed that the mode of gaining influence and of exercising power should be altogether different and peculiar.
It is Christianity that has given to woman her true place in society… "Peace on earth and good will to men" is the character of all the rights and privileges, the influence, and the power of woman. A man may act on society by the collision of intellect, in public debate; … he may drive by physical force, and he does not outstep the boundaries of his sphere. But all the power, and all the conquests that are lawful to woman, are those only which appeal to the kindly, generous, peaceful and benevolent principles.

Woman is to win everything by peace and love; by making herself so much respected, esteemed and loved, that to yield to her opinions and to gratify her wishes, will be the free-will offering of the heart. But this is to be all accomplished in the domestic and social circle. There let every woman become so cultivated and refined in intellect, that her taste and judgment will be respected—so unassuming and unambitious, that collision and competition will be banished;—so "gentle…" as that every heart will repose [relax, at peace] in her presence; then, the fathers, the husbands, and the sons, will find an influence thrown around them, to which they will yield not only willingly but proudly… the moment woman begins to feel the promptings of ambition, or the thirst for power, her ægis [ee-jis – shield, protection] of defence is gone. All the sacred protection of religion, all the generous promptings of chivalry, all the poetry of romantic gallantry, depend upon woman's retaining her place as dependent…—whatever obliges her in any way to exert coercive influences, throws her out of her appropriate sphere.

[These principles] …are entirely opposed to the plan of arraying females in any Abolition movement; because it enlists them in an effort to coerce the South by the public sentiment of the North; because it brings them forward as partisans in a conflict that has been begun and carried forward by measures that are anything rather than peaceful in their tendencies; …because it leads them into the arena of political collision, not as peaceful mediators to hush the opposing elements, but as combatants to cheer up and carry forward the measures of strife.

…In this country, petitions to congress… seem, IN ALL CASES, to fall entirely without the sphere of female duty. Men are the proper persons to make appeals to the rulers whom they appoint, and if their female friends, by arguments and persuasions, can induce them to petition, all the good … But if females cannot influence their nearest friends, to urge forward a public measure in this way, they surely are out of their place, in attempting to do it themselves.

[Beecher also goes on to argue that encouraging women to enter the sphere commonly held by men would deprive the country of much needed teachers, and inevitably lead to uneducated masses.]

[If you would like to read Grimke’s response to Beecher see http://pds.lib.harvard.edu/pds/view/2581430?n=104&s=4 → Letter XI – The Sphere of Women]

Focus Questions:

1. Who and what was this letter in response to?
2. Is Beecher an enemy of Grimke?
3. Does Beecher support immediate or gradual emancipation?
4. What 2 reasons does Beecher provide in arguing one should not join an Abolitionist Society?
5. What does Beecher think the role of women should be in both abolition and the political life? Why? Explain.
Lecture Notes:

In 1832 Garrison formed the New England Anti-Slavery Society. The following year he helped organize the Anti-Slavery Society. Garrison was influenced by the ideas of Susan Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Lucy Stone and other feminists who joined the society. This was reflected in the content of the Liberator that now began to advocate women's suffrage, pacifism and temperance.

Some members of the Anti-Slavery Society considered the organization to be too radical. They objected to the attacks on the US Constitution and the prominent role played by women in the society. In 1839, two brothers, Arthur Tappan and Lewis Tappan, left and formed a rival organization, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

Garrison became increasingly radical and in 1854 he created controversy by publicly burning a copy of the Constitution at a Anti-Slavery rally at Framingham, Massachusetts. Although he doubted the morality of the violence used by John Brown at Harper's Ferry in 1859, his newspaper controversially supported his actions.

On the outbreak of the American Civil War Garrison abandoned his previously held pacifist views and supported Abraham Lincoln and the Union Army. However, during the war, Garrison was critical of Lincoln for making the preservation of the union rather than the abolition of slavery his main objective.

After the passing of the 13th Amendment in 1865, Garrison decided to cease publication of the Liberator. Garrison spent his last fourteen years campaigning for women's suffrage, pacifism and temperance. William Lloyd Garrison died on 24th May, 1879.