

NEH Thoreau Institute Lesson Plan
Thread: Examining Desperate and Deliberative Lives
Barbara Whitlock
Montrose School
29 North St., Medfield MA 02052
bwhitlock@montroseschool.org

Description of Curriculum Plan: *This unit is designed for AP US History students examining the first half of the 19th century Anti-Slavery Reform Movements and Antebellum period. This is roughly a two-week unit, culminating in a DBQ. However, each lesson could be done as a single lesson. Students should read background in their textbooks and consider adding "The Madness of John Brown" (ch 7) in Davidson and Lytle's *After the Fact: The Art of Historical Detection*, 6th ed. (McGraw Hill 2010) before doing the DBQ.*

How to Integrate these materials in the classroom:

1. **Provide Historical Context:** Each lesson includes a brief historical overview framework to help the teacher position the historical context for the lesson's documents. Students will need contextualization support to understand the broader Reform Movement, the specific Anti-Slavery Movement, and particular references to Boston and Concord's Female Antislavery Movement (or substitute with a local focus near your school district). For APUSH teachers: This unit could follow as an in-depth case study following your work in Period 5 of the AP Key Concepts.
2. **Close Reading of Primary and Secondary Sources:** Common Core and AP History reform efforts have focused on developing close reading skills for students. Depending on your student's readiness, you can use some or all of the documents included as in-class exercises guided by teacher prompting or small-group think-pair-share exercises. For advanced readers, they can annotate and answer the guiding questions independently to bring to class discussion.
3. **Looking for Patterns:** The secondary and primary source documents lead students to see several patterns:
 - a. Influences of women (family and broader community) on changes in the engagement, rhetoric, and responses recommended by male leaders (particularly Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau) for the Abolitionist cause.
 - b. Comparison of early and later texts by Emerson and Thoreau that highlight changes in perspective and a pattern of increased radicalization.
4. **DBQ Assessment:** The final assessment focuses on the impact of John Brown and the Harper's Ferry raid on the Abolition Movement. The documents take students beyond the words of Emerson and Thoreau to include leading speakers and commentators of their day.

APUSH Connections: *The study focuses on the following APUSH-relevant learning variables (see details below):*

- **Themes: NAT-1.0, POL-2.0, CUL-2.0**
- **Key Concept Period 5 1844-1877 5.2** *Intensified by expansion and deepening regional divisions, debates over slavery and other economic, cultural, and political issues led the nation into civil war.*
- **History Disciplinary Practices: Analyzing Primary & Secondary Sources**
- **Historical Reasoning Skills: Contextualization, Comparison, Continuity & Change over Time**

2018 AP History Disciplinary Practices & Reasoning Skills:

<https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/resources/ap-history-disciplinary-practices-and-reasoning-skills>

2017 APUSH Key Concepts Guide:

<https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/ap/ap-us-history-course-and-exam-description.pdf> (pp 60-61)

Essential Question: To what extent does deliberation or desperate circumstances drive transformative historic change?

Guiding Question: What role did deliberation play in developing the Anti-Slavery Movement in Massachusetts (1835-1860), and how did desperate responses to the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 and John Brown's Raid at Harper's Ferry in 1859 shift key abolitionist leaders from moderation to calls for more radical intervention?

Focus Question: What was the process by which leading Transcendentalist figures such as Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau became radicalized in their approach to abolition, and what was the pivotal role of women in the Abolitionist movement in Massachusetts and national events in influencing these leaders?

Lesson 1. Research one of the female members of regional anti-slavery societies in Massachusetts.

Overview: *In 1833, women of diverse races formed the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, the first female anti-slavery society in the US. In 1834, women formed the Middlesex County Anti-Slavery Society; and, in 1837, a group of women connected to the Transcendentalists formed the Concord Female Anti-Slavery Society. Similar organizations emerged in towns throughout Massachusetts and across cities throughout the North. The documentary history of these women remains in official documents, such as the Boston Anti-Slavery Society Constitution 1835 (included below), resolutions from meetings, speeches (see below) and letters by members. Uncovering the influence of these women among the men in their families and communities requires inference. In this lesson, students will research one woman involved in a female anti-slavery society in Massachusetts (or local school district) to discern the connection between the social and political history of these community-based movements. The connection between the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society and other such societies in Massachusetts was facilitated by the extension of the railway system. For example, the Fitchburg line of the train station, completed in 1844, connected the Concord activists to Boston activists daily, with five trains running per week day. A network of lecturers spoke among these organizations, further charging the movement's responses to advancing the abolitionist cause.*

These pockets of activism involved years of deliberation and collaboration, yet key events contributed to the process of radicalization. The passage of the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act, with MA Senator Daniel Webster casting the passing vote, along with key legal decisions in MA courts that returned African-Americans to slavery in the South, contributed to the shift toward more charged rhetoric and advocacy for more dramatic responses to the problem of abolition.

→ Use the resources below to identify and research a woman leader of a female antislavery society in MA (or apply this to regions near your school district). Identify her role in her community and discern her impact on spreading the abolitionist cause.

Guiding Questions:

- What was her place in her town/city?
- What role did she play in her local anti-slavery society? How did she get involved?
- What key events did she participate in?
- What texts influenced her?
- What primary source verifies her role? (speech, letter, newspaper article)

Expanding learning: Students could also reflect back to see what role the women they researched may have played in temperance societies in the 1830s and look forward to discern their role in the suffrage movement and Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 to trace the historical reasoning skill of continuity and change over time.

Resources:

Jeffrey, Julie Roy, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Anti-Slavery Movement*, 1998 (UNC Press).

<https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-by-era/slavery-and-anti-slavery/resources/woman-abolitionists>

Female Anti-Slavery Society members in Massachusetts:

For Boston:

Hanson, Debra Gold, *Strained Sisterhood*, 2009 (UMASS Press)

<http://www.americanabolitionists.com/boston-female-anti-slavery-society.html>

<http://www.masshist.org/online/abolition/index.php?id=70>

For Salem: <http://www.blackpast.org/aah/remond-sarah-parker-1824-1894>

For Worcester: <http://www.wwhp.org/Resources/Biographies/sarahhusseyarle.html>

For Concord:

Petruionis, Sandra, *To Set the World Right: The Anti-Slavery Movement in Thoreau's Concord*, 2006 (Cornell Univ Press).

<http://www.robbinshouse.org/wp-content/uploads/Meet-Ellen-Garrison-PROOF.pdf>

Lesson 2: Primary Source Analysis of the Boston Anti-Slavery Society Constitution 1835 and a July 13, 1836 Address to the organization

Overview: *The Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society established its guiding principles in the two documents included here: the organization's constitution and in an early address by leaders to its members. Note that these documents emphasize the right of petition. In addition, the role of women as moral leaders charged to influence men toward what is right and good emerges in such references as: "As wives and mothers, as sisters and daughters, we are deeply responsible for the influence we have on the human race. We are bound to exert it; we are bound to urge men to cease to do evil, and learn to do well." By comparing these two documents, students will uncover the principles that guided the women's commitment to the Abolitionist Movement in light of the broader Reform Movement (1820-1865).*

Guiding Questions:

- What are the key principles guiding these documents, and what implicit values emerge?

- How inclusive was the organization? (Are there references to race? How about the annual fee? Use this historical currency calculator: <https://futureboy.us/fsp/dollar.fsp>)
- How would you assess the organization's methods to advance abolition?

Image of the original document:

**Preamble to the Constitution of the Boston Female
Anti-Slavery Society.**

Believing slavery to be a direct violation of the laws of God, and productive of a vast amount of misery and crime; and convinced that its abolition can only be effected by an acknowledgement of the justice and necessity of *immediate emancipation*,—we hereby agree to form ourselves into a Society **TO AID AND ASSIST IN THIS RIGHTEOUS CAUSE AS FAR AS LIES WITHIN OUR POWER.**

Preamble.

Believing slavery to be a direct violation of the law of God, and productive of a vast amount of misery and crime; and convinced that its abolition can only be effected by an acknowledgement of the justice and necessity of immediate emancipation,—we hereby agree to form ourselves into a Society to aid and assist in this righteous cause as far as lies within our power.

Constitution.

Article 1st. This Society shall be called the Boston Female Anti Slavery Society.

Art. 2d. Any lady may become a member of this Society, by subscribing to the sentiments contained in the preamble, and paying fifty cents annually. Any lady by paying five dollars at entrance will be considered a life member.

Art. 3d. Its funds shall be appropriated to the dissemination of TRUTH on the subject of slavery, and the improvement of the moral and intellectual character of the colored population. The opinions of the members, as to the best means of effecting These purposes will be freely given at the meetings. Questions relative to the business of the Society may be decided by a vote of two thirds of the members present, or such decisions may be transferred by them to the Board of Officers.

Art. 4th. The government of this Society, shall be vested in a Board of Officers, consisting of a President, whose duty it is to preside at all meetings of the Society. A Vice President, to supply the place of the former, in case of absence. A Corresponding Secretary, who shall keep all communications addressed to the Society, and manage all the correspondence with any other bodies or individuals, according to the direction of the Society, or officers. A Recording Secretary, who is to keep a record of transactions, and give notice of the time and place for all meetings of the Society. A Treasurer, authorized to receive subscriptions, donations, &c., and to pay the bills of the Society; and five Counsellors, to advice and assist the other officers. In case of the absence of both President and Vice President, a presiding officer may be chosen by vote. Two thirds of the officers shall constitute a quorum.

Art. 5th. An annual meeting of the Society shall be held on the second Wednesday in October, at which meeting the reports of the Secretaries and Treasurer shall be

read, and officers chosen for the ensuing year.

Art. 6th. Quarterly meetings of the Society shall be held on the second Wednesdays of January, April, July and October, at which time the Secretary shall report the proceedings of the Society, and such other business shall be transacted as circumstances may render necessary. If for any unforeseen reasons, other meetings become advisable, the President is authorized to summon the other officers, and they may give notice to the members of the Society.

Art. 7th. If any vacancies occur in the Board, during the intervals of the regular meetings, the Board shall have power to fill such vacancies, pro tem.

Art. 8th. Each member is entitled to a copy of every publication issued by the Society.

Art. 9th. Any of the above articles may be amended, or new ones introduced, by a vote of two-thirds of the members present.

Boston, May, 1835.

<http://www.lehigh.edu/~dek7/SSAWW/writBoston%20FASS.htm>

July 13, 1836

ADDRESS OF THE BOSTON FEMALE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

TO THE WOMEN OF MASSACHUSETTS:

SISTERS AND FRIENDS:

As *immortal souls*, created by God to know and love him with all our hearts, and our neighbor as ourselves, we owe immediate obedience to his commands, respecting the sinful system of Slavery, beneath which 2,500,000 of our Fellow-Immortals, children of the same country, are crushed, soul and body, in the extremity of degradation and agony.

As *women*, it is incumbent upon us, instantly and always, to labor to increase the knowledge and the love of God that such concentrated hatred of his character and laws may no longer be so intrenched in *men's* business and bosoms, that they dare not condemn and renounce it.

As *wives* and *mothers*, as *sisters* and *daughters*, we are deeply responsible for the influence we have on the human race. We are bound to exert it; we are bound to urge men to cease to do evil, and learn to do well. We are bound to urge them to regain, defend, and preserve inviolate the rights of all, especially those whom they have most deeply wronged. We are bound to the constant exercise of the only right we ourselves enjoy—the right which our physical weakness renders peculiarly appropriate—the right of petition. We are bound to try how much it can accomplish in the District of Columbia, or we are as verily guilty touching slavery as our brethren and sisters in the slaveholding States: for Congress possesses power 'to exercise exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever,' by a provision of the [Constitution](#); and by an *act* of the *First* Congress, the right of petition was secured to us.

By a *resolution* of the *Last* Congress, that no petition respecting slavery, shall be printed for the information of the members, and that no vote shall be taken on it, by which we may know whether the men we call our representatives are truly such, the whole nation is made to feel the slaveholder's scourge. The best and noblest of our countrymen, thus seeing, and thus feeling these things, have spoken and acted like freemen—Oh, let us aid them to rouse the slumbering manhood of the rest! Let us rise in the moral power power of womanhood; and give utterance to the voice of outraged mercy,

and insulted justice, and eternal truth, and mighty love, and holy freedom; in the name and for the sake of our Saviour; and in the mountain-moving faith that we can do all things, Christ strengthening us.

Let us petition:—petition, till, even for our importunity, we cannot be denied. Let us know no rest till we have done our utmost to convince the mind, and to obtain the testimony of every woman, in every town, in every county of our Commonwealth, against the horrible Slave-traffic, which makes the District of Columbia a disgrace to the earth, and exhibits in the centre of a Christian country, an unrebuked wickedness, for which, no other spot on earth affords a parallel.

To facilitate this, we annex a form of petition, and entreat the aid of every woman whose hand it reaches, to circulate it (or a better,) rapidly, faithfully and thoroughly, and to transmit the signatures, as soon as possible, to 46, Washington Street, Boston, addressed to the person whose name, as a member of our Executive Committee, shall to be affixed to this address.

A detail of the mere physical particulars involved in the arrangements of a single Slave-dealer, would show the abolition of Slavery in the ten miles square, to be 'a cause worth dying for:' but while our whole country, by deliberately sanctioning such atrocities, stands before God and the world, as the strong hold of Slavery, while the institutions of the free are daily breaking down under operation of the Slave system; while in the best regulated parts of our country, the lives of the free are endangered by an avowal of the principles of the [Declaration of Independence](#); and freedom itself embittered because honorable and dignifying industry is stigmatized as *slavish*—while these things are, we must devote ourselves to avert the fearful crisis to which these things are leading. Weak and wicked is the idea, that union in oppression is possible. Every nation that attempts it, 'God beholds, and drives asunder;' and has done from the foundation of the world.

Christian friends, again we conjure you, by all that woman holds dear and holy, to labor as woman has never yet done, in view of the unutterable destruction which waits visibly round about, to make our land a perpetual desolation, unless the people repent.

Leave no energy unemployed, no righteous means untried. Grudge no expense—yield to no opposition—forget fatigue—till, by the strength of prayer and sacrifice, the spirit of love shall have overcome sectional jealousy, political rivalry, prejudice against color, cowardly concession of principle, wicked compromise with sin, devotion to gain, and spiritual despotism, which now bear with a mountain's weight upon the Slave. Let but each *woman* in the land do a Christian woman's duty, and the result cannot fail to be his instant, peaceful, unconditional deliverance. Thus, and thus only can we hope to deliver our own souls. Only in thus doing, can we hope to hear the voice of Jesus, saying unto us, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father!—Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me!'

By Order of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society,

M. W. CHAPMAN,

M. AMMIDON,

}
}

Corresponding Secretaries.

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Address_of_the_Boston_Female_Anti-Slavery_Society

Lesson 3. Trace Emerson’s changing views on how to respond to slavery, and consider the role of his wife, Lidian Emerson in affecting his views along with the effect of desperate events triggered by The Fugitive Slave Act of 1850.

Overview: *Emerson worked briefly as a Unitarian minister before settling into a writing and lecturing career and supporting the development of an intellectual community in Concord later known as the Transcendentalists. He was a scholar who advocated for the principles of equality and freedom in his writing and speeches. However, he is often described as “reluctant” to engage in the early years of the Abolitionist Movement. Sandra Petrulionis argued: “Emerson’s embrace of the cause evolved over twenty years from near indifference to full-blown militance.” To what extent did his wife Lidian Jackson Emerson and other female anti-slavery advocates in Concord influence the change in Emerson’s rhetoric, revealed in the documents below? To what extent was the shift in his tone reveal increasing desperation as a result of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850?*

The first secondary source document (“Emerson’s Path into the World of Reform”) notes female influences in this shift. Petrulionis claims that another Concord-based women’s leader helped push Emerson toward greater involvement in Abolition by inviting him to speak at events that marked pivotal anniversaries, such as the freeing of slaves in the British West Indies. Petrulionis claims: “Under the relentless direction of Concord native Mary Merrick Brooks, the female antislavery society joined neighboring towns in hosting antislavery ‘celebrations’ on August 1st to commemorate the anniversary of emancipation in the West Indies. The first of these events in 1844 marked a shift in Waldo Emerson’s public commitment to antislavery as Concord’s leading intellectual addressed a gathering that included Frederick Douglass.” The primary source document of Emerson’s 1844 address to the Concord Women’s Anti-Slavery Society on the Anniversary of the Emancipation of the Negroes in The British West Indies outlines Emerson’s early ideas promoting legislative reform to end slavery while cautioning patience, which he models by documenting the process Great Britain underwent to end slavery.

Reading further, students will read a secondary source that sets the stage for the changes in Emerson’s rhetoric and strategies to end slavery in his Address to Citizens of Concord 3 May, 1851, a year after passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. How did historical events cause Emerson’s dramatic shift in tone? How does Emerson’s transition shed light on the essential question: To what extent does deliberation or desperate circumstances drive transformative historic change?

Resources:

Influence of wife Lidian Jackson Emerson on her husband, Ralph Waldo Emerson:

https://concordlibrary.org/special-collections/antislavery/03b_essay

Petrulionis, Sandra, *To Set This World Right: The Antislavery Movement in Thoreau’s Concord*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

Moody, Marjory M., “The Evolution of Emerson as an Abolitionist,” *American Literature* Vol. 17, No. 1 (Mar., 1945), pp. 1-21 Database JSTOR via bbp.org

Buell, Lawrence. *Emerson*. (Belknap Harvard Press 2003).

Mott, Wesley T, *Ralph Waldo Emerson in Context* (Cambridge Univ Press 2013).

Emerson's Path into the World of Reform

At first, the skeptic in Emerson kept him apart from reforming "associations". He believed that reform could best be accomplished through the individual practice of "self-culture", his Transcendental term for moral self-improvement. Also, in the early years of the abolitionist movement, he found many of its proponents to be narrow, bitter, and self-righteous. After the abolitionist George Thompson visited his home in 1835, Emerson recorded the following in his journal.

Thompson the Abolitionist is inconvertible; what you say or what might be said would make no impression on him. He belongs I fear to that great class of the Vanity-stricken. An inordinate thirst for notice can not be gratified until it has found in its gropings what is called a Cause that men will bow to; tying himself fast to that, the small man is then at liberty to consider all objections made to him as proofs of folly & the devil in the objector, & under that screen, if he gets a rotten egg or two, yet his name sounds through the world and he is praised & praised.[5]

But over the years, he came to admire and support many abolitionist leaders, including Mary Merrick Brooks, president of Concord's own Female Anti-Slavery Society. In fact, all the women in Emerson's household, beginning with Lidian in the 1830s, would become members of that Society.

Eventually, he would entertain several of these leaders in his home, including the Grimké sisters, Garrison, and Wendell Phillips. Phillips, Emerson came to feel, was one of the best orators of the age. Against protests by conservatives, he would argue successfully for Phillip's right to speak on slavery at the Concord Lyceum, a controversial topic even there. His admiration for Garrison, the most famous of the abolitionists, grew considerably over the years. In 1841, Emerson noted, "I cannot speak of that gentleman without respect".[6] He also considered Lucretia Mott a "noble woman", and described Frederick Douglass as a compelling example of the heroic "anti-slave".[7] Emerson's eventual alliance with these reformers came only after the slavery issue heated up and he began to appreciate their abolitionist efforts. Yet seeds for this shift lay in his earlier writings.

When Emerson gave his "American Scholar" address in 1837, he assured his distinguished audience of Harvard alumni and students that "Action is with the scholar subordinate, but it is essential. Without it, he is not yet man".[8] Announcing a cultural revolution, his mission was change and reform. The question was, how might someone such as himself, attuned to "the strains of eloquence", as he put it, actually act? Until the late 1830s and early 1840s, he felt that moral suasion and education were action enough. By "goodness calling to goodness", his speeches sought to open listeners to the divine voice within. He hoped that his message would lead individuals to an intuitive perception of universal moral law, which would then transform society. In this early view, change in the single soul had to come first.

By the mid-1840s, however, Emerson recognized that this strategy was simply not working. Far from improving, America was actually becoming more corrupt. Years before, he had warned about the dangers of materialism. Now the nation's commercial success had fostered what he called a "vulgar prosperity that retrogrades ever to barbarism".[9] In an 1846 poem, Emerson lamented, "Things are in the saddle, and ride mankind".[10] For him, the grossest example of this grasping after goods was the institution of slavery, long embodied by the South's "ownership" of Washington, D.C. Throughout the late 1840s, the Southern slave power threatened to grow exponentially. Soon after the Mexican War ended in 1848, Texas entered the Union as a large, new Slave State. Simultaneously, vast new

territories acquired as a result of the war — territories that extended west to California and north to Utah — promised an even further expansion of the slave power. These national developments accentuated Emerson's moral and cultural distress. Consequently, beginning in the mid-1840s, his philosophy began to undergo a significant transition. The "visionary ecstasy" of his earlier works gave way to a belief in "ethical engagement as a means of spiritual fulfillment".[11] As a result, Emerson became more and more involved in the major social issues of his day, especially slavery and, eventually, the women's rights movement.

<http://brewminate.com/ralph-waldo-emerson-pragmatic-idealist-in-action-as-a-reformer-1850-1865/>

Secondary & Primary Source Analysis: Ralph Waldo Emerson's Address delivered at the Concord Courthouse before the Concord Women's Anti-Slavery Society on the Anniversary of the Emancipation of the Negroes in The British West Indies, August 1, 1844.

Guiding Questions:

- What evidence demonstrates Emerson's support for abolition?
- What methods does Emerson endorse to ensure abolition?
- He documents the process by which England ended slavery by 1833. What should his audience infer from this analogy about how America should end slavery?

Secondary Source: Historical Framework

"Ralph Waldo Emerson's 1844 speech is one of the best-known and better-anthologized examples of antislavery rhetoric to emerge from the Transcendentalist movement. Prior to this speech, Emerson (1803-1882) had not been known as a public voice in support of abolitionism even if his private sentiments long had been opposed to slavery. Likely heavily influenced by his wife Lidian's strong abolitionist sentiments, he accepted a speaking invitation from the Women's Anti-Slavery Society, of which his wife was a member. Public opinion did not support abolitionism at this date and Concord churches refused to host this meeting, causing it to be scheduled for the court-house. To ensure attendance, Henry David Thoreau campaigned from door-to-door throughout town.

"In keeping with his social views emphasizing the advance of human progress, Emerson locates his discussion of race slavery within the "history of mankind [that] interests us only as it exhibits a steady gain in truth and right..." (4) With language that is by turns ironic and incensed, he discusses features of slavery – deprivation, disenfranchisement, ruin of families -- that contradict such a social advance. Emerson enumerates the horrors of slavery and writes "the blood is anti-slavery: it runs cold in the veins: the stomach rises with disgust, and curses slavery." (6) Progress, he argues, arrives through witness reports of these sights and ensuing political action.

"Emerson calls upon rationalism to eliminate slavery, arguing that the concepts of Right and Freedom are aligned with each other."

Lockard, Joe, "Anti-Slavery Literature" <http://antislavery.eserver.org/tracts/emersonaddress>

Primary Source: **Ralph Waldo Emerson's Address delivered at the Concord Courthouse before the Concord Women's Anti-Slavery Society on the Anniversary of the Emancipation of the Negroes in The British West Indies, August 1, 1844**

THERE a captive sat in chains,
Crooning ditties treasured well
From his Afric's torrid plains.
Sole estate his sire bequeathed,—
Hapless sire to hapless son,—
Was the wailing song he breathed,
And his chain when life was done.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: [1](#) We are met to exchange congratulations on the anniversary of an event singular in the history of civilization; a day of reason; of the clear light; of that which makes us better than a flock of birds and beasts; a day which gave the immense fortification of a fact, of gross history, to ethical abstractions. It was the settlement, as far as a great Empire was concerned, of a question on which almost every leading citizen in it had taken care to record his vote; one which for many years absorbed the attention of the best and most eminent of mankind. I might well hesitate, coming from other studies, and without the smallest claim to be a special laborer in this work of humanity, to undertake to set this matter before you; which ought rather to be done by a strict cooperation of many well-advised persons; but I shall not apologize for my weakness. In this cause, no man's weakness is any prejudice: it has a thousand sons; if one man cannot speak, ten others can; and, whether by the wisdom of its friends, or by the folly of the adversaries; by speech and by silence; by doing and by omitting to do, it goes forward. Therefore I will speak,—or, not I, but the might of liberty in my weakness. The subject is said to have the property of making dull men eloquent.

... Let us withhold every reproachful, and, if we can, every indignant remark. In this cause, we must renounce our temper, and the risings of pride. ..

The history of mankind interests us only as it exhibits a steady gain of truth and right, in the incessant conflict which it records between the material and the moral nature. From the earliest monuments it appears that one race was victim and served the other races...The prizes of society, the trumpet of fame, the privileges of learning, of culture, of religion, the decencies and joys of marriage, honor, obedience, personal authority and a perpetual melioration into a finer civility,—these were for all, but not for them. For the negro, was the slave-ship to begin with, in whose filthy hold he sat in irons, unable to lie down; bad food, and insufficiency of that; disfranchisement; no property in the rags that covered him; no marriage, no right in the poor black woman that cherished him in her bosom, no right to the children of his body; no security from the humors, none from the crimes, none from the appetites of his master: toil, famine, insult and flogging; and, when he sank in the furrow, no wind of good fame blew over him, no priest of salvation visited him with glad tidings: but he went down to death with dusky dreams of African shadow-catchers and Obeahs hunting him....

But the crude element of good in human affairs must and ripen, spite of whips and plantation laws and West Indian interest. Conscience rolled on its pillow, and could not sleep. We sympathize very tenderly here with the poor aggrieved planter, of whom so many unpleasant things are said; but if we saw the whip applied to old men, to tender women; and, undeniably, though I shrink to say so, pregnant women

set in the treadmill for refusing to work; when, not they, but the eternal law of animal nature refused to work;—if we saw men’s backs flayed with cowhides, and “hot rum poured on, superinduced with brine or pickle, rubbed in with a cornhusk, in the scorching heat of the sun;”—if we saw the runaways hunted with bloodhounds into swamps and hills; and, in cases of passion, a planter throwing his negro into a copper of boiling cane-juice,—if we saw these things with eyes, we too should wince. They are not pleasant sights. The blood is moral: the blood is anti-slavery: it runs cold in the veins: the stomach rises with disgust, and curses slavery. ...

The richest and greatest, the prime minister of England, the king’s privy council were obliged to say that it was too true. It became plain to all men, the more this business was looked into, that the crimes and cruelties of the slave-traders and slave-owners could not be overstated. The more it was searched, the more shocking anecdotes came up,—things not to be spoken. Humane persons who were informed of the reports insisted on proving them. Granville Sharpe was accidentally made acquainted with the sufferings of a slave, whom a West Indian planter had brought with him to London and had beaten with a pistol on his head, so badly that his whole body became diseased, and the man useless to his master, who left him to go whither he pleased. The man applied to Mr. William Sharpe, a charitable surgeon, who attended the diseases of the poor. In process of time, he was healed. Granville Sharpe found him at his brother’s and procured a place for him in an apothecary’s shop. The master accidentally met his recovered slave, and instantly endeavored to get possession of him again. Sharpe protected the slave. In consulting with the lawyers, they told Sharpe the laws were against him. Sharpe would not believe it; no prescription on earth could ever render such iniquities legal. ‘But the decisions are against you, and Lord Mansfield, now Chief Justice of England, leans to the decisions. Sharpe instantly sat down and gave himself to the study of English law for more than two years, until he had proved that the opinions relied on, of Talbot and Yorke, were incompatible with the former English decisions and with the whole spirit of English law. He published his book in 1769, and he so filled the heads and hearts of his advocates that when he brought the case of George Somerset, another slave, before Lord Mansfield, the slavish decisions were set aside, and equity affirmed...

This decision established the principle that the “air of England is too pure for any slave to breathe,” but the wrongs in the islands were not thereby touched. Public attention, however, was drawn that way, and the methods of the stealing and the transportation from Africa became noised abroad. The Quakers got the story. In their plain meeting-houses and prim dwellings this dismal agitation got entrance. They were rich: they owned, for debt or by inheritance, island property; they were religious, tender-hearted men and women; and they had to hear the news and digest it as they could. Six Quakers met in London on the 6th of July, 1783,—William Dillwyn, Samuel Hoar, George Harrison, Thomas Knowles, John Lloyd, Joseph Woods, “to consider what step they should take for the relief and liberation of the negro slaves in the West Indies, and for the discouragement of the slave-trade on the coast of Africa.” They made friends and raised money for the slave; they interested their Yearly Meeting; and all English and all American Quakers. John Woolman of New Jersey, whilst yet an apprentice, was uneasy in his mind when he was set to write a bill of sale of a negro, for his master. He gave his testimony against the traffic, in Maryland and Virginia. Thomas Clarkson was a youth at Cambridge, England, when the subject given out for a Latin prize dissertation was, “Is it right to make slaves of others against their will?” He wrote an essay, and won the prize; but he wrote too well for his own peace; he began to ask himself if these things could be true; and if they were, he could no longer rest. He left Cambridge; he fell in with the six Quakers. They engaged him to act for them. He himself interested Mr. Wilberforce in the matter.

The shipmasters in that trade were the greatest miscreants, and guilty of every barbarity to their own crews. Clarkson went to Bristol, made himself acquainted with the interior of the slave-ships and the details of the trade. The facts confirmed his sentiment, “that Providence had never made that to be wise which was immoral, and that the slave-trade was as impolitic as it was unjust;” ⁵ that it was found peculiarly fatal to those employed in it. More seamen died in that trade in one year than in the whole remaining trade of the country in two. Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox were drawn into the generous enterprise.

In 1788, the House of Commons voted Parliamentary inquiry. In 1791, a bill to abolish the trade was brought in by Wilberforce, and supported by him and by Fox and Burke and Pitt, with the utmost ability and faithfulness; resisted by the planters and the whole West Indian interest, and lost. During the next sixteen years, ten times, year after year, the attempt was renewed by Mr. Wilberforce, and ten times defeated by the planters. The king, and all the royal family but one, were against it. These debates are instructive, as they show on what grounds the trade was assailed and defended. ..

For months and years the bill was debated, with some consciousness of the extent of its relations by the first citizens of England, the foremost men of the earth; every argument was weighed, every particle of evidence was sifted, and laid in the scale; and, at last, the right triumphed, the poor man was vindicated, and the oppressor was flung out. I know that England has the advantage of trying the question at a wide distance from the spot where the nuisance exists the planters are not, excepting in rare examples, members of the legislature. The extent of the empire, and the magnitude and number of other questions crowding into court, keep this one in balance, and prevent it from obtaining that ascendancy, and being urged with that intemperance, which a question of property tends to acquire. There are causes in the composition of the British legislature, and the relation of its leaders to the country and to Europe, which exclude much that is pitiful and injurious in other legislative assemblies. From these reasons, the question was discussed with a rare independence and magnanimity...

<http://www.bartleby.com/90/1104.html>

Primary & Secondary Source Analysis: Ralph Waldo Emerson's Address to the Citizens of Concord 3 May 1851 after the passage of the Compromise of 1850 Fugitive Slave Act, with MA Senator Daniel Webster casting the vote that secured the legislation.

Secondary Source Historic Context:

"Emerson was outraged by the Fugitive Slave Law and by early attempts to enforce it. His journal and letters after its passage were full of anger. He seethed, for example, in one entry in 1851, "And this filthy enactment was made in the 19th Century, by people who could read & write. I will not obey it, by God."

"Edward Waldo Emerson wrote in *Emerson in Concord* of his father's preoccupation with the detested law: "He woke in the mornings with a weight upon him When his children told him that the subject given out for their next school composition was, The Building of a House, he said, 'You must be sure to say that no house nowadays is perfect without having a nook where a fugitive slave can be safely hidden away.' " Edward recalled, too, that his father's rage was channeled into legal research: "The national disgrace took Mr. Emerson's mind from poetry and philosophy, and almost made him for a time a student of law and an advocate. He eagerly sought and welcomed all principles in law-books, or broad rulings of great jurists, that Right lay behind Statute to guide its application and that immoral laws are void."

"On April 26, 1851, thirty-five of Emerson's Concord townsmen signed a letter asking him publicly to present his views on the law. On May 3rd, he delivered an impassioned speech—his first of several in reaction to the Fugitive Slave Law.

"In the address, Emerson openly advocated breaking the law on the grounds that an immoral law carried no authority. (Henry Thoreau had earlier offered a similar view in his "Resistance to Civil Government," now known as *Civil Disobedience*.) The speech was well-received by the antislavery community. Although under normal circumstances not much inclined to political activism, Emerson repeated the speech a number of times in various Middlesex locations to support the campaign to elect Free Soil candidate John G. Palfrey to the United States Congress."

<https://concordlibrary.org/special-collections/antislavery/29>

Guiding Questions:

- What changes can you note in Emerson's tone and rhetorical strategies?
- What methods does Emerson advocate to bring about change?

Primary Source: Address to Citizens of Concord 3 May, 1851

THE ETERNAL Rights,

Victors over daily wrongs:

Awful victors, they misguide

Whom they will destroy,

And their coming triumph hide

In our downfall, or our joy:

They reach no term, they never sleep,

In equal strength through space abide;

Though, feigning dwarfs, they crouch and creep,

The strong they slay, the swift outstride;

Fate's grass grows rank in valley clods,

And rankly on the castled steep,—

Speak it firmly, these are gods,

Are all ghosts beside.

FELLOW CITIZENS: 1 I accepted your invitation to speak to you on the great question of these days, with very little consideration of what I might have to offer: for there seems to be no option. The last year has forced us all into politics, and made it a paramount duty to seek what it is often a duty to shun. We do not breathe well. There is infamy in the air. I have a new experience. I wake in the morning with a painful sensation, which I carry about all day, and which, when traced home, is the odious remembrance of that ignominy which has fallen on Massachusetts, which robs the landscape of beauty, and takes the sunshine out of every hour. I have lived all my life in this state, and never had any experience of personal inconvenience from the laws, until now. They never came near me to any discomfort before. I find the like sensibility in my neighbors; and in that class who take no interest in the ordinary questions of party politics. There are men who are as sure indexes of the equity of legislation and of the same state of public feeling, as the barometer is of the weight of the air, and it is a bad sign when these are discontented, for though they snuff oppression and dishonor at a distance, it is because

they are more impressionable: the whole population will in a short time be as painfully affected.

Every hour brings us from distant quarters of the Union the expression of mortification at the late events in Massachusetts, and at the behavior of Boston. The tameness was indeed shocking. Boston, of whose fame for spirit and character we have all been so proud; Boston, whose citizens, intelligent people in England told me they could always distinguish by their culture among Americans; the Boston of the American Revolution, which figures so proudly in John Adams's Diary, which the whole country has been reading; Boston, spoiled by prosperity, must bow its ancient honor in the dust, and make us irretrievably ashamed. In Boston, we have said with such lofty confidence, no fugitive slave can be arrested, and now, we must transfer our vaunt to the country, and say, with a little less confidence, no fugitive man can be arrested here; at least we can brag thus until to-morrow, when the farmers also may be corrupted.

The crisis had the illuminating power of a sheet of lightning at midnight. It showed truth. It ended a good deal of nonsense we had been wont to hear and to repeat, on the 19th of April, the 17th of June, the 4th of July. It showed the slightness and unreliableness of our social fabric, it showed what stuff reputations are made of, what straws we dignify by office and title, and how competent we are to give counsel and help in a day of trial. It showed the shallowness of leaders; the divergence of parties from their alleged grounds; showed that men would not stick to what they had said, that the resolutions of public bodies, or the pledges never so often given and put on record of public men, will not bind them. The fact comes out more plainly that you cannot rely on any man for the defence of truth, who is not constitutionally or by blood and temperament on that side. A man of a greedy and unscrupulous selfishness may maintain morals when they are in fashion: but he will not stick.

What is the use of admirable law-forms, and political forms, if a hurricane of party feeling and a combination of monied interests can beat them to the ground? What is the use of courts, if judges only quote authorities, and no judge exerts original jurisdiction, or recurs to first principles? What is the use of a Federal Bench, if its opinions are the political breath of the hour? And what is the use of constitutions, if all the guaranties provided by the jealousy of ages for the protection of liberty are made of no effect, when a bad act of Congress finds a willing commissioner? The levity of the public mind has been shown in the past year by the most extravagant actions. Who could have believed it, if foretold that a hundred guns would be fired in Boston on the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill? Nothing proves the want of all thought, the absence of standard in men's minds, more than the dominion of party. Here are humane people who have tears for misery, an open purse for want; who should have been the defenders of the poor man, are found his embittered enemies, rejoicing in his rendition,—merely from party ties. I thought none, that was not ready to go on all fours, would back this law. And yet here are upright men, *compotes mentis*, husbands, fathers, trustees, friends, open, generous, brave, who can see nothing in this claim for bare humanity, and the health and honor of their native State, but canting fanaticism, sedition and "one idea." Because of this preoccupied mind, the whole wealth and power of Boston—two hundred thousand souls, and one hundred and eighty millions of money—are thrown into the scale of crime: and the poor black boy, whom the fame of Boston had reached in the recesses of a vile swamp, or in the alleys of Savannah, on arriving here finds all this force employed to catch him. The famous town of Boston is his master's hound. The learning of the universities, the culture of elegant society, the acumen of lawyers, the majesty of the Bench, the eloquence of the Christian pulpit, the stoutness of Democracy, the respectability of the Whig party are all combined to kidnap him.

1. By the sentiment of duty. An immoral law makes it a man's duty to break it, at every hazard. For virtue is the very self of every man. It is therefore a principle of law that an immoral contract is void, and that an immoral statute is void. For, as laws do not make right, and are simply declaratory of a right which already existed, it is not to be presumed that they can so stultify themselves as to command injustice.

2. It is contravened by all the sentiments. How can a law be enforced that fines pity, and imprisons

charity? As long as men have bowels, they will disobey. You know that the Act of Congress of September 18, 1850, is a law which every one of you will break on the earliest occasion. There is not a manly Whig, or a manly Democrat, of whom, if a slave were hidden in one of our houses from the hounds, we should not ask with confidence to lend his wagon in aid of his escape, and he would lend it. The man would be too strong for the partisan.

3. It is contravened by the written laws themselves, because the sentiments, of course, write the statutes. Laws are merely declaratory of the natural sentiments of mankind, and the language of all permanent laws will be in contradiction to any immoral enactment.

4. It is contravened by the mischiefs it operates. A wicked law cannot be executed by good men, and must be by bad.

Let the attitude of the states be firm. Let us respect the Union to all honest ends. But also respect an older and wider union, the law of Nature and rectitude. Massachusetts is as strong as the Universe, when it does that. We will never intermeddle with your slavery,—but you can in no wise be suffered to bring it to Cape Cod and Berkshire. This law must be made inoperative. It must be abrogated and wiped out of the statute-book; but whilst it stands there, it must be disobeyed. We must make a small state great, by making every man in it true. It was the praise of Athens, “She could not lead countless armies into the field, but she knew how with a little band to defeat those who could.” Every Roman reckoned himself at least a match for a Province. Every Dorian did. Every Englishman in Australia, in South Africa, in India, or in whatever barbarous country their forts and factories have been set up,—represents London, represents the art, power and law of Europe. Every man educated at the Northern school carries the like advantages into the South. For it is confounding distinctions to speak of the geographic sections of this country as of equal civilization. Every nation and every man bows, in spite of himself, to a higher mental and moral existence; and the sting of the late disgraces is that this royal position of Massachusetts was foully lost, that the well-known sentiment of her people was not expressed. Let us correct this error. In this one fastness let truth be spoken and right done.

<http://www.bartleby.com/90/1106.html>

Lesson 4: Trace Henry David Thoreau’s changing views on how to respond to slavery, and consider the role of the women in his family in affecting his views along with the effect of desperate events triggered by The Fugitive Slave Act of 1850.

Overview: *While Henry David Thoreau is renowned for the relative solitude of his two year experiment living in the Walden woods, scholars reveal that he lived amidst “outcasts” in these woods -- former slaves, Irish laborers and other marginalized people. In addition, Thoreau remained close to his family, dominated by women involved in Concord’s Female Antislavery Society: his mother Cynthia, sisters and aunts. In addition, he was like a “big brother” to the Emerson and Alcott children. These close family and community connections enabled Thoreau to stay closely connected to Abolitionist efforts. While he never joined an organization, he transported fugitive slaves who stayed in his family’s home to rail passage northward.*

In addition to these domestic and community connections, Thoreau responded spiritedly in opposing the annexation of Texas (1845) and the Mexican-American War (1846-1848) to oppose American imperialism and also to oppose the expansion of slavery. The passage of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850, the coopting of MA Senator Daniel Webster in support of this legislation, and Boston-based legal cases in which fugitive slaves were returned to the South (Thomas Sims 1850, Shadrach Minkins 1851, Anthony Burns

1854) provided fuel to fan the flames of Thoreau's antislavery rhetoric and of his advocacy for increased resistance -- including the right to revolution -- to ensure an end to the injustice of slavery in the US.

The first secondary source document advances Petrulionis' arguments for the influence of female family and community members in the process of Thoreau's radicalization, while the following secondary source outline proximate historical events that explain historical allusions in the first primary source document of Thoreau's 1849 "Civil Disobedience" essay. Note the language of "resistance" in this document. Then students will see a shift, five years later when Thoreau presented the 1854 speech "Slavery in Massachusetts" at the 1854 Framingham MA rally that the Boston Anti-Slavery Society organized to protest both the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which allowed popular sovereignty to determine whether new states entering the Union would be slave or free, and the re-enslavement of fugitive Anthony Burns. This Framingham event was held on July 4th and included abolitionists Sojourner Truth and William Lloyd Garrison, who publicly burned copies of both the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act and the US Constitution.

How did these events shift Thoreau's rhetoric and policy suggestions toward greater radicalization? How does Thoreau's transition shed light on the essential question: To what extent does deliberation or desperate circumstances drive transformative historic change?

Guiding Question: What does Sandra Petrulionis argue about the effects of family female influences of Thoreau's involvement in the Abolitionist Movement?

Secondary Source

"Through the years, scholars have extolled Thoreau for helping slaves via the Underground Railroad even as they disparaged him for remaining on the sidelines until slavery came to Massachusetts via the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850. Many of these sentiments, however, oversimplify. Thoreau was a philosopher, social critic, writer, and natural historian, but only a reluctant political reformer. He was and was not a radical abolitionist. He did, with his family, assist fugitive slaves. He denounced collective reform movements and abolitionist leaders, but on more than one occasion he also acted and spoke in concert with the local antislavery societies to which his mother, sisters, and aunts loyally belonged. Like nearly all northerners who opposed the "peculiar institution," Thoreau did respond more fervently to the slave's plight after federal laws delivered the crisis quite bodily to Massachusetts. And, when this volatile issue overran his solitude, Thoreau frequently expressed frustration...

To Set This World Right: The Antislavery Movement in Thoreau's Concord is the first book to recover the voices, events, and influence of this previously fragmented reform narrative. It frames the evolution of Thoreau's antislavery ideology as a product of his community's activism...

Henry Thoreau thus becomes an organizing rather than a main character in the broader narrative of a defining era in Concord's history. ..When and why did Concord moderates finally embrace a radical antislavery agenda? ...

Like his friend Waldo Emerson, in the late 1830s, Henry Thoreau was encircled by the antislavery fervor of the many women sharing his home. Indeed, Thoreau had been home only a few days after graduating from Harvard when the Grimkes lectured in Concord; by the time the female society formed in mid October...Similar to Emerson, the young Thoreau was critical of collective social action and favored individual conversion: "Nothing can be effective but one man...We must first succeed alone, that we may enjoy our success together...In this matter of reforming the world, we have little faith in corporations." Thoreau's mother and sisters, however, were instrumental founders of the female

antislavery society...They and the outspoken Cynthia Thoreau (Henry David's mother) regularly attended antislavery conventions in Boston with Mary Brooks, Prudence Ward, and Susan Barrett; and Sophia and Helen (Henry David's older and younger sister) held various leadership posts in the county society (Middlesex)."

Petrulionis, Sandra, *To Set the World Right: The Anti-Slavery Movement in Thoreau's Concord*, 2006 (Cornell Univ Press).

Secondary Source: From Constitutional Rights Foundation

In 1846, the United States declared war against Mexico. Thoreau and other Northern critics of the war viewed it as a plot by Southerners to expand slavery into the Southwest. Thoreau had already stopped paying his taxes in protest against slavery. The local tax collector had ignored his tax evasion, but decided to act when Thoreau publicly condemned the U.S. invasion and occupation of Mexico.

In July 1846, the sheriff arrested and jailed Thoreau for his tax delinquency. Someone (Petronius confirms his aunt Moria) anonymously paid Thoreau's taxes after he had spent one night in jail. This incident prompted Thoreau to write his famous essay, "Civil Disobedience" (originally published in 1849 as "Resistance to Civil Government").

Thoreau's minor act of defiance caused him to conclude that it was not enough to be simply against slavery and the war. A person of conscience had to act. In "Civil Disobedience," he proclaimed an activist manifesto: "In other words, when a sixth of the population of a nation, which has undertaken to be the refuge of liberty, are slaves, and a whole country [Mexico] is unjustly overrun and conquered by a foreign army, and subjected to military law, I think that it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize."

Thoreau argued that the government must end its unjust actions to earn the right to collect taxes from its citizens. As long as the government commits unjust actions, he continued, conscientious individuals must choose whether to pay their taxes or to refuse to pay them and defy the government.

<http://www.crf-usa.org/black-history-month/thoreau-and-civil-disobedience>

Primary Source: Excerpts from Henry David Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" (1849)

Guiding Questions:

- What does Thoreau suggest are the true principles of liberty?
- What phrases illustrate lack of freedom in America? (Note that he speaks of more than the institution of slavery.)
- What does Thoreau consider man's primary duty? How does he address the responsibility of citizens?
- What words and phrases indicate tone, and what rhetorical strategies does he employ to persuade his audience?
- What methods does he advocate to address injustice?

Excerpts From "Civil Disobedience" - Henry David Thoreau (1849) (originally entitled: Resistance to Civil Government)

I heartily accept the motto, "That government is best which governs least"; and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe— "That government is best which governs not at all"; and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have. Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually, and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient. This American government— what is it but a tradition, though a recent one, endeavoring to transmit itself unimpaired to posterity, but each instant losing some of its integrity? It has not the vitality and force of a single living man; for a single man can bend it to his will. It is a sort of wooden gun to the people themselves. But it is not the less necessary for this; for the people must have some complicated machinery or other, and hear its din, to satisfy that idea of government which they have. Governments show thus how successfully men can be imposed on, even impose on themselves, for their own advantage. It is excellent, we must all allow. Yet this government never of itself furthered any enterprise, but by the alacrity with which it got out of its way. It does not keep the country free. It does not settle the West. It does not educate.

The character inherent in the American people has done all that has been accomplished; and it would have done somewhat more, if the government had not sometimes got in its way. But, to speak practically and as a citizen, unlike those who call themselves no-government men, I ask for, not at once no government, but at once a better government. Let every man make known what kind of government would command his respect, and that will be one step toward obtaining it. Can there not be a government in which majorities do not virtually decide right and wrong, but conscience?— in which majorities decide only those questions to which the rule of expediency is applicable? Must the citizen ever for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislation? Why has every man a conscience, then? I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right. The only obligation which I have a right to assume is to do at any time what I think right. The mass of men serve the state thus, not as men mainly, but as machines, with their bodies. They are the standing army, and the militia, jailers, constables, posse comitatus, etc. In most cases there is no free exercise whatever of the judgment or of the moral sense; but they put themselves on a level with wood and earth and stones; and wooden men can perhaps be manufactured that will serve the purpose as well. Such command no more respect than men of straw or a lump of dirt. They have the same sort of worth only as horses and dogs. Yet such as these even are commonly esteemed good citizens. Others— as most legislators, politicians, lawyers, ministers, and office-holders— serve the state chiefly with their heads; and, as they rarely make any moral distinctions, they are as likely to serve the devil, without intending it, as God. A very few— as heroes, patriots, martyrs, reformers in the great sense, and men— serve the state with their consciences also, and so necessarily resist it for the most part; and they are commonly treated as enemies by it.

...How does it become a man to behave toward this American government today? I answer, that he cannot without disgrace be associated with it. I cannot for an instant recognize that political organization as my government which is the slave's government also. All men recognize the right of revolution; that is, the right to refuse allegiance to, and to resist, the government, when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and unendurable. But almost all say that such is not the case now. But such was the case, they think, in the Revolution Of '75. If one were to tell me that this was a bad government because it taxed certain foreign commodities brought to its ports, it is most probable that I should not make an ado about it, for I can do without them.

All machines have their friction; and possibly this does enough good to counterbalance the evil. At any rate, it is a great evil to make a stir about it. But when the friction comes to have its machine, and oppression and robbery are organized, I say, let us not have such a machine any longer. In other

words, when a sixth of the population of a nation which has undertaken to be the refuge of liberty are slaves, and a whole country is unjustly overrun and conquered by a foreign army, and subjected to military law, I think that it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize. What makes this duty the more urgent is the fact that the country so overrun is not our own, but ours is the invading army.

All voting is a sort of gaming, like checkers or backgammon, with a slight moral tinge to it, a playing with right and wrong, with moral questions; and betting naturally accompanies it. The character of the voters is not staked. I cast my vote, perchance, as I think right; but I am not vitally concerned that that right should prevail...A wise man will not leave the right to the mercy of chance, nor wish it to prevail through the power of the majority. There is but little virtue in the action of masses of men. Unjust laws exist: shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavor to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or shall we transgress them at once?

Men generally, under such a government as this, think that they ought to wait until they have persuaded the majority to alter them. They think that, if they should resist, the remedy would be worse than the evil. But it is the fault of the government itself that the remedy is worse than the evil. It makes it worse. Why is it not more apt to anticipate and provide for reform? Why does it not cherish its wise minority? Why does it cry and resist before it is hurt? Why does it not encourage its citizens to be on the alert to point out its faults, and do better than it would have them? Why does it always crucify Christ, and excommunicate Copernicus and Luther, and pronounce Washington and Franklin rebels?

As for adopting the ways which the State has provided for remedying the evil, I know not of such ways. They take too much time, and a man's life will be gone. I have other affairs to attend to. I came into this world, not chiefly to make this a good place to live in, but to live in it, be it good or bad. A man has not everything to do, but something; and because he cannot do everything, it is not necessary that he should do something wrong. It is not my business to be petitioning the Governor or the Legislature any more than it is theirs to petition me; and if they should not bear my petition, what should I do then? But in this case the State has provided no way: its very Constitution is the evil. I meet this American government, or its representative, the State government, directly, and face to face, once a year— no more— in the person of its tax-gatherer; this is the only mode in which a man situated as I am necessarily meets it; and it then says distinctly, Recognize me; and the simplest, the most effectual, and, in the present posture of affairs, the indispensablest mode of treating with it on this head, of expressing your little satisfaction with and love for it, is to deny it then. I know this well, that if one thousand, if one hundred, if ten men whom I could name— if ten honest men only— ay, if one HONEST man, in this State of Massachusetts, ceasing to hold slaves, were actually to withdraw from this copartnership, and be locked up in the county jail therefor, it would be the abolition of slavery in America.

For it matters not how small the beginning may seem to be: what is once well done is done forever. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate which to choose. If a thousand men were not to pay their tax-bills this year, that would not be a violent and bloody measure, as it would be to pay them, and enable the State to commit violence and shed innocent blood. This is, in fact, the definition of a peaceable revolution, if any such is possible. If the tax-gatherer, or any other public officer, asks me, as one has done, "But what shall I do?" my answer is, "If you really wish to do anything, resign your office." I have paid no poll-tax for six years. I was put into a jail once on this account, for one night; and, as I stood considering the walls of solid stone, two or three feet thick, the door of wood and iron, a foot thick, and the iron grating which strained the light, I could not help being struck with the foolishness of that institution which treated me as if I were mere flesh and blood and bones, to be locked up. I wondered that it should have concluded at length that this was the best use it could put me to, and had never thought to avail itself of my services in some way. I saw that, if there was a wall of stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through before they could get to be as free as I was. I did not for a moment feel

confined, and the walls seemed a great waste of stone and mortar. I felt as if I alone of all my townsmen had paid my tax.

<http://teacherweb.com/CA/WestlakeHighSchool/Schlehner/Civil-Disobediance.pdf>

Secondary & Primary Source Analysis: Thoreau's "Slavery in Massachusetts"

Historical Context to Thoreau's "Slavery in Massachusetts"

"On May 24, 1854, fugitive slave Anthony Burns was arrested and jailed in Boston while Massachusetts officials arranged for his return to his master in Virginia. The Burns case, which closely resembles that of Thomas Sims, a fugitive slave who had been returned to bondage from Massachusetts three years earlier, fueled the ire of abolitionists as it underscored the Commonwealth's continuing complicity in slavery despite its legal termination in the state during the 1780's. For the anti-slavery forces, Burns' capture was tantamount to kidnapping, a charge that became increasingly hard to deny after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law put all blacks in danger of being apprehended and sent into servitude in the South even if they had been born free in states where slavery no longer legally prevailed.

"Some of the most prominent abolitionists of the period shared the stage that day, including Wendell Phillips, whose right to speak at the Concord Lyceum had been vigorously defended by Thoreau and others in 1845, and Sojourner Truth, a former slave who started her career as a circuit speaker for progressive causes while living in an anti-slavery spiritual community in Florence, Massachusetts from 1843 to 1857.

"Having prepared his remarks over the previous two months, Thoreau clearly designed his turn at the podium to provoke a spirited response from a crowd that was variously estimated in newspaper accounts as numbering from 500 to as many as 2,000. In "Resistance to Civil Government," published in 1849, he had denounced the evils of slavery and imperial expansion, but suggested that it might yet be possible to withdraw from the political scene and still live a self-respecting life. In his speech in Framingham, in contrast, he called on his sympathetic listeners to recognize that the Fugitive Slave Law had ended any hope that the people of Massachusetts could persist in their usual pursuits..."

<http://www.mappingthoreaucountry.org/itineraries/framingham/>

Note some historic references:

- Thoreau's reference to "the destiny of Nebraska" is a reference to the Kansas-Nebraska Act of May 1854 which established that new states entering the Union would determine if they would allow or ban slavery based on popular vote.
- Thoreau also notes the "war with Mexico." The Mexican-American War (1846-1848) followed the 1845 annexation of Texas.. The war ended with the US adding 525,000 miles of territory that became the states of Colorado, Arizona, California, Utah, Nevada, Wyoming and New Mexico. Thoreau decried American imperialism and also the expansion of slavery.
- The reference to Mr Loring was the Boston judge who decided the case of Anthony Burns in favor of his southern master's "property rights" and the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850.
- Reference to Webster is MA Senator Daniel Webster who provided the pivotal vote that enabled the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 to pass.

Primary Source Analysis of Thoreau's 1854 Framingham MA address: "Slavery in Massachusetts"

Guiding Questions:

- What phrases note a shift in Thoreau's tone toward his fellow citizens of Concord, toward key leaders in Boston, and toward the federal government?
- What methods does Thoreau seem to advocate to promote justice?
- What does Thoreau say about how historical developments have affected his personal life?

Slavery in Massachusetts [Thoreau] delivered in Framingham, MA

1854
SLAVERY IN MASSACHUSETTS
by Henry David Thoreau

I LATELY ATTENDED a meeting of the citizens of Concord, expecting, as one among many, to speak on the subject of slavery in Massachusetts; but I was surprised and disappointed to find that what had called my townsmen together was the destiny of Nebraska, and not of Massachusetts, and that what I had to say would be entirely out of order. I had thought that the house was on fire, and not the prairie; but though several of the citizens of Massachusetts are now in prison for attempting to rescue a slave from her own clutches, not one of the speakers at that meeting expressed regret for it, not one even referred to it. It was only the disposition of some wild lands a thousand miles off which appeared to concern them. The inhabitants of Concord are not prepared to stand by one of their own bridges, but talk only of taking up a position on the highlands beyond the Yellowstone River. Our Buttricks and Davises and Hosmers are retreating thither, and I fear that they will leave no Lexington Common between them and the enemy. There is not one slave in Nebraska; there are perhaps a million slaves in Massachusetts.

... As I had no opportunity to express my thoughts at that meeting, will you allow me to do so here? Again it happens that the Boston Court-House is full of armed men, holding prisoner and trying a MAN, to find out if he is not really a SLAVE. Does any one think that justice or God awaits Mr. Loring's decision? For him to sit there deciding still, when this question is already decided from eternity to eternity, and the unlettered slave himself and the multitude around have long since heard and assented to the decision, is simply to make himself ridiculous. We may be tempted to ask from whom he received his commission, and who he is that received it; what novel statutes he obeys, and what precedents are to him of authority. Such an arbiter's very existence is an impertinence. We do not ask him to make up his mind, but to make up his pack.

I listen to hear the voice of a Governor, Commander-in-Chief of the forces of Massachusetts. I hear only the creaking of crickets and the hum of insects which now fill the summer air. The Governor's exploit is to review the troops on muster days. I have seen him on horseback, with his hat off, listening to a chaplain's prayer. It chances that that is all I have ever seen of a Governor. I think that I could manage to get along without one. If he is not of the least use to prevent my being kidnapped, pray of what important use is he likely to be to me? When freedom is most endangered, he dwells in the deepest obscurity. A distinguished clergyman told me that he chose the profession of a clergyman because it afforded the most leisure for literary pursuits. I would recommend to him the profession of a Governor.

Three years ago, also, when the Sims tragedy was acted, I said to myself, There is such an officer, if not such a man, as the Governor of Massachusetts- what has he been about the last fortnight? Has he had as much as he could do to keep on the fence during this moral earthquake? ...Yet no doubt he was

endeavoring to fill the gubernatorial chair all the while. He was no Governor of mine. He did not govern me.

But at last, in the present case, the Governor was heard from. After he and the United States government had perfectly succeeded in robbing a poor innocent black man of his liberty for life, and, as far as they could, of his Creator's likeness in his breast, he made a speech to his accomplices, at a congratulatory supper!

I have read a recent law of this State, making it penal for any officer of the "Commonwealth" to "detain or aid in the... detention," anywhere within its limits, "of any person, for the reason that he is claimed as a fugitive slave." ...I had thought that the Governor was, in some sense, the executive officer of the State; that it was his business, as a Governor, to see that the laws of the State were executed; while, as a man, he took care that he did not, by so doing, break the laws of humanity; but when there is any special important use for him, he is useless, or worse than useless, and permits the laws of the State to go unexecuted. Perhaps I do not know what are the duties of a Governor; but if to be a Governor requires to subject one's self to so much ignominy without remedy, if it is to put a restraint upon my manhood, I shall take care never to be Governor of Massachusetts. I have not read far in the statutes of this Commonwealth. It is not profitable reading. They do not always say what is true; and they do not always mean what they say. What I am concerned to know is, that that man's influence and authority were on the side of the slaveholder, and not of the slave- of the guilty, and not of the innocent- of injustice, and not of justice. I never saw him of whom I speak; indeed, I did not know that he was Governor until this event occurred. I heard of him and Anthony Burns at the same time, and thus, undoubtedly, most will hear of him. So far am I from being governed by him. I do not mean that it was anything to his discredit that I had not heard of him, only that I heard what I did. The worst I shall say of him is, that he proved no better than the majority of his constituents would be likely to prove. In my opinion, he was not equal to the occasion.

The whole military force of the State is at the service of a Mr. Suttle, a slaveholder from Virginia, to enable him to catch a man whom he calls his property; but not a soldier is offered to save a citizen of Massachusetts from being kidnapped! Is this what all these soldiers, all this training, have been for these seventy-nine years past? Have they been trained merely to rob Mexico and carry back fugitive slaves to their masters?

These very nights I heard the sound of a drum in our streets. There were men training still; and for what? I could with an effort pardon the cockerels of Concord for crowing still, for they, perchance, had not been beaten that morning; but I could not excuse this rub-a-dub of the "trainers." The slave was carried back by exactly such as these; i.e., by the soldier, of whom the best you can say in this connection is that he is a fool made conspicuous by a painted coat.

Three years ago, also, just a week after the authorities of Boston assembled to carry back a perfectly innocent man, and one whom they knew to be innocent, into slavery, the inhabitants of Concord caused the bells to be rung and the cannons to be fired, to celebrate their liberty- and the courage and love of liberty of their ancestors who fought at the bridge. As if those three millions had fought for the right to be free themselves, but to hold in slavery three million others. Nowadays, men wear a fool's-cap, and call it a liberty-cap. I do not know but there are some who, if they were tied to a whipping-post, and could but get one hand free, would use it to ring the bells and fire the cannons to celebrate their liberty. So some of my townsmen took the liberty to ring and fire. That was the extent of their freedom; and when the sound of the bells died away, their liberty died away also; when the powder was all expended, their liberty went off with the smoke.

...

This is what I thought about my neighbors.

Every humane and intelligent inhabitant of Concord, when he or she heard those bells and those cannons, thought not with pride of the events of the 19th of April, 1775, but with shame of the events of the 12th of April, 1851. But now we have half buried that old shame under a new one.

...I wish my countrymen to consider, that whatever the human law may be, neither an individual nor a nation can ever commit the least act of injustice against the obscurest individual without having to pay the penalty for it. A government which deliberately enacts injustice, and persists in it, will at length even become the laughing-stock of the world.

Much has been said about American slavery, but I think that we do not even yet realize what slavery is. If I were seriously to propose to Congress to make mankind into sausages, I have no doubt that most of the members would smile at my proposition, and if any believed me to be in earnest, they would think that I proposed something much worse than Congress had ever done. But if any of them will tell me that to make a man into a sausage would be much worse- would be any worse- than to make him into a slave- than it was to enact the Fugitive Slave Law- I will accuse him of foolishness, of intellectual incapacity, of making a distinction without a difference. The one is just as sensible a proposition as the other.

I hear a good deal said about trampling this law under foot. Why, one need not go out of his way to do that. This law rises not to the level of the head or the reason; its natural habitat is in the dirt. It was born and bred, and has its life, only in the dust and mire, on a level with the feet; and he who walks with freedom, and does not with Hindoo mercy avoid treading on every venomous reptile, will inevitably tread on it, and so trample it under foot- and Webster, its maker, with it, like the dirt- bug and its ball. Recent events will be valuable as a criticism on the administration of justice in our midst, or, rather, as showing what are the true resources of justice in any community. It has come to this, that the friends of liberty, the friends of the slave, have shuddered when they have understood that his fate was left to the legal tribunals of the country to be decided. Free men have no faith that justice will be awarded in such a case. The judge may decide this way or that; it is a kind of accident, at best. It is evident that he is not a competent authority in so important a case. It is no time, then, to be judging according to his precedents, but to establish a precedent for the future. I would much rather trust to the sentiment of the people. ...

Among human beings, the judge whose words seal the fate of a man furthest into eternity is not he who merely pronounces the verdict of the law, but he, whoever he may be, who, from a love of truth, and unprejudiced by any custom or enactment of men, utters a true opinion or sentence concerning him. He it is that sentences him. Whoever can discern truth has received his commission from a higher source than the chiefest justice in the world who can discern only law. He finds himself constituted judge of the judge. Strange that it should be necessary to state such simple truths!

...

It is evident that there are, in this Commonwealth at least, two parties, becoming more and more distinct- the party of the city, and the party of the country. I know that the country is mean enough, but I am glad to believe that there is a slight difference in her favor. But as yet she has few, if any organs, through which to express herself. The editorials which she reads, like the news, come from the seaboard. Let us, the inhabitants of the country, cultivate self-respect. Let us not send to the city for aught more essential than our broadcloths and groceries; or, if we read the opinions of the city, let us entertain opinions of our own.

Among measures to be adopted, I would suggest to make as earnest and vigorous an assault on the press as has already been made, and with effect, on the church. The church has much improved within a few years; but the press is, almost without exception, corrupt. I believe that in this country the press exerts a greater and a more pernicious influence than the church did in its worst period. We are not a religious people, but we are a nation of politicians. We do not care for the Bible, but we do care for the newspaper. At any meeting of politicians- like that at Concord the other evening, for instance- how

impertinent it would be to quote from the Bible! how pertinent to quote from a newspaper or from the Constitution! The newspaper is a Bible which we read every morning and every afternoon, standing and sitting, riding and walking. It is a Bible which every man carries in his pocket, which lies on every table and counter, and which the mail, and thousands of missionaries, are continually dispersing. It is, in short, the only book which America has printed and which America reads. So wide is its influence. The editor is a preacher whom you voluntarily support. Your tax is commonly one cent daily, and it costs nothing for pew hire. But how many of these preachers preach the truth? I repeat the testimony of many an intelligent foreigner, as well as my own convictions, when I say, that probably no country was ever ruled by so mean a class of tyrants as, with a few noble exceptions, are the editors of the periodical press in this country. And as they live and rule only by their servility, and appealing to the worse, and not the better, nature of man, the people who read them are in the condition of the dog that returns to his vomit....

Are they Americans? are they New Englanders? are they inhabitants of Lexington and Concord and Framingham, who read and support the Boston Post, Mail, Journal, Advertiser, Courier, and Times? Are these the Flags of our Union? I am not a newspaper reader, and may omit to name the worst. Could slavery suggest a more complete servility than some of these journals exhibit? Is there any dust which their conduct does not lick, and make fouler still with its slime?...

The majority of the men of the North, and of the South and East and West, are not men of principle. If they vote, they do not send men to Congress on errands of humanity; but while their brothers and sisters are being scourged and hung for loving liberty, while- I might here insert all that slavery implies and is- it is the mismanagement of wood and iron and stone and gold which concerns them. Do what you will, O Government, with my wife and children, my mother and brother, my father and sister, I will obey your commands to the letter. It will indeed grieve me if you hurt them, if you deliver them to overseers to be hunted by bounds or to be whipped to death; but, nevertheless, I will peaceably pursue my chosen calling on this fair earth, until perchance, one day, when I have put on mourning for them dead, I shall have persuaded you to relent. Such is the attitude, such are the words of Massachusetts. Rather than do thus, I need not say what match I would touch, what system endeavor to blow up; but as I love my life, I would side with the light, and let the dark earth roll from under me, calling my mother and my brother to follow.

I would remind my countrymen that they are to be men first, and Americans only at a late and convenient hour. No matter how valuable law may be to protect your property, even to keep soul and body together, if it do not keep you and humanity together.

I am sorry to say that I doubt if there is a judge in Massachusetts who is prepared to resign his office, and get his living innocently, whenever it is required of him to pass sentence under a law which is merely contrary to the law of God. I am compelled to see that they put themselves, or rather are by character, in this respect, exactly on a level with the marine who discharges his musket in any direction he is ordered to. They are just as much tools, and as little men. Certainly, they are not the more to be respected, because their master enslaves their understandings and consciences, instead of their bodies.

The judges and lawyers- simply as such, I mean- and all men of expediency, try this case by a very low and incompetent standard. They consider, not whether the Fugitive Slave Law is right, but whether it is what they call constitutional. Is virtue constitutional, or vice? Is equity constitutional, or iniquity? In important moral and vital questions, like this, it is just as impertinent to ask whether a law is constitutional or not, as to ask whether it is profitable or not. They persist in being the servants of the worst of men, and not the servants of humanity. The question is, not whether you or your grandfather, seventy years ago, did not enter into an agreement to serve the Devil, and that service is not accordingly now due; but whether you will not now, for once and at last, serve God- in spite of your own

past recreancy, or that of your ancestor- by obeying that eternal and only just CONSTITUTION, which He, and not any Jefferson or Adams, has written in your being.

The amount of it is, if the majority vote the Devil to be God, the minority will live and behave accordingly- and obey the successful candidate, trusting that, some time or other, by some Speaker's casting- vote, perhaps, they may reinstate God. This is the highest principle I can get out or invent for my neighbors. These men act as if they believed that they could safely slide down a hill a little way- or a good way- and would surely come to a place, by and by, where they could begin to slide up again. This is expediency, or choosing that course which offers the slightest obstacles to the feet, that is, a downhill one. But there is no such thing as accomplishing a righteous reform by the use of "expediency." There is no such thing as sliding up hill. In morals the only sliders are backsliders. Thus we steadily worship Mammon, both school and state and church, and on the seventh day curse God with a tintamar from one end of the Union to the other.

Will mankind never learn that policy is not morality- that it never secures any moral right, but considers merely what is expedient? chooses the available candidate- who is invariably the Devil- and what right have his constituents to be surprised, because the Devil does not behave like an angel of light? What is wanted is men, not of policy, but of probity- who recognize a higher law than the Constitution, or the decision of the majority. The fate of the country does not depend on how you vote at the polls- the worst man is as strong as the best at that game; it does not depend on what kind of paper you drop into the ballot- box once a year, but on what kind of man you drop from your chamber into the street every morning.

What should concern Massachusetts is not the Nebraska Bill, nor the Fugitive Slave Bill, but her own slaveholding and servility. Let the State dissolve her union with the slaveholder. She may wriggle and hesitate, and ask leave to read the Constitution once more; but she can find no respectable law or precedent which sanctions the continuance of such a union for an instant.

Let each inhabitant of the State dissolve his union with her, as long as she delays to do her duty. The events of the past month teach me to distrust Fame. I see that she does not finely discriminate, but coarsely hurrahs. She considers not the simple heroism of an action, but only as it is connected with its apparent consequences. She praises till she is hoarse the easy exploit of the Boston tea party, but will be comparatively silent about the braver and more disinterestedly heroic attack on the Boston Court-House, simply because it was unsuccessful!

...

Do you suppose that that Massachusetts which is now doing these things- which hesitates to crown these men, some of whose lawyers, and even judges, perchance, may be driven to take refuge in some poor quibble, that they may not wholly outrage their instinctive sense of justice- do you suppose that she is anything but base and servile? that she is the champion of liberty?

Show me a free state, and a court truly of justice, and I will fight for them, if need be; but show me Massachusetts, and I refuse her my allegiance, and express contempt for her courts. The effect of a good government is to make life more valuable- of a bad one, to make it less valuable.

We can afford that railroad and all merely material stock should lose some of its value, for that only compels us to live more simply and economically; but suppose that the value of life itself should be diminished! How can we make a less demand on man and nature, how live more economically in respect to virtue and all noble qualities, than we do? I have lived for the last month- and I think that every man in Massachusetts capable of the sentiment of patriotism must have had a similar experience- with the sense of having suffered a vast and indefinite loss. I did not know at first what ailed me. At last it occurred to me that what I had lost was a country. I had never respected the government near to which I lived, but I had foolishly thought that I might manage to live here, minding my private affairs, and forget it. For my part, my old and worthiest pursuits have lost I cannot say how

much of their attraction, and I feel that my investment in life here is worth many per cent less since Massachusetts last deliberately sent back an innocent man, Anthony Burns, to slavery. I dwelt before, perhaps, in the illusion that my life passed somewhere only between heaven and hell, but now I cannot persuade myself that I do not dwell wholly within hell. The site of that political organization called Massachusetts is to me morally covered with volcanic scoriae and cinders, such as Milton describes in the infernal regions. If there is any hell more unprincipled than our rulers, and we, the ruled, I feel curious to see it. Life itself being worth less, all things with it, which minister to it, are worth less. Suppose you have a small library, with pictures to adorn the walls- a garden laid out around- and contemplate scientific and literary pursuits and discover all at once that your villa, with all its contents is located in hell, and that the justice of the peace has a cloven foot and a forked tail- do not these things suddenly lose their value in your eyes?

I feel that, to some extent, the State has fatally interfered with my lawful business. It has not only interrupted me in my passage through Court Street on errands of trade, but it has interrupted me and every man on his onward and upward path, on which he had trusted soon to leave Court Street far behind. What right had it to remind me of Court Street? I have found that hollow which even I had relied on for solid.

I am surprised to see men going about their business as if nothing had happened. I say to myself, "Unfortunates! they have not heard the news." I am surprised that the man whom I just met on horseback should be so earnest to overtake his newly bought cows running away- since all property is insecure, and if they do not run away again, they may be taken away from him when he gets them. Fool! does he not know that his seed-corn is worth less this year- that all beneficent harvests fail as you approach the empire of hell? No prudent man will build a stone house under these circumstances, or engage in any peaceful enterprise which it requires a long time to accomplish. Art is as long as ever, but life is more interrupted and less available for a man's proper pursuits. It is not an era of repose. We have used up all our inherited freedom. If we would save our lives, we must fight for them.

I walk toward one of our ponds; but what signifies the beauty of nature when men are base? We walk to lakes to see our serenity reflected in them; when we are not serene, we go not to them. Who can be serene in a country where both the rulers and the ruled are without principle? The remembrance of my country spoils my walk. My thoughts are murder to the State, and involuntarily go plotting against her. But it chanced the other day that I scented a white water-lily, and a season I had waited for had arrived. It is the emblem of purity. It bursts up so pure and fair to the eye, and so sweet to the scent, as if to show us what purity and sweetness reside in, and can be extracted from, the slime and muck of earth. I think I have plucked the first one that has opened for a mile. What confirmation of our hopes is in the fragrance of this flower! I shall not so soon despair of the world for it, notwithstanding slavery, and the cowardice and want of principle of Northern men. It suggests what kind of laws have prevailed longest and widest, and still prevail, and that the time may come when man's deeds will smell as sweet. Such is the odor which the plant emits. If Nature can compound this fragrance still annually, I shall believe her still young and full of vigor, her integrity and genius unimpaired, and that there is virtue even in man, too, who is fitted to perceive and love it. It reminds me that Nature has been partner to no Missouri Compromise. I scent no compromise in the fragrance of the water-lily. It is not a *Nymphaea Douglasii*. In it, the sweet, and pure, and innocent are wholly sundered from the obscene and baleful. I do not scent in this the time- serving irresolution of a Massachusetts Governor, nor of a Boston Mayor. So behave that the odor of your actions may enhance the general sweetness of the atmosphere, that when we behold or scent a flower, we may not be reminded how inconsistent your deeds are with it; for all odor is but one form of advertisement of a moral quality, and if fair actions had not been performed, the lily would not smell sweet. The foul slime stands for the sloth and vice of man, the decay of humanity; the fragrant flower that springs from it, for the purity and courage which are immortal. Slavery and servility have produced no sweet-scented flower annually, to charm the senses of men, for they have no real life: they are merely a decaying and a death, offensive to all healthy nostrils. We do not complain that they live, but that they do not get buried. Let the living bury them: even they are good for manure.

Assessment: Document Based Question

Overview: *John Brown was a white abolitionist who participated in deliberate discussions as well as desperately violent efforts to support the Free Soil Movement against slavery in Kansas and to support arming Southern slaves for an insurrection through his 1859 raid on Harper's Ferry (Virginia) with twenty some conspirators, most of whom were captured by Robert E Lee's troops and executed, including Brown in December of that year.*

While the Harper's Ferry incident further polarized America and drove the country further toward Civil War, the Abolitionist community in Concord rallied behind Brown. The Concord Free Public Library's 200th Anniversary of Thoreau's birth exhibit explains John Brown's connections to Concord MA:

"Brown first came to Concord in March of 1857 at the request of members of the Concord Ladies' Antislavery Society, who were planning a fair on March 10th and 11th. Their invitation was extended by Frank Sanborn. On his first day in Concord, Brown dined with the Thoreaus and met Emerson, who invited him to his home the following night. On the 11th, he spoke at the Town Hall.

"Brown returned to Concord as Sanborn's guest on May 7, 8, and 9, 1859, again talked with Emerson and Thoreau, met Sarah Alden Bradford Ripley at the Old Manse, and on May 8th addressed a local audience at the Town Hall. Bronson Alcott wrote of Brown on this occasion: "He tells his story with surpassing simplicity and sense, impressing us all deeply by his courage and religious earnestness. Our best people listen to his words—Emerson, Thoreau, Judge Hoar, my wife—and some of them contribute something in aid of his plans without asking particulars, such confidence does he inspire with his integrity and abilities." Alcott found Brown "superior to legal traditions and a disciple of the right, an idealist in thought and affairs of state."

Immediately following Brown's October 16, 1859 raid at Harpers Ferry, people everywhere struggled to make sense of the barrage of conflicting and sensational reports that flooded the press. Many—including abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison—were critical. When the details of what had happened in Virginia became clear, his supporters in Concord did what they could to draw sympathetic attention to Brown's situation and to counter his portrayal as a madman and a traitor. Thoreau prepared and, on October 30th, delivered his lecture "A Plea for Captain John Brown" in Concord. Later, he wrote a tribute that was read on July 4, 1860 by Richard J. Hinton at the John Brown commemoration in North Elba, New York (Brown's home). Emerson lectured on Brown and helped to raise money for his destitute family. Jointly, the two did much to promote the image of Brown as a saint and a martyr rather than a fanatic.

"Not everyone in Concord revered John Brown. Nevertheless, Brown's execution on December 2, 1859 was mourned here with solemn public ceremony. John Shepard Keyes, who took part in the memorial service in the Town Hall that day, reported in his autobiography that the hall was crowded. The participants had agreed ahead of time to offer a program of readings so as to avoid the possibility of extemporaneously saying anything "treasonous" in the emotion of the moment. Rev. Grindall Reynolds of the First Parish read from the Bible, Emerson from Milton, Bronson Alcott, Keyes, Sanborn, and Judge Hoar from other texts. According to Keyes, Thoreau alone disregarded the plan and spoke his own mind. The singing of a dirge concluded the service.

“The next day, Henry Thoreau assisted the return to Canada of Francis Jackson Meriam—one of Brown’s conspirators ... to the South Acton train station.

“Louisa Alcott’s poem “With a Rose That Bloomed on the Day of John Brown’s Martyrdom” appeared in the *Liberator* for January 20, 1860. In February, Sanborn arranged to bring Anna and Sarah Brown, two of John Brown’s children, to Concord to attend his school. The Brown girls stayed with the Emersons when they first arrived in Concord, later with the Clarks on Lexington Road. In April, many townspeople rallied around Sanborn when federal officers attempted to arrest him to investigate his part in Brown’s raid.”

https://concordlibrary.org/special-collections/antislavery/07_essay

Clearly, the town of Concord -- including its once reluctant abolitionist agitators Emerson and Thoreau -- became more radicalized because of events led by Brown. These documents represent a diverse set of perspectives on John Brown. Use these to address the question:

Question: *How did John Brown’s raid in Harper’s Ferry affect the Abolitionist Movement?*

Source A: Lincoln

Source B: Brown

Source C: Emerson

Source D: Thoreau

Source E: Douglas

Source F: Whitman

Source G: Harper’s Weekly

Source A

Abraham Lincoln on John Brown, February 27, 1860

Abraham Lincoln’s address at the Cooper Institute in February of 1860, a speech which many believe helped secure Lincoln’s nomination for the presidency.

I would address a few words to the Southern people. I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people. Still, when you speak of us Republicans, you do so only to denounce us as reptiles, or, at the best, as no better than outlaws. You will grant a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing like it to “Black Republicans.” In all your contentions with one another, each of you deems an unconditional condemnation of “Black Republicanism” as the first thing to be attended to. Indeed, such condemnation of us seems to be an indispensable prerequisite—license, so to speak—among you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all. Now, can you, or not, be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves. . . .

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper’s Ferry! John Brown!! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper’s Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable for not designating the man and proving the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable for asserting it, and especially for persisting in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in

a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair; but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold to no doctrine, and make no declaration, which were not held to and made by "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live." You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important State elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely, this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live," declare our belief that slavery is wrong; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us, in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charges the other with sympathy with Black Republicanism; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood and thunder among the slaves.

http://harvardpress.typepad.com/hup_publicity/2012/12/abraham-lincoln-on-john-brown-february-27-1860.html

Source B

John Brown's Last Speech, November 2, 1859

One month before his execution, John Brown addressed a courtroom in Charlestown, West Virginia, defending his role in the action at Harper's Ferry.

I have, may it please the Court, a few words to say.

In the first place, I deny everything but what I have all along admitted, the design on my part to free the slaves. I intended certainly to have made a clean thing of that matter, as I did last winter, when I went into Missouri and there took slaves without the snapping of a gun on either side, moved them through the country, and finally left them in Canada. I designed to have done the same thing again, on a larger scale. That was all I intended. I never did intend murder, or treason, or the destruction of property, or to excite or incite slaves to rebellion, or to make insurrection.

I have another objection; and that is, it is unjust that I should suffer such a penalty. Had I interfered in the manner which I admit, and which I admit has been fairly proved (for I admire the truthfulness and candor of the greater portion of the witnesses who have testified in this case), had I so interfered in behalf of the rich, the powerful, the intelligent, the so-called great, or in behalf of any of their friends, either father, mother, brother, sister, wife, or children, or any of that class, and suffered and sacrificed what I have in this interference, it would have been all right; and every man in this court would have deemed it an act worthy of reward rather than punishment.

This court acknowledges, as I suppose, the validity of the law of God. I see a book kissed here which I suppose to be the Bible, or at least the New Testament. That teaches me that all things whatsoever I would that men should do to me, I should do even so to them. It teaches me, further, to "remember them that are in bonds, as

bound with them." I endeavored to act up to that instruction. I say, I am yet too young to understand that God is any respecter of persons. I believe that to have interfered as I have done as I have always freely admitted I have done in behalf of His despised poor, was not wrong, but right. Now, if it is deemed necessary that I should forfeit my life for the furtherance of the ends of justice, and mingle my blood further with the blood of my children and with the blood of millions in this slave country whose rights are disregarded by wicked, cruel, and unjust enactments, I submit; so let it be done!

Let me say one word further.

I feel entirely satisfied with the treatment I have received on my trial. Considering all the circumstances, it has been more generous than I expected. But I feel no consciousness of guilt. I have stated from the first what was my intention and what was not. I never had any design against the life of any person, nor any disposition to commit treason, or excite slaves to rebel, or make any general insurrection. I never encouraged any man to do so, but always discouraged any idea of that kind.

Let me say, also, a word in regard to the statements made by some of those connected with me. I hear it has been stated by some of them that I have induced them to join me. But the contrary is true. I do not say this to injure them, but as regretting their weakness. There is not one of them but joined me of his own accord, and the greater part of them at their own expense. A number of them I never saw, and never had a word of conversation with, till the day they came to me; and that was for the purpose I have stated.

Now I have done.

<http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/johnbrown.html>

Document C

Remarks by Ralph Waldo Emerson
At a Meeting for the Relief of the Family of John Brown, at Tremont Temple, Boston
November 18, 1859

“JOHN BROWN in Kansas settled, like a steadfast Yankee farmer,

Brave and godly, with four sons—all stalwart men of might.

There he spoke aloud for Freedom, and the Border strife grew warmer

Till the Rangers fired his dwelling, in his absence, in the night;

And Old Brown,

Osawatomie Brown,

Came homeward in the morning to find his house burned down.

Then he grasped his trusty rifle, and boldly fought for Freedom;
Smote from border unto border the fierce invading band:
And he and his brave boys vowed—so might Heaven help and speed 'em—
They would save those grand old prairies from the curse that blights the land;
And Old Brown,
Osawatomie Brown,
Said, 'Boys, the Lord will aid us!' and he shoved his ramrod down."

EDMUND CLARENCE STEDMAN, [John Brown](#).

MR. CHAIRMAN, AND FELLOW CITIZENS: [1](#) I share the sympathy and sorrow which have brought us together. Gentlemen who have preceded me have well said that no wall of separation could here exist. This commanding event which has brought us together, eclipses all others which have occurred for a long time in our history, and I am very glad to see that this sudden interest in the hero of Harper's Ferry has provoked an extreme curiosity in all parts of the Republic, in regard to the details of his history. Every anecdote is eagerly sought, and I do not wonder that gentlemen find traits of relation readily between him and themselves. One finds a relation in the church, another in the profession, another in the place of his birth. He was happily a representative of the American Republic. Captain John Brown is a farmer, the fifth in descent from Peter Brown, who came to Plymouth in the Mayflower, in 1620. All the six have been farmers. His grandfather, of Simsbury, in Connecticut, was a captain in the Revolution. His father, largely interested as a raiser of stock, became a contractor to supply the army with beef, in the war of 1812, and our Captain John Brown, then a boy, with his father was present and witnessed the surrender of General Hull. He cherishes a great respect for his father, as a man of strong character, and his respect is probably just. For himself, he is so transparent that all men see him through. He is a man to make friends wherever on earth courage and integrity are esteemed, the rarest of heroes, a pure idealist, with no by-ends of his own. Many of you have seen him, and every one who has heard him speak has been impressed alike by his simple, artless goodness, joined with his sublime courage. He joins that perfect Puritan faith which brought his fifth ancestor to Plymouth Rock with his grandfather's ardor in the Revolution. He believes in two articles,—two instruments, shall I say?—the Golden Rule and the Declaration of Independence; and he used this expression in conversation here concerning them, "Better that a whole generation of men, women and children should pass away by a violent death than that one word of either should be violated in this country." There is a Unionist,—there is a strict constructionist for you. He believes in the Union of the States, and he conceives that the only obstruction to the Union is Slavery, and for that reason, as a patriot, he works for its abolition. The governor of Virginia has pronounced his eulogy in a manner that discredits the moderation of our timid parties. His own speeches to the court have interested the nation in him. What magnanimity, and what innocent pleading, as of childhood! You remember his words: "If I had interfered in behalf of the rich, the powerful, the intelligent, the so-called great, or any of their friends, parents, wives or children, it would all have been right. But I believe that to have interfered as I have done, for the despised poor, was not wrong, but right." [2](#)

It is easy to see what a favorite he will be with history, which plays such pranks with temporary reputations. Nothing can resist the sympathy which all elevated minds must feel with Brown, and

through them the whole civilized world; and if he must suffer, he must drag official gentlemen into an immortality most undesirable, of which they have already some disagreeable forebodings. Indeed, it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of Slavery, when the governor of Virginia is forced to hang a man whom he declares to be a man of the most integrity, truthfulness and courage he has ever met. Is that the kind of man the gallows is built for? It were bold to affirm that there is within that broad commonwealth, at this moment, another citizen as worthy to live, and as deserving of all public and private honor, as this poor prisoner. [3](#)

But we are here to think of relief for the family of John Brown. To my eyes, that family looks very large and very needy of relief. It comprises his brave fellow sufferers in the Charlestown Jail; the fugitives still hunted in the mountains of Virginia and Pennsylvania; the sympathizers with him in all the states; and, I may say, almost every man who loves the Golden Rule and the Declaration of Independence, like him, and who sees what a tiger's thirst threatens him in the malignity of public sentiment in the slave states. It seems to me that a common feeling joins the people of Massachusetts with him.

I said John Brown was an idealist. He believed in his ideas to that extent that he existed to put them all into action; he said 'he did not believe in moral suasion, he believed in putting the thing through.' He saw how deceptive the forms are. We fancy, in Massachusetts, that we are free; yet it seems the government is quite unreliable... The state judges fear collision between their two allegiances; but there are worse evils than collision; namely, the doing substantial injustice. A good man will see that the use of a judge is to secure good government, and where the citizen's weal is imperilled by abuse of the federal power, to use that arm which can secure it, viz., the local government. Had that been done on certain calamitous occasions, we should not have seen the honor of Massachusetts trailed in the dust, stained to all ages, once and again, by the ill-timed formalism of a venerable bench. If judges cannot find law enough to maintain the sovereignty of the state, and to protect the life and freedom of every inhabitant not a criminal, it is idle to compliment them as learned and venerable. What avails their learning or veneration? At a pinch, they are no more use than idiots. After the mischance they wring their hands, but they had better never have been born. [5](#)

But I am detaining the meeting on matters which others understand better. I hope, then, that, in administering relief to John Brown's family, we shall remember all those whom his fate concerns, all who are in sympathy with him, and not forget to aid him in the best way, by securing freedom and independence in Massachusetts.

<http://www.bartleby.com/90/1110.html>

Document D

Henry David Thoreau, "A Plea for Captain John Brown" (1853)

Our foes are in our midst and all about us. There is hardly a house but is divided against itself, for our foe is the all but universal woodenness of both head and heart, the want of vitality in man, which is the effect of our vice; and hence are begotten fear, superstition, bigotry, persecution, and slavery of all kinds. We are mere figure-heads upon a bulk, with livers in the place of hearts. The curse is the worship of idols, which at length changes the worshipper into a stone image himself; and the New Englander is just as much an idolater as the Hindoo. This man was an exception, for he did not set up even a political graven image between him and his God.

A church that can never have done with excommunicating Christ while it exists! Away with your broad and flat churches, and your narrow and tall churches! Take a step forward, and invent a new style of out-houses. Invent a salt that will save you, and defend our nostrils.

The modern Christian is a man who has consented to say all the prayers in the liturgy, provided you will let him go straight to bed and sleep quietly afterward. All his prayers begin with "Now I lay me down to sleep," and he is forever looking forward to the time when he shall go to his "long rest." He has consented to perform certain old-established charities, too, after a fashion, but he does not wish to hear of any new-fangled ones; he doesn't wish to have any supplementary articles added to the contract, to fit it to the present time. He shows the whites of his eyes on the Sabbath, and the blacks all the rest of the week. The evil is not merely a stagnation of blood, but a stagnation of spirit. Many, no doubt, are well disposed, but sluggish by constitution and by habit, and they cannot conceive of a man who is actuated by higher motives than they are. Accordingly they pronounce this man insane, for they know that they could never act as he does, as long as they are themselves.

Source E
SPEECH OF
SENATOR S. A. DOUGLAS
ON THE INVASION OF STATES;
AND HIS REPLY TO MR. FESSENDEN.
DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 28, 1860.

Can any man say to us that although this outrage has been perpetrated at Harper's Ferry, there is no danger of its recurrence? Sir, is not the Republican party still embodied, organized, confident of success, and defiant in its pretensions? Does it not now hold and proclaim the same creed that it did before this invasion? It is true that most of its representatives here disavow the *acts* of John Brown at Harper's Ferry. I am glad that they do so; I am rejoiced that they have gone thus far; but I must be permitted to say to them that it is not sufficient that they disavow the act, unless they also repudiate and denounce the doctrines and teachings which produced the act. Those doctrines remain the same; those teachings are being poured into the minds of men throughout the country by means of speeches and pamphlets and books and through partisan presses. The causes that produced the Harper's Ferry invasion are now in active operation. It is true that the people of all the border States are required by the Constitution to have their bands tied, without the power of self-defence, and remain patient under a threatened invasion in the day or in the night? Can you expect people to be patient, when they dare not lie down to sleep at night without first stationing sentinels around their houses to see if a band of marauders and murderers are not approaching with torch and pistol? Sir, it requires more patience than freemen ever should cultivate, to submit to constant annoyance, irritation and apprehension.

If we expect to preserve this Union, we must remedy, within the Union and in obedience to the Constitution, every evil for which disunion would furnish a remedy. If the federal Government fails to act, either from choice or from an apprehension of the want of power, it cannot be expected that the States will be content to remain unprotected. Then, sir, I see no hope of peace, of fraternity, of good feeling, between the different portions of the United States, except by bringing to bear the power of the Federal Government to the extent authorized by the Constitution - to protect the people of all the States against any external violence or aggression. I repeat, that if the theory of the Constitution shall be carried out by conceding the right of the people of every State to have just such institutions as they choose, there cannot be a conflict, much less an "irrepressible conflict," between the free and the slaveholding States.

<http://www.wvculture.org/history/jbexhibit/bbspr02-0012.html>

Source F

Re-evaluating John Brown's Raid at Harpers Ferry

By Karen Whitman

West Virginia Archives and History, Volume 34, Number 1 (October 1972), pp. 46-84

Many abolitionist had abandoned their commitments to peaceful means, and some seemed almost to look forward to a confrontation which appeared more and more unavoidable. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow wrote in his journal on December 2, 1859: "This will be a great day in our history; the date of a new Revolution, - quite as much needed as the old one. Even now as I write, they are leading Old John Brown to execution in Virginia for attempting to rescue slaves! This is sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind, which will come soon."¹¹⁹

Even Moncure Conway, an abolitionist who had left his Southern home because of his convictions, finally, after much agonizing, joined in praising Brown as a martyr, even though he realized that the South's firm commitment to slavery could well lead to fratricidal war.¹²⁰ Charles H. Langston, a black abolitionist, issued a statement denying that he had a hand in the Harpers Ferry raid. But he went on to express his solidarity with the attempt at slave liberation: "But what shall I deny? I cannot deny that I feel the very deepest sympathy with the immortal John Brown in his heroic and daring effort to free the slaves." This sentiment, according to Benjamin Quarles, in *Black Abolitionists*, "mirrored the reaction of the overwhelming majority of black Americans."¹²¹

Few abolitionists had any enthusiasm about arguing for non-resistance and moral suasion after John Brown was hanged. They seemed to agree with "Old Ossawatimie" himself, and the statement he handed to a guard on his way to the gallows: "I, John Brown am now quite certain that the crimes of this guilty land: will never be purged away; but with Blood. I had as I now think: vainly flattered myself that without much bloodshed; it might be done."¹²²

http://www.wvculture.org/history/journal_wvh/wvh34-1.html

Source G

Porte Crayon, illustrator for Harper's Weekly November 19, 1859

On October 16, 1859, Brown and a group of followers attacked and captured the federal arsenal at Harper's Ferry, Virginia (today, West Virginia), from which they planned to supply slaves with arms for an insurrection. Brown and his cohorts were captured on October 18, tried for murder and treason on October 27-30, and executed on December 2, 1859. John Brown's raid was a polarizing event in a nation already suffering from increasing sectional tensions centering on the issue of slavery. This cartoon of a slaveowner arming his slaves to fight against Brown reflects the artist's view that outside attacks on the South united whites and blacks in defense of the region.

Strother was a native Virginian known for his colorful tales and sketches of rural life in the South and West, published primarily in Harper's Monthly. Although a firm opponent of secession (and a Unionist during the Civil War), his family included many slaveowners and he adamantly opposed abolitionism. Strother was also related to the special prosecutor at John Brown's trial, Andrew Hunter, and was therefore allowed to accompany Hunter and Governor Henry Wise as they interviewed Brown. Aware of the importance of language in influencing readers' impressions, Strother labeled Brown and his men "outlaws" and the incident an "invasion," rather than "insurgents" and "insurrection" as many reporters had done. He understood that the term "insurrection" still resonated with the legitimacy of the American Revolution and implied a local (slave) rebellion against unjust rule.

<http://www.harpweek.com/09Cartoon/RelatedCartoon.asp?Month=November&Date=19>



Extension Activities: Use the thematic thread of Examining Desperate and Deliberate Lives to compare many pivotal "rights" struggles in the US:

Civil Rights:

- Martin Luther King, Jr and Malcolm X's responses to Civil Rights Era (1954-1968).
- Compare contemporary movements such as Black Lives Matter (<http://blacklivesmatter.com/guiding-principles/>), Moveon.org (<https://front.moveon.org/about/#.WXYx2oTyvIU>) and Eric Foner's Dec 2014 article in *The Nation*: <https://www.thenation.com/article/teaching-the-history-of-radicalism-in-the-age-of-obama/>

Rights of Labor:

- AFL vs Wobblies and CIO (eventual merger of AFL-CIO:
http://www.socialstudieshelp.com/eco_unionization.htm

Women's Rights

- US Suffragette Movement
<http://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/us-national-womans-party-campaigns-suffrage-1914-1920>
- Women's Rights Movement
<http://serious-science.org/feminism-in-the-us-from-sojourner-truth-to-ruth-bader-ginzburg-6992>