

“Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité” – Abolitionist Ideas in Caleb Bingham’s 1797 *The Columbian Orator*

Sorina Georgescu

“Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité” – these are the words that come to mind when speaking about the French Revolution and the way it influenced the political 19<sup>th</sup> century phenomenon called abolitionism, both in Romania and America, two countries situated at the same distance from a centre we might call France. This paper proposes to study such terms as “liberty”, “slavery”, “equality”, “brotherhood”, key concepts for this political trend, in *The Columbian Orator*, an oratory manual written by Caleb Bingham and first published in 1797, in order to see their meanings in the contexts in which they appear, and for that specific period of time: end of 18<sup>th</sup> century, beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup>. The usefulness of this project lies in the fact that, by discussing a famous school manual whose author’s main purpose was to teach people eloquence and virtue, it helps to trace back the beginnings of American abolitionist ideology, until now placed in the 1830s.

If we first read this manual against the political and juridical context at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, we will meet a first instance of the terms “liberty” and “equality”, as an official term, in the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776, where the first and most famous phrase says: “That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”.

However, it is widely known that such terms as “man” and “citizen”, that is, “the man” legally existent and entitled to such rights, were limited to the White Anglo Saxons. If we add to these two more important events we’ll also see how slavery was not yet an official problem to be solved.

The first would be a juridical document called “The Bill of Rights” (1791) which clearly states the scope of individual freedom (synonym with “liberty”), as freedom of speech, religion and association, the right to keep arms, to be protected against arbitrary government actions, and the right to a trial, among its 10 Amendments with problems more or less related to these.

The second is the political debate between Federalists (Hamilton) and Anti-Federalists (Democratic Republicans) (Jefferson), with the first arguing for an authoritative and stable national state, for federal taxes to stabilize the government finances and establish the government's reputation internationally and its authority in every corner of the republic, i.e. the centralization of power in the national government, and the second arguing for a republic of small-property holding farmers, a central government to protect property but not strong enough to threaten it or other republic rights, against the national debt and the federal taxes, and pleading for fewer government employers and free trade.

If we next read the manual against the didactic context in which it was published and studied, what we first find out, from John A. Nietz's book "Old Textbooks" is the lack of authoritative organizations, such as The American Historical Society, the American Mathematical Society and others of the kind, at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup>. A first consequence was, as Nietz's argument follows, that "each author could largely determine what his text would include and what omit" (Nietz 5), with "individual whims and interests of the authors" determining "the nature of the textbooks" (Nietz 5). Under such circumstances we have spellers, readers, grammars, arithmetics, geographies, American Histories, Civil Government Texts, physiology and a group called "Penmanship, Art and Music".

If we want to see the aims and kind of contents of the most famous examples from the humanist category, we'll have "virtue", "patriotism" "cultural aims", "civic aims" (nationalism, or worldmindedness), and, "the chief aim of education in early American schools" (Nietz 50), the teaching of religion and morality, which we are told, was present even in geographies. Actually, here is the only section where Nietz mentions four authors of such geographies that, among other problems to condemn, also place slavery. All these authors (Morse, Davies – 1805, Dwight – 1796, Adams – 1818) are before 1830, when, we are told, this anti-slavery trend softens in order to sell the books both in North and South.

In Nietz' book, *The Columbian Orator* is placed under the title "Speakers" due to its very full title: "*The Columbian Orator: Containing a Variety of Original and Selected Pieces together with Rules Calculated to Improve Youth and Others in the Ornamental*

*and Useful Art of Eloquence*". While its author, Caleb Bingham, is also placed under the "Spellers" section, together with famous Noah Webster, due to his "*The Child's Companion, Being an Easy and Concise Reading and Spelling Book*" (1792). In this section we find out that Bingham was a school master in Boston, the city of reform, ninety-years later, according to Henry James's novel, *The Bostonians*.

Bingham's *Orator* is analyzed by Nietz only as a speaker, "calculated particularly for dialogue and declamation" (Nietz 65) in a time called "Launching the Nation" when "the democratic political development of our country required the election of persons to public office. So public speaking on the part of the candidates and their friends became common" (Nietz 66), that is, "effective public speaking" was a very important subject to be taught at the time we are talking about. Regarding its content, Nietz says "on 23 pages there is an introduction for speaking" followed by the selections:

...the practical pieces for speaking; consisting of Orations, Addresses, Exhortations from the Pulpit, Pleadings at the Bar, Sublime Descriptions, Debates, Declamations, Grave and Humorous Dialogues, Poetry, etc." (Nietz 66) all these in 82 texts written on 277 pages.

If we read the preface of the book, we see the purpose declared by the author himself as

In his choice of materials, it has been his object to select such as should inspire the pupil with the ardour of eloquence and the love of virtue. He has spared no pains to render the Work, in every respect, worthy of the generous patronage, which a liberal public have bestowed on his former publications. (Bingham Preface)

So, as Nietz also notices, the popularity of the manual was due to the fact that it successfully combined the teaching of elocution and speaking with the teaching of morals, a very important issue to be taught, as we have said earlier in the paper.

The texts in the book are not grouped thematically, the author preferring "no method" and choosing "variety" over "system" (Bingham Preface). Therefore, for the purpose of the present paper, I'll divide them into extracts that contain the words "liberty", "slavery" and "equality and rights of men", and those who teach moral or eloquence in relation to other themes. The first category is made of 34 pieces out of the total number of 82, that is, little less than one half. If we divide again, these 34 texts into three major themes, we'll have: 1. "America as the land of liberty" – 13 texts; 2. "France as the land of liberty" - 6 texts; 3. "Slavery – different types of slavery" – 15 texts, "Black slavery – 4 texts" - (total 19 texts). From this division we can clearly see that the

two themes that most preoccupied Bingham for half of his book are “America as the land of liberty” and “slavery” in its whole spectrum.

I’ll start my analysis of the book with the first theme, “America as the land of liberty”, in order to define the term “liberty” in relationship with the term America in Bingham’s acceptation.

As we’ll see from six out of the thirteen speeches under these theme, the meaning comes directly from the American Independence war, only natural for the time of writing, and praises America, either through President Washington’s words: “that Almighty Being, ...that his benedictions may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the U.S., a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes” (Washington, qtd in Bingham 34), or “I rejoice that liberty, which you have so long embraced with enthusiasm, liberty of which you have been the invincible defenders” (Washington qtd in Bingham 87), and:

...the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue, that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete.....” (Washington qtd in Bingham 148).

Or, through three orations on July 4, different years, where the people of U.S. are “the votaries of freedom” and “the friends to the rights of men” (1796) (Francis Black, Worcester, qtd in Bingham 234), they “have fought the battles of freedom and enkindled that sacred flame which now glows with vivid fervor through the greatest empire of Europe (1794)” and the Americans are “a band of patriots determined to be free” (1794) (Boston, Bingham 272).

The independence is also the theme of the rest of the speeches included here, seeing America either as the country where eloquence can flourish, through the similarity, as republic and “soil of liberty” between Columbia, and Antiquity - Greece (Athens) and the Roman Commonwealth (Bingham 30) - , or praising it through the homage paid by France - through its ambassador in U.S. (Addet, qtd in Bingham 85), and at the death of dr Franklin - , and, finally, by taking it as the model for Irish Catholics to emancipate themselves against British dominant Protestantism (O’Connor, qtd in Bingham 243).

Let’s add to this the second category I called “France as the land of liberty”. Here we’ll see that all six references will be at the French Revolution. They will start with

Franklin whose philosophy of morality inspired them, will continue with France that “broke her chain” (Addet, qtd in Bingham 86), and with the French people who, in Washington’s speech, resemble the U.S. due to their Revolution. They will end with Napoleon who will not conquest but “shall accord to Europe a glorious peace” (Bonaparte qtd in Bingham 135), with the “glory of the French” whose aim is “to humble the proud kings who dare to meditate putting us again in chains” (Bonaparte qtd in Bingham 154) and with another proof of admiration on the part of the Americans, because they “fought and bled for the security of our lives and our liberties.” (Francis Black qtd in Bingham 235)

If we put all these in connection with the purpose of the book mentioned by the author, that of oratory and virtue, and with the cause of its fame, according to Nietz, that of teaching both speaking and moral, how can we define here “liberty”? In my view, the message here is that fighting for liberty and trying to preserve it after, is a virtue at least for the American and French people, but probably for everybody. The moral here would be to fight for your liberty.

Following this first message, let’s pass to the analysis of the second major theme I called “Slavery” and see how he frames it in the context of the idea of fighting for liberty. Here the criterion for ordering the texts will be the chronological order of the actions in the different dialogues, speeches, poems.

The first dialogue, both in the book and in terms of action, is called “Judah’s Plea for His Brother Benjamin, before Joseph in Egypt”. It is important as the beginning of my analysis and of such examples in the book because it belongs to the Bible – Genesis, the Old Testament – and it shows us how a biblical fragment can be used as an anti-slavery argument *avant-la-lettre*: “With what eyes shall we dare to look upon him, unless we carry back with us this son of his right hand, this staff of his old age, whom, alas! You have condemned to slavery?” (Bingham 35) The connection between “slavery” and “liberty” comes through the idea of sacrifice, the voluntary sacrifice of his brother to free Benjamin: “If your just indignation must needs have a sacrifice, here I am ready, at the price of my liberty or of my life, to expiate this young man’s guilt, and to purchase his release” (Bingham 36). That is, according to Bingham, “slavery” was not scripturally dictated and is not to be biblically accepted.

The next four examples belong to politics, but to that of Antiquity, in the times of Romans, not to contemporary America, according to the school curricula of the time.

The first two examples show a ruler tyrant, perhaps after the model of the king of England, but this time the role is played by Cesar while those enslaved are the Romans: “Did Cesar, drunk with power, and madly brave/Insatiate burn, his country to enslave?” (Bingham 69) or:

“He was willing to have indulged us with preferents and honors; but we were not willing to accept, as the gift of a master, what we were entitled to claim as free citizens. [...] Cesar cancelled the laws, and overturned the constitution of his country; he usurped all the powers of the commonwealth, set up a monarchy, and himself affected to be a king.” (Bingham 142)

The third example makes Rome itself, as a state, the tyrant, just like England before the Independence is gained, and the British people the fighters for liberty, just like Americans not long before the writing of this book: “...restoration of British liberty and for shaking off the infamous yoke of Roman slavery, Caledonia is yet free. The all-grasping power of Rome has not yet been able to seize our liberty.” (Bingham 185)

The last example is Cato, who may be either Cato the Elder, a Roman statesman, orator, and writer, who, as censor in 184 BC engaged in a vigorous programme of moral and social reform, or Cato the Younger (95-46 BC) known in America through an 18<sup>th</sup> century drama by Joseph Addison, and remembered both as politician and statesman in the late Roman Republic and his conflict with Julius Caesar, as well as for his moral integrity, which would fit him perfectly to the purpose of the manual. In Bingham’s “Scene from the Tragedy of Cato” we have Sempronius pleading for war, because: “Heav’ns! Can a Roman senate long debate/Which of the two to choose, slavery or death!” (Bingham 265), then Lucius pleading for “submission to the gods” (Bingham 265) and, finally, the voice of Cato arguing for a “virtuous liberty”: “Let us draw our term of freedom out/In its full length and spin it to the last, / [...]. A day, an hour of virtuous liberty/ is worth a whole eternity of bondage” (Bingham 267).

So, chronologically speaking, the first instances of “slavery” and “liberty” regard a problem that was of actuality for 18<sup>th</sup> century American people, that is, states or people subdued by one tyrant or empire, and their wish not to accept this and fight for their freedom, considering, if possible, this last idea of “virtuous liberty”.

The next group of texts would be, again, from France, another interesting theme at the time, due both to their help in the American Revolution and to the French Revolution as such.

The first text here is an “Extract from the Eulogy of Dr. Franklin Pronounced by the Abbe Fauchet, in the Names of the Commons of Paris, 1790” and it praises not only Franklin but “the empire of freedom” that was “extended to France”, and made the “French females” applaud the females of America:

“Already our female citizens (for they have lately become such) are not any longer occupied with those frivolous ornaments, and vain pleasures, which were nothing more than the amusements of slavery; they have awakened the love of liberty in the bosoms of fathers, of brothers and of husbands; they have encouraged them to make the most generous sacrifices [...] It is no longer the love of voluptuous softness that attracts their regard; it is the sacred fire of patriotism” (Fauchet, qtd in Bingham 66).

The French Revolution is again praised by Citizen Carnot, “President of the Executive Directory at the Festival of Gratitude and Victory, Celebrated at the Champ-de-Mars, May 29, 1796”, and again we have this connection between the idea of revolution and the idea of slavery as in the examples with Rome – a tyrant enslaving his people: “...courageous philosophers, whose writings have planted the seeds of the Revolution, corroded the fetters of slavery” (Carnot qtd in Bingham 82). The same idea, of France who “broke her chains”, or who will “humble the proud kings who dare to meditate putting us again in chains”, can be seen in the rest of the texts belonging to this group.

So, if virtue here means patriotism, patriotism in its turn leads to the famous French “liberté”, which implies the fight against being enslaved, the fight to “break your chains” and “the fetters of slavery”.

I’ll skip those fragments that deal with “slavery to fashion”, “slavery to popular impulse” or with the inexistence of “American servitude”, as underlined in British Parliament debates and I will pass on to the last important category in this group, the black slavery in U.S.

I’ll start with the “General Description of America. Extract from a Poem Spoken at Dartmouth College, on Commencement Day, 1795”, where we see one instance of the French “fraternity”, or American “equality” regarding the relationship of blacks and whites, while slavery is described as inhuman, with gloomy colors, in accordance with an upset nature that punishes this institution, in Romantic fashion:

“But weep, humanity, the black disgrace,  
And spread the blushes o’er oppression’s face!  
Ye sons of mirth, your bowl, your richest food,  
Is mingled with fraternal tears and blood.  
Still groans the slave beneath the master’s rod,  
But nature, wrong’d, appeals to Nature’s God.  
The sun frowns angry at th’inhuman sight.  
[...] The rich plantation lies a barren waste  
And all the works of slavery are defac’d  
Ye tyrants, own the devastation just.  
‘Tis for your wrongs the fertile earth is curs’d”. (Bingham 238)

That is, not only is slavery not God-given in the sense we saw in the Genesis, or not acceptable by any known state, from Antiquity until that day, but this institution cannot be accepted by the nature either, especially by the American nature, one way of subverting the whole idea of slavery being “natural”, so common in the pro-slavery rhetoric of the time.

The idea of brotherhood began in the verses commented upon, is continued when referring to the future of humanity at large:

“Over all the earth shall freedom’s banner wave,  
The tyrant blast, and liberate the slave  
Plenty of peace shall spread from pole to pole,  
Till earth’s grand family possess one soul.” (Bingham 238)

If nature does not admit such an inhuman institution, let’s see how morality and human rights fit with it. In order to do this, I will analyze three texts: two very important dialogues, one of which is mentioned by African-American former slave Frederick Douglass, at 1845, as truly influential for his want of liberty and for his career as a free man, and as such, commented upon by all critics dealing with Douglass (“Dialogue between a Master and a Slave”), another one not mentioned by them (“Slaves in Barbary: A Drama in Two Acts”) and a speech (“Extract from a Discourse Delivered before the New-York Society for the Manumission of Slaves, Ap 12, 1797, by Rev. Samuel Miller”).

I will start with the first in the order of the appearance in the book, “Slaves in Barbary: A Drama in Two Acts”, where “Barbary” stands for Tunis, and as a name it is



in opposition with “Christianity”, which should represent the good, moral, civilized world.

The action takes place probably during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, in the middle of the Ottoman expansion over Arab territories and the Venetian-Turkish wars. The slaves brought here and sold at auction, just like in Bingham’s America, are “prisoners of all colors, sorts, sizes captured in the Mediterranean”, not only blacks. The worse character here is Oran, a cruel purchaser of slaves, while the best, among masters, is the Turk Hammet Bashaw, “noted for his humanity”. So here we’ll see how another concept, “humanity”, important for the 18<sup>th</sup> century, will be put in relation to the idea of “master” and of “slavery”.

The characters that start the story are two brothers from Venice captured by the Muslims: one of them was already freed by Hammet, the other still a slave to Oran, but who will be freed by his freed brother and, together, they will be brought to the Turk whose true relationship to them will be revealed only at the end of the drama. One important point in the brothers’ discussion about Hammet’s humanity is, on the one hand, the clear contradiction between this concept and the idea of keeping someone in slavery, apparently as a “barbarian” thing to do. On the other hand, they present us their native Christian Venice as a country where “we have seen the Turks sold there in open market, and exposed to all indignities which we have borne with Oran” (Bingham 104). So here the author seems to subvert the idea of synonymy between Christian morality and true humanity. Still, Hammet, it is said, “takes a liking to Christians and is very often doing them a good turn” (Bingham 104), so, perhaps, according to the 18<sup>th</sup> century mentality, the Turk will be good and moral only because he is inspired by Christianity. Unlike him, the Arab Oran expresses the same ideas about slavery as many South masters in the U.S.: “He who frees a slave, arms an assassin”; “if there are lords, there must be slaves” (Bingham 115), words that, coming from the mouth of an Arab, may underline the non-Christianity, the non-humanity of such ideas.

Let’s now see who the slaves at the auction are. The most important characters here are a black slave, Sharp, captured with his American master, who is suggestively called Kidnap. The language of Sharp is the broken English which all authors in 19<sup>th</sup> century will use when creating black characters, while his opinions regarding his master

are really negative: “Dat learn you strike poor negur. Me wish he killa you” (Bingham 116). The moral side of the story starts with the fate of this bad master. Such a bad master that, according to one officer,

In his social glee, he ordered six dozen of port, gave Liberty and Independence for a toast, sung an ode to Freedom; and after fancying he had kicked over the tables, broken all the glasses, and lay helpless on the floor, gave orders, attended by a volley of oaths, to have fifty of his slaves whipped thirty stripes each, for singing a liberty-song in echo to his own; and six more to be hung up by the hills for petitioning him for a draught of milk and water, while he was reveling with his drunken companions. Then waked up and exclaimed, O happy America! Farewell for ever! Justice! Thou has overtaken me at last. (Bingham 116)

What can we see here is the portrait of the master as a drunkard, cruel man, using the sacred words of Freedom, Liberty and Independence in improper circumstances and then breaking them all by ordering the whipping and hanging of his slaves. His only remorse starts when he feels his fate will completely change from liberty to slavery: “Officer: Discipline him freely, with a whip for several weeks. Kidnap: “Severe reverse! Now, Africans, I learn to pity you” (Bingham 116). He draws the officers hatred even more as they realize he must have been “a wholesome dealer in slaves himself” (Bingham 117), and Hammet is told the white master comes from North America, “that boasted land of liberty?” (Bingham 117). In order to complete the justice, Hammet orders “to let misery teach him what he could never learn in affluence, the lesson of humanity” and sends him to an Arab master so as to: “have the advantage of a whip-lecture from his former slave” (Bingham 117), a most subversive fate decided by Bingham at the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century America, even more subversive than famous abolitionist Harriet Beecher Stowe, half a century later.

The moral message of the drama is uttered by Hammet, a former Turkish slave in Venice, freed by the mercy and humanity of the father of the two brothers at the beginning of the story, now himself a master in Tunis, and who, as a moral consequence of his former fate, was buying slaves in order to free them: “There is no luxury so exquisite as the existence of humanity, and no post so honorable as his, who defends the rights of man.” (Bingham 118)

So, here we have, for the first time in the U.S. rhetoric of morality, the ideas of “liberty” and “rights of men” clearly associated with “blacks” and “black slavery”, in Caleb Bingham’s *The Columbian Orator*, through the mouth of a Turkish man.

The next dialogue, between master and slave, explores almost the same problems, but this time on the American territory. Now we have the “Slave”, a black who had tried to run away, and his “master”, very upset with his ingratitude at the beginning of the dialogue. We have again, for the first time, since we are talking about another text in the same manual, and of a dialogue composed by the same author, the idea of giving a slave the right to speak in his own defense. The first important point is the slave’s apparent acceptance to “submit to my fate” (Bingham 240), since “slave” is an “answer enough” (Bingham 240) for all his misery, and the master’s wish to hear him say more, because, unlike the stereotyped portrait of black as beast, he feels that this slave has “a mind superior to your condition” (Bingham 240). So, for the first time, the slave is not only human, but has a mind and a voice of his own. But what has this slave to say? In the first place, he mentions the most precious thing that has been taken away from him: the liberty. A thing that was not taken honestly since “Did I give my consent to the purchase?” (Bingham 241) and, speaking of liberty as a natural right, like the very Declaration of Independence said it was, he denies having lost the right as such, but only the power to defend this right. And he names the three categories that compose the evil system in U.S.: “the villain who stole me”, the “slave-merchant who tempted him to do so” and “you, the master, who encouraged the slave-merchant to bring his cargo of human cattle to cultivate your lands” (Bingham 241), saying again more than Stowe who mostly blamed politics and slave-traders.

In what follows we’ll find another instance of the idea of black slavery being something natural: “It is the order of Providence that one man should become subservient to another. It ever has been so, and ever will be. I found the custom and did not make it.” (Bingham 241) And the idea is again subverted, with a new kind of arguments:

You cannot be but sensible, that the robber who puts a pistol to your breast may make just the same plea. Providence gives him a power over your life and property; it gave my enemies a power over my liberty. But it has also given me legs to escape with; and what should prevent me from using them? (Bingham 242)

Quite a powerful argument, but the master insists on his having been treated his slave kindly, even humanly. Here comes the slave’s counter-argument, underlining again the contradiction between slavery and humanity:

Humane! Does it deserve that appellation to keep your fellowmen in forced subjection, deprived of all exercise of their free will, liable to all the injuries that your own caprice, or the brutality of your

overseers, may heap on them, and devoted, soul and body, only to your pleasure and emolument? (Bingham 243)

So, in order to prove his own honesty, goodness, humanity, the master will free his slave at being awakened by such arguments. The end of the dialogue turns the slave into a grateful human being who “now I am indeed your servant, though not your slave”, and who, in order to return a true kindness reveals, for his master and, as such, for the (white) reader, the reality of the relationship between master and slave:

You can rely on no kindness on your part, to soften the obduracy of their resentment. You have reduced them to the state of brute beasts; and if they have not the stupidity of beasts of burden, they must have the ferocity of beasts of prey. Superior force alone can give you security. As soon as that fails, you are at the mercy of the merciless. Such is the social bond between master and slave! (Bingham 243)

Now I will pass to the third and last text of this category and as such, of the present analysis: “Extract from a Discourse Delivered before the New-York Society for the Manumission of Slaves, Ap 12, 1797, by Rev. Samuel Miller”.

The first important word here is “manumission” because it is synonym to “freedom” in the sense that it is “the legal release of a person from slavery”, an “emancipation”, something owners did “as a reward for meritorious and or faithful service”. So, this text first serves as information that tells us this was the case in U.S. even before 1797 when this speech was delivered at an already existing society. And what is this speech about? It directly calls slavery “unjust” and blames all those who, “instead of diminishing, strive to increase the evil in question” (Miller qtd in Bingham 300). Thus, the so called “friends of humanity” according to all we have seen both as juridical and political context at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, or as a discourse regarding liberty, virtue, independence in this manual, these Americans that “claim the titles and privileges of citizens” (Miller qtd in Bingham 300) are actually trafficking on human flesh” (Miller qtd in Bingham 300), while Africa, that “unhappy” continent due to bad climate, captivity and slavery, to which the Euro-American hypocrisy in terms of justice, humanity, sublime morality and religiousness adds, stands for an “everlasting monument of European and American disgrace”.”( Miller qtd in Bingham 300)

I conclude my analysis saying once again that the present study aimed to analyze the concepts of “liberty”, “slavery”, “equality” and even “brotherhood” in *The Columbian Orator*, considering both the political, juridical and didactic context in which the manual was published and Bingham’s own intentions when writing the manual, that of teaching (white) people the art of eloquence and the “love of virtue”, in order to find

out more about the beginnings of abolitionism in America, placed, with this manual's help, at the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century, and about the morals and mentality that helped bring it up. My understanding of the message of this book, regarding "liberty" and "slavery" is that slavery is neither God-, Bible- or Nature-given, it should not be accepted either by states or individual people, who are advised to fight for their liberty, either through arms or words, and that a good citizen of the U.S. should never keep a man in slavery.

## Works Cited

### Primary Sources

Bingham Caleb, *The Columbian Orator: Containing a Variety of Original and Selected Pieces together with Rules Calculated to Improve Youth and Others in the Ornamental and Useful Art of Eloquence*, Boston : J.H.A. Frost, 1832, c1810.

### Secondary Sources

Douglass, Frederick. *My Freedom and My Bondage*. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, 1994

Hawkins, Joyce ., Robert Allen. *The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991

James, Henry. *The Bostonians*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/19717/19717.txt>

"Manumission". [www.eldritchdark.com/articles/criticism/69/a-glossary-for-the-fiction-of-clark-ashton-smith](http://www.eldritchdark.com/articles/criticism/69/a-glossary-for-the-fiction-of-clark-ashton-smith)

- [www.african-american-art-history.com/glossary.html](http://www.african-american-art-history.com/glossary.html)

Nietz, John A. *Old Textbooks: Spelling, Grammar, Reading, Arithmetic, Geography, American History, Civil Government, Physiology, Penmanship, Art, Music – as Taught in the Common Schools from Colonial Days to 1900*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961

Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. London: Collector's Library, 2004