

Transcriber's Notes:

Greek words that may not display correctly in all browsers are transliterated in the text like this: βιβλος. Position your mouse over the line to see the transliteration.

Other notes [follow](#) the text.

[1]

ABOLITIONISM EXPOSED!

**PROVING THAT THE PRINCIPLES OF
ABOLITIONISM ARE INJURIOUS TO THE
SLAVES THEMSELVES, DESTRUCTIVE TO THIS
NATION, AND CONTRARY TO THE EXPRESS
COMMANDS OF GOD; WITH STRONG
EVIDENCE** *That some of the principal CHAMPIONS
of Abolitionism are inveterate Enemies to this Country,
and are taking advantage of the 'ANTI-SLAVERY
WAR-WHOOP' to dissever, and break up, the UNION.*

"While they promise them *Liberty*, they themselves are the *Slaves*
of corruption."—2 Pet. ii. 19.

**BY W. W. SLEIGH, F. R. C. S. L.
FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ANATOMY AND**

**SURGERY, LONDON; HON. MEMB. R. W. L. S. I.;
AUTHOR OF "THE SCIENCE OF SURGERY;" "THE
CHRISTIAN'S DEFENSIVE DICTIONARY AGAINST
INFIDELITY;" &c. &c. &c.**

**PHILADELPHIA: PUBLISHED BY D.
SCHNECK, N. W. CORNER OF SECOND AND
RACE STREETS. Stereotyped by J. Fagan.**

1838.

[2]
Entered according to the act of Congress, in the year 1838, by W.
W. Sleight, in the office of the district court of the eastern district of
Pennsylvania.

[3]
CONTENTS.

	Pag e
Preface	4
CHAPTER I.	
Liberty and Slavery defined—Difference between Words and Things	5
CHAPTER II.	
The Principles, &c. of the Leaders of Abolitionism exhibited	16
CHAPTER III.	
The impracticability of the object of Abolitionists demonstrated	24
CHAPTER IV.	
The Errors of the Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine, for April, 1837, respecting the Scriptural Words, " <i>servant</i> "—" <i>property</i> "—" <i>buy</i> ," &c.,	43

briefly noticed

CHAPTER V.

The Conduct and Character of the Southern Slave-holder vindicated [49](#)

CHAPTER VI.

Colonization Principles vindicated—Calumnies refuted—The good the Colonization Society has already done—is doing—and the incalculable good it must do, if duly patronized [66](#)

CHAPTER VII.

Colonization and Abolitionism contrasted [88](#)

APPENDIX.

Extract of an Address of William Lloyd Garrison, Esq., published in the London Patriot, of August, 1833 [91](#)

Conclusion [92](#)

[4]

PREFACE.

The conflagration of the late "*Pennsylvania Hall*" having frustrated the contemplated discussion between some of the champions of Abolitionism and the Author, he feels it a duty he owes the public, and the best service he can render this country, to make known, through the medium of a Pamphlet, a few of the facts and arguments which he intended adducing on that occasion. Thus contributing his mite of information towards allaying the general excitement on this subject, and, if possible, to open the eyes of those who, *through mistaken philanthropy*, have become the *innocent* tools of a few reckless men, whose object, (to put the most favourable construction on it) may be, while indifferent of consequences, to render themselves conspicuous. Were he not convinced that the best interests of this country, that the real interests of the coloured population, bond and free, and that common humanity itself, are involved in the question of Abolitionism, he would not presume to obtrude himself on the

notice of the Public, on a topic more or less now connected with politics, from which he has hitherto carefully refrained. He comes forward therefore, while he declares himself an eternal and uncompromising enemy to all *cruelty, injustice, tyranny, and oppression*, not *against*, but *for* liberty—not *against*, but *for* the coloured man—not *against*, but *for* humanity.

Philadelphia, 285 Race Street. *May 21st, 1838.*

[5]

ABOLITIONISM EXPOSED!

CHAPTER I. LIBERTY AND SLAVERY DEFINED.—DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WORDS AND THINGS.

Mankind has ever been disposed to be carried away with *names* and *words*, with the *representation* of things, rather than with *things themselves*: and that portion of mankind thus apt to be deceived by *mere sound*, is generally the most innocent—the best—the most unsuspecting—the most charitable—these very qualities rendering them the easy victims of design and imprudence: the history of the world proves, not only this, but also that demagogues are the *first* to fly from the commotions, which they themselves create; and thus leave their poor innocent victims to suffer the vengeance of an outraged and insulted community! They stand their ground while the weapons used are merely words, and "*rotten*" eggs, &c.; but when recourse is had to leaden balls, and swords of steel, they generally take good care to make a quick

retreat, leaving their deluded followers to have the glory of martyrdom!

Liberty is a glorious term—so is *Christianity*—but under the sacred garb of both one and the other, the

[6]

foulest deeds have been, and may be, perpetrated! Under the name of *Christianity*, the holy crusades, in which thousands were slain, were instituted and carried on, by Englishmen! And under the name of *Liberty*, men, women, and children were, in 1793, slaughtered by Frenchmen! Be not therefore carried away by *sounds*—by mere *words*.

Slavery is a horrid term! But why? Not that bondage or slavery is uncommon, or rare; for there are few, very few men, white or black, on the face of the Earth who are not SLAVES! He who commits sin is the *slave* of lust—so says the Bible—Let God be true, and every man a liar. Who therefore is not a slave? Was not Buonaparte, while he was the Emperor of nearly all Europe, a *slave* to his god—ambition? And is not the *covetous* man a slave to his idol—gold?

"He is a freeman whom the truth makes free,
And all are slaves beside. There's not a chain,
That hellish foes, confederate for his harm,
Can wind around him, but he casts it off,
With as much ease, as Samson his green withes."

The principal reason why we abhor so much the term *slavery* is, the base cruelty with which *some* tyrant slaveholders, for there are wicked slaveholders as well as wicked husbands and masters, have treated their slaves. Hence we are very apt to use as synonymous terms, *slavery*, *cruelty*, *tyranny*, and *oppression*. Moreover it is the interest of certain persons so to use these words, for the purpose of getting more ready access to the hearts of good-natured men and women. Does any one really believe that a man *cannot* treat his slaves *kindly*, *tenderly*, and *affectionately*? If any one thinks it

possible, then let not, for the future, the terms *slavery* and *cruelty* be inseparably

[7]

united. But if he thinks it impossible, then it is evident the testimony of some thousands of disinterested, good, and religious men, who have visited the South, and who have most solemnly borne testimony to the kind, tender, and Christian manner in which *numerous* slaveholders treat their slaves, must be rejected! If all this is to be rejected, then let the doubter, who is so charitable towards the coloured population, exercise a little of that charity, "which rejoiceth not in iniquity," and is "without partiality," towards his white fellow citizens, and ere he slanders them, or encourages those who bear false witness against them, pay the South a visit, and judge for himself, with his own eyes, and his own ears. Methinks he replies, "but I have it from those who themselves have witnessed it!" Witnessed what? Is it that *all* the slaveholders in the South treat their slaves with *cruelty* and *barbarity*? Oh no, perhaps he says, not *all*, but many of them! Many thanks! This is fully admitted, and much regretted; but this exception proves the very proposition with which we started, viz. "that slavery, and cruelty, ought not to be used as *synonymous* terms!" Again, fresh he is no doubt to the charge, with the thrust, "but this fact of many of the slaveholders treating their slaves with cruelty, shows there ought to be no slavery!" Avast, friend! is the *abuse* of a system a just cause of condemnation? Do you say it is: then the system of apprenticeship—of guardianship—of matrimony—*Liberty*—and *Christianity* themselves, ought to be condemned, for they all have been abused—all have had the most *cruel*—*tyrannical*—and *Satanic* acts, committed under their names! Therefore, according to the very argument by which you would have slavery condemned, you would also

[8]

have *liberty*, *matrimony*, and *Christianity*, banished from the earth!—You cannot get out of the dilemma—there is no possible

alternative—if *slavery* is to be condemned because it has been *abused*, so are Liberty and Christianity! Out of thine own mouth thou art condemned!

A total recklessness of truth is a remarkable feature in the arguments adopted by the advocates of Abolitionism; while they give no credit to the statements of those differing from them! they unblushingly assert that *all* slaveholders are *tyrants* and *cruel*! Does truth require falsehood to make it conquer? Ought not those preposterous misstatements open the eyes of the public to the real character, and motive, of those men?—The cause of God they cannot be advocating, for his cause requires not the weapons of Satan! Error invariably stands in need of lies for its support.

That there is great cruelty in the South, no one denies; but is there no cruelty in the North? Are there no cruel, tyrannical, husbands and masters in Philadelphia or in Boston? Are no acts of oppression committed north of the Chesapeake? These cannot be attributed to slavery! There is, rely on it, a deeper, a more concealed, a more galling *slavery* and *bondage*, to which these evils are attributable, even the slavery of the soul to sin and to Satan. To this one, and the same *mental slavery*, both cruelty and tyranny in the South, and in the North, are alike referable. Therefore attributing these detestable evils, cruelty, and tyranny, to *corporeal* slavery, is not only unphilosophical and unscriptural, but fatally erroneous; for it leads us to attack the *effect*, and not the *cause*.

The Author, while listening last week to the Abolition

[9]

Champions in the late "Pennsylvania Hall," was forcibly struck with the strong similarity between the *mode* of argument adopted by them, and by the champions of Infidelity in the late public discussions, between them and him, in New York! They commenced their addresses with high-sounding words about *liberty! oppression! tyranny, &c.!* Having by this mode (*and they*

know the value of it!) got ready access to the hearts of their audience, and made a favourable impression, so as to make the females whisper to each other, "Oh what a fine, good man, that must be," &c.(!) then they depicted, in the strongest colours, the horrors of slavery—next they issued forth a tirade of slander and abuse against all slaveholders; and lastly they proceeded to undermine the character of every man opposed to them—the credibility of every witness bearing testimony against them—and the motives of all men, *except themselves!* Moreover they invariably attacked the *abuses* of each system (as if a system were answerable for its abuse) holding up to public odium, what every good man from his heart must condemn, viz: oppression, tyranny, and cruelty; thus leaving the vast majority of the audience under the impression that it was the *thing itself*, and not the *abuse of it*, on which they were animadverting!

Liberty—there is scarcely a word in the English Vocabulary so often perverted as the term *liberty*.—A vast mass of mankind conceive that the meaning of the word is, a perfect privilege and license for each and every man to do as he pleases.—If this be the real and true meaning of liberty, and that where this is *not*, there is *slavery*, then there is no liberty in the United States, (and God forbid, say I, there ever should be here such liberty,) and every man, woman, and child in the

[10]

Union, is a *slave!* I doubt not this is the kind of liberty at which some of the champions of Abolitionism, viz. Fanny Wright Darusmont—Owen—et hoc omne genus, are aiming! But is this the liberty sanctioned by God? No! Is this the liberty guaranteed by the declaration of Independence? No! Is this the liberty for which the Fathers of this Country fought and bled? No! No! Such liberty would be the most awful tyranny and oppression—The liberty authorised by God, and sanctioned by the laws of this Country, is, that no man shall do aught to the injury, prejudice, or hurt of his neighbour—This is the only true liberty granted by God to man;

yet this is the very liberty, the advocates of Abolitionism turn into ridicule, and attempt to destroy, under the plausible plea of vindicating the rights of man! This was the plea of Thomas Paine—This was the plea of Robert Owen—this is the plea of Fanny Wright Darusmont—this is the plea of all the infidels on the face of the earth! But, say Abolitionists, the Bible commands us, to "do unto others as we would be done by." Admitted. This very passage was addressed by the Infidels in their discussion with me to show the absurdity of the Bible: and according to the use made of it by Abolitionists, the argument of Infidels would be unanswerable! But will Abolitionists stand by this rule? They will not: for if they did, they would instantly abandon their crusade against their southern fellow citizens: and if they will not, then let them no longer quote that as authority, by which they themselves will not be governed! [See this subject further illustrated in a subsequent chapter.]

Liberty then may be defined to be, *the privilege of doing all that is good—and nothing that is evil*—But who is to decide that which is good, and that which is evil?

[11]

The Creator of the universe—Man unassisted by revelation never was, and never will be, able. The Bible which contains the revealed will of Omnipotence is that volume, and that only, which constitutes the umpire of good and evil^[11:A]—The very fact of the existence of laws in the land, proves man is not at liberty to do as he pleases: for, "law is a rule of action:" actions therefore must be controlled—Society demands it—God has authorised it—And perfect Liberty maintains it.

The Pirate boasts of liberty—preaches liberty to his comrades—and condemns all law! Here is a specimen of perfect liberty! He may with equal propriety, when taken prisoner, urge the Abolition text, "do unto others, as you would be done by." Now, if you had been a pirate, (he would say) and had the misfortune of having

been taken prisoner, would *you* not *wish* to be set at liberty? You reply, yes, certainly—then he says, the Bible commands you to do unto others as you would be done by; and, as you would *wish* to be set at *liberty*, were you in my situation, if you regard the authority of God you will set me *free*! The reader must perceive to what lengths this principle may be carried out—even to the utter destruction of all society!

Again; would opening the doors of a lunatic asylum, and letting free the patients thereof, be an act of kindness or friendship towards them? You reply, Certainly not! Yet this would be granting them immediate liberty—this would be pure abolitionism! But, you rejoin, the condition of the persons—their mental inabilities disqualify them for liberty till they are cured—till they can take care of themselves—till there is no danger of their doing violence to others; therefore, keeping them confined till *then*, is in fact an act

[12]

of kindness towards them,—and the opposite course would be most injurious to them! Thank you, kind reader, these are identically the same reasons I give for not advocating the *immediate* emancipation of the slaves. I give you full credit for the wisdom and propriety of your reasons: be so liberal as to grant me the same indulgence—to give me the same credit for the sincerity of my actions. It is probable the Abolitionist will reply, that the condition of the slaves, and of the inmates of a lunatic asylum, is very different. I answer, without fear of contradiction, that, as far as mental incapability, the vast mass of the slaves are as incapable of taking care of themselves as the great proportion of lunatics; and this we shall fully demonstrate in a subsequent chapter. Again; do you think children ought to be freed from all parental control? You reply, certainly not; and you give the same reasons as you have just adduced for not setting lunatics free. Is not this, then, a case parallel with that of the slaves? And in both, I may as justly accuse you of oppression, of tyranny, of a hatred to liberty, because you

will not emancipate lunatics, and all children, as you accuse me, for not advocating the immediate abolition of slavery.

Slavery is derived from *slave*; as *servant* comes from *service*. In the English language the two are distinct from one another; the former term being applied to *involuntary*, the latter to voluntary, servitude. But this is not the case in either the Hebrew, Greek, or Latin tongues; one and the same word, in each language, signifies both voluntary and involuntary service. Thus "*obed*," in Hebrew—"δουλος," in Greek—and "*servus*," in Latin, signify what we mean by the terms, *servant* and *slave*. Hence in works written in

[13]

any of these languages, we can never tell from the word *itself* whether the person to whom the term is applied was a *slave*, or a *servant*: it is therefore only by concomitant expressions or circumstances that we can come to a conclusion as to the actual nature of his situation. This is the case both in the Old and New Testament.

For instance, when we read of individuals having been *sold*, having been *purchased*, having been "*bought with money*" &c., we cannot doubt for a moment the propriety of applying to such persons the term *slave*: and that, no matter whether their servitude was temporary, or for ever—whether they had sold themselves, or were sold by *others*; they were *slaves* to all intents and purposes—from the moment they were sold they became subject to *involuntary* servitude.

Again, while it by no means follows that every servant ("*obed*"—"δουλος"—"*servus*,") mentioned in the Bible, was a slave, it does follow that every slave was a servant!

Ere I make the next statement, I request it may be distinctly understood, 1st, that I consider the "*Slave-trade*," and "*Slave-holding*," two distinct things: 2d, that I do not consider "*slave-holding*," "*cruelty*," "*oppression*," and "*tyranny*," synonymous. While therefore I pronounce the former, that is *the slave-trade*, to

be barbarous, iniquitous, and *unscriptural*, I *cannot* find a single passage in the whole word of God which either denounces *slave-holding*, or commands the owner to liberate instantaneously his slaves. And I fearlessly defy all the Abolitionists on earth to produce one such passage. If therefore the Bible is to be the umpire, and to its authority alone I ever consent to strike, that sacred book announces that

[14]

"WHERE THERE IS NO LAW THERE IS NO TRANSGRESSION;" (Rom. iv. 14): and as there is no law prohibitory of *slave-holding*, it cannot be considered *sin* (for sin is the transgression of the law) by any, except those who aim at possessing a higher degree of moral worth and righteousness, than the Lord Jesus Christ himself; and, "who by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

While I thus humbly vindicate the slandered slave-holder, I desire equally to denounce all cruelty—all inhumanity—all oppression—the same law of God which desires the slave to "be obedient to his master, with fear and trembling" (Eph. vi. 5-9) commands the Master, "to FORBEAR THREATENING"—(for "vengeance belongeth unto God") "to give that which is *just*, and *equal* to his slave; knowing that there is a Master in Heaven; who will render to every man, without respect of persons, according to his deeds." (Col. iv. 1.)

But so far from the Bible condemning *slave-holding*, I maintain it recognizes the practice by giving laws, and directions, both for Master and for slave—and so far from encouraging the slave to run away from his master, as the principles of Abolitionism teach, it unequivocally exhorts and commands "*every* man to ABIDE in the same calling wherein he is called"—"if called, *being a slave*, care not for it; but if thou *mayest* (i. e. if thou lawfully) be *made* (set) free, use it rather." (1 Cor. vii. 20, 21.) This is my *guide*, this is my *principle*, this would be the foundation of my advice to all.—But

how opposite are the principles, the advice, and the conduct of Abolitionists, to the inspired Apostle! Paul says to the slave, "be obedient to your Master—care not for being a slave"—*abide* in it,

[15]

unless "*lawfully* you can be made free." The Abolitionist says to the slave: "your Master has no lawful control over you—run away from him the first opportunity—take with you whatever of his property you can, *for it is yours not his!*—and I will shelter you!" Thus it will easily be perceived, that a very different spirit actuated Paul, from that which now actuates the Abolitionist! More about this hereafter.

If it be now enquired whether I consider slave-holding a sin and an evil, I readily reply, I do consider it an *evil*; but I do *not* consider it a *sin*! I am aware Abolitionists confound the two terms together, some through design, and, no doubt, many through want of reflection or ignorance. Now although every *sin* is an *evil*, yet every evil is not a sin—I hesitate not to pronounce slavery one of the *effects* of sin—hence an *evil*: for all evil is the effect of sin. Disease, famine, poverty, &c., are all evils; but who will venture to affirm that they are therefore *sins*—I would use means to the best of my judgment to assuage those evils—yea to remove them; but I would not in order to remove *suddenly* a disease, adopt a remedy which if it would not *instantly* cure it, would in all human probability destroy the individual, or produce a greater disease—this would be Abolition practice! Nor would I desire the poor man, in order to get rich *instantly*, to go and plunder a bank—this would be Abolitionism! But I would in the former case, adopt such remedies as would, with the least possible danger to my patient's life, be calculated to assuage or *remove* the disease; and if it could not be removed, without having recourse to a measure which would put his life in *jeopardy*, I would not, provided life could be sustained at all, adopt any such measures; but use every means

[16]

in my power, to mitigate his sufferings—allay all pain—and make his life as comfortable as possible. As to the latter case (the indigent person) while I would relieve him to the best of my ability, I would exhort him, not to have recourse to violent measures—not to commit evil; but to put his trust in an all-wise and benevolent Omnipotence, and by slow and sure means, by active industry, to endeavour to better his condition—the opposite course I leave to Abolitionists for adoption.

Upon the principles inculcated in the cases I have just related, would I act towards the slave, and the slave-holder; as more fully explained in another part of this treatise.

CHAPTER II. THE PRINCIPLES, &C. OF THE LEADERS OF ABOLITIONISM EXHIBITED.

As Abolitionists are constantly taunting the friends of Colonization with the charge, that the founders of it were Slave-holders, (which, by the by, like almost all their other statements, as will be shown in a subsequent chapter, is destitute of truth,) they cannot complain at their opponents taking a *peep* into the *principles* of some of their *Chief Champions*, and Promoters of Abolitionism—And, as William Lloyd Garrison, Esq. stands pre-eminently distinguished as their great Apostle, we shall let the public know what this Gentleman's *principles* are; with his abilities, character, moral or religious worth, we have nothing to do—And as they have made him their head, and sent him as their representative to

[17]

England, we are fully justified, in concluding that he spoke his sentiments not as an individual, but as the deputed representative of those who sent him there; viz. the Promoters of Abolition in this Country:—Therefore we need not further or stronger evidence of

the nature of sentiment, opinions, and objects of these Gentlemen.
Ex uno disce omnes.

To begin,—

Who was sent to Europe, a few years ago, as the REPRESENTATIVE
of the American Anti-Slavery Society?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who, in that Country, publicly pronounced the American Union to
be, "the most bloody and heaven-daring arrangement ever made by
man"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who, in said Country, and in said year, called the said *Union*, "A
wicked and ignominious compact"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who, in said place, and said year, denounced the SIGNERS of the
Declaration, to be men who, "virtually dethroned the Most High
God"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who pronounced the *American Union* to be, "the most atrocious
villany ever exhibited on earth"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who declared, "he recognized the Union with feelings of shame
and indignation"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who predicted that the Union "would be held in everlasting infamy
throughout the World"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who pronounced the Union an "unholy Alliance"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

[18]

Who has pronounced the Union "to be null and void from the beginning"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Who has asserted, "that the Signers of the Union had no *lawful* power to bind themselves, or their posterity for one hour—for one moment"?

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

Finally, who in the same country and year announced that the American Union "was not valid when it was made, *and is not valid now?*"

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.![\[18:A\]](#)

Again, who, on Tuesday, May 14th, 1838, in "Pennsylvania Hall," Philadelphia, Pa., in the presence of nearly two thousand persons, announced that "he hated, from the bottom of his heart, *prudence, caution, and judiciousness?*"

William Lloyd Garrison, Esq.!

What can be thought of a system which has such a person for its head, its chief champion—its Apostle? Was this gentleman *in earnest* when he used this language last week; or was he only "in fun"(!) (to use the expression by which one of his friends attempted to excuse him) or was he out of his senses? The last excuse is the only justifiable one—for if *in earnest*, the public need not be surprised at the Utopian scheme (abolitionism) of which he is the principal promoter.—If on the contrary, he was only "*in fun*," it proves what an adept he is in assuming to weep over the evils of slavery, while he was actually *quizzing* his audience! But peradventure he meant only *colonization* caution and prudence! Well did Dr. Reese say of him, in his letters to the Hon.

[19]

William Jay, (page 7) that "just so far as he (Mr. Garrison) was

believed in Great Britain, the (American) Society and Nation, would be viewed with *abhorrence!*" This is the gentleman sent to this city of *brotherly love*, who during the last week insulted not only the public at large, but the tried, and disinterested, friends of the slave! He opened his mouth with a tirade of abuse against that unremunerated friend and advocate of the oppressed African, *David Paul Brown*, Esq., whose judgment and talents would adorn the cabinet of any nation under heaven.—He could not spare even this gentleman, whose person and property have so frequently been threatened by the populace, for the part he has so often taken in gratuitously defending the man of colour. And all this because forsooth Mr. Brown, not having the fear of William Lloyd Garrison before his eyes, but being tempted and seduced by a love for his country, ventured to say, "if the question was, whether the Union, or slavery, should be preserved, he would say the Union." For this unpardonable expression of love and attachment for his country, Mr. Garrison said that either Mr. Brown, or his speech (I did not distinctly hear which he said) ought to be tied to a millstone and cast into the depths of the sea! He next assailed Elliott Cresson, Esq., who has by his talents, property and zeal, done more service to the African, than the whole Abolition Society has, or ever will, do.—Lastly, he could not let pass the humble Author, whose *nothingness*, as yet, in the cause of the poor man of colour, ought to have sheltered him from notice; but even the professed *intention* of exposing the designs of Abolitionists appears quite sufficient to stir up the ire of this gentleman; hence he denounced me, "as a foreign

[20]

adventurer!" In this instance he has truly proved the truth of his declaration, "that he hates caution and prudence," for verily if ever I can get the opportunity of meeting him on a platform before the public, he may ever after go to the South with perfect impunity. His friends say, the Southerners have offered *five thousand* dollars for his head. If this be like the numerous other misstatements

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

