

The manuscript was written in 1776, but unpublished. Nevertheless a good document for us as prepares us to read Cugoano's works, which were published in England 10-15 years later.

Reading Haynes will also let us connect the metaphysical notion of freedom to its practical application to US slavery. This is especially interesting given the use of "freedom" as a rallying cry for the American Revolution (in which Haynes fought).

Let's back up a little. We read in La Boétie the use of "servitude" applied to voluntary (or probably better, habitual / customary – as that is the majority of the cases) obedience to an absolute monarch (the "tyrant"). We distinguished that from the usual sense of "slavery" as forced capture and forced labor.

Philosophers distinguish negative and positive liberty.

Negative liberty is *freedom from* interference by others: you do what you want (as long as it in turn doesn't interfere with the abilities of others to do what they want). Remember our discussion of Hume: liberty is non-constraint, or acting according to your will. (It's not having an uncaused will, however.)

Positive liberty can have individual or communal senses.

The individual sense of positive liberty is *freedom to* develop your capacities. This includes negative liberty (you have to be free from interference) but goes further to include the necessities for self-development: physical security, physical nourishment, emotional support in the sense of being recognized as possessing "dignity" and full equality, and education. You can see that positive liberty implies an essential sociality of humans: no one can go it alone, so you have to have social institutions that allow you access to security, nourishment, recognition, and education.

La Boétie has a communal sense of positive liberty: a community's *freedom to* direct its actions. This would again include negative liberty: the community cannot be conquered and ruled by another, external, force. But it goes further, in recognizing our social being. Recall the argument: nature has made us roughly equal, so we should see each other as "comrades or rather as brothers" even if there is a distribution of physical / mental gifts (9). But these differences are what allow for brotherly love, as you can't do something for someone who is utterly self-sufficient. Further, nature has given us that gift of language that allows sharing thought to "bring about a communion of our wills" (9). So "freedom" is the ability for equal partners to work together to direct their common political situation. We could call that either "direct democracy" or "anarchism" depending on your tastes. If you are willing to accept representation, then "representative democracy" would fit, as long as there is "consent."

MAIN POINTS IN HAYNES:

- 1) Everyone has a natural right to liberty, so it can't be restricted to Englishmen and denied to Africans.
- 2) Due to this right embedded in human nature, slavery provokes resistance, flight and rebellion.
- 3) Color is accidental so doesn't touch the essence of human nature, which includes liberty.
- 4) Americans are obliged to be anti-slavery due to their fighting their revolution in the name of liberty.
- 5) Pro-slavery arguments do not work:
 - a) just bcs something is wide-spread doesn't mean it's right;
 - b) there is no Scriptural evidence that Africans are suited for slavery;
 - c) slavery produces the ignorance that is used to justify slavery.

OUTLINE OF HAYNES

1. Liberty is an "innate principle, which is immovably placed in the human species." That is, it's part of humanity; any and all humans have this principle; it's part of human nature.
 - a. Thus "aspiring after" liberty cannot be a puzzle since in doing so you are not acting against your nature. So slave-holders should expect "opposition" (last time we talked about "resistance, flight, and rebellion")
 - b. Now Haynes will replace "innate principle" with "the very Laws of nature" as that which explains resistance, flight, and rebellion. And those laws of nature have divine backing.
2. Next Haynes will discuss the universality of the right to liberty.
 - a. It's been a common trope that Englishmen have a right to liberty.
 - b. But why think that it's **only** Englishmen? Nothing stops us from thinking Africans have the same right.
 - c. Haynes knows that there are pro-slavery arguments; to defeat them is a form of "opposition" to slavery.
3. At this point Haynes turns to the great contradiction of the American Revolution: fighting for their liberty from England, the colonists maintain slavery, a much greater oppression than English colonialism.
4. Given the right to liberty of the African, slavery is "illicit" (against divinely ordained natural law).
5. Turning now to race Haynes appeals to reason: "we may reasonably conclude" that the preciousness of liberty and the intolerability of slavery is shared among Blacks and whites alike.

6. He then turns back to slavery's defenders and denies that any man has the right to deprive another of divinely ordained liberty. He further denies that Scripture shows any essential slavery for Blacks.
7. Why should color be so important as to deprive someone of the natural right to liberty?
8. Against the argument that the widespread (historical and contemporary) practice of slavery legitimates it, Haynes appeals to the Fall to explain the "thirst for superiority" that some have.
9. Haynes admits that criminals might forfeit their liberty, but that has to be in individual cases only; Africans as a group ("a Nation") never committed such a crime.
10. Of course there has to be Law for social order, but this has to work to the interest of everyone, and when it hurts people those laws need to be called into question.
11. Slave-owners keep slaves from secular and religious education, but then turn around and blame them for their ignorance.
12. Love for American should entail anti-slavery struggles for everyone.