A STUDY OF THE MANUMISSION OF NEGRO SLAVES TO 1832

A Thesis

Presented to

the Division of Social Sciences

The Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

Edward Beasley, Jr.

August 1964

William V. Seiler

Approved for the Major Department

Maurice L. Boylan

Approved for the Graduate Council

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. William H. Seiler, Division of Social Sciences, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, for his challenging questions, valuable suggestions, patience, and understanding.

E.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Manumission, the freeing of slaves, was the chief means by which the number of free Negroes was increased during the period in American history from 1645 to 1832. Manumissions were accomplished through various procedures which were motivated by both public and private action. The basic method of manumission was by will. The earliest known will manumitting Negroes was dated 1645. By its provisions a Virginian named Vaughn "freed his Negroes at certain ages; some of them he taught to read and make their own clothes. He left them land."[1] The earliest mention of manumitting Negroes in New England appears to have been in 1646, when Governor Theophilus Eaton of New Haven Colony freed John Wham and his wife and settled them on a farm.[2] The emancipation of these slaves may be considered the beginning of

---

[1] Helen Tunnicliff Catterall (ed.), Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1926), Vol. I, p. 58.

[2] Lorenzo Johnston Greene, The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), p. 290.

private manumissions, a procedure through which a free Negro group was to arise in America.

The philosophy of the American Revolutionary War was most likely responsible for some of the early fervor in manumitting slaves. The impact of the Enlightenment with its emphasis on freedom, the statements in the Declaration of Independence, and the desire to counteract British manumission efforts all contributed to a favorable appreciation for the rights of man. For example, Thaddeus Kosiciuszko, knowing Thomas Jefferson's interest in seeing all men become free, named Jefferson executor of his will. In the will, Kosiciuszko, who lived in Poland, authorized Jefferson to use his American funds for the purchase and education of slaves so that they might become good citizens of their country and defenders of its liberties.[3]

The movement to manumit slaves, either by will, deed, or legislative enactment, was well under way before the opening of the nineteenth century. Individual manumission in Pennsylvania constantly increased the free class. Slavery almost became extinct in that colony through this

---

[3]John H. Russell, The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1885 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1913), p. 43.

means within two generations after 1750.[4] Private manumission was not without legal restriction, however, and in Virginia private manumission was forbidden by an act passed in 1723.[5] Owing chiefly to the persistent efforts of the Quakers and the Methodists, restrictions upon voluntary manumission were generally removed by 1782.[6]

During the period between 1790 and 1832 such conditions as insurrections and the economic and social factors varied the number of manumissions allowed in the South. Thus, manumission of slaves corresponded with conditions prevailing during this period.

Classes in Negro history taken under Doctor Lorenzo Greene, a noted Negro historian at Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri, a seminar class taken at the University of Kansas, and private studies in Negro history revealed lack of complete studies on manumission and thus prompted the writer's attention to this topic. It is true that complete case studies have been collected by Helen

---

[4]Ulrich B. Phillips, American Negro Slavery (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1936), p. 428.

[5]Russell, Free Negro in Virginia, pp. 52-53.

[6]Ibid., pp. 58-59.

Tunnicliff Catterall in Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro, and the topic has received an indirect consideration in the research on the free Negro by such scholars as Greene, John Hope Franklin, and Benjamin Quarles. The footnote references and the bibliography acknowledge many such contributions.

The topic is vast in scope. Some background information on the earlier period is included in chapters II and III. Chapter IV is an evaluation of manumissions and of "the fear of servile insurrections." Further discussion of this topic is included in Chapter V. The correlation of manumissions and "the fear of servile insurrections" in the development of American history has not received the benefits of substantial research. Indeed, the writer failed to find any investigation in depth on this subject. A total compilation of manumission cases between 1790 and 1832, as listed in Catterall's Judicial Cases, and a summary of data concerning them are included in the Appendixes.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF SURVEY OF MANUMISSION PROCEDURES BETWEEN 1624 AND 1774

To study the manumission movement in colonial American history is like trying to put together a picture puzzle when many of the pieces are missing, or it is like reconstructing a vase from a few shards taken from other vases. Some of the pieces will fit while others may fit the fragments in a different fashion.

There has been, and there still is, a notable lack of agreement, both in contemporary and secondary accounts, concerning the details of colonial manumissions and their relative importance. One authority on Negro slavery contends that during the colonial period in American history, Negro slaves were manumitted as a rule only when generous masters considered the slaves' circumstances and rated them individually deserving of liberty, or when the Negro slaves bought themselves.[1] Another authority stresses the rise of manumitted slaves through illicit relations between whites

---

[1]Phillips, American Negro Slavery, p. 425.

and blacks, and that the illegitimate mulatto children followed the status of the mother.[2] Another scholar notes that during the early colonial period Negroes were used as indentured servants and after a fixed term were freed. Professor Craven adds, however, that it is dangerous to generalize too much from the relatively few cases recorded.[3]

The conclusions of these authorities are quite valid. Along with their conclusions, a few more observations can be added to aid in somewhat clarifying the manumission movement during this period. Methods of manumissions by which the number of free Negroes continued to increase may be summarized as follows: (1) children born of free colored persons, (2) mulatto children born of free colored mothers, (3) mulatto children born of white servants or free women, (4) children of free Negro and Indian parentage, (5) slaves set free by generous masters, (6) slaves manumitted by meritorious services or deeds, (7) a slave who had been christened or baptized, and (8) Negroes who had

---

[2]Clement Eaton, A History of the Old South (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), p. 270.

[3]Wesley Frank Craven, The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949), p. 218.

resided in England before being brought to America.

The first Negroes brought to the continental colonies were few and served largely as indentured servants. They were closely attached to the homes of their masters and were treated like members of the families. After serving their masters a few years, the indentured servants could become free. This happened in the case of some of the first twenty Negroes brought to Jamestown in 1619.[4]

In 1619 when the twenty Negroes were purchased from a Dutch man-of-war by the Virginia settlers, there was no precedent in English law for slavery.[5] Little is known of the fate of the first Negroes who were introduced into Virginia. However, as mentioned, common agreement exists that they were considered as indentured servants, and there is a record of the baptism of a child of one couple among the original Negroes. This is significant, because at the time, according to the law of England by which the colony was governed, "a slave who had been christened or baptized

---

[4]William B. Hesseltine, The South in American History (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1943), p. 16.

[5]James C. Ballagh, A History of Slavery in Virginia (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1902), p. 32.

became 'infranchised'" and thus became manumitted at a future date.[6] A case which came before the general court of Virginia in 1624 demonstrated that this law was recognized in the colony. A Negro, John Phillips, was permitted to testify as a freeman and a Christian in the trial of a white man because he had been baptized twelve years previously in England.[7] During the following year another case came before the court which showed that Negro servitude was clearly distinguished from Negro slavery. In September, 1625, the court ordered "the Negro that cam in with Capt. Jones shall remaine with the La: Yardley till further order be taken for him and that he shalbe allowed by the Lady Yardley monthly for his labors forty pownd waigght of good merchantable tobacco for his labor and service so long as he rmayneth with her."[8]

The early manumission cases which came before the colonial courts were mainly concerned with the question of whether or not a slave gained his freedom through becoming a Christian. The early theory that the enslavement of

---

[6] Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 55.

[7] Ibid., p. 76. [8] Ibid.

infidels was justifiable, in order to make Christians of them, had a corollary that when the purpose of enslavement had been achieved, by their conversion, their slavery would cease and they would become free. As more slaves were brought into the colonies, however, this corollary met resistance from slaveholders. Slaves, in turn, thought of baptism as a means to an end: to secure the rewards of manumission. Therefore, slaves began to abuse this privilege, although many may have been spiritually inclined toward the Christian faith. The slaveholders began to realize that baptism of a slave was a challenge or threat to the servile institution.

Maryland, rallying against slaves' using baptism as a means of securing manumission, took precaution by passing a law in 1664 to prevent further manumission cases because of baptism. This statement in the colonial government records of Maryland verifies an attempt to regulate or control manumissions of this type: "Munday 19th Sept. 1664 ..came a member from the lower howse . . . Itt is desired by the lower howse that the upper howse would be pleased to drawe up an Act obligeing negroes to serve durante vita they thinking itt very necessary for the pretending to be

Christned and soe pleade the lawe of England."[9]

James M. Wright cites further information about this situation by giving the act which resulted from Maryland's legislative action: "All Negroes and other slaves already within the Province and all Negroes and other slaves to be hereafter imported into the Province shall serve Durante Vita. And all children born of any Negro or other slave shall be Slaves as their fathers were for the term of their lives."[10] The same objective was promoted further by an act of 1671 which decided that baptism according to the rites of the Christian church did not entitle a slave Negro to release from slavery, which presumed that persons of African blood were slaves, and which, in manumission cases, placed the burden of proof as to status upon the plaintiffs rather than upon their detainers.[11] There was thus a tendency to strengthen the ties of slavery, which, in turn, would weaken the opportunities of manumission for the Negro slave.

In 1661 the first reference was made in the statutes

---

[9] Ibid., IV, p. 1.

[10] James M. Wright, The Free Negro in Maryland, 1634-1860 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1921), p. 21.

[11] Ibid.

of Virginia in regards to Negroes as slaves; however, Negroes were not designated as slaves until the next year, when a more comprehensive act on slavery was passed.[12] Later, in the Act of 1670, the status of all servants who were not Christians was regulated.[13] This act divided slaves into two classes, those who came to the colony by land and those who came by sea. This distinction on the method of arrival obviously favored the Indian, who usually came by land, and fixed the status of slave on the non-Christian African, who was usually imported into Virginia by shipping. However, the African coming by sea might still keep his status of servant for a certain number of years and then be manumitted if he had become a Christian before landing. Such was the case of Anthony, sold by John Endicott of Boston in 1678 to Richard Medictt to serve "but for Tenn yeares from the day that he shall Disimbarke in Virginia, and at the expiration of the said Tenn yeares . . . to be a free man to goe wherever he pleaseth."[14] Endicott's intention

---

[12]Carter G. Woodson, The Negro in Our History (Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1922), p. 83.

[13]Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, pp. 59-60.

[14]Ibid., p. 60.

that Anthony should not be a slave for life, but should be manumitted after a certain time, would have been defeated had Anthony been imported "not being Christian."

The first landmark in the history of Rhode Island legislation regarding slavery was the Act of 1652 passed by the representatives of Providence and Warwick, before Rhode Island and Providence Plantations were brought into one jurisdiction by the 1663 charter. The act provided that:

> No blake mankind or white being forced by covenant bond, or otherwise, serve any man or his assighnes longer than ten yeares, or untill they came to bee twentie four yeares of age, if they bee taken in under fourteen, from the time of their cominge within the liberties of the Collonie, and at the end or terme of ten yeares to sett them free.[15]

Negroes were probably manumitted through the application of this law, which, as indicated, limited slavery to ten years. Although this law was openly violated, as shown by the rise of slaves in this colony, the law was never repealed, and, therefore, it is possible that under its provisions a few slaves may have been manumitted.[16]

The methods employed in manumitting later in the

---

[15] Ibid., IV, p. 448.

[16] Phillips, American Negro Slavery, p. 104.

seventeenth century were by word of mouth, by last will and testament, and by deed. Manumissions in the colonies during the early portion of the colonial period were never numerous. Two reasons may be assigned for this fact: first, the labor situation had not then reached a fitting stage of development, and, second, the other later powerful causes had not yet begun to act. As the motives behind slaveholders' actuating manumission were not often stated in records, it was left to others to determine the motives. However, from assigned reasons in some of the cases, direct information may be gleaned. The following chief causes seem to merit discussion: (1) blood relationship to manumitter, or to other white men, and (2) good will of masters earned by faithful service, or otherwise.

The reason for regarding blood relationship as a major cause is based chiefly on inferences. One of the cases which served as a basis for future cases was the case of Irish Nell.[17] In 1681 Lord Baltimore returned to Maryland after a stay of four years in England, bringing with him as a domestic servant a free white woman named Eleanor,

---

[17]Woodson, Negro in Our History, p. 111.

commonly called Irish Nell.[18] During the same year of her arrival Irish Nell married a Negro slave. Many times planters would marry white women servants to Negroes in order to transform such servants and their offspring into slaves. When Lord Baltimore returned to England he sold Irish Nell to another planter.

A law had been enacted in 1661 to prevent interbreeding of the races. The preamble of the law in Maryland said:

> And forasmuch as divers free-born English women, forgetful of their free condition, and to the disgrace of our nation, do intermarry with negro slaves, by which also divers suits may arise, touching the issue of such women, and a great damage doth befall the master of such Negroes, for the prevention whereof, for deterring such free-born women from such shamefull matches, be it enacted: That whatsoever free-born women shall intermarry with any slave, from and after the last day of the present assembly shall serve the master of such slave during the life of her husband; and that all the issues of English, or other free-born women, that have already married Negroes shall serve the master of their parents, till they be thirty years of age and no longer.[19]

Lord Baltimore, before returning to England, secured the repeal of the Act of 1661 (also known as the Act of

---

[18] William and Mary Butler v. Boarman, 1 Har. and MCH. 371, September 1770, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 49.

[19] Woodson, Negro in Our History, pp. 110-111.

1664) and the Act of 1663. The Act of 1663 was designed to prevent persons from purchasing white women and marrying them to their slaves for the purpose of making slaves of them.[20] After this act was repealed, Nell had children in consequence of this marriage, and in 1770 her grandchildren, William and Mary Butler (first cousins), petitioned for freedom "as being descended from a free white woman." The civil law that the line of slavery derived from the status of the mother prevailed in Maryland, as it did in all the other American colonies and in the West Indies. The proceedings instituted to obtain freedom for Nell's offspring by her Negro husband occupied the attention of the courts of Maryland for a number of years. The Provincial Court adjudged that the petitioners were free, but the Court of Appeals in 1771 reversed judgment, agreeing with defense counsel: "There is no circumstance appearing, to shew that the Legislature meant to discriminate or distinguish between the issue born before the act and those born after."[21]

---

[20] William and Mary Butler v. Boarman, 1 Har. and MCH. 371, September 1770, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 49.

[21] Ibid.

Sixteen years later Mary Butler, the daughter of William and Mary Butler and the great-granddaughter of Irish Nell, petitioned for freedom and was successful in obtaining it.[22] A general court held that without a conviction in a court of record of Irish Nell's having intermarried with a slave, neither she nor her issue could become slaves by virtue of such intermarriage, and that no presumption of such conviction arose because the petitioner and her ancestors had been held in slavery. It was also noted that the record, proceedings, and judgment on the petition of William and Mary Butler (her parents) against Boarman "were no bar to prevent the petitioner from claiming and having her freedom." The defendant, Craig, appealed. In the court of appeals, counsel for the appellee argued convincingly that:

> Irish Nell was an English subject in an equal degree with any other English subject, however possessed with wealth, and exalted in station or rank. If she committed the crime of marrying a negro slave, she would by law be subject to no punishment before conviction in some mode, and she was entitled to the common law mode of trial by jury, as no other mode was prescribed by law...Parol evidence is not admissible, to prove that Irish Nell married a negro slave during the existence of the act of 1663 (1664). Hearsay or tradition is not

---

[22] Butler v. Craig, 2 Har. and MCH. 214, June 1791, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 50.

> sufficient to prove any crime. [The judgment of the general court in favor of Mary Butler's freedom was affirmed in 1791.][23]

In a similar manner Eleanor Toogood gained her freedom in 1783. In Eleanor's case a higher court, a court of appeals, affirmed the judgment of a lower court which was called a general court. The general court, in turn, agreed with the decision of a lower court, a county court, in which the judgment of a county court in 1780 ruled in favor of granting manumission to Eleanor. Eleanor's mother, Ann Fisher, was a slave for life by virtue of the Act of 1664; however, Ann Fisher's mother, Mary Fisher, was the daughter of a free white indentured servant, and her father was an East Indian. Mary Fisher, Eleanor's grandmother, became a free mulatto after serving some time for a Major Beale. Mary Fisher was married to a Negro named Dick. A Roman Catholic priest performed the ceremony. Thus Eleanor petitioned for manumission through the lineage of her grandmother Mary Fisher. A court of appeals held that the Act of 1664 did not extend to Mary Fisher.[24]

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Toogood v. Scott, 2 Har. and MCH. 26, May 1783, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 49.

If manumitters had been uninfluenced by ties of kinship, it is probable, in view of the disparity between the two complexional classes of slaves, that at least as large a number of Negroes as of mulattoes would have become free.

The other chief reason assigned during the colonial period was that on account of the good will of masters, however gained, manumission was conferred as a favor. Two early deeds of 1703 and 1709 in Maryland well illustrate this motive. In the latter the granter wrote that he was actuated by "divers good and lawful considerations of the trusty and faithful services done me by my negro Sambo and his wife Betty."[25] He therefore made them both free. A larger number of such grants was made by last will and testament. Two other cases demonstrating this occurred in New Jersey and South Carolina. The will in 1722 of Thomas Stanford of New Jersey stated that upon the death of Stanford's wife his Negro man should be manumitted if in the opinion of three neighbors named he had behaved well.[26] Robert Daniell of South Carolina in 1759 granted manumission to his slave

---

[25]Wright, Free Negro in Maryland, p. 26.

[26]Phillips, American Negro Slavery, p. 425.

David Wilson in what Daniell considered due for the faithful service of Wilson.[27] Many of these cases occurred in Virginia, an example being that of Tony Bowze, a servant of Major General Bennett. Bowze, a Negro, petitioned the court for his freedom after the decease of his master. He produced "a note under his said Masters hand wherein it Appeareing that he is to pay 800 li. of tobacco yearly and be at Liberty." The court ruled that Bowze had to produce a yearly income of five hundred pounds of tobacco and pay a percentage to his master's family in order to maintain his freedom.[28]

All such manumission cases, however, were not granted. In the case of Negro Angell v. Mathews, "Angell a negro Servant to Capt Mathews deced Petitioning to this Court that her Said Master promised that when he died shee should be free which being examined, It is ordered that she Returne to her Service."[29]

---

[27] Ibid.

[28] Negro Bowze v. Dunn, 4 McIlwaine 437, March 1676, Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 81.

[29] Negro Angell v. Mathews, 4 McIlwaine 413, June 1775, Ibid., p. 80.

Further additions to the free Negro group resulted from agreements between master and slave, whereby the latter would be set free after serving his owner for a stated number of years from the date of purchase. The net result of such compacts was to convert the slave into an indentured servant. One of the earliest of these contracts was that between Judge John Saffin of Boston and his slave Adam in 1694, whereby the slave was to receive his freedom after six years of faithful service.[30] Five years later, William Hawkins of Providence, Rhode Island, agreed to manumit his Negro, Jack, provided the latter served him dutifully for twenty-six years.[31] This practice continued into the eighteenth century. In 1723, Tolleration Harris, also of Providence, agreed to manumit her slave, Felix, if he faithfully "discharged his duties to her, her heirs, administrators and assignees" for six years. Felix, upon emancipation, was to post a bond guaranteeing that he would not become a public charge; if unable to do so, he might gain his unconditional freedom by serving his master four years longer.[32]

---

[30] Greene, Negro in Colonial New England, p. 342.

[31] Ibid., p. 350. [32] Ibid.

*Manumitted slaves did not always go forth empty-*handed from their masters' service. Some Negroes, like indentured servants, were furnished certain necessities for embarking upon their new lives as freemen. Richard Arnold of Providence stipulated in his will of 1708 that when his slave, Toby, was freed at the age of twenty-five he should be given "two suits....a good narrow axe, a board hoe, and sithe with tackling fitt for mowing and twenty shillings in money."[33]

While slavery was commonly practiced in New Jersey, there was from earliest days considerable anti-slavery sentiment in the colony. By the Act of 1713-14 it was provided that every man who manumitted his slaves should furnish security to the Queen in the sum of two hundred pounds to insure that he would pay each manumitted slave twenty pounds annually. The colony evidently did not propose to give relief to those who by age, infirmity, or sloth could or would not support themselves after manumission. A similar Act of 1769 required two hundred pound bond to the King.[34]

---

[33] Arnold v. Toby, 4 Leigh 163, May 1708, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 428.

[34] State v. Emmons, Ibid., p. 328.

The first act in Maryland dealing with the manumission of slaves was passed in 1752. It contained certain provisions which placed restrictions upon the action of masters concerning the form of manumissions and the age and fitness of the slaves for freedom. For example, it was designed to exercise some control over masters whose practice was to set their slaves adrift when they were no longer profitable, thus placing a burden upon the community.[35]

The desire of individual slaveholders and the incessant activities of the Society of Friends were constantly in opposition to restrictions upon manumission.

The rise of the manumitted Negro group was also facilitated through legal means. Aggressive Negroes, appealing to the courts for their freedom, often received it. Impetus was given to such action during the constitutional controversy with Great Britain, when the bonds of slavery were gradually being dissolved by the revolutionary philosophy. Besides those already cited, there was a suit brought by Jenny Slew of Ipswich, Massachusetts, in which the litigation is typical. Greene described the case thus:

---

[35]Jeffrey R. Brackett, The Negro in Maryland (Baltimore: N. Murray, 1889), p. 149.

> On March 5, 1762, Jenny sued John Whipple, her master, charging that Whipple had unlawfully detained her in bondage from January 29, 1762 until March 5 of the same year. Jenny contended that she had been illegally deprived of her liberty, and that she also had suffered damages to her person in the amount of 25 pounds. This sum, together with costs of court, she sought to recover from Whipple. The master, countering with the sweeping claim that no such person as Jenny Slew existed, further asked that he be granted "costs of court against said Jenny."[36]

After several delays an inferior court decided in favor of Whipple, thereby remanding Jenny back into slavery. The slave then appealed to a superior court for a reversal of the judgment, and the court in session at Salem in 1765 declared Jenny a freewoman and awarded her damages and costs amounting to more than nine pounds.[37]

The colonial period initiated the movement toward manumission of Negro slaves. Multiple social, political, and economic forces contributed to the increase of free Negroes during that time. The preceding survey is an effort to provide background for clarifying early procedures in manumission cases and to aid in understanding later laws, judicial decisions, and personal acts regarding manumissions.

---

[36] Greene, Negro in Colonial New England, p. 347.

[37] Ibid.

CHAPTER III

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND ITS INFLUENCE UPON MANUMISSIONS

By the end of the American Revolutionary War the ideology of the struggle for independence that had been so clearly proclaimed at the outset of the war set in motion the legal mechanism for a manumission movement throughout America. The effectiveness of this manumission movement was determined by military, sociological, and economic elements. These elements prodigiously manifested their presence in judicial proceedings concerning manumission cases.

The aims of the leaders of the American Revolution might have been more political than social, but the consequences of the revolutionary philosophy set in motion manumission forces which operated to effect a change in the status of slaves. So powerful did the philosophy act upon the minds of the people that almost every state enlisting slaves to serve in the army either freed them at the outset or promised them manumission at the end of their service. The philosophy of the Revolution was not only beneficial for slaves who had served in the army, but it was probably also

responsible for some of the early fervor in manumitting slaves generally.

The acceptance of the philosophy and its initial implementation concerning manumission was not immediately apparent. Rather, military necessity and response to British actions in promising manumission furnished an original stimulus to the new American states. Then, as the war went on, and especially by its conclusion, the revolutionary philosophy that all men are created equal began to take effect.

This early fervor in manumitting slaves could have been initiated through the fear propagated by British officials in their promise to manumit any slave who would associate himself with the British cause. Such a cause of fear by the American colonists can be easily understood when, on November 7, 1775, Lord Dunmore, the governor of Virginia, issued a proclamation to manumit slaves under certain conditions. He said, in part: "I do hereby declare all indentured servants, Negroes, or others free, that are able and willing to bear arms by joining his Majesty's troops."[1] Sir

---

[1] H. Niles, Principles and Acts of the Revolution in

Henry Clinton, a British general, also sought Negro slave aid by proclaiming in 1779 that all Negroes in arms should be purchased from their owners for public service. He also emphasized that every Negro who might desert the "Rebel Standard" would be safe under the British rule, and the manumitted slave could follow any occupation which he might desire.[2] Much to the dismay of the colonists, these plans of manumission by the British were executed.

Manumission activities were further initiated by the British in their attempts to recruit two Negro regiments in North Carolina. North Carolina vigorously retaliated against this movement by passing acts against manumission of slaves. In passing the acts of 1775 and 1777 the North Carolina legislature felt that it would discourage any of its citizens who were aiding the British by manumitting slaves for usage in the British military service. North Carolina did not desire massive manumissions because of the large number of slaves in proportion to its white citizens. The preamble of the Act of 1775 states, in part, the cause

---

America (Baltimore: Niles Publishing Company, 1822), p. 286.

[2]John Hope Franklin, From Slavery To Freedom (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Company, 1947), p. 130.

for the act to be that "divers, evil minded persons, intending to disturb the public peace did liberate..their slaves."[3] It was deemed necessary to pass the Act of 1777 to prevent any domestic insurrection because of the large number of slaves apparently roaming the countryside. This act was a countermeasure against the manumitting of slaves by the British, stating: "Where as the evil and pernicious practice of freeing slaves in this state, ought at this alarming and critical time to be guarded against by every friend and well wisher to his country."[4] The act also stated that any Negro caught roaming the countryside would be placed in jail if he did not have a registration stating he was a freedman.

Along with the problem of the British using run-away Negro slaves to whom they had promised manumission, there was the problem of colonial military setbacks. In the winter of 1777-78 the American Revolutionary cause came upon bitter times. The American army had been driven out of New York, was pursued across New Jersey, and had fled into Pennsylvania. Defeats at Brandywine, Schuylkill, and Germantown

---

[3]Catterall, Judicial Cases, II, p. 4. [4]Ibid.

gave the appearance that the American cause was on the verge of dissolution, although this view in fact was markedly modified by the American success at Saratoga at the same time in the fall of 1777.

While the British were comfortably quartered for the winter in Philadelphia, Washington's American army settled at Valley Forge. It suffered starvation, lack of clothing, and freezing temperatures. Under those conditions, deaths, desertions, and expired enlistments depleted Washington's forces from nine thousand to about "five or six thousand, of whom probably not more than half were really fit for duty." Desertions, for example, included those who "went off 'ten to fifty at a time,'" and it was reported that twenty-three hundred deserters checked into Philadelphia.[5]

As the army slowly dissolved, white enlistments became progressively more difficult to procure. To aggravate the situation further, enlistments were for short periods, generally three months. Attempts were made by Congress to recruit more white colonists for the army.

---

[5]Christopher Ward, The War of the Revolution (John Richard Alden, ed.) (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952), II, pp. 545, 550.

At this critical point, suggestions were made on recruiting Negroes into the army. The five hundred thousand Negroes in the colonies could have aided Washington.[6] The British, meanwhile, were offering Negroes freedom for joining their forces and the Negroes were enrolling by "the tens of thousands."[7]

Because of those situations it became necessary for the leaders of the country to resort to recruiting Negroes. Congress, however, not wishing to infringe upon the states, was disposed to leave the matter up to them.

Most men of foresight approved the recognition of the manumitted Negro as a soldier. Henry Laurens, in a letter to George Washington, said that if North Carolina had arms for three thousand Negroes, they could drive the British out of Georgia and east Florida in five months.[8] The

---

[6]Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, American Population Before 1790 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Company, 1932), p. 7.

[7]Lorenzo J. Greene, "Negroes in the Armed Forces of the United States, 1619 to 1865," Negro History Bulletin XIV (March, 1951), 125-126; and Benjamin Quarles, The Negro in the American Revolution (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1961), p. 119.

[8]"Henry Laurens to George Washington," Letters of

delegates from South Carolina and Georgia asked Congress to provide clothing for some battalions of manumitted Negroes who were to have white officers.[9] William Whipple, in writing to Josiah Bartlett, stated that favorable recommendations had been issued by the state legislature of South Carolina for raising regiments of Negroes. He also felt that this would lay the foundation for the manumission of the slaves. In a letter to the Rhode Island governor, the delegates from that state said that Congress had under consideration further measures for the defense of South Carolina.[10] It had been recommended to South Carolina that the state purchase the slaves, manumit them, and form them into two battalions. The purchase money for the slaves was to be paid by the national government. Congress further recommended to South Carolina and Virginia that they enlist a body of militia, including Negroes, for the defense of the southern states, with the Continental Congress underwriting

---

the Continental Congress, Edmund C. Burnett, editor (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1932), Vol. IV, p. 107.

[9]"John Fell, Diary," Ibid., p. 117.

[10]Ibid., p. 133.

the cost.[11]

General James Mitchell Varnum, one of Rhode Island's delegates to the Continental Congress in December, 1777, made two proposals to General Washington. He first recommended that Rhode Island consolidate its two battalions because they were undermanned. Varnum was convinced that a battalion of white men could not be raised in Rhode Island. Thus, he made a second proposal that slaves be recruited instead, and, if they joined, they would be manumitted. Varnum was confident that the patriot cause could be advanced by enlisting such a battalion. He also suggested that Colonel Christopher Greene, Lieutenant Colonel Olney, and Major Ward be sent home to Rhode Island to enlist this battalion. No action was taken concerning Varnum's suggestion at that time.[12]

Two months later, in February, 1778, the General Assembly of Rhode Island passed a law permitting slaves to join the American Revolutionary Army. "Every able-bodied Negro, Mulatto or Indian Man, slave in this state may enlist

---

[11] Ibid., p. 113.

[12] Robert Mazyck, George Washington and the Negro (Washington: Associate Publishers, Inc., 1932), p. 65.

into either of the two continental battalions" [to serve for the duration].[13] As a reward for enlistment, the law promised every slave all the bounties, wages, and encouragements allowed by the Continental Congress to any other soldier joining the patriot army. For the slave, however, the prospect of freedom was probably the prime inducement, because the law provided that upon his acceptance he would be immediately discharged from the service of his master or mistress and be made absolutely free, as if he had never been encumbered into servitude or slavery.[14]

Since slaves were regarded as property, another section of the Rhode Island law directed that masters be compensated for each of their Negroes who enlisted in the army. Like any other commodity, slaves were to be purchased from their owners by the state at a price not exceeding four hundred dollars for the most valuable slave. Less valuable slaves were to be paid for proportionately. A striking item in this clause reflected the difficulty of clothing in the army. Unless the master turned over his newly-manumitted

---

[13] Burnett (ed.), Letters, IV, p. 134.

[14] Greene, Negro History Bulletin, XIV, p. 128.

slave's wearing apparel to the recruiting officer, the owner would not be paid the appraisal price of his slave. For assessing the value of the slaves, a Committee of Evaluation consisting of five men, usually one from each county, was to make the determination. The committee was to examine each slave after he had passed muster and to put a price on him according to his value. The enlisting officer was to give to the owner of the slave a certificate which would forever discharge the Negro from his service, and thus manumit him.[15]

The success of the recruitment of Negroes in Rhode Island was evidenced in the Battle of Newport in August, 1778. "A newly raised Rhode Island all-Negro regiment under Colonel Christopher Greene especially distinguished itself by 'desperate valor,' repelling three successive 'furious onsets' of the Hessians."[16]

It was felt by some that manumitted slave troops would be regarded by the enemy with contempt and would not

---

[15] Ibid., p. 133.

[16] Ward, War of the Revolution, II, p. 592, citing Thomas C. Amory, The Military Services and Public Life of Major-General John Sullivan (Boston, 1868), p. 82.

be regarded as equal to their troops and that it would be impossible to secure an equal exchange of prisoners, a white British or Hessian soldier for a manumitted Negro soldier. However, since both armies used Negroes and Indians, as well as white troops, this contention was open to question. Legislatures also contended that the enlistment of Negro troops would convey the impression to the enemy that the Americans were not able to get their own people to bear arms, thus bringing upon the American troops the same ridicule that was heaped upon Lord Dunmore, who, at the beginning of the Revolution, had so freely enlisted Negroes in Virginia.[17]

In the first months of the war, the British and Tory writers poked fun at the complexion of the American army in jingles such as the following:

> The rebel clowns, oh what a sight
> Too awkward was their figure
> 'Twas yonder stood a pious wight
> And here and there a nigger.[18]

The state of Virginia furnished four military units to wage war against the British: the continental line for

---

[17] From notes taken in a class under Dr. Lorenzo J. Greene, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo., 1952.

[18] Ibid.

service in the continental army, the state line, the state militia, and the state navy. Negroes, slave and manumitted, fought in each of these branches, with the largest number serving in the navy. Dr. Benjamin Quarles asserts that probably one out of every ten sailors of African descent in the Virginia navy was a free man, enlisting of his own accord. He also states that the remainder were slaves, many of whom were enlisted in the guise of free men as substitutes for their masters.[19]

The British in Georgia had also promised slaves freedom if the slaves would join their troops. One-third of the men by whom Fort Cornwallis was garrisoned at the siege of Augusta were manumitted Negroes loyal to the British. There were many similar situations throughout the colonies where the British used manumitted slaves to further their cause.[20]

The bid for Negroes during the war had the effect of liberalizing the policy of colonists toward manumitting slaves for war duty. This effect also had significant

---

[19] Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution, p. 91.

[20] Ibid., p. 149.

influences on judicial cases concerning manumission during the years following the war, 1780 to 1790.

New York offered to manumit any slave who would serve in the army for three years, and the owners were given a land bounty for their slaves.[21] New Hampshire offered Negro soldiers the same bounty it was giving to whites, and the owners were given bounties as payment for the freedom of their slaves.[22] Congress recommended that three thousand Negroes be recruited in Georgia and South Carolina, with the continental government paying not over a thousand dollars for each slave recruited, and at the end of the war the slave was to be manumitted and given fifty dollars.[23] This plan was rejected by South Carolina and Georgia. In May of 1782 Virginia passed a law to authorize the manumission of slaves who had faithfully served in the army.[24]

After the Revolutionary War only three instances of manumission of slaves for war services were recorded in

---

[21]Edward Channing, A History of the United States (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937), Vol. III, p. 560.

[22]Franklin, From Slavery To Freedom, p. 134.

[23]Ibid., p. 135.

[24]Woodson, Negro in Our History, p. 125.

Georgia.[25] One such case was David Monday, a Negro slave. Monday was appraised at a hundred guineas and this amount was ordered to be paid by the state to his owner. Another manumission case was that of a mulatto named Austin Dabney. Austin was praised for his action against the British. The Georgian commendation for Austin stated that his actions would have honored any freeman. It also asserted that he would be manumitted and entitled to all the liberties, privileges, and immunities of a free citizen so far as free Negroes and mulattoes were allowed. Austin had been disabled through his services and, therefore, was paid the same pension received by other disabled veterans.[26]

Virginia initiated changes in its manumission laws after the Revolutionary War. An important change was the repeal of the Act of 1723, which provided that no Negroes, mulattoes, or Indian slaves could be set free, upon any pretence, except for some meritorious services.[27] In 1777 the Virginia assembly manumitted a slave owned by John Barr.

---

[25]Greene, Negro History Bulletin, XIV, p. 137.

[26]Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution, p. 75.

[27]Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 72.

The slave had performed meritorious service in the army. In 1779 and 1780 other slaves were manumitted by the assembly for the same reason. In one of those cases a slave named Kitt was manumitted for giving information against several persons engaged in counterfeiting money.[28]

A more liberal manumission act was passed by the Virginia assembly in 1782.[29] This act authorized slaveholders the right to manumit their slaves if they so desired. In 1783 an act was passed which provided complete manumission for each slave who, by the direction of his owner, had enlisted in any unit that had been raised in Virginia, or for any slave who joined any unit as a substitute for any free person and had been discharged.[30] The Revolutionary War philosophy was manifested in the act by this passage: "Whereas it appears just and reasonable that all persons enlisted contributed towards the establishment of American liberty and independence, should enjoy the blessing of freedom as a reward for their toils and labours."[31]

---

[28] Ibid. [29] Ibid.

[30] Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution, p. 183.

[31] Greene, Negro History Bulletin, XIV, p. 140.

In 1786 a slave named James was manumitted under the Act of 1782. With the permission of his master, James had entered the service of the Marquis La Fafayette and, at the peril of his life, had gone into a British camp and faithfully executed an important commission entrusted to him by La Fafayette.[32]

The revolutionary philosophy that all men are created equal began taking effect through the activities of groups and individuals who began to organize manumission and anti-slavery societies after the war. The Quakers, who had organized the first society in 1769, were joined by many other groups.

The Quakers had continually petitioned legislatures to pass acts which would better facilitate manumission procedures. In 1769 a committee of Quakers comprising the leading men of the Society was appointed to collect information and to visit all slaveholding Friends to "dissuade them from the practice of keeping slaves."[33] The report of this committee was made before the Quaker yearly meeting, and it

---

[32]Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution, p. 186.

[33]Stephen B. Weeks, Southern Quakers and Slavery (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1896), pp. 206-209.

showed that the majority of the Quakers who were interviewed had expressed unwillingness to comply with the advice. In 1773 the Quakers met this challenge head-on by proclaiming that it desired its members to manumit their slaves. In 1776 the yearly meeting emphasized to all its members that they should "cleanse" their hands of slaves as soon as possible. Also, the members were no longer allowed to participate in any activity which would perpetuate or prolong the institution of slavery. If any member refused to follow the instructions, he was to be disowned by the Society.[34] Hence, from the end of the Revolutionary War it was clearly settled in the new United States that Quakers were working for the manumission of slaves.

The Quakers in Virginia were instrumental in petitioning the legislature to pass a manumission Act of 1782.[35] More than a decade before this act was passed, Quakers had made provisions in their wills desiring manumission of their slaves. The law of 1782 aided the slaveholding Quakers who desired to manumit their slaves by will after their death or those Quakers who desired to acknowledge some action on

---

[34] Ibid. [35] Ibid., p. 212.

manumission while they were alive. However, the Quakers had to agree in an open court that they would provide support for the aged, the ill, and young persons to be manumitted. Those slaves who could not take care of themselves were not to be manumitted.[36] This desire for manumission in wills was involved in the judicial cases of Pleasants v. Pleasants, 1776; Mayo v. Carrington, 1791; and Charles v. Hunnicutt, 1781.[37]

The most topical case demonstrating this future desire of the Quakers for manumission of their slaves was Pleasants v. Pleasants. In this case the will of John Pleasants, dated August 11, 1771, stated that his slaves would be manumitted when they reached thirty years of age, if the laws of the land allowed them to be free. He also desired that any future children of his slaves were to be manumitted, if the laws of the land allowed them to be free. Pleasants willed his slaves to his son, John, with the provision that he was to carry out his father's request, if

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Pleasants v. Pleasants, 2 Call 319, May 1799; Mayo v. Carrington, 4 Call 472, November 1791; Charles v. Hunnicutt, 5 Call 311, October 1804: Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, pp. 105, 98, 109.

future laws granted manumission. In May, 1799, his son opposed the will in court. The court held that there were peculiar circumstances because of the desire to manumit slaves on a future law which would emancipate them. John's father had had a hope that such a law would be enacted. The court also held that if such a law was enacted, the slaves would be manumitted regardless of who owned them or their offsprings. The court decreed that limited manumission, according to the modification in the will, would be carried out. The court further stated that all slaves above thirty years old would be manumitted after the claims of the creditors were settled. The court commented further that the county would not permit manumission of slaves who could not take care of themselves, or slaves which the county would have to support. The court concluded the case by stating:

> . . . and when their freedom shall severally take effect according to this decree, there shall be delivered to each of them, by their respective masters and mistresses, a certificate, written or printed, attesting their freedom, in such form as shall be directed by the said High Court of Chancery. That no account ought to be taken of profits, it being unusual in such cases, and less reasonable in this very difficult one.[38]

---

[38] Pleasants v. Pleasants, 2 Call 319, May 1799, Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 105.

The effectiveness of the manumission movement was determined by military, sociological, and economic elements; the sociological element was mainly manifested in the abolition movement during this period. As early as 1774, largely through the influence of the Quakers, the first anti-slavery society was organized in Philadelphia, with Benjamin Franklin as its president. Along with the influence of the Quakers, the Americans had to reflect the philosophy of liberty which they had preached to the British. This philosophy was brought out in the denunciation of slavery by many outstanding patriots in America. John Adams thought that "every measure of prudence ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States."[39] Thomas Jefferson denounced the system as endangering the principle of liberty on which the state was founded; however, he maintained that the black race and the white race could never live together in a state of freedom. He desired slaves manumitted by process of laws to depart Virginia by a specified time or lose the right of manumission.[40]

---

[39]Benjamin Brawley, A Short History of the American Negro (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945), p. 22.

[40]Nathan Schachner, Thomas Jefferson (New York:

In 1776, Jefferson, George Wythe, and others were appointed to revise the laws of Virginia. Jefferson made a serious attempt to have a plan of manumission written into the laws of Virginia. The plan provided that "slaves imported into the State should be set free and that slaves already in the State might be emancipated (manumitted) by deed or by will."[41] The legislature did not approve the plan. This demonstrates, however, that important men were thinking about manumission, and by 1782 a more liberal manumission act was passed in Virginia.

The New York Society for Promoting the Manumission of Slaves was organized in 1785 with John Jay as president. In Delaware a similar society was set up in 1788, and by 1792 there were anti-slavery societies in every state from Massachusetts to Virginia. Some of the societies sought to prevent slave trade; others were concerned with deportation of Negroes. Most of the societies envisioned a scheme, however remote, of complete abolition of slavery. Local societies collected information on slavery and published reports

---

Thomas Yoseloff, 1957), p. 205.

[41]Channing, History of the United States, Vol. III, p. 557.

on the progress of emancipation. Others published orations and addresses designed to arouse public sentiment against slavery.[42]

Pennsylvania, in 1780, was the first state to make provisions for the gradual abolition of slavery. The Pennsylvania law provided that from that year forward no slave would be held in bondage after he became twenty-eight years old. Prior to the slave's twenty-eighth birthday, he was to be treated as an indentured servant or as an apprentice. The indentured servant clause of this act initiated judicial cases in which slaveholders attempted to disregard the notation that slaves were to obtain their freedom upon reaching the age of twenty-eight years. In 1788 another manumission act was passed requiring all masters of slaves under twenty-eight to register them.[43]

Delaware, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Maryland also attempted gradual manumission acts. State manumission movements in most cases initiated efforts to procure the

---

[42]Herbert Aptheker, The Negro in the Abolition Movement (New York: International Publishers, 1940), p. 8.

[43]Channing, History of the United States, III, pp. 559-560.

removal of restraints on manumissions. This procedure had already been provided in Connecticut, 1777, and in Virginia, 1782. In Maryland and Delaware the attempts toward gradual manumission were not successfully accepted by their legislatures, and they gave way to the milder measure of facilitating manumission.

In Delaware a bill for the gradual abolition of slavery was introduced in January, 1786; after consideration it was replaced by a bill for furthering manumission. This bill was postponed until the following June and finally dropped. The following year an act was passed permitting manumission by will or other written instrument. Manumission could be obtained also without security which was furnished by the master in the cases of slaves between eighteen and thirty-five years of age. The slaves had to be sound in mind and body and capable of self-support. Under this law many manumissions were made by wills.[44]

Between 1785 and 1791 various bills to provide for the gradual abolition of slavery were introduced in the

---

[44]John Clark Ridpath, The New Complete History of the United States of America (Chicago: Jones Press, 1918), Vol. VI, p. 2827.

Maryland legislature. They were supported by John Carroll of Carrollton and William Pinckney, but the bills were defeated. A bill to make it easier for Maryland owners to free their slaves, although supported by Pinckney, was lost in 1788, but another for the same purpose was passed two years later.[45] During the period between 1770 and 1790 there was a noticeable increase in the number of slaves manumitted. Manumission by will or otherwise during the last illness of the master, which had been forbidden in 1772, was allowed by the Act of 1796. Three years before this act was passed, in the judicial case of Negroes Peter and Others v. Elliott, an attempt was made to petition for freedom on a deed of manumission after the death of their master.[46] Their master had properly executed a deed of manumission, but it was done during his last illness, only eleven days before his death. Two weeks earlier he had spoken of manumission as desirable, but as an injury to the public. He had since, he said, changed his mind, and his

---

[45] Phillips, American Negro Slavery, p. 121.

[46] Negroes Peter and Others v. Elliott, 2 Har. and MCH. 199, November 1793, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, pp. 51-52.

conscience would not rest until he had freed his slaves. The magistrate testified to the manumitter's soundness of mind, but the general court held that freedom could not be granted because a manumission was made void when executed by a person during his last sickness. The case was appealed, but the court of appeals confirmed the decision of the lower court.

Manumission acts were also passed in New Jersey, 1786; New York, 1785 and 1788; Kentucky, 1798 and 1800; and Tennessee, 1801. Rhode Island, in 1784, included a clause in her gradual emancipation act providing for voluntary manumission; in Connecticut the process of voluntary manumission, permitted since 1777, was further facilitated in 1784 and 1792. The chief feature of these acts, as in the case of Delaware and Maryland, was the endeavor to prevent the manumitted slave from being a public charge. In Rhode Island the manumitter was still liable for maintenance unless the slave manumitted was between eighteen and forty years of age and capable of self-support. In New Jersey in 1786 the age limits were twenty-one and thirty-five years of age. In New York slaves could be manumitted with security until fifty years of age. In Connecticut, novel conditions were

introduced: the good character of the slave, the real advantage for the slave, and the slave's desire for manumission.

In 1783 Massachusetts abolished slavery by asserting that the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 discountenanced the institution by saying, "All men are born free and equal." Quork Walker, a Negro slave, sued his master, Jennison, for freedom on these grounds and won his case in 1781. With the decision rendered by this case, the manumission procedure in Massachusetts advanced successfully.[47]

Virginia and North Carolina enacted legislation which facilitated the efforts of slaveholders to manumit their slaves during the period between 1780 and 1790.

It was relatively easy for the northern states, where many historians claim slavery was unprofitable, for manumission laws to be effectively legislated. In the South, however, slaves were quite numerous, and many slaveholders probably felt that manumitting the Negro would not only shake the economic and social system to its foundation

---

[47] Quork Walker v. Jennison, Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc. 1873-75, 296, September 1781, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, pp. 479-480.

but would substitute a Negro problem for a slave problem. Consequently, the sociological element mentioned at the beginning of this chapter manifested itself in the manumission movement after the Revolutionary War.

Prior to and immediately following the Revolutionary War the economic status of slavery was on the decline, and slavery was losing ground as an American economic institution. For years many Southerners of foresight were abolitionists before the people of the North had hardly begun to think of the slavery question and manumission. Both Washington and Jefferson were opposed to slavery and deplored its existence. They considered it uneconomic, but they did not know what to do about it. Washington hoped that some form of gradual emancipation would be adopted, and Jefferson proposed the colonization of the Negroes in areas outside of Virginia. Harold Underwood Faulkner states: "Slavery fulfilled an economic need, and as long as this continued it prospered. Toward the time of the Revolution, when the tobacco farms were wearing out, slavery fell into disfavor."[48] This economic strain upon the slaveholders resulted

---

[48]Harold Underwood Faulkner, American Economic

in aiding the manumission movement. Such was the case of John Horsfield. Desiring to leave financial aid to his daughters, Horsfield provided in his will that his two Negro slaves earn money for his daughters by working fifteen years. The money earned by the Negroes was to be equally divided among his daughters, and the slaves were then to be manumitted.[49]

By the end of the Revolutionary War the ideology of the struggle that had been so clearly defined and so loudly proclaimed at the outset had been dimmed and muffled in many ways by the grim and practical realities of the war. And yet some forces had been set in motion that operated to effect a change in the status of persons, and these had reached down to the manumitted Negro. It is no mere coincidence that when the Battle of Lexington was fought the first anti-slavery society was just beginning to formulate its plans for action. This and similar organizations reflected the social implications of the revolutionary philosophy

---

History (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1939), p. 78.

[49] State v. Anderson, I Cox 36, September 1790, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, pp. 322-323.

acting upon the minds of the people. Almost every state enlisting slaves to serve in the army either freed them at the outset or promised manumission at the end of service. The records of several states in the 1870's abound in deeds of manumission of Negro soldiers and their families. While the number is undeterminable, it is not difficult to conclude that hundreds, if not thousands, of slaves secured manumission at the end of the war.

The ideological principles which were manifested and clearly proclaimed at the outset of the war changed to meet the existing circumstances in America. Consequently, the manumission movement was affected by military, sociological, and economic factors, which, in turn, were influenced by the American Revolutionary War. This is evident by the growth of anti-slavery attitudes such as the Quakers' abolition movement, the liberal Virginia Act of 1782, the economic problems shown in the declining farm prices which stimulated manumission, and, finally, the Declaration of Independence, which declared: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness." The

American Revolutionary War and the philosophy connected with the war thus had both a direct and an indirect effect upon the manumission movement.

CHAPTER IV

MANUMISSIONS AND THE FEAR OF SERVILE INSURRECTIONS

This chapter is an evaluation of judicial cases and legislation concerning manumissions in conjunction with the historical record on servile insurrections or threats of these revolts in the ante-bellum South. Was there an increased or decreased frequency of manumissions depending upon the occurrence of servile insurrections or threats of them? This subject is discussed further in Chapter V.

Various types of evidence indicate that the people in certain southern sections suffered from psychological fear of their slaves which was not always justified by actual situations of fear or danger. This fear psychosis emphasized the potentialities of danger in the slave system, and when there were these signs or fears of servile insurrections, fewer judicial cases exist in which manumissions were granted. However, during periods of peace in areas not bothered with servile insurrections, manumission cases in the courts usually resulted in favorable action.

In addition to this direct relationship between

number of manumissions granted and the conditions of slave revolts or lack of them, the legal status of the manumitted Negro in the South also depended in a large measure on the attitude of the white citizens. This attitude was reflected in the laws which were passed affecting manumissions. If there were peace in the community and if the slave system seemed unchallenged, the legal status of the manumitted Negro was raised considerably. This peace also aided in the increase of manumissions, not only because of a cessation of legislation restricting manumission activities but also in a relaxation in the enforcement of the laws regulating manumissions. Hence, important aspects in the legal status of manumissions were those directly related to disciplinary measures taken in time of panic, following rumors or fears of a servile insurrection, or those directly related to conditions of easement, following periods of servile tranquility.

The effects of the servile insurrections and conspiracies in many ways influenced ante-bellum southern life and history. Such was the case in 1803 when Southerners became aroused and appealed for the annexation of Louisiana in order to take it out of the hands of a possibly hostile

and apparently revolutionary France, which might use that possession as a means of arousing slave rebellion in the United States. Similar arguments were used to justify the annexation of Texas and Florida.[1]

The possibility of slave rebellion in the arming of slaves during the Revolutionary War by the American government caused the South much anxiety. When, for example, South Carolina learned that the Continental Congress was seriously contemplating the wholesale arming of the slaves to fight the British, with future manumission understood, she threatened to withdraw from the contest with England and return to a colonial status.[2] The selection of George Washington as commander of the revolutionary forces was promoted by the desire to make the war appear as a unified effort on the part of New England and the South.[3] The South preferred to keep its militia at home because of the constant fear of insurrection and because of the British promise to manumit slaves who would join their forces. This fear of slave

---

[1]Herbert Aptheker, Negro Slave Revolts in the United States (New York: International Publishers, 1943), p. 61.

[2]Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution, p. 65.

[3]Woodson, Negro in Our History, p. 122.

employment in the war also became a subject of importance in other colonies. From the beginning of hostilities in 1775 the question of arming the Negro, slave and manumitted, consistently bothered patriots. The fear of slave insurrections had caused the colonists to exclude Negroes from militia service. This fright of insurrection had caused the whites to pass numerous laws regulating the movements and the lives of Negroes. Therefore, the principle of arming the Negro required some thought on the part of the white population in areas where the Negro was in the majority. This fear was clearly demonstrated when John Murray, Earl of Dunmore and royal governor of Virginia, in an effort to keep that colony loyal to the British by attempting to prevent munitions from getting into the hands of the patriots at Williamsburg, sent a troop of marines to seize the munitions and stated: "By the living God, if any insult is offered to me, or those who have obeyed my orders, I will declare freedom to the slaves and lay the town [Williamsburg] in ashes!"[4] This statement probably alarmed the slaveholders in Virginia and served as a warning of servile insurrections.

---

[4]Ward, War of the Revolution, II, p. 845.

"The colonists [wrote a contemporary] were struck with horror."[5] Dunmore, to further antagonize the colonists, notified the British government that he planned to organize a force of Indians and Negroes to compel the colony of Virginia to submit to his authority.[6]

The presence of British troops in America and the existence of the war had an unsettling effect on slavery in the South. Slaves ran away in large numbers even if they had no intention of reaching the British lines. With slaves roaming the countryside and with knowledge that the British promised manumission to any slave who joined the British forces, southern colonies found it necessary to regulate and control manumissions to prevent a greater number of slaves and manumitted slaves from congregating to formulate revolt plots. To handle this situation in the states of Maryland and South Carolina, delegations petitioned the legislatures for munitions and forces to put down any servile insurrection. In North Carolina the fear of servile insurrection was heightened because it was believed the British had

---

[5]Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution, p. 20.

[6]Ward, War of the Revolution, II, p. 845.

ordered that all slaves who put their masters to death would come into possession of their master's plantation.[7]

> These insurrections [a Virginian wrote during a period of panic] have alarmed my wife so as really to endanger her health, and I have not slept without anxiety in three months. Our nights are sometimes spent in listening to noises. A corn song, or a hog call, has often been the subject of nervous terror, and a cat, in the dining room, will banish sleep for the night. There has been and there still is a panic in all this country. . . . There is no principle of life. . . . Death is autocrat of slave regions.[8]

This fear of servile insurrection made Southerners do strange things. Two poor whites told Frederick Law Olmsted how it was in the South's palmiest days:

> Where I use to live (Alabama) [the husband said], I remember when I was a boy--mus' ha' been about twenty years ago--folks was dreadful frightened about the niggers. I remember they built pens in the woods where they could hide, and Christmas time they went and got into the pens 'fraid the niggers was rising. [This man's wife had seen similar scenes.] I remember [she said] the same time where we was in South Carolina, we had all our things put in a bag so we could tote 'em, if we heard they was coming our way.[9]

The fear of the slave in South Carolina can be

---

[7]Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution, p. 14.

[8]Lerone Bennett, Jr., Before the Mayflower (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1962), p. 100.

[9]Frederick Law Olmsted, The Cotton Kingdom (Arthur M. Schlesinger, ed.) (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), pp. 380-381.

easily understood since the slaves out-numbered the whites two to one.[10]

Many historians disagree regarding the importance of servile insurrections and the contentedness of the Negro in slavery.[11] One historian relates that the good feeling between master and slave was promoted in large measure by the happy disposition and docile temperament of the Negro. He further comments that the Negro was seldom discontented and rarely harbored a grudge against his master for depriving him of his liberty.[12] However, another historian challenges this point of view by listing two hundred and fifty slave revolts and conspiracies within the area of the continental United States.[13]

The fact that whites in South Carolina were fewer in

---

[10]Lawrence Henry Gipson, The Coming of the Revolution (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954), p. 147.

[11]Stanley M. Elkins, Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), Chap. I., for a comparison of views.

[12]Oliver Perry Chitwood, A History of Colonial America (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1948), p. 426.

[13]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, p. 11.

number than the Negro slaves may have been behind the reason there were no judicial manumission cases in its courts until 1792. The first rebellion in which Negroes were "actually armed and embodied" took place in South Carolina in 1730. Within the year 1739 there were three insurrections in this colony, and in one of these six houses were burned and twenty-five white persons were killed. The Negroes were pursued and fourteen were shot at once; within the next two days twenty more were killed and twice as many captured.[14]

This fear must have influenced the desires of slaveholders to keep closer control of their slaves rather than to manumit them. This same fear was perpetuated during the following year in South Carolina when the most formidable insurrection during the colonial period occurred. A number of Negroes assembled at Stono, surprised and killed two young men in a warehouse, and took guns and ammunition. Having elected as captain one of their number named Cato, they proceeded to march twelve miles toward the southwest, burning or plundering each house to which they came and spreading desolation. The Negroes stopped in an open field

---

[14]Brawley, Short History of the American Negro, p. 15.

to rejoice in their success by drinking and dancing. This allowed the militia time to surround the insurrectionists, and a battle between the two groups occurred. The militia won the battle. Thus, again this fear of servile insurrections reduced manumissions because the people of that colony were struck with terror by this uprising in which more than twenty white persons lost their lives.[15] To better regulate the lives of slaves after the Cato insurrection, South Carolina's legislature passed laws which it felt would tighten the control of slavery. Although these laws were difficult to enforce, other Gulf States used them as a foundation for their own servitude regulations.[16]

During the years of insurrections in South Carolina, other colonies were not free of a like danger. Therefore, during this period, greater emphasis was placed upon regulating the lives of slaves. This, in turn, regulated manumissions.

---

[15]Miles Brewton and others, "The Evil Deeds of the Spaniards (1702-1740)," Building of the Republic, 1689-1783, ed. Albert Bushnell Hart (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938), pp. 43-44, for the best contemporary source for this insurrection; Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, pp. 187-188; and Franklin, From Slavery To Freedom, p. 79.

[16]Phillips, American Negro Slavery, pp. 492-493.

A servile insurrection which occurred in Maryland during the spring of 1738 demonstrates how judicial cases and laws played an important role in manumission procedures. Several slaves broke out of a jail in Prince George's County, united themselves with a group of outlying Negroes, and proceeded to wage a small-scale guerrilla war. The colony's council decided that the magistrates of the affected area had not exerted themselves sufficiently and instructed the sheriff to put down the trouble, empowering him to use the entire strength of the county if necessary.[17]

The next year this same Maryland council was told that some of the escaped slaves and other slaves were planning to establish their own government after capturing the town's magazine and the capitol. On the Sunday appointed for the revolt a storm occurred, and the event was postponed for two weeks. At that point a slave belonging to a Mr. Brookes betrayed the plot, and immediate measures of repression were taken that included the execution of at least one of the leading rebels.[18]

---

[17]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, p. 191; and Brackett, Negro in Maryland, p. 76.

[18]Ibid.

In January, 1740, other Negroes were brought to trial. The judicial proceedings brought out how the slaves had planned to possess the whole country. Fear of another insurrection must have been great, because the court was asked to have a "speedy Tryal of the Said Offenders."[19] Slaveholders lived under constant fear of slave insurrection, a fear manifested in laws limiting manumissions.

The first manumission law to correct the situation which arose in the servile insurrection of 1740 was enacted in 1752. This law did not allow slaveholders to manumit slaves if the slaves could not support themselves. Slaves that were manumitted had to be physically sound, capable of working, and not over fifty years of age. This also prevented slaveholders from turning loose slaves the masters found no longer profitable. Also, to better regulate manumissions and to provide a uniform plan, it was decreed that all manumissions had to be in writing, under hand and seal, with two witnesses; the papers had to be acknowledged and endorsed by a justice and then recorded within six months in

---

[19] Brackett, Negro in Maryland, p. 149; and Re Negro Conspiracy, 28 Md. Arch. 188, January 1740, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 35.

the appropriate county clerk's office.[20] The slaveholders' fear generated by the servile insurrection, the judicial case, and the legislative action thus combined and resulted in policies regulating manumissions.

Because of the fear of servile insurrections, some slaveholders encouraged their slaves to reveal such plots and offered the promise of manumission as an incentive. In 1710 the assembly freed a slave, Will, for "his fidelity" in discovering a conspiracy of diverse Negros..for levying war in this colony."[21] According to Aptheker's[22] chronological list of slave revolts, there were eight servile insurrections in Virginia from 1644 to 1694. The dates listed for these insurrections were 1644, 1663, 1672, 1680, 1687, 1688, 1690, and 1694. The servile insurrections must have created waves of panic for the slaveholders, and they must have discussed among themselves the question of manumission. They could have drawn a conclusion that the manumitted slave was behind these insurrections. To justify this observation,

---

[20]Brackett, Negro in Maryland, p. 149.

[21]Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 72.

[22]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, p. 71.

the writer points to the Virginia Act of 1691, which provided "that no negro..be..set free by any person..unless such person..pay for the transportation of such negro..out of the country within six months after."[23] With numerous servile insurrections occurring, the slaveholders had to find some way to control those Negroes not under their immediate control.

Aptheker[24] also lists two servile insurrections in Virginia in 1722 and 1723, and, in turn, Catterall cites an act limiting manumissions. The act provided "that no negro, mullato, or indian slaves, shall be set free, upon any pretence whatsoever, except for some meritorious services, to be adjudged and allowed by the governor and council, for the time being, and a licence there upon first had had and obtained."[25] Therefore, there is a definite relationship between servile insurrections and manumissions as related in the chronological list of Aptheker and in the manumission laws cited by Catterall.

---

[23]Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 72.

[24]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, p. 71.

[25]Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 72.

There has never been an adequate investigation to ascertain the effect of the fear of servile insurrection upon the mind of the southern whites; therefore, assumptions based upon laws regulating manumissions and upon judicial cases which correspond with the periods of insurrections must be scrutinized to formulate a given pattern between insurrections and manumissions. It was not the function of this thesis to evaluate servile insurrections. The attempt was to uncover the trends in opinions, judicial decisions, and servile insurrections which stimulated or motivated prevention of manumission or promotion of manumission. This topic is discussed further in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

A SURVEY OF MANUMISSION CASES BETWEEN 1790 AND 1832

In the foregoing pages attention has been centered largely upon the manumission movement to 1790. The movement to manumit slaves by will, deed, and legislative enactment was well under way before the opening of the nineteenth century. The closing years of the colonial period witnessed the practice of freeing Negro slaves in the last will and testament of the slaveholder, as in the case of Joseph Mayo, who stated:

> It is my most earnest request, that the gentlemen who shall be named and appointed executors of this my last will, petition the general assembly for leave to set free all and every one of the slaves of which I may die possessed, on account of their services to me whilst alive, and I entreat my said executors to leave nothing undone which may be requisite for obtaining the manumission of said slaves.[1]

To the Negro in bonds, the institution of slavery must have been one long night with little hope of day.[2] His

---

[1] Mayo v. Carrington, 4 Call 472, November 1791, Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 98.

[2] Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), Chap. II.

highest impulses, his tenderest emotions, and every incentive to noble endeavor felt the effects of the slave system. He might have worked in the field from sunrise to sunset, but none of the fruits of his labor belonged to him. He might cherish the instincts of a father, only to see his child torn from his arms forever. Kenneth M. Stampp relates the reaction to slavery by a former slave who stated: "Tisn't he who has stood and looked on, that can tell you what slavery is,--'tis he who has endured. I am black, but I had the feelings of a man as well as any man."[3] This desire of the slave for manumission was usually present as long as the slave was in bondage. "The passionate desire for liberty exists in the bosom of every slave--whether the recent captive, or him to whom bondage has become a habit."[4] A Negro could visualize only three ways to escape the status of slavery: by regular manumission, by running away, or by open revolt. Two of these means of escape, regular manumission and open revolt, are discussed in this chapter.

The years from 1790 to 1832 were marked by servile

---

[3]Stampp, Peculiar Institution, p. 430.

[4]Lockett v. Merchants Insurance Co., 10 Rob. La. 339, March 1845, Catterall, Judicial Cases, III, p. 568.

insurrections, fears by the white society of servile plots, the African colonization movement, abolitionism, war with Great Britain, American economic and social problems, and the question of manumission. And, that question of manumission was continuously interwoven within the framework of those other activities. Manumissions were granted during the periods of peace, and manumission cases were limited during periods of actual servile insurrections or periods of fear of servile insurrections. Also, this fear of servile insurrection was not constant; it grew so intense at certain times as to amount to a panic or hallucination, then subsided until another stimulus was provided.

1790 TO 1800

The period from 1790 to 1800 was one of those storm centers of fear based on servile insurrections.

American independence was closely followed by the French Revolution with its doctrines of fraternity, liberty, and equality. Moved by the logic of events and consistency, France eventually extended these principles to the slaves of Santo Domingo, who received them with joy. The Negroes' enjoyment of liberty was short-lived, however, because the

slaveholding whites of the island protested against the liberal doctrine of fraternity, liberty, and equality for all Frenchmen regardless of color. The liberal principles of brotherhood were withdrawn by the French government. This action initiated arguments which ultimately ended in fights between the races. Thus confusion and bloodshed spread into the great slave insurrection of Santo Domingo in 1793. Toussaint Louverture, a Haitian slave, was the leader of the Negro forces which defeated the French forces.[5]

During this insurrection over ten thousand "emigres" from the island fled to the southern states, each bringing tales of the horror from whence he fled along with new elements of fear of slave uprisings. Many Negroes escaping the disturbed condition in Haiti immigrated to the seaports of Baltimore, Norfolk, Charleston, and New Orleans, where they sowed the seed of insurrection from which came indirectly most of the Negro uprisings in the United States.[6]

---

[5]Thomas Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958), pp. 106-108; and Bennett, Before the Mayflower, pp. 104-111.

[6]Clement Eaton, Freedom of Thought in the Old South (Durham: Duke University Press, 1940), p. 89; and Carter G. Woodson and Charles H. Wesley, Negro Makers of History (Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1958), p. 83.

For more than a decade, beginning in 1791, many Americans were more concerned with the events in Haiti than with the life-and-death struggle that was going on between France and England. Despite the fact that southern states wanted more slaves, they were afraid to import them. This anti-slave-trade agitation by the South was prompted by the many reports brought to that section by whites who had escaped from Haiti. The fear that some of the slaves imported from the West Indies were identical with some of those who were involved in the Haitian insurrection prompted the Georgia legislature on December 19, 1793, to pass an act which forbade the importation of slaves from the West Indies, the Bahamas, and Florida. In 1792 South Carolina found it inexpedient to allow Negroes from Africa, the West India Islands, or other places to enter for two years. In 1794 North Carolina passed an act to prevent further importation of slaves into the state. Virginia and Maryland strengthened their non-importation laws. In 1793 the first fugitive slave law was enacted by Congress. It empowered the master of an interstate fugitive to seize him wherever found, carry him before any federal or state magistrate in the vicinity, and obtain a certificate warranting his

removal to the state from which he fled. This law allowed no trial by jury and required conviction only on the oral testimony of the claimant or on an affidavit certified by a magistrate of the state from which the Negro was alleged to have fled.[7]

During the period between 1790 and 1800 Catterall records thirty judicial cases in Virginia. Only four of these dealt with manumission.[8] The servile insurrection in Northampton County in 1792 was caused by a military commander's orders and might have caused public fear of manumitted slaves. The commander attempted to check some of the privileges of the newly-manumitted slaves and to restrict the privileges of the slaves. Appointed patrols from each company of the militia were directed to patrol as often as possible and the captain and commanding officers of the companies were requested to make sure assigned tasks were carried out. This operation prevented manumitted Negroes and slaves

---

[7] Phillips, American Negro Slavery, pp. 131-133.

[8] Mayo v. Carrington, 4 Call 472, November 1791; Shelton v. Barbour, 2 Wash. Va. 64, Spring 1795; Fairclaim v. Guthrie, 1 Call 7, April 1797; Pleasants v. Pleasants, 2 Call 319, May 1799; Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, pp. 98, 103-106.

from going place to place at will. The Negroes decided to revolt against these measures. Six Negroes armed themselves with clubs and waylaid and attacked the patrols. The patrols escaped unharmed, but the fear of such attacks stimulated the action to suppress any servile insurrection before it was allowed to develop. The Negroes were captured the next day, tried for their lives, condemned, and executed. On May 5, 1792, the county lieutenant of Northampton wrote a letter to the governor stating what had happened and that there was no public ammunition in the county. He requested that the governor send one hundred pounds of powder and four hundred pounds of lead.[9]

Servile insurrections in Haiti and then in Virginia must have played an important role in developing the thoughts of Virginia slaveholders concerning manumissions.

It is difficult to find manumission cases granted during this period; however, of those cases listed by Catterall, the majority of the manumission cases were in the upper South and in the Middle States. Consequently, this

---

[9]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, pp. 211-212; and Harvey Wish, "American Slave Insurrections Before 1861," Journal of Negro History, XXII (July, 1937), 205-206.

demonstrates that when servile insurrections or periods of fear of servile insurrections occurred, manumission cases were fewer, and that in states where there was no fear of servile insurrections, more manumission cases were listed. To substantiate this viewpoint, the writer uses a portion of the chronological list of slave revolts which Aptheker[10] documents. Aptheker is not concerned with the manumission; his interest is in slave revolts. The listing below illustrates that slave revolts during this period occurred in the deep South, and, as previously stated, Catterall lists few manumission cases in that section at this particular time. It is to be noted that there were fewer servile insurrections in the upper South and in the Northeast states. In these areas Catterall cites more manumission cases (see appendixes A and B).

Date	Locality of Revolt
1791 . . .	La.
1792 . . .	La., N. C., Va.
1793 . . .	S. C., Va.
1795 . . .	La., N. C.
1796 . . .	Ga., N. C., N. J., N. Y., S. C.
1797 . . .	S. C., Va.
1798 . . .	S. C.
1799 . . .	Va.

[10]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, pp. 71-72.

In one of the four manumission cases in Virginia a slave attempted to sue for his freedom under the action of "trespass, assault and battery and false imprisonment."[11] The lower court granted manumission, but when the case was heard by a higher court, the decision was reversed and manumission was denied. In another of the four, John Guthrie willed James Guthrie his slaves. Jeany was to be manumitted if she gave birth to ten live children. There was no record of Jeany's securing manumission.[12]

Maryland did not have any servile revolts during the period 1790 to 1799. Although information concerning other servile revolts must have circulated, Maryland demonstrated her calmness through manumission acts which enabled more slaves to be free.[13] Catterall lists twenty-two cases concerning Negro slavery in Maryland during this period. Of these, thirteen dealt with manumission and the remaining number dealt with general law. Seven cases won decrees of

---

[11] Shelton v. Barbour, 2 Wash. Va. 64, Spring 1795, Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 103.

[12] Fairclaim v. Guthrie, 1 Call 7, April 1797, Ibid., pp. 103-104.

[13] Brackett, Negro in Maryland, pp. 152-153.

manumission and six cases were denied manumission. The majority of the cases which won manumission were based on the petitioners' claim of freedom as being descended in the female line from a free white woman.

An interesting decision was reached in one particular Maryland case where manumission was denied. Mary petitioned for freedom, stating that she was a descendant from a Negro named Mary who was imported into America from Madagascar. The court held that Madagascar was a country where the slave trade was practiced, and America tolerated slavery; therefore the petitioner had to show that her ancestor was free in her own country to entitle her to manumission.[14]

Pennsylvania had two cases which involved manumission during the period 1790 to 1799 (see Appendix B). They were based on the Pennsylvania law of 1782 which granted manumission gradually. These cases granted manumission to the Negro slaves involved.

In South Carolina three manumission cases were held (see Appendix B). Two of the cases were granted. In one of the cases the slave Sally was purchased by another slave who

---

[14] Negro Mary v. Vestry of William and Mary's Parish, Md., October 1796, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 53.

had earned money by working in town with the permission of her master. The slave acquired a considerable sum of money over and above what her master had stipulated that she pay him monthly. The slave developed an affection for Sally, purchased Sally with the money she had accumulated, and gave Sally her freedom. Beatty, the owner of the slave who purchased Sally, was accused of owning Sally. He acknowledged that he had no property in her, but he refused to acknowledge that Sally was free. The point was brought out in court that Beatty allowed his slave to work and earn her living. "If the slave chose to appropriate the savings of her extra labor," the court held, "to purchase Sally, she should be allowed to do so." The court decreed that Sally was manumitted.[15]

The economic element which impeded the progress of manumission was based on the development of a staple crop. The cotton gin invented by Eli Whitney made it practicable to grow short-staple cotton at a profit. Formerly, it took one hand a day to gin a pound of this cotton, but the cotton gin multiplied the effectiveness of a man so that he could

---

[15] The Guardian of Sally (an negro) v. Beatty, S. C., May 1792, Ibid., II, pp. 275-276.

clean three hundred and fifty pounds of cotton a day.[16]

The invention of the cotton gin and the extension of the area of cotton cultivated ushered in a period of economic change in the South. One of the most important manifestations of this change was the increased demand for Negro slaves, and from this period on there were fewer acts promoting manumission in the deep South. The tendency was toward increasing rather than diminishing the restrictions on manumissions. The theory that cotton diminished the manumission movement and aided the movement toward adding more slaves in the South to cultivate the cotton is generally accepted by historians. As Faulkner relates:

> The years 1790-1830 witnessed a veritable revolution in southern agriculture as far as the chief product was concerned. By the latter date cotton had become the principal southern crop and the largest single item of export from the country. . . . The effects of the invention of the cotton gin permeated the whole social as well as the economic life of the South by fastening upon it the system of slavery. Slavery as an institution was decidedly under fire in the years immediately following the Revolution, and its desirability was questioned.[17]

In 1793 North Carolina attempted to stop any illegal

---

[16]Nelson Manfred Blake, A History of American Life and Thought (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1963), p. 120.

[17]Faulkner, American Economic History, pp. 244, 249.

manumissions by the general public. Under the Act of 1793 any slave who was manumitted and not under the jurisdiction of the law could be arrested. Also, any information with regard to illegal manumissions could be given to a justice of the peace by any freeman, and the justice was required to immediately issue a warrant for the Negro's apprehension. This act, however, still allowed manumission for meritorious service, although such service had to be approved by the county courts. In South Carolina and Georgia the restrictions were even more severe. In South Carolina no manumissions could take place except by deed executed according to certain regulations which included obtaining approval of a justice and a quorum of five freeholders. In Georgia after 1801 manumission could be accomplished only by special legislative acts.[18]

By the Act of 1787 slaves in Delaware could not be carried out of the state for sale, or sold for export, without a license. Violators of the act could be fined one hundred pounds for each offense, and an additional penalty was inflicted by a clause in the Kidnapping Act of 1793 which

---

[18]Catterall, Judicial Cases, II, p. 1.

declared such slaves free.[19]

An illustration of this law occurred in a judicial case of 1799. A slaveholder named Hicks removed eleven of his slaves from Delaware to Maryland. In 1801 one of the slaves, Amelia, escaped to Delaware and was found in the possession of Andrew Allen, who claimed and held her on the allegation that he purchased her from a man named Austin. The purchase was not established, but there was evidence that this Austin was a Negro trader from one of the southern states and that Hicks, when he reached Maryland, actually sold the other ten Negroes to slave traders. Amelia's three children, born after her return to Delaware, and her grandchildren petitioned for freedom under the Act of 1793. The members of the court were unanimous in the opinion that the petitioners were entitled to their freedom, that such exportation did, ipso facto, establish Amelia's freedom, and that the "right and title to freedom..attaches the moment the offence is committed, that a prior conviction (of the master) is not requisite;...proof of the fact of exportation, contrary to the act, confers freedom."[20]

---

[19]Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 212.

[20]Brackett, Negro in Maryland, p. 87.

Conversely, by the Act of 1787, a slave became free if brought into Delaware for sale or otherwise. Even a slave sent by his master in Maryland to haul wheat to sow on his Delaware farm, or to plow on his farm there for a few days, was decreed free. Such was the case in 1804 in which Abram, the slave of Edward Burrows, was manumitted under the Act of 1787. Burrows resided in Maryland and had a farm in Delaware on which his brother Lewis lived as a tenant. Abram was sent to plow and to save fodder on his master's farm in Delaware. Burrows lived three miles from this farm. The judicial decision rendered was: "Held: amounted to a hiring or sale; and therefore is a bringing into the State, under the act (1787) so as to entitle negro Abraham to his freedom."[21]

The period from 1790 to 1799 was thus one of storm centers of fear in the lower South and one of peace in the Northeast section, which, in turn, regulated the manumission movement as previously stated.

---

[21] Negro Abram v. Burrows, 5 Har. 102N, Catterall, Judicial Cases, IV, p. 218.

1800 TO 1820

The fear of servile insurrection which resulted from some of the early attempts of slaves to free themselves by force, during the period 1790 to 1799, still existed in the South. This fear was constantly fed by former slaveholders who came to America to escape the servile insurrections in the West Indies. Slaves who came to America from the West Indies also continued to stimulate interest in the Haitian revolt by spreading rumors of future insurrections in America. As Phillips puts it: "Each outbreak, plot or agitation brought as a fruit of apprehension a new crop of statutes to make assurance increasingly sure that the South should continue to be a 'white man's country.'"[22] This desire by the slaveholder to subjugate the Negro to the lowest level in the social order was due to the large number of slaves in proportion to the slaveholders and other whites in the deep South. The ever-present fear of a black servile insurrection was uppermost in the minds of the whites, and in the hearts of the slaves was the ever-present desire for

---

[22]Ulrich B. Phillips, Life and Labor in the Old South (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1937), pp. 164-165.

manumission. Clement Eaton comments that the danger and discontent within the slave system had far-reaching effects that have never been adequately investigated.[23] Consequently, the fear of servile insurrections and the influence that fear had upon the minds of the slaveholders directly affected the manumission movement.

The outbreak in the West Indies was followed by the discovery in 1800 of a serious plot more ambitious in scope than any effort that had preceded it. Richmond was saved, however, by a rainstorm which occurred on the appointed day of the insurrection and by a slave who disclosed the secret to save his master's life. Assisted by his brother and by a Jack Bowler, Gabriel Prosser was the author of the plan for the Negroes in and around Richmond to march upon the city, seize the arsenal, strike down the whites, and liberate the slaves. The alarm caused by this threat promoted a movement by the Virginia legislature to colonize manumitted slaves and free Negroes in a territory or country outside the United States. The fear of slaveholders toward manumitted Negroes was met by a law in 1806 which forbade manumitted

---

[23] Clement Eaton, Freedom of Thought in the Old South (Durham: Duke University Press, 1940), p. 96.

Negroes to remain in Virginia for more than one year under penalty of re-enslavement. This law caused a large number of manumitted Negroes to seek asylum in other states. Bennett provides information which illustrates the role southern newspapers played in developing this fear complex of servile insurrection.

> When details of the plot leaked out, a deep fear spread through the populace. "They could scarcely have failed of success," wrote the Richmond correspondent of the Boston Chronicle, "for, after all, we could only muster four or five hundred men, of whom not more than thirty had muskets." Another correspondent wrote to the Philadelphia United-States Gazette: "Let but a single armed negro be seen or suspected, and, at once, on many a lonely plantation, there were trembling hands at work to bar doors and windows that seldom had been even closed before, and there was shuddering when a grey squirrel scrambled over the roof, or a shower of walnuts came down clattering from the overhanging boughs."[24]

Thus, the fear of servile insurrections was always present, and with this fear the manumission movement, in turn, would rise or decline according to the mildness or intensity of the panic.

Following closely upon the Virginia act, Maryland, Kentucky, and Delaware passed laws prohibiting the entrance of newly-manumitted slaves. Within twenty-five years, Ohio,

---

[24]Bennett, Before the Mayflower, pp. 112-113.

Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina, and Tennessee passed similar laws or placed rigid requirements upon the admission of free Negroes.

In Georgia the Act of 1801 forbade emancipation except by act of the legislature, and made it unlawful to record "any deed of manumission, or other paper which shall have for object the manumitting..any slave." Another act in 1818 increased the penalties of granting unauthorized manumission; therefore there are no manumission cases recorded for Georgia during this period.[25] Aptheker[26] lists four servile insurrections in Georgia during this period, the years of their occurrence being 1804, 1805, 1810, and 1819. Consequently a parallelism can be drawn to conform with the economic theory of slavery, and that is manumissions declined because of legislative enactment which, in turn, was based on servile insurrections. Slavery thus prospered to aid in the cultivation of cotton. To substantiate the statement concerning the legislature and servile insurrections, an observation was made by a West Indian writer in

---

[25]Catterall, Judicial Cases, III, p. 1.

[26]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, pp. 71-72.

which he points out that the legislative acts to control slaves "took their rise from some very atrocious attempts made by the negroes on the property of their masters or after some insurrection or commotion which struck at the very being of the colonies."[27] He asserts further that legislature might find it necessary under these circumstances to pass laws to prevent revolts, and that these laws should frighten the slaves and thus restrain them from insurrections. He bases his assumptions upon self-preservation, generally accepted as the first and ruling principle of human nature.[28]

The first constitution of the state of Kentucky, 1792, provided "that all laws then in force, in the State of Virginia not inconsistent with the Constitution, and of a general nature, and not local to the eastern part of Virginia, should be in force here, until altered or repealed by the Legislature."[29] Accordingly, many of the Virginia laws concerning slaves were in force in Kentucky, and there were

---

[27] Phillips, American Negro Slavery, p. 495.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Catterall, Judicial Cases, I, p. 269.

numerous cases involving wills which granted freedom to slaves on condition that they go to Liberia. The next best thing to manumission to a slave was the privilege sometimes given of choosing his master. Illustrations of this in Kentucky may be found in connection with the wills of Constance Blakey and of Joseph Morgan. Constance Blakey directed her executor to sell all her slaves, "giving the said negroes the full right of choosing their masters; the mother and father of the younger negroes choosing the masters they would wish their children to belong to."[30]

One particularly interesting judicial manumission case in Kentucky was the will Thomas Davis made in 1801 and admitted to record in that year. The will provided that

> negro Beck, and all her offspring, she be set free from all bondage at forty years of age. [Beck was then fourteen years old and died before reaching forty. She] gave birth to a female child named Sicily, about the year 1803 or 1804, . . . [and later, the] descendants of Sicily..some children and others grand-children . . . some twenty..persons of color [filed a petition] to.. establish their freedom against Wood and others, holding them in bondage. [The court held that] the attainment of [the age of forty] by Beck herself was not a condition precedent to the freedom of her offspring,..the testator intended that his devise should take effect at

---

[30] Blakey v. Blakey, 4 Har. and MCH. 215, Ibid., p. 315.

> a particular time, fixed by reference to the age of Beck, instead of naming the year itself....If the intention was that Beck and her offspring in successive generations remaining in slavery until they respectively attained the age of forty years, should then be free, this would..be an illegal and ineffectual devise, because it attempts to create a perpetuity.[31]

New states which entered the Union and were close to older states, like Kentucky and Virginia, would quite often adopt the manumission laws of the older state.

On March 2, 1807, an act to prohibit importation of slaves became effective. The act brought several judicial cases into light to challenge whether or not slaves brought in later would be manumitted. One case to illustrate this problem was Gomez v. Bonneval.

> The petitioner for freedom is a negro in actual state of slavery..imported since the laws prohibiting the introduction of slaves in the United States. [The court decision was that the plaintiff had nothing to claim as a freeman.] Formerly, while the act dividing Louisiana into two territories was in force...slaves, introduced here in contravention to it, were freed by operation of law;...Under the now existing laws, the individuals thus imported, acquire no personal right:... are disposed of according to the will of the different state legislatures. In this country they are to remain slaves, and to be sold for the benefit of the state.[32]

---

[31] Davis v. Wood, 4 Leigh 163, Ibid., p. 424.

[32] Gomez v. Bonneval, 8 Peters 220, Ibid., p. 461.

During the year of Gabriel Prosser's plot and the year following there are no listings of manumission cases granted; however, there were five manumission cases denied. In 1803 to 1810 there was a rise in the number of manumission cases granted in the United States. This was a time of peace, and manumission cases were usually on the rise during times of peace. Prior to the War of 1812 there was a rise in servile insurrections, and the tendency for manumission declined, thus, more manumission cases were denied in judicial courts.

This fear of insurrections and general unrest throughout the United States is demonstrated by a letter in which John Randolph, a Virginia slaveholder and Congressman, before the outbreak of hostilities, in December, 1811, tells of the danger of leaving his home.

> [Randolph] dwelt on the danger arising from the black population. . . . He said he would touch this subject as tenderly as possible; it was with reluctance that he touched it at all. . . . While talking of taking Canada, some of us are shuddering for our safety at home. I speak from facts when I say, that the night bell never tolls for fire in Richmond, that the mother does not hug the infant more closely to her bosom. I have been a witness of some of the alarms in the capital of Virginia.[33]

---

[33]Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, p. 23.

Judicial cases during the period 1810 to 1820 concerning the manumission for Negro slaves usually favored the slave; however, the newly-manumitted slave had to leave the state within a specified time.

Aptheker lists nine servile insurrections from 1812 to 1814. In analyzing judicial cases taken from Catterall, there were few manumissions granted during this time in the deep South; however, in the Northeast, manumission cases appear more frequently and more were granted than in the South. After the war more manumission cases were granted in the South. Pierre Chastang of Mobile was bought and manumitted by popular subscription in recognition of public services in the war and in the yellow fever epidemic in 1819.[34]

In New York an act was passed in 1814 providing for the raising of two Negro regiments. Each regiment was to consist of slightly more than one thousand men who were to receive the same pay as the other soldiers. If slaves enlisted with the permission of their masters they were to receive their freedom at the end of the war. Doubtlessly, these manumitted slaves and free Negroes served faithfully,

---

[34]Franklin, From Slavery To Freedom, p. 214.

for in 1854 at the New York State Convention of the Soldiers of 1812, a resolution was passed asking Congress to provide the officers, men, and their widows with a liberal annuity, "and that such provisions should be extend to and include both the Indian and African race . . . who join with the white men in defending our rights and maintaining our independence."[35]

1820 TO 1832

The period 1820 to 1832 was a period in which slave insurrections and abolition movements impeded manumission cases. Denmark Vesey, a manumitted slave who, by a strange boon of fortune through a lottery ticket, won a prize of fifteen hundred dollars with which he bought his freedom, initiated a conspiracy to destroy the city of Charleston. The plot was disclosed by a slave and subsequently frustrated before the night selected for the uprising.[36] As an outgrowth of this plot, the South Carolina legislature passed a law on December 21, 1822, requiring free Negro

---

[35] Ibid., p. 167.

[36] Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, pp. 267-270.

seamen on any vessel entering a South Carolina port to be imprisoned until the vessel was ready to depart. This law was held unconstitutional by the federal courts. In consequence of protests lodged with the State Department by the British, William Wirt, Attorney General of the United States, ruled likewise that the law was unconstitutional. Despite these opinions, South Carolina continued to enforce the law.

To illustrate this law, the judicial case of Elkison v. Deliesseline, 1823, demonstrates the suit of South Carolina against a Negro British seaman. This case was significant because it showed how far the South Carolina legislature would go to regulate manumitted Negroes regardless of what country they were from. The seaman was arrested under the third section of an act of South Carolina passed in December, 1822, and entitled "An Act for the Better Regulation of Free Negroes and Persons of Color, and Other Purposes." The sheriff took the prisoner, a native of Jamaica,

> out of the ship Homer, a British ship trading from Liverpool to Charleston. The British consul presented the claim of this individual as a British subject, and with it a copy of a letter from Mr. Adams to Mr. Canning, of June 17, written in answer to a remonstrance of Mr. Canning against the law. In the case, the letter stated, "Certain seizures under this act were made in

> January 1 st, some on board of American vessels and others in British vessels and among the latter one very remarkable for not having left a single man on board the vessel to guard her in the captain's absence...I felt confident that the act had been passed hastily and without due consideration, and knowing the unfavorable feeling that it was calculated to excite abroad, it was obviously best that relief should come from the quarter from which proceeded the act complained."[37]

In the case it was brought out that the seizure of the man on board a British ship was an express violation of the commercial convention of 1815 with Great Britain. The court decreed that the act was a violation of national laws, but it could only order the release of persons imprisoned and could not compel the sheriff from continually arresting manumitted seamen.[38]

In the late fall of 1829 it was discovered that some Negroes in Savannah, Georgia, possessed a pamphlet entitled "Walker's Appeal in Four Articles, Together with a Preamble to the Colored Citizens of the World, But in Particular, and Very Expressly to Those of the United States of America." Walker was a free-born Negro of North Carolina who had moved to Boston to open up a shop for selling old clothes. "The

---

[37] Elkison v. Deliesseline, 8 Fed. Cas. 493 (Brun. Col. Cas. 431); Catterall, Judicial Cases, II, pp. 323-324.

[38] Ibid.

Appeal" was published in September, 1829. This pamphlet immediately stimulated actions in the South toward further restrictions on manumissions and the prevention of abolitionist literature being distributed throughout the South.[39]

In the lonely quiet of the night August 21, 1831, Nat Turner began a servile revolt that sent a thrill of terror through all the southern states and ended the manumission movement in southern legislatures.

---

[39]Woodson and Wesley, Negro Makers of History, p. 249.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

For many years a difference of opinion has existed among historians regarding the importance of servile insurrections in the South. The majority of these historians claim that servile insurrections played little part in the development of slavery, while others contend that servile insurrections were the measure of the slave's reaction to the slave system. No adequate investigation has ever been made to ascertain the effect of servile insurrections upon the southern mind. Also, there has been no complete study covering the manumission movement; however, short period studies have dealt with the subject. Therefore, it was the purpose of this thesis to combine a study of servile insurrections with judicial decisions, private opinions and laws with manumission movements, to show that the fear of servile insurrections regulated manumissions. The fear of servile insurrection was kept alive in the South by a series of actual revolts and by intermittent rumors of others, and, in turn, manumissions were granted during times of peace or denied in times of panic or servile insurrections. Thus,

this thesis was a survey of the rise and decline of the manumission movement from 1790 to 1832. A complete survey of the manumission cases listed by Catterall between 1790 and 1832, with the main servile insurrections, is arranged in the appendixes.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MANUMISSION CASES AND MAJOR SLAVE INSURRECTIONS*

1790 TO 1799

State v. Administrators of Prall, N. J., April 1790, IV, p. 322, Granted.

State v. Anderson, N. J., September 1790, IV, p. 322, Granted.

1791, Haitian Slave Revolution

Butler v. Craig, Md., June 1791, IV, p. 50, Granted.

Mayo v. Carrington, Va., November 1791, I, p. 98, Granted.

Negro Brister v. Dickerson, Del., 1792, IV, p. 217, Granted.

Johnson v. Dillard, S. C., April 1792, IV, pp. 274-275, Denied.

The Guardian of Sally (an negro) v. Beatty, S. C., May 1792, II, pp. 275-276, Granted.

Hillyard v. Nichols, Conn., January 1793, IV, p. 424, Granted.

State v. Pitney, N. J., May 1793, IV, pp. 323-324, Granted.

Rawlings v. Boston, Md., May 1793, IV, p. 51, Granted.

Negroes Peter and others v. Elliott, Md., November 1793, IV, pp. 51-52, Denied.

---

*Source: Helen Tunnicliff Catterall (ed.), Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro (5 vols.; Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1926).

Robert Thomas v. The Reverend Henry Pile, Md., October 1794, IV, p. 52, Granted.

Shorter v. Rozier, Md., October 1794, IV, p. 52, Granted.

State v. Frees, N. J., November 1794, IV, pp. 324-325, Denied.

State v. Justices, N. J., November 1794, IV, p. 324, Granted.

Shelton v. Barbour, Va., Spring 1795, I, p. 103, Granted.

Pennsylvania v. Montgomery, Penn., March 1795, IV, pp. 259-260, Granted.

State v. Mount, N. J., April 1795, IV, p. 325, Denied.

State v. M'Donald and Armstrong, N. J., May 1795, IV, p. 326, Granted.

State v. Hedden, N. J., May 1795, IV, p. 325, Granted.

Porter v. Butler, Md., November 1795, IV, p. 52, Denied.

Ebenezer Kingsbury v. Town of Tolland, S. C., February 1796, IV, pp. 424-425, Granted.

Geer v. Juntington, Conn., March 1796, IV, p. 425, Granted.

De Kerlegand v. Negro Hector, Md., June 1796, IV, p. 52, Granted.

Negro Mary v. Vestry of William and Mary's Parish, Md., October 1796, IV, p. 53, Denied

Evans v. Kennedy, N. C., October 1796, II, pp. 13-14, Granted.

Fairclaim v. Guthrie, Va., April 1797, I, pp. 103-104, Granted.

Mahoney v. Ashton, Md., October 1797, IV, pp. 53-55, Denied.*

Higgins v. Allen, Md., June 1798, IV, p. 55, Denied.*

Negro Plato v. Bainbridge, Md., 1799, IV, p. 56, Denied.

Pleasants v. Pleasants, Va., May 1799, I, pp. 105-106, Granted.

Phillip (a negro) and Eve (his wife) v. Kirkpatrick, Penn., May 1799, IV, p. 263, Granted.

Negro David v. Porter, Md., October 1799, IV, p. 56, Granted.

Boisneuf v. Lewis, Md., October 1799, IV, pp. 55-56, Granted.

Perkins v. Emerson, Mass., November 1799, IV, pp. 482-483, Denied.

1800 TO 1819

Negro Harry v. Lyles, Md., June 1800, IV, p. 57, Denied.

Anonymous, N. C., January 1801, II, p. 17, Denied.

Sylvia v. Coryell, D. C., July 1801, IV, p. 154, Denied.

August 30, 1801, Gabriel Prosser Slave Insurrection, Richmond, Virginia

Cunningham's Heirs v. Cunningham's Executors, N. C., December 1801, III, p. 17, Denied.

Gobu v. E. Gobu, N. C., April 1802, II, p. 18, Granted.

Jennings v. Higgins, Md., October 1802, IV, p. 58, Denied.

---

*Hereafter cited for decisions of lower courts which were reversed by higher courts.

Negro Guy v. Hutchins, Del., 1803, IV, p. 218, Granted.

Coleman ads., S. C., April 1803, II, p. 283, Granted.

Wythe's Will, Va., April 1803, I, p. 108, Denied.

Maverick v. Stokes, S. C., May 1803, II, p. 283, Denied.

Somers v. Smyth, S. C., May 1803, II, p. 284, Denied.

Lyne v. Lyne, Ky., December 1803, I, p. 280, Granted.

Cedar Swamp Case, Del., 1804, IV, p. 218, Denied.

Blacksmith's Shop Case, Del., 1804, IV, p. 218, Denied.

Mason v. Ship Blaireau, Md., February 1804, IV, pp. 58-59, Granted.

Henderson v. Allens, Va., June 1804, I, pp. 113-114, Denied.*

Charles v. Hunnicutt, Va., October 1804, I, pp. 109-110, Granted.*

Bazil v. Kennedy, D. C., November 1804, IV, p. 156, Granted.

Respublica v. Smith, Pa., March 1805, IV, p. 266, Granted.

Wilson v. Isbell, Va., April 1805, I, p. 110, Granted.

Woodley v. Abby and other Paupers, Va., May 1805, I, p. 111, Granted.

Parker v. _____, N. C., November 1805, II, p. 359, Granted.

Link v. Beuner, N. Y., November 1805, IV, p. 359, Granted.

Negro Beck v. Holiday, Del., November 1805, IV, p. 218, Granted.

Commonwealth v. Lango, Pa., 1806, IV, pp. 268-269, Granted.

Scott v. Negro London, D. C., February 1806, IV, p. 158, Denied.

Conframp v. Bunel, Pa., April 1806, IV, p. 266, Granted.

State v. Emmons, N. J., May 1806, IV, pp. 328-329, Denied.

Beall v. Joseph (a negro), Ky., May 1806, I, p. 281, Denied.

Foster v. Simmons, D. C., June 1806, IV, pp. 158-159, Denied.

Ex parte Letty, D. C., July 1806, IV, p. 159, Denied.

Hudgins v. Wrights, Va., November 1806, I, pp. 112-113, Granted.

State v. Quick, N. J., March 1807, IV, pp. 329-330, Denied.

Fidelio v. Dermott, D. C., June 1807, IV, p. 160, Denied.

Henderson v. Allens, Va., June 1807, I, pp. 113-114, Denied.*

Mulatto Lucy v. Slade, D. C., July 1807, IV, pp. 160-161, Denied.

Negro Jenny v. Crase, D. C., July 1807, IV, p. 161, Denied.

Patty and others (paupers) v. Colin, Va., November 1807, I, p. 113, Denied.

Negro James v. Gaither, Md., December 1807, IV, p. 60, Denied.

Inhabitants of Winchendon v. Inhabitants of Hatfield, Mass., March 1808, IV, pp. 484-486, Denied.

Dawson v. Thruston, Va., March 1808, I, p. 116, Denied.

Pegram v. Isabell, Va., March 1808, I, p. 117, Granted.

Negro Cato v. Howard, Md., June 1808, IV, p. 60, Granted.*

Sarah (a woman of colour) v. Henry, Va., June 1808, I, p. 119, Denied.

Crease v. Parker, D. C., November 1808, IV, p. 161, Granted.

Inhabitants of Salem v. Inhabitants of Hamilton, Mass., November 1808, V, p. 488, Granted.

Drury v. Negro Grace, Md., December 1808, IV, p. 161, Denied.

Nan v. Moxley, D. C., December 1808, IV, p. 162, Granted.

Shorter v. Boswell, Md., December 1808, IV, pp. 61-62, Granted.*

Joice v. Alexander, D. C., December 1808, IV, p. 163, Granted.

Pringle v. M'Pherson, S. C., January 1809, II, p. 293, Granted.

Bates v. Holman, Va., April 1809, I, p. 119, Granted.

Thompson v. Wilmot, Ky., June 1809, I, p. 282, Granted.

Hazlerigs v. Amos and Jane, Ky., June 1809, I, pp. 283-284, Denied.*

Prall v. Patton, N. J., September 1809, IV, p. 331, Denied.*

Anonymous, N. J., September 1809, IV, p. 331, Denied.*

Children of Sibley ads. v. Shannon, Ky., December 1809, I, pp. 284-285, Denied*

Negro George v. Dennis, Md., December 1809, IV, p. 62, Denied.

In the case of Tom, N. Y., February 1810, IV, p. 360, Granted.

Scott v. Negro Ben, D. C., February 1810, IV, p. 163, Granted.

Donaldson v. Jude, Ky., Spring 1810, I, p. 285, Denied.

Mahan v. Jane, Ky., Spring 1810, I, p. 285, Denied.

Quackenboss v. Lansing, N. Y., May 1810, IV, pp. 360-361, Denied.

Mima and Lousia Queen v. Hepburn, D. C., June 1810, IV, p. 164, Granted.

Thomas v. Scott, D. C., June 1810, IV, p. 163, Granted.

Priscilla Queen v. Neal, D. C., June 1810, IV, p. 163, Granted.

Davis (a man of color) v. Curry, Ky., Fall 1810, I, p. 286, Denied.

Adelle v. Beauregard, La., Fall 1810, III, p. 444, Granted.

Queen v. Neale, Md., December 1810, IV, p. 62, Denied.

Ketletas v. Fleet, N. Y., February 1811, IV, p. 361, Denied.

Ned v. Beal, Ky., Spring 1811, I, p. 286, Denied.

Speaks v. Adams, Ky., Spring 1811, I, p. 287, Granted.

Davis v. Forrest, D. C., June 1811, IV, p. 164, Granted.

Bell v. Hogan, D. C., June 1811, IV, p. 164, Denied.

Hughes v. Hughes, Va., June 1811, I, p. 121, Granted.

Murray, Va., June 1811, I, p. 121, Granted.

Hook v. Nanny Pagee and her children, Va., June 1811, I, p. 121, Granted.

Long v. Long, N. C., July 1811, II, p. 22, Granted.

Commonwealth v. Negress Hester, Pa., September 1811, IV, pp. 270-271, Granted.

Commonwealth v. Blaine, Pa., October 1811, IV, p. 271, Denied.

McDaniel v. Will, Ky., Spring 1812, I, p. 313, Denied.*

State v. Vevil, La., Spring 1812, III, p. 448, Granted.

Wood v. John Davis, D. C., March 1812, IV, pp. 164-165, Denied.*

Bynum v. Bostick, S. C., June 1812, II, pp. 296-297, Denied.

Violet and William v. Stephens, Ky., July 1812, I, pp. 287-288, Denied.

Hopkins and Mudge v. Fleet and Young, N. Y., August 1812, IV, p. 364, Denied.

Ex parte Lawrence, Pa., December 1812, IV, p. 271, Granted.

Mima Queene and child v. Hepburn, D. C., February 1813, IV, pp. 165-166, Granted.

Edwards v. M'Connel, Tenn., February 1813, II, p. 484, Denied.

The Executors of Rogers v. Berry, N. Y., May 1813, IV, p. 364, Denied.

Potts v. Harper, N. J., May 1813, IV, p. 33, Granted.

Stewart v. Oakes, Md., December 1813, IV, p. 62, Granted.

Caesar v. Peabody, N. Y., January 1814, IV, p. 366, Granted.

Commonwealth, ex rel. negro Lewis v. Holloway, Pa., January 1814, IV, pp. 272-273, Granted.

Violette v. Ball, D. C., June 1814, IV, p. 167, Denied.

Wood v. Negro Stephen S. and R., Penn., October 1814, IV, p. 273, Granted.

M'Gill v. Wood, S. C., November 1814, IV, p. 299, Granted.

Sprigg v. Negro Mary, Md., December 1814, IV, pp. 62-63, Denied.

Haney v. Waddle, Md., March 1815, IV, p. 64, Denied.

Graham (Simmons?) v. Graham, Pa., April 1815, IV, pp. 273-274, Granted.

Fulton v. Lewis, Md., May 1815, IV, p. 64, Granted.

Davis v. Sanford, Ky., January 1815, II, p. 289, Denied.

Concklin v. Havens, N. Y., August 1815, IV, p. 369, Granted.

Marchand v. Negro Pegg, Pa., September 1815, IV, pp. 275-276, Denied.

Clarke v. Bartlett, Ky., October 1815, I, pp. 289-290, Granted.

Negro John Davis v. Wood, D. C., February 1816, IV, p. 168, Denied.

Negress Sally Henry, D. C., February 1816, IV, p. 168, Denied.

Victoire v. Dussuau, La., March 1816, III, p. 451, Denied.

Beard v. Poydras, La., May 1816, III, p. 452, Granted.*

Administrator of Allen v. Peden, N. C., July 1816, II, p. 29, Denied.

Commonwealth v. Hollow, Pa., July 1816, IV, p. 275, Granted.

Haywood v. Craven's Executors, N. C., July 1816, II, p. 28, Denied.

Kendall v. Kendall, Va., November 1816, I, p. 127, Denied.

Trudeau's Executor v. Robinette, La., January 1817, III, p. 455, Denied.

Lemon v. Reynolds, Va., April 1817, I, p. 128, Granted.

Garnett v. Sam and Phillis, Va., April 1817, I, p. 128, Granted.

Pepoon, Guardian of Phebe (a woman of color) v. Clarke, S. C., May 1817, II, pp. 301-302, Granted.

State v. Greenwood, S. C., May 1817, II, p. 304, Granted.

Walls v. Hemsley, Md., June 1817, IV, pp. 64-65, Granted.

Henderson v. Negro Tom, Md., June 1817, IV, p. 65, Granted.

Burroughs v. Negro Anna, Md., June 1817, IV, p. 65, Denied.*

Petit v. Gillet, La., June 1817, III, p. 456, Denied.

In the matter of Nan Michel, a negro girl, N. Y., August 1817, IV, p. 369, Granted.

Renney v. Field, Tenn., August 1817, II, pp. 488-489, Denied.

Seville v. Chretien, La., September 1817, III, p. 456, Granted.

Wilson v. Belinda, Pa., September 1817, IV, pp. 275-276, Granted.

South v. Solomon, Va., October 1817, I, pp. 128-129, Denied.

Town of Windsor v. Town of Harford, Conn., November 1817, IV, p. 427, Granted.

Thompson v. Clarke, D. C., December 1817, IV, p. 169, Granted.

Abraham v. Matthews, Va., February 1818, I, p. 129, Denied.

William and Mary College v. Hodgson, Va., March 1818, I, pp. 129-130, Granted.

Augustin et al. v. Cailleau, La., April 1818, III, p. 458, Granted.

Commonwealth v. Hambright, Pa., May 1818, IV, p. 458, Granted.

State v. Wilson, S. C., May 1818, II, p. 308, Granted.

Quay v. McNinch, S. C., May 1818, II, p. 307, Denied.

Negro Hannah and Children v. Sparkes, Md., June 1818, IV, pp. 65-66, Granted.

DeFontaine v. DeFontaine, Md., June 1818, IV, p. 66, Denied.

Wright v. Lowe's Executors, N. C., July 1818, II, p. 34, Denied.

Peggy and Mary v. Legg, Va., November 1818, I, p. 130, Denied.

Betty v. Deneale, D. C., November 1818, IV, p. 170, Granted.

Bias v. Rose, D. C., December 1818, IV, p. 170, Denied.

Metayer v. Metayer, La., January 1819, III, p. 549, Granted.

Sam v. Green, D. C., April 1819, IV, pp. 170-171, Denied.

James Executors v. Masters, N. C., May 1819, II, p. 36, Granted.

Johnson v. Negro Lish, Md., June 1819, IV, pp. 66-67, Granted.

Gomez v. Bonneval, La., June 1819, III, p. 461, Denied.

Wicks v. Chew, Md., December 1819, IV, p. 67, Denied.

1820 TO 1832

Helm v. Miller, N. Y., January 1820, IV, p. 375, Granted.

Bazzi v. Rose and her Child, La., May 1820, III, pp. 463-464, Denied.

Catin v. D'Oregenoy's Heirs, La., June 1820, III, p. 465, Denied.

Davis v. Jacquin, Md., June 1820, IV, p. 69, Denied.

Baptist v. De Volumbrun, Md., June 1820, IV, p. 69, Denied.

Negro Clara v. Meagher, Md., June 1820, IV, p. 69, Denied.

Negro William v. Kelly, Md., June 1820, IV, p. 69, Denied.

Walkup v. Pratt, Md., June 1820, IV, pp. 68-69, Denied.

Commonwealth v. Jerry Mann, Va., June 1820, I, p. 133, Granted.

Town of Columbia v. William et al., Conn., October 1820, IV, p. 369, Denied.

Talbot v. David (a pauper), Ky., October 1820, I, p. 295, Denied.

Ranklin v. Lydia, Ky., October 1820, I, pp. 294-295, Granted.

Griffith v. Fanny, Va., December 1820, I, pp. 133-134, Granted.

Julien v. Langlish, La., January 1821, III, pp. 466-467, Denied.

Garretson v. Lingan, D. C., April 1821, IV, p. 171, Denied.

Barnett v. Sam, Va., April 1821, I, p. 134, Denied.*

Petry v. Christy, N. Y., May 1821, IV, pp. 377-378, Granted.

Dempsey v. Lawrence, Va., June 1821, I, pp. 134-135, Denied.*

Hall v. Mullin, Md., June 1821, IV, pp. 69-70, Granted.

Hughes v. Negro Milly, Md., June 1821, IV, p. 71, Granted.

Winney v. Cartright, Ky., June 1821, I, p. 297, Granted.

Alexander v. Stokely, Pa., September 1821, IV, p. 278, Granted.

Susan (a blackwoman) v. High, Mo., September 1821, V, p. 216, Denied.

Brown v. Compton, La., September 1821, III, pp. 469-470, Denied.*

Butler v. Delaplaine, Pa., October 1821, IV, pp. 278-279, Denied.

Clifton v. Phillips, S. C., November 1821, II, p. 319, Granted.

Commonwealth v. Tyree, Va., November 1821, I, p. 134, Granted.

Overall v. Overall, Ky., December 1821, I, p. 299, Granted.

Lewis v. Pullerton, Va., December 1821, I, pp. 135-137, Granted.

State v. Ben (the slave of Herrington), N. C., December 1821, II, pp. 41-42, Granted.

Ellis v. Baker, Va., January 1822, I, p. 137, Denied.

Brown v. Wingard, D. C., April 1822, IV, p. 172, Denied.

Daniel v. Kincheloe, D. C., April 1822, IV, p. 172, Denied.

May 30, 1822, Denmark Vesey Slave Insurrection, Charleston, South Carolina

Spencer v. Negroes Amy and Thomas R. M. C., Ga., May 1822, III, p. 9, Denied.

Findly v. Tyler, Ky., June 1822, I, p. 300, Granted.

Huckaby v. Jones, N. C., June 1822, II, p. 43, Denied.

Scott v. Law, Md., June 1822, IV, p. 71, Denied.

Amy (a woman of colour) v. Smith, Ky., June 1822, I, p. 301, Denied.

Humphries v. Tench, D. C., October 1822, IV, p. 173, Granted.

Gardner v. Simpson, D. C., April 1823, IV, p. 173, Denied.

Jordan v. Sawyer, D. C., April 1823, IV, p. 173, Granted.

Peter Cooke (a person of colour) v. Cokka, Ky., April 1823, I, p. 302, Denied.

Smith v. Hoff, N. Y., May 1823, IV, pp. 379-380, Denied.

Hamilton v. Cragg, Md., June 1823, IV, p. 71, Denied.*

Elkison v. Deliesseline, S. C., August 1823, II, p. 323, Granted.

Rice ads. v. Spear, S. C., November 1823, II, p. 324, Granted.

Attoo v. the Commonwealth, Va., November 1823, I, p. 45, Denied.

Turner v. Whitted, N. C., December 1823, II, p. 45, Denied.

Tabittha Singleton v. Eliza E. Bremar, S. C., January 1824, II, pp. 336-337, Granted.

Calder v. Deliesseline, S. C., January 1824, II, p. 326, Denied.

Doubrere v. Grillier's Syndic, La., February 1824, III, p. 171, Granted.

Maria v. Surbaugh, Va., February 1824, I, p. 138, Denied.

Tarlton v. Tippett, D. C., April 1824, IV, p. 174, Granted.

Wall v. Hampton et al., La., April 1824, III, p. 475, Denied.

Lunsford v. Coquillon, La., May 1824, III, p. 476, Granted.

Greer v. M'Crackin, Tenn., May 1824, p. 401, Granted.

Alice v. Morte, D. C., May 1824, IV, p. 175, Granted.

Delphine v. Devize, La., June 1824, III, p. 477, Granted.

Free Jack v. Woodruff, N. C., June 1824, II, pp. 46-47, Granted.

Aldridge v. the Commonwealth, Va., June 1824, I, pp. 140-141, Denied.

Ben v. Peete, Va., June 1824, I, p. 139, Denied.

Chasteen v. Ford, Ky., June 1824, I, p. 304, Granted.

English v. Latham, La., September 1824, III, p. 477, Denied.

South Brunswick v. East Windsor, N. J., November 1824, IV, p. 336, Denied.

Winny (a free woman held in slavery) v. Whitsides, Mo., November 1824, V, 175, Denied.

Dreux v. Dreux's Syndics, La., January 1825, III, p. 478, Granted.

Peter v. Cureton, D. C., April 1825, IV, p. 176, Denied.

Chew v. Gray, Md., June 1825, IV, p. 73, Denied.

Winder v. Diffenderffer, Md., August 1825, IV, p. 73, Granted.

Moosa v. Allain, La., December 1825, III, p. 480, Denied.

Pride v. Pulliam, N. C., December 1825, II, pp. 49-50, Denied.

Real Estate of Mrs. Hardcastle ads. Porcher, Escheator, S. C., 1826, II, pp. 334-335, Denied.

Hope v. Johnson, Tenn., January 1826, II, p. 491, Granted.

Sallust v. Ruth, Va., February 1826, I, p. 144, Denied.*

M'Michen v. Amos, Va., March 1826, I, pp. 144-145, Granted.

Carney (a coloured man) v. Hampton, Ky., May 1826, I, p. 306, Granted.

Fox v. Lambson, N. J., May 1826, IV, p. 337, Denied.

Betty v. Lowe, D. C., May, 1826, IV, p. 177, Granted.

Livingston v. Ackeston, N. Y., May 1826, IV, pp. 383-384, Denied.

Coale v. Harrington, Md., June 1826, IV, pp. 73-74, Denied.

Minklaer v. Rockfeller and Feller, N. Y., August 1826, IV, p. 384, Denied.

Miller v. Dwilling, Pa., September 1826, IV, p. 282, Granted.

Scott v. Waugh, Pa., October 1826, IV, p. 282, Granted.

William v. Van Zandt, D. C., December 1826, IV, p. 178, Denied.

U.S. v. Gooding, D. C., January 1827, IV, pp. 74-75, Denied.

Armstrong v. Lear, D. C., January 1827, IV, p. 178, Denied.

Mathurin v. Livaudais, La., January 1827, III, p. 482, Denied.

Vaughan v. Phebe (a woman of colour), Tenn., January 1827, II, pp. 492-493, Granted.

Fulton v. Shaw, Va., January 1827, I, p. 146, Granted.

Kitty v. Fitzhugh, Va., January 1827, I, pp. 146-147, Granted.

Gregory v. Baugh, Va., February 1827, I, pp. 147-148, Denied.

Green v. Judith, Va., March 1827, I, pp. 148-149, Denied.

Hunter v. Fulcher, Va., March 1827, I, p. 149, Granted.

Mason v. Matilda, D. C., March 1827, IV, p. 179, Denied.*

Bore v. Bush et al., Tenn., May 1827, III, pp. 483-484, Granted.*

Merry v. Tiffin and Menard, Mo., May 1827, V, pp. 128-129, Granted.

Warren et al. v. Brooks, N. Y., May 1827, IV, pp. 385-386, Denied.

Lee v. Preuss, D. C., May 1827, IV, p. 179, Denied.

Bernadine v. L'Espinasse, La., June 1827, III, pp. 483-484, Granted.

Trustees, of the Quaker Society of Contentea v. Dickenson, N. C., June 1827, II, p. 52, Denied.

Roberts v. Smiley, Ky., June 1827, I, p. 308, Granted.

Hart v. Fanny Ann, Ky., October 1827, I, pp. 309-310, Granted.

Richard v. Van Meter, D. C., December 1827, IV, p. 180, Denied.

Mandeville v. Cookenderfer, D. C., December 1827, IV, p. 181, Granted.

1828, David Walker's Appeal

Hawkins v. Vanwickle, La., January 1828, III, pp. 484-485, Granted.

Arthur v. Shavis, Va., February 1828, I, p. 151, Granted.

Talbert v. Jenny, Va., February 1828, I, pp. 151-152, Granted.

Redford v. Peggy, Va., March 1828, I, pp. 154-155, Denied.

Battles v. Miller, D. C., May 1828, IV, p. 182, Granted.

Johnson v. Mason, D. C., May 1828, IV, p. 182, Denied.

Franciois La Grange (alias Isidore) v. Pierre Chouteau, Mo., May 1828, V, p. 130, Denied.

Milly (a woman of color) v. Smith, Mo., May 1828, V, pp. 130-131, Denied.

Marguerite v. Pierre Chouteau, Mo., May 1828, V, pp. 132-135, Denied.

State v. Jim (a negro slave), N. C., June 1828, II, pp. 54-55, Denied.*

Samuel Scott v. Williams, N. C., June 1828, II, pp. 54, Denied.

Murray v. Dulany, D. C., November 1828, IV, p. 182, Denied.

Spotts v. Gillaspie, Va., November 1828, I, pp. 156-157, Denied.

Moses v. Denigree, Va., November 1828, I, p. 156, Denied.

State v. Jones, N. C., December 1828, II, p. 55, Denied.

Isacc v. West, Va., December 1828, I, p. 157-158, Granted.

Calgett v. Gibson, D. C., December 1828, IV, p. 128, Granted.

Curranee v. McQueen, N. Y., January 1829, IV, p. 386, Granted.

Conclude v. Williamson, Ky., January 1829, I, pp. 311-312, Denied.

Dorothee v. Coquillon, La., January 1829, III, p. 485, Denied.

Le Grand v. Darnall, D. C., January 1829, IV, pp. 76-77, Granted.

Stevenson v. Singleton, Va., February 1829, I, p. 158, Denied.

Hunter (pauper) v. Fulcher, Va., March 1829, I, p. 159, Granted.

Pilie v. Lalande, La., April 1829, III, p. 486, Granted.

Theoteste alias Catiche v. Pierre Chouteau, Mo., April 1829, V, p. 135, Denied.

Meilleur et al. v. Coupry, La., May 1829, III, pp. 486-487, Denied.

Wigle v. Kirby, D. C., May 1829, IV, p. 183, Denied.

Butler v. Duvall, D. C., May 1829, IV, pp. 183-184, Granted.

State v. Mary Hayes, S. C., June 1829, II, p. 339, Granted.

Emily v. Smith, Ky., June 1829, I, p. 313, Granted.

Milly v. Smith, Mo., September 1829, V, p. 137, Granted.

Russell v. Commonwealth, Pa., October 1829, IV, pp. 283-284, Granted.

Fanny v. Dejarnet, Ky., October 1829, I, p. 313, Granted.

M'Daniel's Will, Ky., October 1829, I, p. 313, Granted.

Joe v. Hart, Ky., October 1829, I, pp. 313-314, Granted.

Dunn v. Amey, Va., November 1829, I, p. 159, Granted.

Miller v. Negro Charles, D. C., December 1829, IV, p. 77, Granted.

Hammond v. Hammond, D. C., December 1829, IV, p. 77, Granted.

Smith v. Parker, D. C., December 1829, IV, p. 184, Granted.

Robin and others (paupers) v. King, Va., March 1830, I, pp. 160-161, Denied.

Merry v. Chexnaider, La., March 1830, III, p. 484, Denied.

Prudence v. Bremodi et al., La, April 1830, III, p. 489, Granted.

Desfarge vt al. v. Desfarge et al., La., May 1830, III, p. 489, Granted.

Stockett v. Watkins, D. C., June 1830, IV, p. 78, Granted.

Lenior v. Sylvester, S. C., June 1830, II, pp. 342-343, Denied.

Ferguson v. Sarah, Ky., June 1830, I, pp. 315-316, Granted.

Thrift v. Hannah, Va., June 1830, I, pp. 161-162, Denied.*

Walthall v. Robertson, Va., June 1830, I, pp. 161, Granted.

Vincent (a man of color) v. James Duncan, Mo., September 1830, V, pp. 137-138, Granted.

Dencan v. Mizner, Ky., October 1830, I, p. 317, Granted.

Fanny v. Bryant, Ky., October 1830, I, p. 317, Granted.

Stevens v. Ely, N. C., December 1830, II, pp. 60-61, Granted.

Hunter v. Shaffer, Ga., January 1831, III, p. 12, Granted.

Jeffrie v. Robideaux, Mo., January 1831, V, p. 138, Granted.

Menard v. Aspasia, Mo., January 1831, V, pp. 138-139, Denied.*

Sherarman v. Angel, S. C., March 1831, II, p. 345, Granted.

Ex parte Tunno, Bailey, S. C., March 1831, II, p. 345, Granted.

Miller v. Mitchell, S. C., April 1831, II, p. 345, Granted.

Patton v. Patton, Ky., April 1831, I, p. 318, Granted.

Kitty v. McPherson, D. C., May 1831, IV, p. 186, Granted.

Gilbert v. Ward, D. C., May 1831, IV, p. 186, Granted.

Redmond v. Coffin, N. C., June 1831, pp. 61-62, Denied.

Charles (a man of color) v. French, Ky., June 1831, I, pp. 319-320, Granted.

David v. Bridgman, Tenn., July 1831, II, p. 495, Denied.

State v. John N. Philpot, Ga., July 1831, III, p. 13, Denied.

State v. Fraser, Ga., July 1831, III, p. 13, Granted.

Winn v. Bob and others (paupers), Va., July 1831, I, p. 163, Denied.

August 13-23, 1831, Nat Turner's Slave Insurrection Southhampton, Virginia

Commonwealth, ex rel. Taylor v. Hasson, Pa., October 1831, IV, p. 285, Granted.

Valsain et al. v. Cloutier, La., October 1831, III, pp. 492-493, Denied.

Samuel v. Childs, D. C., December 1831, IV, pp. 186-187, Denied.

Reed (f.m.c.) v. Palfrey et al., La., December 1831, III, p. 495, Granted.

Conquet v. Creditors, La., December 1831, III, p. 495, Granted.

Gordon, Del., 1832, IV, p. 219, Granted.

Gallego v. Attorney General, Va., February 1832, I, p. 169, Granted.

State v. Harden, S. C., Spring 1832, II, p. 350, Granted.

Hadley v. Latimer, Tenn., August 1832, II, p. 495, Denied.

McPherson (f.m.c.) v. Robinson et al., La., October 1832, III, p. 497, Granted.

Delilah v. Jacobs, D. C., October 1832, IV, P. 187, Denied.

Esther v. Buckner, D. C., November 1832, IV, p. 187, Granted.

APPENDIX B

NUMBER OF MANUMISSION CASES GRANTED AND DENIED BETWEEN 1790 AND 1832

	1790-1799		1800-1810		1811-1820		1821-1832	
State	G	D	G	D	G	D	G	D
D. C.	0	0	8	7	4	7	15	16
Conn.	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Del.	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	0
Ga.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Ky.	0	0	2	6	3	5	16	3
La.	0	0	1	0	5	4	12	12
Md.	7	6	3	6	6	9	3	5
Mass.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Mo.	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	7
N. J.	6	2	2	2	1	0	0	2
N. Y.	0	0	2	1	2	3	3	4
N. C.	1	0	2	2	2	3	3	8
Penn.	2	0	3	0	8	2	5	1
S. C.	2	1	2	2	4	2	9	3
Tenn.	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2
Va.	4	0	6	6	8	5	13	17
Total	25	10	34	35	46	42	90	83

Summary: Granted, 192; Denied, 173; Total, 365.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aptheker, Herbert. American Negro Slave Revolts in the United States. New York: International Publishers, 1943.

_____. The Negro in the Abolition Movement. New York: International Publishers, 1940.

Bailey, Thomas. A Diplomatic History of the American People. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958.

Ballagh, James C. A History of Slavery in Virginia. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1902.

Bennett, Lerone Jr. Before the Mayflower. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1962.

Blake, Nelson Manfred. A History of American Life and Thought. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1963.

Brackett, Jeffrey R. The Negro in Maryland. Baltimore: N. Murray, 1889.

Brawley, Benjamin. A Short History of the American Negro. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945.

Brewton, Miles, and others. "The Evil Deeds of the Spaniards (1702-1740)," Building of the Republic, 1689-1783. Albert Bushnell Hart (ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.

Burnett, Edmund C. (ed.). Letters of the Continental Congress. Vol. IV. Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1932.

Catterall, Helen Tunnicliff (ed.). Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro. 5 vols. Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1926.

Channing, Edward. A History of the United States. Vol. III. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.

Chitwood, Oliver Perry. A History of Colonial America. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1948.

Craven, Wesley Frank. The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949.

Eaton, Clement. A History of the Old South. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

_____. Freedom of Thought in the Old South. Durham: Duke University Press, 1940.

Elkins, Stanley M. Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Faulkner, Harold Underwood. American Economic History. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1939.

Franklin, John Hope. From Slavery To Freedom. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Company, 1947.

Gipson, Lawrence Henry. The Coming of the Revolution. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954.

Greene, Evarts B., and Virginia D. Harrington. American Population Before 1790. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Company, 1932.

Greene, Lorenzo J[ohnston]. "Negroes in the Armed Forces of the United States, 1619 to 1865," Negro History Bulletin, XIV (March, 1951), 119-131.

_____. The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Hesseltine, William B. The South in American History. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1943.

Mazyck, Robert. George Washington and the Negro. Washington: Associate Publishers, Inc., 1932.

Niles, H. Principles and Acts of the Revolution in America. Baltimore: Niles Publishing Company, 1822.

Olmsted, Frederick Law. The Cotton Kingdom. Arthur M. Schlesinger (ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

Phillips, Ulrich B. Life and Labor in the Old South. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1937.

_____. American Negro Slavery. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1936.

Quarles, Benjamin. The Negro in the American Revolution. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Ridpath, John Clark. The New Complete History of the United States of America. Chicago: Jones Press, 1918.

Russell, John H. The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1885. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1913.

Schachner, Nathan. Thomas Jefferson. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1957.

Stampp, Kenneth M. The Peculiar Institution. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Ward, Christopher. The War of the Revolution. John Richard Alden (ed.). Vol. II. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952.

Weeks, Stephen B. Southern Quakers and Slavery. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1896.

Wish, Harvey. "American Slave Insurrections Before 1861," Journal of Negro History, XXII (July, 1937), 205-206.

Woodson, Carter G. The Negro in Our History. Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1922.

_____, and Charles H. Wesley. Negro Makers of History. Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1958.

Wright, James M. The Free Negro in Maryland, 1634-1860. New York: Columbia University Press, 1921.