



Butler University

Digital Commons @ Butler University

Manuscript Thesis Collection

Manuscript Thesis Collection

1900

Slavery

Willis M. Blount
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/mantheses>



Part of the [Cultural History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blount, Willis M., "Slavery" (1900). *Manuscript Thesis Collection*. 25.
<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/mantheses/25>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Manuscript Thesis Collection at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Manuscript Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

Butler University Early Theses Collection

Summary

Volume of Collection

8 boxes, 154 folders

Collection Dates

1887 – 1911

Scope and Content Note

The collection contains early theses manuscripts from Butler University dating from 1887 until 1911 on subjects including Literature, Religion, Science, Greek and Latin. Until 1897 Butler required all students, including undergraduates, to write a theses statement in order to receive a degree. One year after Butler University joined the University of Indianapolis and became Butler College the theses requirement for undergraduate students was dropped. Postgraduate theses are available in this collection ending in 1911. While the majority of these manuscripts are handwritten, as early as 1908 graduate students were required to type theses statements.

Thesis of
Willis M. Blount,
applying for
the degree of Master of Arts, at
Butler College, University of Indianapolis,
in which it is attempted to give a
sketch of the rise, development and
decay of the practice of human
slavery with the causes for its
existence, the reasons for its
extinction and its influence upon
the industrial and moral progress
of society.

Slavery.

Among the many rude and painful tools used in carving out the present day culture, slavery takes a very high rank. Its uses were two, it enabled military action to prevail with the degree of intensity and continuity requisite for the system of incorporation by conquest to which the world was doomed, and secondly, it compelled an industrial life in spite of the antipathy to regular and sustained labor which is so deeply rooted in human character. In fact, it may be said that nowhere has productive industry developed itself in the form of voluntary effort, it was always imposed by the strong upon the weak. From this point of view, the warrior and the slave were mutual auxiliaries, each necessary to the development and maintenance of the other and both working in cooperation towards a common public end. During this stage slavery worked beneficial results. Its evil began to be felt in modern times where the occupations of both the free and the

slave classes were industrial, and the existence of the servile class when there was no other available field of usefulness for the free class only guaranteed for some of them the possibility of indulgent ease, whilst it imposed upon the other the necessity of indigent idleness.

Slavery appears to have been a necessary factor in the development of society from a wandering to a firmly situated sedentary life in which the various elements have become arranged and put into smoothly working coöperation. In the early periods the hunter warrior did not capture his vanquished enemy with a view to enslaving him. He did not need any such assistance; he might and did often bring home women for wives or as helps in the camp drudgery which was performed by the females, but in his circumstances a hostile slave would have only been a nuisance, as he killed him as a matter of convenience. The pastoral age shows a slight advance in the custom due to the fact that a few slaves could be advantageously used in the care of the flocks, but the number was still

small. It is a universal principle however that slaves increase in number as sedentary life becomes prevalent. It is while agricultural exploitation is practiced on a large scale contemporaneously with the prosecution of war that the labor of slaves is chiefly introduced to provide food for the master while on expeditions and to save him from irksome toil when at home. Slavery seems to have been the general accompaniment of this stage which may be considered a step in advance of the time when the conquered were slain without mercy or delay.

It was only in those communities in which the military order attained the ascendancy over the sacerdotal that true slavery is seen. Wherever theocratic organizations established themselves it did not become a vital part in the social system. The members of the lower castes were not in a state of individual subjection, they were collectively inferior as a caste. It was in Rome that military action, so often purposeless and fruitless in Greece, worked out the social mission which

formed its true justification. Hence
at Rome, slavery ~~was~~ properly found
its place as long as that purpose was
in progress of accomplishment. As soon
as the march of conquest had reached its
limit, slavery began to be modified and
when Empire was divided into the
several states which had grown up ~~up~~
under it and the system of despotism
which characterized the Middle Ages was
substituted for the aggressive methods of
antiquity, slavery disappeared and was
replaced by serfdom, which was to
be in turn replaced by personal freedom
with the rise of modern industrial life.

Slavery in Greece.

Slavery developed in Greece at a very early stage and is found fully established in the Homeric period. The Iliad gives accounts of the prisoners taken in war being retained as slaves or sold. (XIII 752) and being held at ransom, II 427. Other sources were kidnapping and private vengeance. The prospect or at least the possibility of becoming a slave was held continually over the heads of even the noblest while a slave was frequently as noble as his master. Homeric slavery does not present itself to us as a very harsh institution, especially when we consider that all slaves were on very much of a level in regard to taste, refinement and instruction. The male slaves were employed in herding and tillage, while the females were used in domestic labor and the household manufactures. The principal slaves often enjoyed the confidence of their masters and meritorious service was generally rewarded, frequently by a house and land apart.

from the rest.

Historic Greece and especially Athens, affords a good field for investigation and study of the system of slavery. The sources were -

- (1) Birth - Not a very abundant source as marriage among slaves was but exceptionally permitted.
- (2) Sale of children - which was generally tolerated except at Aetica.
- (3) Sale for debt.
- (4) Capture in war.
- (5) Piracy and Kidnapping.
- (6) Slave Commerce - which drew upon Syria, Pontus, Lydia, Galatia and especially Thrace; Egypt and Ethiopia also furnished a considerable number. At the slave sales held at Cyprus, Samos, Ephesus, and Chios, Grecian slaves brought the best prices, while the Asiatics were considered the most valuable of foreign slaves because of their docility. Slaves were employed in public and in private service. In the public service they were used on the public works, in the army and navy, as city police and about the

temples.

In private they were either domestic as household servants, attendants and personal escorts, agricultural or urban. Down to the time of Pericles, the land-owners had been accustomed to live in the country; but after the Peloponnesian war they generally resided in Athens. This change caused an alteration in the servile classes. Farms were entrusted to the supervision of slaves, and the cultivation of soil became a badge of disgrace as it implied condition of servitude.

Things were no better in the city than in the country. Servile labor was displacing free labor in manufacturing and commerce. Speculators either directly employed their slaves as artisans, or commercial or banking agents or hired them out sometimes in factories and mines, sometimes in household service. There was no avenue of labor into which slavery did not thrust its degrading presence. Besides these forms of slavery common to all Greece, there was a class of underlings in Laconia which

seemed partly slave and partly free. They were known as "Helots." They served as domestic servants to their Spartan masters, but were regarded as the property of the state as a whole. No individual citizen could injure a Helot any more than he could steal munitions of war from the public treasury. While they were treated very cruelly, this fact tempered the harshness with a care against physical injury. These Helots claimed a Dorian origin and greatly outnumbered the Spartans, Hallon says 260000 to 32000. These two facts caused the state to take very stringent measures to keep them in subjection and while the individual citizens had to be careful of the slave as state property, the state itself ordered an annual massacre of the more prominent ones. This was known as the "war of the Helots" and was carried on by young men who were anxious to gain military experience.

The condition of the Greek slave was not as a rule very wretched. He was introduced with certain customary rites into his position in the family.

he was in practice, though not by law, allowed to accumulate a fund of his own; his marriage was recognized by custom, and though in general, excluded from participation in sacred ceremonies and public sacrifices, he was admitted to those of a private nature and even had special ceremonies for his place at Athens and other Greek centres. Their remains were deposited in the family vault and they frequently lived on terms of intimacy with the head of the house or its younger members. Right here however, is where its most baleful influence was felt. The companions and tutors of the youth were slaves, who finding how much easier it was to leave tyranny to enforce a strict regime of study and education, soon began to pander to the worst side of a nature already beginning to become overbalanced by the unnatural command over their fellow creatures, and the result was disastrous for the state.

A refuge from cruel punishment was afforded by temples and altars and by

the sacred groves. He had as Demosthenes
boasted an action for outrage like a freeman
and his death at the hands of a stranger was
dealt with as if he had been a citizen, while
if it had been caused by his master it had
to be atoned for by exile and severe religious
expiation. If a slave killed his master, the
family could not punish him but had to
hand him over to the proper courts. The slave
who had just cause of complaint against
his master could demand to be sold; when
he alleged mispright to liberty the law
granted him council and the sanctu-
aries afforded him protection while the
case was being heard.

But it was not all roses. Severe mea-
sures were taken to prevent flight and
even when a slave reached a refuge
the master waited around till the poor
fellow was forced by hunger to wander
away and he pounced upon him and
carried him home to a life of work
loaded with fetters, if it were an aggra-
vated case, the slave was liable to
branding or mutilation. There were
extradition laws and societies similar

to our horse thief associations, which
hunted up run-aways & stolen slaves. Still
many slaves ran away and the number
of successful escapes is shown by the
crowd which joined the Spartans when
occupying Sicily. Beside all these un-
pleasant customs it was considered good
law to get evidence from a slave by means
of torture. But even here a little care
was exercised because any permanent
enfranchisement had to be paid for to the master.

The slave could purchase his freedom
with his private savings by agreement
with his master. He could be liberated
by (1) will, (2) by proclamation at the
theater or other public place, (3) by hav-
ing his name inscribed on the public
registers and (4) in later Greece by sale
of a portion to the temples. These eman-
cipations were all subject to any conditions
which the master chose to attach to
them. By manumission the slave became
a metique in the relation to the state
and a client towards his former master.
If he violated the terms of his emanci-
pation he was reduced to the old con-

dation. He became a full citizen, as
was the case with a foreigner, only
by a vote in an assembly of six
thousand citizens. However the num-
ber of freedmen at Athens never seems
to have been very great.

Roman Slavery.

As was observed in the introduction, slavery had its most natural and relatively legitimate place in Rome, and it was accordingly there that the institution extended its operations farthest and methodized its details most. Not only on this ground is Roman slavery important for study but because out of the slave class as it was there organized and in countries subject to Roman control, developed the modern proletariat.

Roman slavery falls naturally into three periods corresponding to the three periods of the state. First, the period in which she founded herself. Here the people were poor and warlike, seafaring traders but honoring agriculture and there was little slavery. Second, the period of the great conquests. Slavery rapidly developed and spread. Third, - Her decline which was accompanied by the decay of the institution. (Wallon) Chapter II. The change made by the conquests is illustrated by the fact that during the

first period slaves were known as the slave of Junius or Marcus, &c, going to show that it was customary for a man to have but one slave. The free slaves were farmers, the slaves did the work of artisans. After the conquests began to multiply the number of slaves and to increase the necessity for them by drawing off the freemen as warriors, servile labor intruded upon all classes of work except the highest kinds of technique which was carried on by "collegii". Domestic slaves were made possible by the captives taken in foreign wars and desirable because of the taste for luxury which the views of foreign manners of living cultivated.

There were three main sources of slavery.

- 1) They were raised, but in small numbers.
- 2) They were made by sale for debt and crime.
- 3) They were captured. This was the great source. Caesar sold 63000 Gauls on a single occasion. Even this regular capture in war, large as it was, could not overcome adverse influences which slavery has on

population however and soon there arose regular slave markets where the victims of kidnapping and piracy were sold in great numbers. Rome and Delos were the centres of this traffic. Rome of captives of war and Delos of piracy. These slaves taken by piracy came partly like the war captives from Spain, Gaul and Africa but chiefly from Bithynia, Galatia, Cappadocia and Syria. This trade was the source of considerable revenue as a portorium of $\frac{1}{8}$ for export and $\frac{1}{10}$ for others was charged for export & import and 2% - 4% on the sale.

Slaves were divided into two classes (1) *Servi Publici* and (2) *Servi Privati*.

The more common public officers such as couriers etc., were at first like the higher ones, filled by free men but they soon fell into the hands of slaves. The execution of public works, such as roads, sewers, aqueducts etc., were also committed to their charge. Public slaves who attended the magistrates and worked in the temples were known as slaves of service, while those who served on the

16.
street and sewer-gangs were called slaves
of work.

The private slaves were divided into the
familia urbana and the familia rustica
according to whether they lived on the do-
main or in the city residence. The
familia urbana which had charge
of the domain was administered by a
villicus and sometimes a villicus, a mon-
itor, guards (salterni) and supervisors
of work (magistri operum). The villicus at
the head of this household was nearly always
a slave who had a wife given him as a reward
of meritorious service. A slave prison was
maintained on all estates of any size. There
families of slaves which crowded the free
agriculturists out, were often of immense
size. Vettius, for instance, owned 400 of
his own when he entered upon the career
which was the prelude to the second servile
war. Pliny tells us of a freedman named
Caecilius who left 4116 by his will.

It would be very hard to determine
just how many slaves there were in
Rome. Gibbon thinks that about the
time of Claudius they were equal in

number to the free citizens. Blair however thinks that while this estimate might do for an earlier period, it is entirely too low for the age to which it is assigned, and he would make it three to one in favor of the slaves. The entire population of Italy then during the time of Claudius would consist of 20,832,000 slaves to 6,944,000 free men.

In the eyes of the law, the slave was the legitimate object of all sorts of legal transactions. He could be given away, bought or sold, loaned or borrowed or pledged, in fact could be treated as any sort of inanimate property. He had no rights of property or of family. A master was responsible for the acts of a slave, just as he would be for the trespass of a horse or a goat. His testimony was competent in law when put to the torture but any injury was valued by a board of appraisers and had to be paid for while the killing of the slave while being put to the "question" had to be recompensed by a payment of twice his value.

8.
The slave could legally possess no property but was in practice allowed to accumulate his earnings in a "peculium". A master could not enter into a contract with his slave, neither could he accuse him of theft for in the eye of the law when the slave took anything, it was not an abstraction, it was only a displacement of property. Penalties were generally much more severe on slaves than on free men.

But although some of these practices were cruel and harsh, since the Roman slave was not a public enemy like the Helot, there was none of that systematic cruelty which the Spartans thought themselves obliged to use. The slave was valuable and was cared for accordingly. He was well if not luxuriantly fed. The master talked his business over with his slaves and often his chief advisors and agents were slaves.

The common practice of allowing a slave to save a peculium was a great stimulation to faithfulness on the side of the slave and generosity

on the part of the master. The slave saw it was to his interests to be well-behaved and industrious in order that this privilege might be extended to him while the master comprehended that the transaction meant exceptional gain to him. He gained an orderly and faithful slave in the first place and in the end could buy a substitute with the money which the slave had paid for his freedom while at the same time gaining a client. For the free-man was only a half way mark between slaves and free men. He was in the eye of the law only semi-free and could for many reasons, ^{such} as small crimes or breaking the terms of his manumission be restored to his previous condition.

As slavery spread the condition of slaves became much worse. Overseers became necessary for the business, became too great for the master to personally superintend it all. Punishments grew more rigorous, work more burdensome. The former

personal acquaintance between the master and slave, became impossible, and lack of acquaintance bred lack of confidence which led to harsher treatment. The immediate authority was vested in the overseer who had only his interests to guide him and was often prompted by that severity which one understands generally shows to another. Formally the country slaves were the companions of their masters, now they were the slaves of a slave. Slavery, ^{which} at best is the exploitation of human beings, began to assume a most brutal form.

These changed conditions reacted upon the temperaments of the slaves and from being quiet and obedient, they became turbulent and unruly. They began to make conspiracies and uprisings about 500 B.C. These attempts were always failures and the leaders were generally crucified but the awful fate of their predecessors did not deter other slaves from essaying.

ing the same thing. Later, the beginning of the Punic wars and then the victories of Hannibal gave the movements fresh vigour and stimulated the desire to reconquer their freedom, and it was not until Rome triumphed and the republic was firmly established that they gave it up. It grew continually harder, however, to keep the slaves in subjection.

The ordinary increase of the slave population together with the habit which the state fell into treating hostages as slaves added constantly to the danger. In 191 B. C. a servile war had almost broken out, and in the next few years there were uprisings in Etruria and Apulia. These movements were the forcible remonstrances of slavery and should have been heeded. The first great revolt was in Sicily where the conditions were worst. Partial revolts in Italy succeeded and then came another Sicilian struggle. The servile war under Spartacus

followed next and coming at an otherwise critical period, tested the power and resources of Rome to the utmost in its suppression. These gladiators around whom were rallied the rest of the army under able leadership gave two crushing defeats to the Roman legions and if Spartacus had not been outweighed in the rebel council in his desire to quit Roman land forever and to retire to his own country, his rebellion would have been successful. But to many of the slaves such course had no attraction and they demanded to be maintained in the South. He was finally defeated and himself and all but 600 of his band slain. He was supposed to have killed 33 men, whose bodies were found piled round his corpse.

In the subsequent civil wars, slaves were used by both parties and gladiators were made the nucleus of the armies, and a body guard of them escorted the murderers of Caesar to the Capitol.

This changed conduct of masters

and slave was due to the prevalent conditions and was not unnatural. The large number of slaves which the times compelled a proprietor to keep, forbade strict control of them and the decisions into which agriculture and industry had fallen made free men reject the position of supervisors and the employment of slave as such and the cruelty and harshness of their government virtually necessitated a servile rebellion.

While Rome was strong enough to put down any open resistance to the existing customs, there were quiet influences at work which were just as detrimental to the welfare of the state. Slavery was getting its baleful influence upon public customs and private life alike, and was dominating the Society which believed that it was using the institution as it saw fit and finally more, as in Greece, for the degrading of the family and the ruin of the state. Some were being trained by slaves. They took her children and reared them or let them grow up into idle and

vicious men as they preferred. They advised her public men and built her public works, and the worst part of the practice was well stated by Plutarch when he says, "if a man has a good slave he makes him a banker, a farmer, a factor or a money-lender but if he has a shiftless one he makes him an instructor over his children". It would be hard to estimate the demoralizing influence which even intelligent men but with no moral responsibility could have upon a community when its youth were intrusted to their tutelage.

The gladiatorial shows, the banquets with their attendants and the unscrupulous tutors, all did a powerful part in the downfall of Rome. "Scenes of murder were places of public amusement, scenes of debauchery accompanied the meals and crime was tolerated if not taught by the instructors." "Slavery had corrupted the family and demoralized the private life even to the point of appearing

in public with its blackness. It
had corrupted public life and ruin-
ed the Roman constitution as it had
ruined Sparta and Athens and contin-
ued to prove with another example
that no matter what may be the
size of a state that it cannot over-
come the action of this destruction
even if despised war. Work was
now abandoned to slaves with the
exception of the higher forms of tech-
nique, which from their very nature
had to remain free. The free popula-
tion gave itself over to a life of idle-
ness, either in equal or luxury, dis-
daining all employment caring only
war. Even the poorer free classes
who were compelled to work or to
starve were included in this pop-
ular scorn and Cicero well expressed
the sentiment of the times when he
reproaches not only the servile classes all those
who work. Here was slavery supplying
the strength of the state with a
vengeance, running the rich into
its train and giving over to

disgrace that portion of its population upon which national strength mainly depends.

While the Roman system was superior in many respects to the Greek, Blair points with justice to the greater facility and frequency of emancipation as the great superiority. "No Roman slave" says he, "needed to despair of becoming both a freeman and a citizen."

Manumission was of two general kinds, (1) *justa* or legally regular, and (2) *minus justa*, or extra legal. There were four modes of *manumissio justa*,—

(1) Adoption: a method but rarely resorted to.

(2) By testament: a method already recognized in the "Twelve Tables."

(3) By inscribing the slave's name on the census tablets, a method of exceptional use and which only existed down to the time of Vespasian.

(4) By *vindicta*; or the rod, which was the customary form. By this method the master simply turned the slave around in the presence of a qualified

7.
Official who struck him with his rod,
the master saying meantime "liber esto"

The *manumissio minus iusta* was affected by a sufficient manifestation of the will of the master as by letter, by declaration before a considerable assembly, by putting the pilius on the slave's head or by any other convenient and popularly accepted means. But this *extra legal manumission* was precarious and uncertain, even after the *lex Julia Urbana*. (19 A.D.) which assimilated the position of such with the *latini coloniarii* under the name of *latini juniores* and a person remained in the light of the law still a slave, and could not dispose of his peculium. A freedman, unless he became such by operation of law remained still a client of his former master and both parties were bound by the obligations arising out of that relation. i.e. The freedman took his former master's name, he owed him *obsequium* and *officium*. Neglect of these obligations was punished in extreme cases

with even the loss of liberty. Conditions might also be annexed by the master at the time of manumission, such as continued residence with him, payment of a certain sum of money etc., but the rigour of these conditions was limited by the praetor Atilius and his example was followed still further by the later jurists and the imperial Constitution. A freedman could dispose of only half of his property by will, the other half went to the patron as did the whole thing in case the man died intestate. Freedmen and their sons were subject to civil disabilities but the third generation became ingenui. Thus by a process of gradual infiltration the slave element tended to merge itself in the general popular body.

Under the empire the freedmen rose steadily in influence; they became admissible to the senate and the ranks of the equites; they obtained provincial governments and were appointed to offices in the imperial household which virtually placed them at the head of administrative departments. Those

of humbler rank filled the lower offices and entered into the ranks of trades and professions when free labor began to revive. Christianity came to the rescue and formed a larger and more solid basis for the mutual relations of men just at the time when the country was being harried at the decrease of the free slave and the increase of servile and freed classes. As Mallon says, "the doctrine which said 'Plus de grec ni de grec, plus d'homme ni de femme, plus d'esclave ni de libre; vous êtes tous une même chose en Jésus-Christ'; came like a sunrise to scatter the old darkness. Christianity united the slave and the master, giving to one as the rule of conduct, obedience, to the other, mercy and justice. Now the slave had the power of doing good to his master where formerly he could only do duty. Philosophy was an inert force which resisted every change which it could not base upon its supposedly indispensable laws of thought and still looked down on slaves and the new movement with its insensible and scornful indifference.

But in spite of all opposition, Christianity worked a more and more appreciable

modification in the condition of the servile classes and the laws concerning them. By the second century of the Christian era we find a marked change with respect to this institution, both in the region of thought and in that of fact. The military vocation of Rome was now felt to have reached its normal limits and the emperors understanding that in the future industrial activity would have to prevail, prepared for the abolition of slavery, so far as was then possible, by honoring the freedman, protecting the slave against his master and by facilitating manumission. The jurists, too, in the absence of a recognized spiritual power provisionally discharged in their own way the office of systematizing practical morals and modified by the useful fiction of the *jure naturale*, the presumptions of law and the interpretation of doubtful instruments. The general tendency both of the empirical constitutions and of the maxims of the jurists was in the direction of liberty. The practice of sale and exposure of children was forbidden. Later legislation issued an edict forbidding a man to sell himself for debt.

Manstealers and kidnappers were punished with death, and the insolvent debtor was given means of freeing himself from his creditors. Special laws were made favoring the slave possession of the peculium and public slaves were allowed to bequeath half of their possessions. Hadrian took from masters the right of death-punishment and punished the murder of a slave as of any other man. Slaves were given the right of forcing a sale upon the grounds of ill-treatment, and it was decided that liberty could not be forfeited. Under Justinian, a new process of manumission was established which took place in places of worship and the liberated slave was made a free citizen, the master only retaining nominal rights of patronage.

Serfdom or the transition from the slavery of the working classes to their freedom.

There are, according to Hume, four principal considerations that have to be kept in mind during the study of this period.

- (1) That the substantial completion of the Roman system of conquest and incorporation had reduced the supply of slaves by restricting the dealings in them to trade taking place in fixed limits of the empire. This tended to render the physical welfare of the slave of greater importance to the master, and was indeed one cause of the change to serfdom by making it to the interest of each family to preserve indefinitely its own hereditary slaves since they could only be replaced at great trouble and expense. The final result was the total abolition of the foreign slave trade with the consequent internal sale and the attachment of the slaves to the households or lands of their masters.
- (2) The diminished supply of slaves also acted in the direction of the rehabilitation

3
of Free Labor. A general movement of this kind is noticeable from the second century. Freeman had always been employed to some extent in the public service; (a) as subordinates to the magistrates, scribes, lictors, viatores etc; (b) on the public works and in productive industries carried on by the state which were let out to corporations of free plebeians; (c) The higher kinds of technique had always been in the hands of freemen for slave labor while it may execute has not the inspiration to work out and institute new ideas.

(3) By the remarkable organization introduced by Numa and his successors by which they sought to oppose a strong internal consolidation to foreign invasions, to secure public order, to enforce industrious habits and to guarantee financial resources, personal liberty was very largely sacrificed. Members of various collegia could not withdraw; they were, in general, bound absolutely to their employment not being able to even marry outside of their trade. If they abandoned their posts of duty the state made it its

business to seek for them and return them. The members of the local senate were bound to their offices. The soldier recruited for the army by conscription was compelled to pass the profession on down to his sons. Every one was treated as a servant of the state. The nature of each man's employment was definitely fixed for him, he was in the language of the law "conditio legis irritata." This general system by diminishing the freeman's mastery over himself reduced the interest between him and the slave and made it possible for both to pass insensibly into the common condition of serfdom.

4. The corresponding change in the case of the rural slaves took place through their being merged in the order of the colonies. The Roman colony was originally a freeman who took land on lease, paying either a grain or a cash rent for it. Later it grew to mean a man who though personally free was attached to the soil and who transmitted his condition to his descendants. There was

the same fixity about place and kind
of employment here as in the city.
A colonus could not marry out of the
domain, if he ran away the state
restored him and punished him, he
could possess property of his own but could
not alienate it without the consent of his
master. Thus his condition partook of both freedom
and dependence and this fact made the
assimilation of the colonus and the slave
into a single class very easy. This union
took place by natural steps. As the
colonies became very large, it was found
to be advantageous to settle certain slaves
on holdings, separate from the land
worked by the gang of predial slaves. These
were known as quasi coloni. By custom,
these slaves became more and more
attached to their allotments until in 374
a law was made, forbidding their sale, ex-
cept the land went with them. Inter-
marriages of the two classes became
frequent and by the end of the seventh
century there was no practical difference.

From this point of view, the northern
invasions had little to do with the

transition from slavery to serfdom. The
Germans could not understand, or at any
rate would not in practice, respect the dis-
ciple and distinction between the slaves,
and probably regarded the slaves and coloni,
so close that their resemblance grew to
be, as ^{one} class. The other point which
might have influence is that according
to ~~Christian~~ Tacitus, the Germans ^{had} ~~at~~ ^{not} ~~not~~
any peculiar slaves, since they were familiar
with the system of having slaves settled
on a subsoil portion of the domain and
granting a fixed share of the produce to
their owners. Their influence however was
rather as a spur than a rein, and the
change would have taken place just
as surely if the invasions had never oc-
curred.

This change was truly a beneficial
one. The serf, no longer liable to separation
from his wife and children, was able
to form a family in the true sense of the
word. As the head of a separate house-
hold, he could claim for himself and
family their full share of the moral in-
struction provided by the Church ser-

He for his part, being a slave by custom, to
retain a part of his earnings, he could ex-
pect to acquire by purchase his complete liber-
ation. This prospect stimulated him to
habits of industry, and his pursuit of a
definite object of such momentous importance
to him, developed his self control and
taught him the essential qualifications
of a freeman, which long years of servitude
had almost crushed out.

But while ancient slavery was a system
fitted to endure under given social conditions
and a definite political function to perform
in the organization of society, freedom which
succeeded where slavery had exhausted
its function, had a no less important task,
shorter, in leading the working population
up to a condition in which they would
be capable of entire personal freedom.

It can be easily imagined how the city
self became a free laborer for hire. The
nobles in many cases purchased his
freedom and in others, it was not to the
masters interest to retain his services at
the expense of his keep. The entire e-
manicipation was favored by the

movement which established free industrial communities and gave them municipal jurisdiction.

But it is a very difficult task to trace the same process in the country, which attributes the change to two causes, (1) The greater advantage which the proprietor derived from the efforts of his cultivator when he worked entirely for himself, and (2) The encouragement which the sovereign's jealousy of his great lords gave to the Villains, besides these two positive causes, there was the influence of the clergy who never lost an opportunity of urging the Lords to treat the slaves humanely, and who set a good example in the management of the Church estates. But this transition from serfdom to freedom was a tedious process, which required all the administrative ability, and energy and perseverance, which the statesmen of the period could muster. Though the law no longer bound him to the soil, the tenant could not afford to quit the holding which was his only source of subsistence, and had to submit to such hard conditions as the proprietor

might suppose. These conditions and relationships were limited by the central government as much as possible in its own interests and ambitions, but reforms were retarded and rendered difficult by the opposition of the aristocracy who clung obstinately to their old traditional privileges. Even when all traces of feudal subjection had disappeared and the peasant sold his land by a formally voluntary contract he was frequently at the mercy of his landlord, who could raise the rent at will and oblige him to consent to the increase by the threat of dispossession, and who sometimes let the land annually by auction to the highest bidder and who could appropriate without compensation, such improvements as the former tenant might have made. These abuses have been problems for the social reformer from feudal times down to the present, and it cannot be said that they have been satisfactorily solved in all the communities yet. The majority of European serfs

outside of Russia and Germany, were
freed by the fourteenth century and
the last in Germany, in 1848. In
Russia, however, white slavery and
chattel slavery lasted until
quite recently. It was not until
1861 that the last vestiges were wiped
out - by Alexander II in a decree
which made more than forty three
million free men.

Slavery in America -

The first slaves were imported into America - in 1619, in a Dutch ship. There were nineteen of them and they were sold to the planters along the James river. Before this there had been five forms of servitude which closely resembled slavery, practiced in the colonies. First there were known as "indentured servants" i.e. boys and girls who were bound to serve until they became of age, and adults who were bound to serve a certain number of years to pay for their passage. This was temporary bondage, but was very irksome for the masters were strict and often cruelly treated them. There was no law but moral sentiment, to be invoked in their behalf. Men who were "crimiped" or "trepanned", that is kidnapped and sold to America as slaves. This was a favorite method of getting rid of rivals and heirs to estates, whose removal would benefit some unscrupulous relative. A large class of men sold themselves into a period of servitude of some years in order to pay the expense of their passage.

These men were known as bond-servants or "redemptioners". The business of bringing these indigent people over and peddling them out to the farmers of the Virginia, became quite popular among a certain sort of unfeeling and unscrupulous men, who drove them around over the country as the Africans were, later on.

This trade was considered unworthy of a gentleman, and those who indulged in it were termed "soul drivers".

Many of these poor fellows grew rich when their time was out, but the majority never raised themselves to an independent condition.

(4) The "convict servants". This class was very objectionable to the colonies, who complained bitterly at having their country made a dumping ground for English criminals. These men were as a rule, sold for only seven years, but as they were generally prisoners who had had a death sentence commuted to sale in the colonies, their lot was so hard and their treatment so cruel, that a large percent died

in bondage.

(5) There were some Indians who were captured and enslaved, but their proud disposition which preferred death to dishonor, made them very unsatisfactory servants.

The nineteen negroes imported in 1619 were the first men who were considered to be genuine slaves. It was considered to be proper to enslave these negroes because they were heathen, and it was thought that they should be glad to purchase the redemption of their souls at the small expense of their temporal freedom, for it was presumed that their Christian owners would give them religious training. It is a commentary upon the times, however, that so long as this was the main excuse few slaves were brought in and white bond servants to whom nothing was due, were the common workmen until the close of the 17th Century, when the high price of tobacco stimulated the colonial missionary spirit and they began to bring slaves in, in ship loads. The introduction of rice

into the low lands also worked in the same direction, for the cultivation of both these commodities could be prosecuted most profitably with the large amount of cheap labor which slavery furnished. Slavery existed in all the colonies but in the north where wheat was the chief crop, it was confined chiefly to the cities where slaves were used as household servants, porters in warehouses etc. Wheat has always seemed to be a free man's crop, yielding large returns as it does, for little land labor it has been a foe to slavery everywhere. The larger number of the slaves were taken to the Southern colonies which raised tobacco, rice & indigo where their immunity from the diseases consequent upon a hot climate and a swampy country, made them specially valuable. Some of these imported slaves were fierce, and the terror which their master regarded them lead to very harsh measures in subduing them. For cowardice is a very abundant source of cruelty. There were some very

bloody insurrections which were
handed with great severity. One in
New York City in 1712 when twenty four
were put to death, some were burned,
so great was the general desire to in-
timidate them. Again in 1741, thirty-
three slaves were executed upon a bare
alarm of intended insurrection. New
York was not exceptional in her severity
either for the other colonies were just
as bad.

After the revolution slavery was
abolished in the colonies which had
few negroes but in those where the
nature of the country, climate and
crops made them profitable, the system
was continued and from the small
beginning of 19 grew the millions and
became a large factor in the trouble
which caused the civil war. The colonies
still obliged by the British "Navigation Laws"
to admit them when they came as
merchandise in ships belonging to Englishmen.
So that in 1790 one seventh of the four
million people in the United States
were negro slaves. They were found

in every state except Mass. and Maine which was then part of Mass., but were few in the Northern states, New York had the most, more than 20000.

About seven eighths of the slave population was in Maryland, Virginia and the Carolinas.

These were the states where large landowners flourished. The property generally descended to the eldest son and the rich were much like nobles. This system had its serious defects. There were two classes of white people, those of idleness, whether in luxury or poverty, who were considered respectable and those who worked who were looked down upon and who were known as "poor white trash." This was but an American way of expressing the idea, which always ~~accompanies~~ accompanies slavery, that work is degrading. The education of the youth was not entrusted to slaves as was the custom in Greece and Rome and that debasing influence was never felt in America. The opportunity to exhibit and practice tyrannical power, however, had

to the development of a haughty and intolerant disposition which nothing but the high sense of honor and standards of gentility which commonly prevailed in the South restrained. There are many authorities who try to prove that slavery was a good system and worked much benefit to its victims. They quote the christianizing theory and point to the sure protection and care in old age to which the slave could look forward.

But any system which provides for the herding of human beings as animals and the forcible separation of families can hardly be said to depend upon philanthropy for its basis.

The cruelty and baleful influences which seem to be the necessary companions of slavery impressed the country more and more and societies were formed with its abolition as their main object. This agitation had become so strong by 1787 that when the "North-west Territory" was admitted into the union and divided into what is known as the "North Central States" it was declared

in the ordinance that there should be no slavery north of the Ohio river and that when a man died without leaving a will all the children should inherit equally. This struck at the roots of two of the most threatening institutions or practices in America, slavery and primogeniture. This began the war over the admission of new states, the South soon realizing that the north by its greater population would control the House and that its only hope lay in the Senate, seeking to keep that body in favor of slavery by making each territory as it was admitted a slave state, while the North opposed this policy for the reverse reasons. From the Ordinance of 1787 to the civil war slavery agitation was the pivot around which centered discussions and debates which stand out as perfect examples of their class. The nation's greatest statesmen were developed in this turmoil and a standard of statesmanship was set which the later generations have found themselves unable to maintain. In the North slavery had

continued to decline untill it came to an end without shock or violence and it was the general expectation that such would be the case in the whole country. But circumstances gave development a new direction and as time passed the south instead of abandoning the system adjusted its industrial activities to slavery as a center and grew so fond of it that many of her men were willing to suffer the terrors and hardships of war sooner than allow the practice to be uprooted.

The question whether the Territory beyond the Alleghany Mountains should be free or slave had been raised as early as 1784. The "Ordinance of 1787" settled the question for the North West Territory in favor of freedom but Congress when organizing the South West Territory in 1792 refused to apply the same principle. This left opportunity for the spread of slavery. In the beginning there had been seven northern and six southern states and physical conditions and the desire of statesmen to preserve what they called the "balance of the Constitution"

tended to keep this relative number about the same. Slavery did not become a sectional political question till 1819 when the balance was perfect eleven to eleven. The feeling that no more slave states should be admitted - declared itself strongly when Missouri applied for admission. The debate was settled by the second great compromise of the nation known in history as the "Missouri compromise". It embraced two main features: First the admission of Missouri as a slave state and second the enacting of a resolution that no slavery should exist north of $36^{\circ} 30'$ N. L. in the territory which we had acquired from France under the name of Louisiana. After this question and debate in 1820 the names ~~because~~ "North" and "South" became more definite. Each side fought for an advantage and national politics were in a state of continual compromise. Maine in 1820 balanced Louisiana, Arkansas balanced Michigan. Florida was the last available slave territory and her admission gave the South the advantage.

but southern statesmen saw that it would be only a temporary triumph for the great north-west was still to be coined into free states. They sought to balance this by securing the admission of Texas in 1845. The territory acquired by the Mexican War which followed the annexation of Texas was another bone of contention and was settled by a bunch of compromises known as the "Omnibus Bill" from the burden of clauses it had to carry. In this dispute a new question for debate was evolved, that of "popular sovereignty" according to which a question as to freedom or slavery was to be left to the people of a territory to settle for themselves. It must not be supposed that the north and south acted as units on this question for as yet the political parties had not been organized with this question prominent. In 1856 the newly formed Republican party which had developed largely from the Abolitionists disclaimed in its platform any purpose of

interfering with slavery in any territory in which it was actually existing but at the same time it denied the power of any authority congressional or territorial to give a legal existence to the system. On the other hand the democratic party put forth the doctrine of "non interference with slavery in the states and territories and the District of Columbia." The parties were now directly opposed and slavery in the territories became the great political issue. In 1857 while the country was still excited from the campaign in which Buchanan was elected occurred what is known as the "Dred Scott Case." He was a negro who claimed that by right of being in a free state he became a free man. In handing down the decision Chief-justice Taney denied that negroes had legal existence as persons in U. S. or that they could sue in the national courts. He also denied that congress had supreme power

over the territories and declared the Compromise of 1820 unconstitutional. This decision served to intensify the already very bitter feeling which existed between the two parties and arrayed the north almost entirely on the side of the Republican party.

The result of the next election was that Abraham Lincoln was elected on a platform of freedom and that the eleven states seceded. At the north the general opinion was that slavery was the cause of the rebellion and that it could not be finally and completely suppressed without the death and removal of the cause.

So September 22nd 1862 President Lincoln issued a preliminary proclamation warning the states in rebellion that on the first of January 1863 all persons held as slaves in any part of the country then in rebellion would be then and forever free and that the military and naval authorities of the country would recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons.

The seceded states paid no attention to this notice and on the day named the Emancipation Proclamation was issued. This was a war measure and was so named in the instrument. As this only affected slavery in the rebelling states it left it in full operation in several sections of the country, but the conviction that the practice should come to an end with the conclusion of the war spread rapidly and Congress - in the Senate Apr. 8th 1864 and the House Jan. 31st 1865 - proposed the following amendment to the Constitution. Art XIII Sect I neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted shall exist within the U. S. or any place subject to its jurisdiction.

Sect II Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Sec. of State Seward issued his

certificate on Dec. 18th 1865 that this amendment had been duly ratified and declared it valid as a part of the Federal Constitution. The the slaves were free but were still a problem. The question of their citizenship quickly came to the front and to settle the matter beyond dispute the XIV amendment was added to the Constitution. This states "That all persons born or naturalized in the U. S. and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens of the U. S. and of the state in which they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the U. S.; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of its laws." This clause removed all doubt as to the question debated in the "Dred Scott Case"

The second section provides that representatives shall be apportioned according to the number of persons in the state excluding Indians not taxed. This section was called forth by the fact that negroes were denied the right to vote in most of the Southern districts. This way of putting the number of representatives dependant upon the whole population, offered the Southern States a very strong motive for giving the negroes the right of voting, but not one of them did so. This condition of affairs necessitated still another amendment, the XV.

This reads. Sect. I. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Sect. II. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The result of this favorable legislation and the efforts of certain northern men, who went south after the war to take advantage of the industrial and commercial advantages, to use the negro politically, was to cause the negroes to feel

The importance of their political rights
without impressing upon them the immense
weight of the accompanying responsibilities.
They began to assume a mein which
was very distasteful to their former masters
who formed a society known as the Ku
Klux with the purpose of regulating affairs.
The southern men were called "carpet
baggers" from the style of luggage bags
they carried. The strife between these
two organizations was sometimes very bitter
and sometimes often sanguinary. Both
were lawless in their methods but were
actuated by the motives which very largely
control humanity, pride and pocketbook.
But that calmer sentiment upon which
the strength of the Union depends, made
itself felt in the end and now when
we are in the midst of another con-
flict, children of the veterans from both
north and south are arrayed, under
formerly hostile leaders in many instances,
against a common enemy.

Taking it all in all slavery was
probably a good friend to the United
States. It developed portions of the

Country, which without it might only
now be coming into cultivation, its ex-
tirpation furnished the basis for some
of the first friendly treaties between
England and the United States. It
connected itself so closely with certain
other domestic disagreements, such as
"State rights" etc., that a war in which
they all went down together was precipi-
tated and led the way to a firmer
union of the states on a more closely
defined foundation.

Slavery never had such a bad in-
fluence on America as it had on Rome
or Greece. Here slaves were not allowed
to come into the same relations with
the family. They could do the manual
labor and that alone. They did not
because of their ignorance have an
opportunity to impress their characteristics
upon the youth of the land, as in the
ancient examples. Still there was a
feeling started that made honest
employment dishonorable and unworthy
the attention of a gentleman. This idea
which slavery undoubtedly hastened,

might have grown up anyhow, for the second generation of rich people all over the country seem to be afflicted with it. It seems likely, however, that as genuine culture and honest and unbiased esteem of real worth are the customary companions of several generations of enlightened and educated appreciation of the nature of universal suffrage, the present disrepute of labor which is now comparatively limited, will pass entirely away and the country will look upon men as divided by intellect alone.

Slavery in Africa, (modern times) in its relation to slave markets.

The maritime exploration of the African coasts by the Portuguese navigators of the fifteenth century was the direct cause of the traffic in negroes. Little did these sailors who were responsible for the trade and the concurrent system of slave holding imagine the amount of suffering and the great evil which their venture was going to cause. From the year 1482 when the Gama rounded the cape of Good Hope, to 1807, when England prohibited the exportation of slaves over the high seas, is a period of 310 years. During all this time, Africa was surrendered to the cruelty of the slave hunter and the avarice of the slave trader. European governments approved the trade and sanctioned and legalized it, the public conscience applauded it, and the united heads of the church blessed the slave gangs as they marched to the shore, while the tax collector received the levy per head as lawful revenue. This form of slavery unlike that which we have previously examined, was not the spontaneous

unproductive of social necessities which sub-
served a temporary need of human develop-
ment, but was dragged in by the heels as it
were and was politically as well as morally
a monstrous aberration and generally
produced only evil.

The Spaniards were introduced to the custom
of negro slavery by the Moors, among whom it had
existed, to a limited extent only, for long ages.
The Europeans, however, were not content with
keeping a few for domestic services, their cupidity
and avarice was excited and they fitted out
a number of ships and built several forts
along the African coasts for the sole purpose
of carrying on and protecting the slave trade
under the Portuguese flag. 'By 1540 so many
had been imported, that King Leopold considered
it a business policy to order some sent to the
Colonies to work the mines.

Before this time Columbus had sent home some
500 prisoners taken in the wars with the Indian
Caciques, recommending that it would be to the tem-
poral advantage of the state and the spiritual advan-
tage of the captives, if they were made the slaves
of a Christian community, such as Seville. The
royal order for their sale was made out by

Queen Isabella, but later she became interested by stories of their gentle and hospitable character, and ordered some brought before her. Her sympathy was so aroused in their behalf that the order was countermanded and an investigation into the lawfulness of their capture was called for. Her theological advisors differed on the question, and she ordered the Indians sent back to their native land and a more conciliating policy to be pursued.

The greatest impetus was given to the system was given by the bishop of Chiapa Don Casas who accompanied Orlando when the latter was appointed governor of Hispaniola. This remarkable man was led by his desire to better the condition of the Indian slaves who were being very cruelly treated, and killed in great numbers in the mines, to recommend that a license be given to each Spanish resident in Hispaniola, to import fifteen negro slaves. He did not consider the injustice and cruelty of enslaving the negroes, and made the suggestion upon the grounds that the latter were better able to bear the labor than the Indians. It is due to Don Casas, to note that later he saw the

faulters of his position, and says in his
"Decline History," that had he been able to have
foreseen a small portion even of the con-
sequences, he would not have outlined and
recommended such a policy for the world.

The traffic was systematized in 1517, when
the Master of Seville's granted a patent to one
of his favorites to supply 4000 slaves an-
nually to Hispaniola, Cuba, Jamaica and
Porto Rico. This man sold his privilege to
some Spanish merchants for 25000 ducats;
these merchants got their cargoes from the
Portuguese. Thus the odious traffic was legalized
and systematized and grew very rapidly, for
all the nations in Europe, who had colonial
interests, quickly adopted the same policy.

The English first engaged in the traffic
for the purpose of supplying Spanish settlements,
for it was not until the reign of Elizabeth
that they had any settled colonies of their
own. It is a curious fact, that they did not
then introduce the custom, for the first slaves
were landed at Queenstown by a Dutch
trader. The ice having been broken however,
they took up the business, and the number
of slaves, while seeming to grow but slowly,

work very steadily, and the first field labor began to be performed, more by white hands, so that by the time of the revolution they composed a quarter of the population.

The English-African slave trade was in the hands of exclusive companies for a long time, but William and Mary made it the privilege of any good citizen to engage in the business if he wished. Between 1680-1700 about 14000 slaves were exported from the country by the African Company, and 160000 more by private concern, making a total of 174000. The slave trade in America reached its height, shortly after the Revolutionary war, when the 172 ships sailing from British ports to participate in the trade offered room for 47176 slaves. Some notion of what Africa was suffering can be obtained from the following statistics of 1780, when the British exported 38000, the French 20000, the Dutch 4000, the Danes 2000, and the Portuguese 10000, a total of 74000 annually. Not only did the natives suffer very much from the foreigners directly, but the native slave dealers, instigated by a desire to take advantage

of the impetus given to the trade by its introduction into European colonies, pushed their raids into every corner of the Dark Continent.

As soon as all or even part of the horrors of the traffic began to be known, the best men became opposed to it, and if having an honorable opponent sends a fighter any credit, slavery can surely shine brightly by reason of its learned list. Birkbeck has prepared a long list, many of them unfamiliar to most, but among the number are: Baxter, Steele, Southey, Pope, Thomson, Savage, Bowyer, Dr. Johnson, Wakefield, Fisher and many others. The result of the agitation raised by these men, culminated in a decision of the English Supreme Bench, delivered by Lord Mansfield in June 1772, that so soon as a slave set foot on the British islands he became free. The first body of people to take united action against this curse of Africa, were the Quakers, who expelled all members who kept slaves, and in 1783 formed an association

for the suppression of the traffic. A work published by Thomas Clarkson in 1786, from which the list of names were taken, called the attention of Wilberforce to the movement, and he decided to champion the cause in Parliament. A committee was formed May 22nd 1787 for the abolition of the slave trade in all British possessions. This committee after nearly twenty years work effected its object and removed a great blot from the British escutcheon and aided greatly in the amelioration of the condition of humanity. In 1811 a bill was passed in Parliament making participation in the trade a felony punishable with transportation, and the slave trade was at an end so far as England was concerned.

Denmark was the first country to take this step of abolition when she made every man upon Danish soil a free man in 1802. America forbade the importation of slaves into her territory January 1st 1808, and Bonaparte ordered the trade abolished in France in 1814. England paid Portugal 530,000 to

abolish the slave trade in 1830, and Spain
5-100000 in 1820. Sweden had closed the trade
in her territory in 1813 and Holland in 1814.
The South American states generally pro-
hibited the traffic when they were formed, and
by 1842 when the Ashburton Treaty was
negotiated between England and the
United States, the slave trade so far as
it was carried on under the flag of
any respectable nation, had ceased to
exist.

Although the slave trade was formally
abolished, the fact that slavery was per-
mitted in many of the richest parts of
the globe kept up an illicit form of
the business. Reformers said that they had
not cut the tap root of the evil yet so
they began working for another and more
radical reform, the complete abolition
of slavery itself in colonial possessions.
The results of the previous reforms had
been, that the slaves anxious to make as
much as possible out of every voyage,
crowded their cargoes mercilessly and
in order to save their own necks, would
throw the whole lot overboard at the

aboard of a cruiser. Thrice or four
a number of negroes were exported, for it was
to the interest of the cruisers who shared the
prize, to allow the owner to clear the land
with as full a cargo as possible, so as to
make the prize a rich one. Besides the
slaves already to use were overworked
and that fresh supplies were limited, for
of the immense numbers who started, two
thirds were murdered on the high seas.

There was some little difficulty in getting
a competent champion in parliament, but
at length Earl Grey took the matter in
hand and an abolition bill was passed
in 1833. A sum of £20,000,000 and a
period of several years apprenticeship was
offered as compensation to the planters for
the loss of their slave property. Public
opinion was not entirely satisfied with the
seven years transition period and in 1838
it was done away with and the negroes
became unqualifiedly free.

England's example was gradually
followed by the other states of Europe,
France in 1848. Holland in 1863, Portugal
in 1878, many of the South American

states did likewise.

Slavery still existed almost unchecked in the United States, Cuba and Brazil, not that the respectable elements did not deplore the conditions it enforced, but that circumstances seemed to demand it. The struggle which resulted in Emancipation in the United States, has been elsewhere treated. The pioneer of the movement was Ben Lundy and after him followed some of the most illustrious men America or the world, has ever produced, Wm Lloyd Garrison, Douglass, Wendell Phillips, Chas. Sumner, Channing, Emerson, Whittier, Longfellow, Whitman and others, used of their time and talents to the utmost, in order to do away with what they considered a stain upon the fame of the Republic. The Emancipation Proclamation went into effect Jan. 1st 1863, and the close of the war in 1865 saw the dearest struggles of slavery in the "Land of the Free."

Spain passed a bill in 1870 known as the Mont Law, which provided that all slaves over 60 years of age should at once be free,

as were also the children born after that date, and by the close of the eighties the institution had ceased to exist in Cuba and Porto Rico.

The Brazilian Chambers issued a decree Sept 28th 1871, abolishing slavery throughout the empire, except that the then existing slaves with exception of those belonging to the government, which should remain such. Facilities for emancipation were provided, however, and a certain sum was set aside annually from the fines of each province to be expended in liberating slaves. Although this bill did not meet the expectations of its drafters and the practice was not killed, it led to a more and more healthy opinion on the subject, and it was completely abolished in

It would seem that the dearth of markets would have a powerful effect on the condition of the African slave business, but as the Western demand ceased, the Eastern grew and great fairs are held annually at convenient places, such as Kuka, Mogador, etc. The slaves scour the country far and near in preparation for these fairs and the suffering occasioned in the hunting is too

enormous to estimate. But a small per cent of the natives are captured in the first place, the others are either killed in the attack on the village or driven into the forests to starve, then of those captured, the majority are killed by the hardships of the journey and the cruelty of the drivers, so that Stanley estimates that hardly two per cent of the native population which is raided, ever reaches the market, the others fertilize the country along the route with their bones. Rolfs says that did a person not know his way to these trading places, he would only have to follow the bones of the murdered slaves and he need never go astray. The efforts of the Congo Free State and the other companies sanctioned by the powers of the World have done much towards alleviating the suffering, but only a step has been made. Missionaries are now located in many places and find a field for work, broad and fertile enough to satisfy the desires of the most exacting of them. Mr. Stanley, who is perhaps about the best authority upon the subject, thinks there is but one way to crowd the Arab slaves out, that is to cut off their supply of

powder. Without powder they could not stand before the natives a single season. With the gradual opening up of the country, due to the healthy growth of commerce encouraged by the placing of boats upon the upper Congo and its tributaries with the connecting lakes which give access to an immense territory, and the provision of better transportation by means of railroads, the slavers are being crowded out more and more, without any embargo being laid upon the powder supply. They have disappeared entirely, from the east coast, and are found principally around Lake Victoria and in the surrounding British territory.

The East African Company which is the English representation in the territory, is putting forth its best efforts in the suppression of the nefarious business, and the probabilities are that by the close of the century or early in the next at least, it will be reduced to a minimum.