

THE NEGRO:

WHAT IS HIS ETHNOLOGICAL STATUS?

IS HE THE PROGENY OF HAM? IS HE A DESCENDANT OF ADAM AND EVE? HAS HE A SOUL? OR IS HE A BEAST IN GOD'S NOMENCLATURE? WHAT IS HIS STATUS AS FIXED BY GOD IN CREATION? WHAT IS HIS RELATION TO THE WHITE RACE?

By ARIEL.

"Truth, though sometimes slow in its power, is like itself, always consistent; and like its AUTHOR, will always be triumphant.

The Bible is true."

SECOND EDITION.

CINCINNATI:

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR.

1867.

(Copyright secured according to law.)

THE NEGRO.

[Pg 3]

What is his Ethnological Status? Is he the progeny of Ham? Is he a descendant of Adam and Eve? Has he a Soul? or is he a Beast, in God's nomenclature? What is his Status as fixed by God in creation? What is his relation to the White race?

The intelligent will see at once, that the question of *slavery*, either right or wrong, is not involved in this caption for examination: nor is that question discussed. The points are purely ethnological and Biblical, and are to be settled alone by the Bible and by concurrent history, and by facts existing outside of the Bible and of admitted truth. We simply say in regard to ourself, in this day of partisan strife, religious and political, that we take no part in any such party strife, and that it is many years since we cast our last vote. This much, to prevent evil surmises.

With this understood independence of all parties, we begin by saying, that the errors and mistakes, in understanding the true position of the negro, as God intended it to be in his order of creation, are all traceable to, and arise out of two assumptions. The learned men of the past and present age, the clergy and others have assumed as true:

1. That the negro is a descendant of Ham, the youngest son of Noah. This is false and untrue.
2. That the negro is a descendant of, or the progeny of, Adam and Eve. This is also false and untrue.

These questions, or rather these assumptions, of the learned and unlearned world, are Biblical, and are to be settled by the Bible alone, whether they be true or false, and by outside concurrent history—and of facts known to exist, and admitted to be true by the intelligent, and as they may serve to elucidate any statement or account given in the Bible.

We shall have frequent use of the term, "logic of facts," and now explain what we mean by it. It is this: If one sees another with a gun in his hands, and that he shoots a man and kills him, and the bullet is found afterward in the dead man's body, that although we did not see the [Pg 4]bullet put into the gun, yet we *know* by this "logic of facts," that it was in the gun. It is the strongest evidence of what is true, of any testimony that can be offered.

It will be admitted by all, and contradicted by none, that we now have existing on earth, two races of men, the *white* and the *black*. We beg here to remind our readers, that when they see the word men, or man, *italicised*, we do not use it as applying to Adam and his race. But we may sometimes use these words in the general and accepted sense of them, but it is only for the purpose of getting before the minds of our readers, the propositions of the learned of this age, exactly as they would wish them to be stated. We will now describe, ethnologically, the prominent characteristics and differences of these two races as we now find them.

The white race have long, straight hair, high foreheads, high noses, thin lips, and white skins: the olive and sunburnt color, where the other characteristics are found, belong equally to the white race.

The negro or black race, are woolly or kinky-headed, low foreheads, flat noses, thick-lipped, and have a black skin.

This description of the two races is (though not all their differences), full enough for the fair discussion of their respective stations in God's order of creation, and will be admitted to be just and true, as far as it goes, by all candid and learned men. Therefore the reader will observe, that when either of the terms, *white*, *black* or *negro*, is used, referring to race, that we refer to the one or the other, as the case may be, as is here set forth in describing the two races.

In God's nomenclature of the creation, his order stands thus: 1. Birds; 2. Fowls; 3. Creeping things; 4. Cattle; 5. Beasts; 6. Adam and Eve. We shall use this, but without any *intended* disparagement to any, as it is the *best* and *highest authority*.

Before proceeding with the examination of the subjects involved in the caption to this paper, we will for a moment, notice the prevailing errors, now existing in all their strength, and held by the clergy, and many learned men, to be true, which are: 1. Ham's name, which they allege, in Hebrew, means black; 2. The curse denounced against him, that a servant of servants should he be unto his brethren; and that *this* curse, was denounced against Ham, for the accidental seeing of his father Noah naked—that this curse was to do so, and did change him, so that instead of being long, straight-haired, high forehead, high nose, thin lips and white,[Pg 5] as he then was, and like his brothers Shem and Japheth, he was from that day forth, to be kinky-headed, low forehead, thick lipped and black skinned; and that his *name*, and this *curse*, effected all this. And truly, to answer their assumptions, it must have done so, or the case would not fit the negro, as we now find him. And they adduce in proof, that Ham's name in Hebrew (tCHam), means *black*, the present color of the negro, and that therefore Ham is the progenitor of the black race. They seem to forget, or rather, they ignore the fact, that the Bible nowhere says, that such a curse, or that any curse whatever, was denounced against Ham by his father Noah; but that this curse, with whatever it carried with it, was hurled at Canaan, the youngest son of Ham. But it is of little consequence, in the settlement of these great questions, *which* was intended, whether Ham or his youngest son Canaan. But if it be of any value in supporting their theory, this meaning of Ham's name in Hebrew, in designating *his* color to be black, and *black* it must be, to answer the color of the negro, then the names of Shem and Japheth should be of equal value, in determining *their* color; for each of the brothers received their respective names a hundred years or more before the flood, and were all the children of the same father and same mother. Now, if Shem and Japheth's names do not describe their color (which they

do not), upon what principles of logical philology or grammar, can Ham's *name* determine his color? How many of this day are there who are called, black, white, brown, and olive, all of whom are white, and without the slightest suspicion, that the *name* indicated the color of their respective owners. Is it not strange, that intelligent and learned men, should be compelled to rely on such puerilities, as arguments and truly supporting such tremendous conclusions? But they say it was his name in conjunction with the curse, that made him and his descendants the negro we now find on earth. It is an axiom in logic, that, that which is not in the constituent, can not be in the constituted. We have seen, that the making of Ham a negro, is not *in* the name, which is one of the constituents, now let us see, if it is in the other constituent, the *curse*. Now the *curse* and *name* changed Ham, if their theory be true, from a white man, to a black negro. If the curse, were capable of effecting such results, it is to be found in the word *curse*, and not in the words, that a servant of servants should he be, as he and his descendants could, as readily be servants,[Pg 6] white as black, and he was already white, and no necessity to make him black, to be a servant. If *this* effect on *Ham*, is to be found in the word *curse*, it will then be necessary, for the advocates of the assumption, to show, that such were its *usual* results, whenever that word was used; for unless such were its common effects, when used by God himself, by men of God, by patriarchs and by prophets, then we ask, on what grounds, if any there be, it is, that they assert, that *it did produce this* effect, in *this instance*, by Noah on Ham and his descendants? We do not question or doubt, that Canaan, was denounced in the curse, pronounced by Noah, that *he* should be a servant of servants; but whether Ham or Canaan *alone* is meant, is not material to the questions at issue, except in this view; but the advocates of such being its effect, must show, that such, at least was its effect previous to, and after Noah used it; and if they fail in this, that necessarily, this part of their argument is also a total failure. Let us look into the Bible. God cursed our first parents. Did this curse kink their hair, flatten their skulls, blacken their skin and flatten their nose? If it did, then Noah was sadly mistaken and these gentlemen too, in supposing that it was Noah's curse, that accomplished all this, for it was already done for the whole race—and long before, by God himself. God cursed the serpent. Did the curse produce this effect on him? He cursed Cain—did it affect his skin, his hair, his forehead, his nose or his lips? These curses were all pronounced by God himself and produced no such effects. But we proceed and take up the holy men of God, the patriarchs and prophets, and see what their curses produced. Did the curse of Jacob, produce this effect on Simeon and Levi? did it produce this effect on the man who would make a graven image? did it produce this effect on the man who would rebuild Jericho? did it produce this effect on those, who maketh the blind to wander out of the way? did it produce this effect on those, who perverteth the judgment of the stranger, the fatherless and the widow? *Cum multis aliis*. It did not. But if it did produce this effect in these cases, then when we read, that Christ died to redeem us from the curse, are we to understand, that he died to redeem us from a kinky head, flat nose, thick lips and a black skin? But such curses, never having produced *such* effects, when pronounced by God, by patriarch, by prophet, or by any holy man of God before or since, then we inquire to know, on what principles of interpretation, grammar or logic[Pg 7] it is, that it can so mean in this case of Noah? There are no words in the curse, that express, or even *imply* such effects. Then in the absence of all such effects, following such curses, and as they are narrated in the Bible, whether pronounced by God or man; and there being nothing in the language beside to sustain it, and if true, Ham's posterity must be shown now, as its truthful witnesses, from this, our day, back to the flood or to Ham; and which can not be done—and if this can not be done, then all arguments and assertions, based on such assumptions, that Ham was the father of the negro or black race, are false; and if false, then the negro is in *no sense*, the descendant of Ham; and therefore, he must have been in the ark, and as he was not one of Noah's family, that he *must* have entered it in some capacity, or relation to the other beasts or cattle. For that he did enter the ark is plain from the fact, that he is now here, and not of the family or progeny of Ham. And no one has ever suspicioned either Shem or Japheth of being the father of the negro; therefore he must have come out of the ark, and he could not come out, unless he had previously entered it; and if he entered it, that he must have *existed* before the flood, and that, too, just such negro as we have now, and consequently not as a descendant of Adam and Eve; and if not the progeny of Adam and Eve, that he is inevitably a

beast, and *as such*, entered the ark, though having the *form* of man, and *man* he is, being so *named* by Adam. Such is the logic, and such are the conclusions to which their premises lead, if legitimately carried out; and by which it is plainly seen, that the position assumed by the learned of the present and past ages—that the present negroes are the descendants of Ham, and were *made so* by his *name*, or by the *curse* of his father—is false in fact, and but an unwarranted assumption at best. But while this conclusion is inevitable, it also reveals to us another sad fact, that the good men of our own race (the white), though learned and philanthropic, exhibit a weakness, alas! *too* common in this our day, that anything they wish to believe or think will be popular, that it is very easy to convert the greatest *improbabilities* into the *best* grounds of their *faith*. The word used by God, used by patriarch and by prophet, is the *same* word used by Noah. If the word thus used by God, and by holy men, did not produce the effect as is charged by these men, how can the *same* word, when used by Noah, do it? And yet, on these assumptions, the faith of more than half the [Pg 8] world seems to be now based. To expose these cobweb fabrics, called by *some* reason, on this subject, and *Christian* philanthropy by others, in which are involved, such tremendous conclusions, for weal or for wo, of so large a portion of the biped creation, that we feel like apologizing to our readers, for answering such *learned* ignorance, blindness or weakness. But the meaning of Ham's name in Hebrew is not *primarily* black. Its primary meaning is: 1. Sunburnt; 2. swarthy; 3. dark; 4. black—and its most *unusual* meaning.

Having now disposed of these *fancies*, for they are nothing better, of the effects of Ham's name, and Noah's curse, in making him a negro; and having examined them, for the purpose of allowing on what flimsy grounds this mightiest of structures of air-built theories rests, and for *this* purpose *only*, as what we have said about them is not connected with, nor germane to the way we intend to pursue, in investigating the questions forming the caption to this paper. But having now disposed of them, we take up our own subject. The reader will bear in mind the description we have given respectively of the white and black races.

The first question to which we now invite attention is: Do the characteristics which we have given of the white race, belong equally, to all three of the sons of Noah—Shem, Ham and Japheth, and their descendants? If they do, then the black race, belong to, and have since the flood at least, belonged to another and totally different race of *men*.

Now to our question: Do the characteristics, which we have given of the white race, belong equally to the three sons of Noah and their descendants alike? We will begin with Noah himself first. The Bible says of Noah, that he was perfect in his generation. We will not stop to criticise the Hebrew translated "generation," for any English scholar on reading the verse in which it occurs, will see at once, that to make sense, it should have been *genealogy*. Then Noah was perfect in his genealogy—he was a preacher of righteousness—he was the husband of one wife, who was also perfect in her genealogy; by this one wife, he had three sons, all born about one hundred years before the flood, and all three of them married, before the flood, to women who were perfect also in their genealogies. Ordinarily speaking, this little statement of facts, undenied by all, and undeniable, would settle at least *this* question, that whatever the color of *one might* be, the others would be the same color—if one were [Pg 9] black, all would be black—if one were white, all would be white. Out of this arises the question, what was the color of these three brothers—were they and their descendants black or white?

We will begin with Shem, so as to find his race *now* on earth, to see if they are white or black. The Bible tells us where he went, and where his descendants settled, and what countries they occupied, until the days of our Saviour, who was of Shem's lineage after the flesh. From the days of the Saviour down to the present day, we see the Jews, the descendants of Shem, in every country, and see they belong to the white race, which none will pretend to deny—that they were so before, and after the flood, and have continued to be so to the present time, is unquestionably true. We know then, on Biblical authority, with mathematical certainty, that they are not negroes, either before, at, nor since the flood, but white.

We next take up Japheth. We know where he went, and what countries his descendants peopled, with equal certainty and on equal authority—and all outside concurrent history, equally clearly prove, that Japheth's descendants peopled Europe, whence they have spread over all the world. That they too belong to the white race, is also unquestioned, nor doubted by any that have eyes to see. That they were so before, and at the flood, and not negroes then, nor since, is equally undoubted and indisputable. We have not taken the trouble of showing step by step, where those two brothers went, and what countries they peopled *seriatim*, because they are admitted by all, learned and unlearned, to be and to have done just what is here stated in spreading over the world. It was, therefore, unnecessary to incumber this paper, by proving that which none disputes. This being so, then two of the three brothers, are known certainly, to be of the white race, and not of the negro, either before or after the flood.

We now take up the youngest brother, Ham. The evidence establishing the fact, that he too, and *his descendants* belong to the white race, with long, straight hair, high forehead, high noses and thin lips, is if *possible still stronger*, than that of either of his brothers; if indeed anything can, in human conception, be *stronger* than that, which is of perfect strength, and if this is true, then Ham can not be the father of the negro. As in the cases of the other two brothers, the Bible tells us where Ham, and his descendants went, and what countries they peopled, and where his race[Pg 10] may be found at this day; and which likewise, all contemporaneous history abundantly testifies, and shows that they are of the white race, and were so before the flood, and from the flood continued so, and yet continue so to the *present time*; and that not one of them, is of the negro race of this day. We will, in establishing the truths of the above declarations, take up two of Ham's sons and trace them and their descendants, from the flood to the present time, and show what they were, and what they are down to this day. These two sons of Ham, whose posterity we propose to trace, and show that they *now* belong to the white race, are Mizraim and Canaan, the second and the youngest of his sons. The families of all of the sons can be traced from the flood to the present day, but we presume two are sufficient, and that they be white; and we have selected Canaan *intentionally* and for a purpose that will be seen hereafter. Canaan *was* denounced by Noah, that he should be a servant of servants to his brethren, and if it turns out, in this investigation, as we *know* it will, that they belong to the *white race*, it will satisfactorily settle this question, that the *curse* of Noah did not make *him* and his descendants the black negro we now find on earth, much less Ham, who was not so cursed. The Bible plainly tells us, that the country now called Egypt, was settled by Mizraim, the second son of Ham, and was peopled by his descendants; that Mizraim, the second son of Ham, and grandson of Noah, gave his name to the country; that they called it the land of Mizraim, and by which name it is still known, to the present day, by the descendants of its ancient inhabitants; that they built many magnificent cities on the Nile—among them, the city of Thebes, one of the largest and most magnificent in its architecture, and the grandeur of its monuments and temples, the world ever saw. Its ruins at the present day, are of surpassing magnificence and grandeur. The city was named Thebes, to commemorate the Ark, that saved Noah, the grandfather of Mizraim, from the flood; the name of the Ark in Hebrew, being *Theba*. Then we take it for granted, all will admit, that what is now called Egypt, was settled by Mizraim, the son of Ham, and grandson of Noah. The Bible, and outside concurrent history, abundantly prove that he and his descendants, held, occupied and ruled over Egypt, and continued in the possession and the occupancy of the country as such, until long after the Exodus of the Hebrews, under Moses and Aaron; that Ham's descendants, through *Canaan*, in the persons of his sons Sidon and Heth, settled[Pg 11] Sidon, Tyre and Carthage. This will not be denied by any intelligent Biblical student or historian. Sidon itself was named after Canaan's oldest son.

From Egypt in Africa, Mizraim's descendants passed over to Asia, and settled India, whence they spread over that continent; that great commerce sprung up between India, etc., and Egypt and connecting countries, which was carried on by caravans; that Greece and Rome subsequently, shared largely in this commerce, especially after the march of Alexander the Great to India, by the caravan route, three hundred and thirty-two years before our Saviour's birth. This commerce has

continued to our day. All these facts are undeniable, and will be denied by none acquainted with the Bible and past history. These descendants, of this maligned Ham, were at, and after the flood, and continue to be, *to this day*, of the white race, all having long, straight hair, high foreheads, high noses and thin lips; that they are so, and as much so as the descendants of the other two brothers, and possessing all of the same general lineaments—lineaments that so long as the race shall exist, will be an eternal protest against their being of the negro race that we now have. But as we intend to show conclusively that Ham and his descendants were and are white, long, straight hair, etc., from Noah to the present time, so *plainly* and so *positively* that no fair or candid man can have the least doubt of its truth, we proceed to state: That we will now give the names of the country, now called Egypt, beginning with its first settlement by Mizraim, in regular order down, to enable the Biblical and historical student to refer readily to the histories of the different epochs, to detect any error, if we should make one, in tracing Ham's descendants, down to the present day. In Hebrew it is called Mizraim, in Coptic and Arabic (the former being now the name of its ancient or first inhabitants), it is called Misr or Mezr, being spelled in both these ways by the Arabian and Coptic writers. In Syro-Chaldaic and Hellenic Greek it is called Aiguptos—and in Latin, Ægyptus. In many of the ancient Egyptian and Coptic writings it is called *Chimi*, that is, the land of Ham, and is so called in the Bible, see Psalms cv, 23; cvi, 22, and other places. The ancient inhabitants now in Egypt, the Copts, are called the *posterity of Pharaoh*, by the Turks of the *present day*. The ancient *Hyksos*, or shepherd kings (patriarchs) of the Hebrews, are sometimes confounded in ancient history, with the descendants of Ham, being of the same original stock.[Pg 12] Egypt has not had a ruler of *its own* since the battle of Actium, fought by Augustus Caesar, thirty years before our Saviour, as God by his prophet had foretold that their own kings would cease forever to reign over that country. After the battle of Actium, it became a Roman province, and since that time, it has been under *foreign* rule. It now is, and has been governed by the Turks since 1517.

It appears (see Asiatic Miscel., p. 148, 4to), that Mizraim, the son of Ham, and his sons (descendants), after settling Egypt, a portion went to Asia, which was settled by them, and that they gave their names to the different parts of the country where they settled, and which they *retain yet*. The names of these sons of Mizraim as given in history are as follows: Hind, Sind, Zeng, Nuba, Kanaan, Kush, Kopt, Berber and Hebesh, or Abash. From these children of Ham, we not only readily trace the present names of the countries, but that of the people also to this day; that they founded the nations of the Indus, Hindoos, Nubians, Koptos, Zanzibar, Barbary, Abyssinia, the present Turks, is unquestioned and undoubted, by any intelligent scholar. That they are the white race, with long, straight hair, etc., is equally unquestionable, and are so *this day*, and as positively as that Shem and Japheth's descendants are now white. They first commenced to settle on the Nile in Africa, they then passed into Asia; and these two continents were principally settled by them. A portion of Europe (Turkey) is occupied by them—these, too, have long, straight hair, etc.

A portion of Ham's descendants, through Canaan's sons, Sidon and Heth, settled Sidon, Tyre, and later, Carthage. Tyre became a great power, and a city of much wealth and commerce, as we learn by the Bible and other history. Tyre was eventually overthrown, and her Queen and people fled. They subsequently built the great city of Carthage, near to where Tunis, in Africa, is now situated. They were again overthrown and their city destroyed by Scipio Africanus Secundus, after the battle of Zama. But, during one of the sieges, the city being invested by the Romans, the people became hard pressed for provisions, to supply which, they resolved on building some ships, to run the blockade for provisions. But after their ships were built, they had no ropes to rig them, nor anything within the city to make them. In this dilemma, the ladies, the women of Carthage, to their eternal honor be it spoken, patriotically stepped forward, and tendered their hair, *their long and beautiful tresses*, to make[Pg 13] the much needed ropes, which was accepted, and a supply of provisions obtained. Now *how many*, and what *sort* of ropes would the kinky-headed negro have furnished, had the inhabitants been negroes? This noble act of the women of Carthage, is mentioned to their honor, by Babylonian, Persian, Egyptian, Grecian, Roman and Carthaginian writers and historians; and yet, we have seen it stated, and stated by learned modern writers, and who ought to have known

better, that Hannibal, Hamilcar, Asdrubal, etc., the great Carthaginian Generals, were kinky-headed negroes—that Carthage itself, was a negro city. Why, the annals of fame do not present such an array of great names, whether in arts and sciences, and all that serves to elevate and make man noble on earth, or in the senate, or the field, by any other race of people, as will compare with those of Ham's descendants. These Carthaginians were all long and straight haired people. After the fall of Carthage, in the last Punic War, many of its people passed over subsequently into Spain, which they held and occupied for centuries, and are known in history as Saracens. A part of Spain, they held and occupied, until the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, when they were expelled. These, too, had long and straight hair, etc. But to return to that portion of Ham's descendants through Mizraim. These settled Egypt, India, China, and most all of Oriental Asia, where they have *continued to live*, and where *they yet live*, and not one of them is a negro. They all have long, straight hair, etc., peculiar *only* to the white race. Not one negro belongs to *their race*. That this is their history, none will deny.

Ham, the maligned and slandered Ham—Ham who is falsely charged as being the father of the negro—Ham, the son of the white man Noah—this Ham, and his descendants, the long and straight haired race, it appears from history—from *unquestioned* history—*governed and ruled the world* from the earliest ages after the flood and for many centuries—and gave to it, all the arts and sciences, manufactures and commerce, geometry, astronomy, geography, architecture, letters, painting, music, etc., etc.—and that they thus governed the world, as it were, from the flood, until they came in contact with the Roman people, and then their power was broken in a contest for the mastery of the world, at Carthage, one hundred and forty-seven years before A.D., and Carthage fell—but fell, not for lack of talents in her people, not for lack of orators, statesmen and generals of the most consummate abilities, but *because* God had long before determined, that the Japhethic race should govern the world; and the Roman people were Japheth's children. When Hannibal, the most consummate general the world ever saw to his day, fought the battle of Zama, he met a fate similar to that which befel another equally consummate commander at a later day, on the field of Waterloo—both became exiles. That Ham's talents, abilities, genius, power, grandeur, glory, should now be attempted to be *stolen*, and to be stolen, not by the negro, for he has neither genius or capacity for *such* a theft, but stolen by the learned men of this and the past ages, and thrust upon the negro, who has not capacity to understand, when, where, or how, he had ever performed such feats of legislation, statesmanship, government, arts of war and in science. The negro has been upon the earth, coeval with the white race. We defy any historian, any learned man, to put his finger on the *history*, the *page*, or even *paragraph* of history, showing he has ever done one of these things, thus done by the children of Ham; or that he has shown, in this long range of time, a capacity for self-government, such as Ham, Shem and Japheth. If he has done *anything* on earth, in *any age* of the world, since he has been here, as has been done by the three sons of Noah, in arts and sciences, government, etc., it surely can be shown; and shown equally as clear and *unequivocally*, *when* and *where he did it*, as that of Shem, Ham and Japheth can. But such a showing can never be made; that page of history has never yet been written that records it. On these subjects, *his history* is as blank as that of the horse or the beaver. But we are not yet done with Ham's descendants. The great Turko-Tartar generals, Timour, Ghenghis Kahn and Tamerlane, the latter called in history, the scourge of God—the Saracenic general, the gallant, the daring, the chivalrous, the noble Saladin, he who led the Paynim forces of Mahomet, against the lion-hearted Richard, in the war of the Crusades, all, all these were children of Ham. Mahomet himself, the founder of an empire, and the head of a new religion, made his kingdom of Ham's descendants, as *all Turks are*: and these all—have straight, long hair, etc. Those who have read the various histories of the crusades of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, know that the Turkish forces then, had long, straight hair, etc., and that it is so yet with their descendants none doubt—and these were children of Ham.

It will be seen now, how we have taken up one of Ham's[Pg 15] sons; that we have traced him and his descendants from the flood to Egypt, *where they are still*; that we have traced them across the continent of Africa into Asia, settling countries as they went; and to the countries still bearing their

names, where they settled, and where they *are yet*; that we have taken up another son, and traced him and his descendants to Sidon, Tyre, Carthage, and Spain, and shown that they, too, *without exception*, were long, straight haired, high foreheads, high noses, thin lips, and belong to the white race. Not a kinky-headed negro among them. We have shown that Ham's descendants have led and governed the world, for twenty-three centuries after the flood to the battle of Actium; that they gave it, also, the arts and sciences, manufactures and commerce, etc., etc. There is one discovery, one dye, as old as Tyre itself, and yet eminently noted—the *Tyrian Purple*—consecrated exclusively to imperial use. Imperial purple is the synonym of a king, in ancient and modern history; that we have found these children of the slandered Ham, and have traced them step by step, as it were, from country to country, from the days of the flood down to the present day; that *wherever* we found them, and *whenever* found, in any day, of any century from Noah down to this day, we have found them white, and of the *white race only*. And we now challenge the production of a single history, or a single paragraph of history, showing *one nation—one single nation or kingdom*—of kinky-headed, flat-nosed, thick-lipped and black-skinned negroes, that made such discoveries in arts and sciences, built such cities, had such rulers, kings, and legislators, such generals, such commerce, and such manufactures, as Mizraim's people on the Nile, or as Ham's children in Tyre, in Carthage, in Spain, show that they had—we defy its production. But we are not yet done with our proofs about Ham and his descendants being white.

It seems as if God, foreseeing the slander that would, in after ages, be put, or attempted to be put, on *his son Ham*, by ignorant or designing men attempting to show that he was the progenitor of the negro race, directed Mizraim, the second son of Ham, by an interposition of his power and providence, or by direct inspiration, to put away his dead, by a process of embalming, the details of which, for the accomplishment of the object, can be regarded as little, if anything, short of being miraculous; and by which, we can *now* look into the faces of the children of Mizraim, male and female, even at this day, in succeeding generations, and from[Pg 16] the flood; and which *can not be done* with the children of Shem and Japheth, about whose identity with the white race no controversy has ever existed. It was this fact that caused us to say, that the testimony establishing Ham's identity, as belonging to the white race, was *stronger*, if possible, than that of either of his brothers. God foreseeing, as we have said, this atrocious slander, that would be put on Ham and his posterity, so directed Mizraim, and at once inspired his mind, that from the first, he appeared to be fully acquainted with all the necessary ingredients, and how to use them, and in what proportions, and how many days were to be consumed to perfect the corpse, that it would be incorruptible, and thereby become and be *forever* a testimony of God for Ham, that should speak to the eyes and senses of all men, in after ages, and proclaiming as they do, to this day, and from the very time of the flood, and *through each successive generation from the flood*, that their ancestor, Ham, and they, his descendants, were like the children of the other brothers, their equal, in all the lineaments that stamp the race of Adam with the image and likeness of the Almighty, and belonging to the white race. That these mummied witnesses of Ham, his dead children, speaking from the tombs of ages for their father, and proclaiming from the days of the flood as they do, by each succeeding generation of his buried ones, down to the present day, and protesting by their long, straight hair, by their high foreheads, by their high noses, and by their thin lips, now hushed in silence forever, that the slander, that their father was the progenitor of the negro, was a *slander most foul*—a slander most *infamous*. Well might their indignant bodies be so aroused—well might Ham's children, who have been slumbering for centuries, be so electrified by these foul aspersions, as to burst their sarcophagii, and tear the cerements of the grave, and this foul calumny, from their faces at one and the same time and forever. It looks as if God *intended*, by this overruling or inspiring of Mizraim, so to embalm his dead, to teach *us* a lesson, that there was an *importance*, in being of the white race, *to be attached to it*, of grander proportions, and of nobler value, than any earthly, filial or paternal affections that could be symbolized by it. Millions of these mummied bodies have been exhumed this century, but *not one* negro has been found among them. What does this teach? What value do you place on this testimony prepared and ordained by God himself, as *his testimony to the*[Pg 17] *worth of the white race*? The writer of this has seen many of these mummies, but never a negro. He

has assisted in unrolling some, and all had straight, long hair. It was his fortune, as it happened, to assist in unrolling the body of one possessing peculiar interest. From the hieroglyphic inscription on the sarcophagus, it proved to be the body of a young lady, who died in her seventeenth year, that she was the daughter of the High Priest of On (the temple of On was situated six miles northeast from the present Cairo), and that she was an attendant of the princesses of the court of King Thothmes 3d. This king is recognized and believed to be that Pharaoh under whom Moses and Aaron brought out the children of Israel from Egypt. This mummy we assisted in unrolling. The inner wrapping next to the skin was of what we now call *fine linen cambric*. When this was removed, the hair on the head looked as though it had but recently been done up. It was in hundreds of very small plaits, three-ply, and each from a yard to a yard and a quarter long; and although she had then been buried 3,338 years, her hair had the *apparent* freshness as if she had been dead only a few days or weeks. The face, ears, neck and bosom were gilded; and so were her hands to above the wrists, and her feet to above the ankles. Such had been the perfect manner of her embalmment, that the flesh retained its roundness and fullness remarkably, with fine teeth, beautiful mouth, and every mark by which we could, at this day, recognize her as a beautiful lady of the white race. Without disparagement to our fair country-women, we can say, that a more beautiful hand, foot and ankle, we never beheld.

Now, what have we proven by this recitement of Bible history—of that of contemporaneous and concurrent history outside of the Bible—of facts, facts now existing in the mummied remains of Ham's descendants, commencing with Mizraim and coming down through centuries since the flood—of the *yet living nations*, comprised *unquestionably* of his descendants, and who, like the descendants of Shem and Japheth, have the distinctive marks of the white race *alone*, and as clear as either Shem or Japheth, and that, too, as they *exist now on earth*, and running back as such from this our day to Noah; and as *distinct* from the negro race as that race is now distinct from the children of Japheth? Of that miraculous intervention of divine power, in causing Mizraim so to embalm his children, that they should speak from the grave, in attestation of their being of the white,[Pg 18] and not of the negro, race. Why did God require that *only* the children of Ham should be embalmed, of all then on earth? No other nation, as such, then or *since*, embalmed their dead. Why was it, that the children of Ham alone did this? Except but for the reason that God, foreseeing the disputes to arise about the negro, and that Ham would be slandered and held to be the progenitor of the negro; that, therefore, in vindication of him, as belonging to the white race, and as an *immortal* being, and not of the beasts that perish, God caused these descendants of Ham to embalm their dead, and to *continue* doing so for many centuries. No other valid reason can be assigned, why these people of Mizraim, *alone* of all the nations of the earth, did so. There may have been, and doubtless there were, many reasons with the people, of a private and personal character, inciting them to do so; but *this was God's reason*, and he chose these personal considerations of the people, as *his* means of accomplishing it.

We have shown conclusively: 1. That Ham's descendants now on earth, in Egypt, in India, all over Asia, a portion of Africa and Europe respectively, have, *this day*, long, straight hair, high foreheads, high noses and thin lips—that they have ever *been* so; this, all history in the Bible, and all history outside of the Bible, fully attest. 2. While, on the other hand, all history tells us (when it says anything about them), that the negro race is kinky-headed, low forehead, flat nose, thick lip and black skin; that he has *always* been so, and the negro of this day attests that he is so yet; and that, consequently, he is in *no way* related to Ham, even by a *curse*, for he is black, and Ham is white. 3. That the descendants of Shem and Japheth are white, and have always been white, none dispute. 4. That, having established, then, that Shem, Ham and Japheth were perfect in their genealogies from Adam and Eve; that they were the children of one father and one mother; that they were born about a hundred years before the flood; that their wives, like themselves, were perfect in their genealogies; that these brothers and their descendants, as regards their genealogy, were the perfect equals of each other; that the curse of Noah, even if directed against Ham, and which it is not, that it is *impossible* that that curse could, in any way, make him the father or progenitor of the present

negroes—as no curse denounced by God himself, by patriarch or by prophet, had ever done so before or since, and there is nothing in the language used by Noah that covers that idea; that, on the[Pg 19] contrary, the *exact word* used by Noah, had been before used by God and by patriarchs, without the slightest suspicion being excited that such was its effect on the person so cursed; that it was not found in Ham's name, and that the effort to connect the color of the negro with the meaning of Ham's name in Hebrew, is a mere *fancy*, not of the strength even of a cobweb. Now, reader, are these things true? Look into your Bible—look into contemporaneous and concurrent history—look at existing facts outside of the Bible, and running from the flood down to the present day, and hear the prophet of God defiantly ask, Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?—both beasts; and when you have so looked, you will say, *true*, every word, *indubitably* true! Then, what? One word more, before we proceed further. The embalming of Ham's dead and the Jewish genealogical tables *ceased* at about the same time, and by God's interposing power. Each were permitted by God to continue as *national records*—the one to show the genealogy of Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah, the other to show that Ham was *white*, and *not* the progenitor of the negro; and each having accomplished the end designed, God permitted them to cease, and both ceased about the same time. Is not this embalming, then, in effect, the direct testimony of God himself, that Ham and his children were of the white race, and that there is an *importance in being of the white race*, and which we will see by and by, and beyond any appreciation ever given to it heretofore? And is it not equally God's testimony, *ipso facto*, that the negro race have always existed as we have it now, and as have those of the three brothers equally always existed, and as we have *them* now?

But, reader, suppose we admit, for the sake of the argument, that Ham was black, and that he was made so by the curse of his father Noah—we say, suppose we were to admit this, then what follows? Ham would have been just *such a negro* as we now find on earth—admitted; but then he would have been the *only* negro on earth. Where was his negro wife to be had? He could not propagate the negro race, by a cross with the white woman; for that would have produced a *mulatto*, and not the negro, such as we now have. To propagate the negro that we now have on earth, the *man* and the *woman* must both be negroes. Now, where did Ham's negro wife come from? She did not come out of the ark? She was not on earth? Do we not see clearly from this statement of facts, that the assumption of the learned world,[Pg 20] even admitting it, destroys itself the moment that we bring it to the test of facts. Under *no* view of their *assumptions* can the negro we now have on earth be accounted for.

These things being so, now what? We proceed with our subject. It being shown to be incontestibly true, that the three brothers, Shem, Ham and Japheth, when they came out of the ark, were *each* of the white race, and that they have continued so to the *present day* in their posterity—this is incontestible, and being true, it settles *the question, that Ham is not the progenitor of the negro*, and we must now look to some other quarter for the negro's origin. As the negro is not the progeny of Ham, as has been demonstrated, and knowing that he is of neither family of Shem or Japheth, who are white, straight haired, etc., and the negro we have now on earth, is kinky-headed and black, by this logic of facts we *know, that he came out of the ark*, and is a totally different race of men from the three brothers. How did he get in there, and in what station or capacity? We answer, that he went into the ark by *command of God*; and as he was neither Noah, nor one of his sons, all of whom were white, then, by the logic of facts, *he could only enter it as a beast, and along with the beasts*. This logic of *facts* will not allow this position to be questioned. But we will state it in another way equally true, from which the same result must necessarily follow, that the negro entered the ark *only as a beast*. All candid or uncandid men will admit that the negro of the *present day*, have kinky heads, flat nose, thick lip and black skin, and which we have shown is *not* true of either Shem, Ham or Japheth's progeny of *this day*, and consequently *it is impossible* that either of them could be, or could have been, the progenitor of the negro, at or since the flood, for each race exists now, the one white and the other black; and then, as it is impossible to believe that the negro was created at or since the flood, therefore, he must have been in the ark. This being so, now let us see what God said

to Noah in proof of this position. He told Noah that he intended to destroy the world by a flood, but that he intended to save him and his wife, and his three sons and their wives. These were all God intended to *save*, for *they* had *souls* and *beasts have not*. God told him he must prepare an ark, into which besides his family, he must also take of *every beast* after his kind, and all cattle after their kind, and of every creeping thing that creepeth on the earth, and every fowl after his kind, and every bird after his sort, and food for[Pg 21] their support. Thus did Noah, and thus by God's command he entered the Ark with his family. God promised Noah to *save* him and his family—but God did not promise to *save* the *beasts*, etc., although he preserved them in the ark; but, *besides this preservation*, Noah and his family were to be *saved*—why, we will see presently. Then, Ham, not being the father of the negro, the negro must have come out of the ark with the beasts, and *as one*, for he was *not one of Noah's family* that entered it. This is inevitable, and can not be shaken by all the reasonings of men on earth to the contrary. Now, unless it can be shown that, from Noah back to Adam and Eve, that in some way this kinky-headed and black-skinned negro is the progeny of Adam and Eve, and which we know can not be done, then *again* it follows, indubitably, that the negro is not a *human* being—not being of Adam's race. This point we will now examine and settle, and then account for the negro being here.

Noah was the tenth in generation from Adam and Eve. We have before shown that the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth, at this day, are white—have been so from the flood, with long, straight hair, etc. This fact establishes another fact, viz: that Noah was also white, with long, straight hair, etc. The Bible tells us that Noah was perfect in his genealogy, and the tenth in descent from Adam and Eve; that, consequently, Adam and Eve were white—with long, straight hair, high foreheads, high noses and thin lips. Our Saviour was also white, and his genealogy is traced, family by family, back to Adam and Eve—which *again* establishes the fact that Adam and Eve were white. We have also shown that the negro did not descend from either of the sons of Noah. That he is now here on earth, none will deny; and being here now, this logic of facts proves that he was in the ark, and came out of the ark after the flood; and that it indubitably follows, from the necessities of the case, that he entered the ark as a *beast*, and *only* as a beast. Now, it is very plain, from this statement, that as he came out of the Ark, the negro, *as we now know him*, existed anterior to the flood, and *just such a negro as we have now*, with his kinky head, flat nose, black skin, etc.; and that, Noah and his wife being white, and perfect in their genealogy, it establishes that Adam and Eve were white; and no *mesalliance* having taken place from Adam to Noah, by which the negro could be produced, that, therefore, as neither of the sons of Noah, nor Noah himself, nor Adam and Eve, ever could by[Pg 22] any possibility be, either of them, the progenitor of the negro, that, therefore, it follows, from this logic of facts, that the negro is a *separate* and *distinct* species of the *genus homo* from Adam and Eve, and being distinct from them, that it *unquestionably* follows that *the negro was created before Adam and Eve*. Created before them? Yes. How do we know this? Because the Bible plainly tells us that Adam and Eve were the last beings of God's creation on earth, and being *the last*, that the negro must have existed before they were created; for he is here now, and not being their offspring, it follows, from this logic of facts, that he was on the earth before them, and if on the earth before Adam, that he is inevitably a beast, and as a beast, entered the ark. Let us recapitulate our points. We have shown that the assumption of the learned world, that Ham is the progenitor of the negro, is a mistake, philanthropically and innocently made, we have no doubt, but nevertheless a mistake, and a very great one. As Ham is not the father of the negro, and no one asserts that either Shem or Japheth is, then the negro belongs to another race of people, and that he came out of the ark, is a demonstrated fact; and not being of Noah's family, who are white, and Adam and Eve being likewise white, therefore, *they* could not be the progenitors of the negro; and as neither the *name* or *curse* did make Ham a negro, or the father of negroes (and this covers the space of time from now back to the flood and to Noah), and no *mesalliance* ever having taken place from the flood or Noah, back to Adam and Eve, by which the negro can be accounted for, and Adam and Eve being white, that they could never be the father or mother of the kinky-headed, low forehead, flat nose, thick lip and black-skinned negro; and as Adam and Eve were the last beings created by God on earth, therefore, all beasts, cattle, etc., were consequently made *before* Adam and Eve were created; and

the negro being now here on earth, and not Adam's progeny, it follows, beyond all the reasonings of men on earth to controvert, that he was created *before* Adam, and with the other beasts or cattle, and being created *before* Adam, that, like all beasts and cattle, they have no souls. This can not be gainsaid, and being true, let us see if it is in philosophic harmony with God's order among animals in their creation. Not to be prolix on this point, we will take a few cases. We will begin with the cat. The cat, as a genera of a species of animals, we trace in his order of *creation* through various grades—cougar, panther, leopard, tiger, up to the[Pg 23] lion, improving in each gradation from the small cat up to the lion, a noble beast. Again, we take the ass, and we trace through the intervening animals of the same species up to the horse, another noble animal. Again, we take up the monkey, and trace him likewise through his upward and advancing orders—baboon, ourang-outang and gorilla, up to the negro, another noble animal, the noblest of the beast creation.

The difference between these higher orders of the monkey and the negro, is very slight, and consists mainly in this one thing: the negro can utter sounds that can be imitated; hence he could talk with Adam and Eve, for they could imitate his sounds. This is the foundation of language. The gorilla, ourang-outang, baboon, etc., have languages peculiar to themselves, and which they understand, because they can imitate each other's sounds. But man can not imitate them, and hence can not converse with them. The negro's main superiority over them is, that he utters sounds that could be imitated by Adam; hence, conversation ensued between them. Again, the baboon is thickly clothed with hair, and goes erect a *part* of his time. Advancing still higher in the scale, the ourang-outang is less thickly covered with hair, and goes erect most altogether. Still advancing higher in the scale, the gorilla has still less hair, and is of a black skin, and goes erect when moving about. A recent traveler in Africa states that the gorilla frequently steals the negro women and girls, and carry them off for wives. It is thus seen that the gradation, from the monkey up to the negro, is in philosophical juxtaposition, in God's order of creation. The step from the negro to Adam, is still progressive, and consists of change of color, hair, forehead, nose, lips, etc., and *immortality*. That the negro existed on earth before Adam was created, is so positively plain from the preceding facts, no intelligent, candid man can doubt; and that he so existed before Adam, and *as a man* (for he was so *named* by Adam), we now proceed to show.

We read in the Bible, and God said, let us make man *in* our own image and after *our* likeness; which is equivalent to saying, we have *man* already, but *not in our* image; for if the negro was already in God's image, *God could not have said*, now let us make man *in* our image. But God did say, after he had created every thing else on earth *but Adam*, that he *then* said, let us make man *in our* image, and after *our likeness*, and let him, so created now, have dominion. God so[Pg 24] formed *this* man, out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul, and endowed with immortality. Now, it is indisputably plain, and so shown from the Bible in this paper, that *this BEING*, thus created by God, had long, straight hair, high forehead, high nose, thin lips, and white skin, and which the negro has not; and it is equally clearly shown that the negro is not the progeny of Adam. Therefore the negro must have existed before Adam. But another fact: Adam was to have *dominion* over all the earth. There must, of *necessity*, be an established boundary to that dominion, as betwixt God and himself, in order that Adam should rule only in his allotted dominion. In settling this domain, the Bible is full and exact. That which was to be, and to continue under *God's* dominion, rule and control, God named himself. He called the light, day; the darkness he called night; the dry land he called earth; and the gathering together of the waters, he called seas; and the firmament he called heaven, etc. And what was to be under Adam's dominion, rule and control, Adam named himself, but by God's direction and authority. But mark: *Adam did not name himself*—for no child ever names himself. But God named *him and his race*, but he did not call or name him *man* after he created him. Adam's dominion, starting *from* himself, went *downward* in the scale of creation; while God's dominion, starting *with* Adam, went upward. God, foreseeing that Adam would call the negro by the name *man*, when he said, let us make man, therefore so used the term; for by such *name* "man," the negro, was known by to the flood, but not *the* man.

Whenever Adam is personally spoken of in the Hebrew scriptures, invariably his name has the

prefix, *the man*, to contradistinguish him from the negro, who is called *man* simply, and was so *named* by Adam. By inattention to this distinction, made by God himself, the world is indebted for the confusion that exists regarding Adam and his race, and the negro. Adam and his race were to be *under God's dominion, rule and government*, and was, therefore, *named* by God, "and he called *their* name Adam," in reference to his *race*, and *the man*, to contradistinguish *him* from the negro, whom Adam named "*man*." *But God did not call Adam man after he created him*—he called *their* name Adam—while Adam named the negro *man*. But some may say, again, as many have already said, that the negro might be the offspring of Adam by some other woman, or of Eve by some one other than Adam. Have such reasoners thought of the de[Pg 25]struction, the *certain* destruction, to their own theory, this assumption would entail upon them? Can they not see that, in either case, by Adam or by Eve, the progeny would be a *mulatto*, and not a kinky-headed, flat nose, black negro, and that we should be at as much loss as before, to account for the negro as we now have him on earth, as ever. And if such miscegenating and crossing continued, that now we would have no *kinky heads* nor *black skins* among us. But this amalgamation of the whites and blacks was never consummated until a later day, and then we shall see what God thought of its practice. But while on this point, just here let us remark, that God in the creating of Adam, to be the head of creation, intended to distinguish, and did distinguish, him with eminent grandeur and notableness in his creation, over and above everything else that had preceded it. But when creating the negro and other beasts and animals, he made the male and female—each out of the ground. Not so with Adam and his female, for God expressly tells us that he made Adam's wife out of himself, thus securing the *unity* of immortality *in his race alone*, and hence he called *their* name Adam, not *man*. The black *man* was the *back ground* of the picture, to show the white man to the world, in his dominion over the earth, as the *darkness* was the back ground of the picture of creation, before and over which light, *God's light*, should forever be seen.

The discussion and practice of the social and political equality of the white and black races, heretofore, have always carried along with them their kindred error of the equality of *rights* of the *two* sexes, in all things pertaining to human affairs and government. But both end in destruction, *entire* destruction and extermination, as we shall see in the further prosecution of our subject, and as the Bible plainly teaches. The conclusion, then, that the negro which we now have on earth was created *before* Adam, is inevitable, from the logic of facts, and the divine testimony of the Bible, and can not be resisted by all the reasonings of men on earth.

How is it that we say that the horse was created before Adam? The Bible does not tell us so in so many words, yet we *know* that it is true. How do we know it? Simply because we know that the Bible plainly tells us that Adam and Eve were the last of God's creation on earth, and by the fact that we have the horse *now*, and know that he must have been created, and Adam being the last created, that, consequently, by this logic of facts, we *know* that the horse was made before[Pg 26] Adam. The horse has his distinctive characteristics, and by which he has been known in all ages of the world, and he has been described in all languages by those characteristics, so as to be recognized in all ages of the world. His characteristics are not more distinct from some other animals than that of the white race is distinct from that of the negro, or of the negro from the white. We can trace all the beasts, etc., now on earth, back to the flood, and from the flood back to the creation of the world, and just *such animals* as we find them now. Why not the negro? We know we can that of the white man. Then we ask, again, why not the negro as readily as the white man or the horse? Has *any* animal so changed from their creation that we can not recognize them now? Certainly not. Then, why say that the negro has? Has God ever changed any beings from the *order* in which he created them since he made the world? Most certainly he has not. Has he ever intimated in any way that he would do so? Certainly not. Has he created any beings since he made Adam? No. How, then, can any man *assert that he did make or change a white man* into a black *negro*, and say not *one word* about it? Such a position is untenable, it is preposterous.

But, to go on with our subject: We read in the Bible that it came to pass when *men* began to multiply, etc., that the sons of God saw the daughters of *men*, that they were fair, and they took

themselves wives of all which they chose. A word or two of criticism before we proceed. In this quotation the word *men* is correctly translated from the Hebrew, and as it applies to the negro, it is not in the original applied to Adam, for then it would be *the men*, Adam and his race being so distinguished by God himself, when Adam was created. Again, the *daughters of men* were *fair*. The word *fair* is not a correct rendering of the original, except as it covers simply the *idea*, captivating, enticing, seductive.

With this explanation we proceed, and in proceeding we will show these criticisms to be just and proper.

Who were these sons of God? Were they from heaven? If they were, then their morals were sadly out of order. Were they angels? Then it is very plain they never got back to heaven: nor are wicked angels ever sent to earth from heaven. And they are not on earth for the angels that sinned, are confined where there is certainly no water; and these were all *drowned*. And angels can not be drowned. Angels belong to heaven, and if they do anything wrong there,[Pg 27] they are sent, not to earth, but to—tophet. They are not the sons of men from *below*, nor its angels; for these could not be called sons of God. Who were they then? We answer, without the fear of successful contradiction, that they were the sons of Adam and Eve, thus denominated by *pre-eminence*; and as they truly were, the sons of God, to show the horrible *crime* of their criminal association with *beasts*. Immortal beings allying themselves with the beasts of the earth. These daughters of *men* were *negroes*, and these sons of God, were the children of Adam and Eve, as we shall see presently, and beyond a shade of doubt.

God told Adam and Eve to multiply and replenish the earth. Then it is plain, God could have no objection to their taking themselves wives of whom they chose, of their own race, in obeying this injunction; for they could not do otherwise in obeying it. But God *did* object to their taking wives of *these daughters of men*. Then it is plain that these daughters of *men*, whatever else they may have been, *could not be the daughters* of Adam and Eve; for, had they been, God would certainly not have objected, as they would have been exactly fulfilling his command, to take them wives and multiply. But our Saviour settles these points beyond any doubt, when he taught his disciples how to pray—to say, *Our Father*, who art in heaven. His disciples were white, and the lineal and pure descendants of Adam and Eve. This being so, then, when he told such to say, "Our Father, who art in heaven," equally and at the same time told them that, as God was their father, *they were the sons of God*; and as God did object to the "sons of God" taking them wives of these daughters of *men*, that it is *ipso facto* God's testimony that these daughters of *men* were negroes, and *not his children*. This settles the question that it was Adam's pure descendants who are here called the *sons of God*, and that these daughters of men were negroes.

By this logic of facts we see, then, who these sons of God were, and who these daughters of *men* were; and that the crime they were committing, could not be, or ever will be, *propitiated*; for God neither *could* or *would forgive it*, as we shall see. He determined to destroy them, and with them the world, by a flood, and for the crime of *amalgamation* or *miscegenation of the white race* with that of the *black—mere beasts of the earth*. We can now form an opinion of the awful nature of this crime, in the *eyes of God*, when we know that he destroyed the world by a flood, on account of its perpetration. But it is probable that we should not, in this our day, have been so long in the dark in regard to the sin, the *particular sin*, that brought the flood upon the earth, had not our translators rejected the rendering of some of the oldest manuscripts—the Chaldean, Ethiopic, Arabic, *et al.*—of the Jewish or Hebrew scriptures, in which *that sin* is plainly set forth; our translators believing it *impossible* that brute beasts could corrupt themselves with mankind, and then, not thinking, or regarding, that the *negro* was the *very beast* referred to. But even after this rejection, such were the number and authenticity of manuscripts in which that *idea* was still presented, that they felt constrained to admit it, covertly as it were, as may be seen on reading Gen. vi: 12-13, in our common version.

It will be admitted by all Biblical scholars, and doubted by none, that immediately after the fall of

Adam in the garden of Eden, God then (perhaps on the same day), instituted and ordained sacrifices and offerings, as the media through which Adam and his race should approach God and call upon his name. That Adam did so—that Cain and Abel did so; and that Seth, through whom our Saviour descended after the flesh, did so, none can or will doubt, who believe in the Bible. Now, Seth's first-born son, Enos (Adam's first grandson), was born when Adam was two hundred and thirty-five years old. Upon the happening of the birth of this grandson, the sacred historian fixes the time, the *particular time*, immediately after the birth of Enos, as the period when a certain important matter *then first* took place; that important event was: that "*Then men began to call on the name of the Lord*," as translated in our Bible. Who are *these men* that *then began* to call on the Lord? It was not Adam; it was not Cain; it was not Abel; it was not Seth; And these were all the men that were of Adam's race that were upon the earth at that time, or that had been, up to the birth of Enos; and these had been calling on the name of the Lord ever since the fall in the garden. Who were they, then? What *men* were they, then on earth, that *then began* to call on the name of the Lord? There is but one answer between earth and skies, that can be given in truth to this question. This logic of facts, this logic of Bible facts, plainly tells us that these *men* who *then began* (A.M. 235) to call upon the name of the Lord, were negroes—the *men* so named by Adam when he named the other beasts and cattle. This can not be questioned. Any other view would[Pg 29] make the Bible statements false, and we know the Bible to be true. If our translators (indeed all translators whose works we have examined), had not had their minds confused by the *idea* that all who are, in the Bible, called *men* were Adam's progeny; or had they recognized the simple fact, that the term *man* was the *name* bestowed on the *negro* by Adam, and that this *name* was never applied to Adam and his race till long after the flood, they would have made a very different translation of this sentence from the original Hebrew. The logic of facts existing *before* and at the time the sacred historian said that "*Then men began to call*," would, in conjunction with the original Hebrew text, have compelled them to a different rendering from the one they adopted. But, believing as they did, that it was some of Adam's race, then called *men*, they stumbled on a translation that *not one* of them has been satisfied with since they made it. The propriety of this assertion in regard to antecedents *controlling* the proper rendering, will be readily admitted by all scholars. The rendering, therefore, of the exact *idea* of the sacred historian, would be this: "*Then men began to profane the Lord by calling on his name*." This is required by the *Hebrew*, and the antecedent facts certainly demand it; otherwise we would falsify the Bible, as Adam and his sons had been calling on the Lord ever since the fall; therefore, the men referred to, that then *began* to call, could not be Adam, nor any of his sons. This logic of facts compels us to say that it was the negro, created before Adam and by him *named man*, for there were no other *men* on the earth. That the calling was profane, is admitted by all of our ablest commentators and Biblical scholars, as may be seen by reference to their works. See Adam Clark, *et al.* The Jews translate it thus: "*Then men began to profane the name of the Lord*."

But we have this singular expression in the Bible, occurring about the flood: That it repented the Lord that he had made *man* on the earth, and that it *grieved him at his heart*. Now, it is clear that God could not refer, in these expressions, to Adam as the man whom it repented and grieved him that he had made; for Adam was a part of himself, and became so when God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and he became a living soul, immortal, and must exist, *ex consequentia*, as long as God exists. God can not hate any part of himself, for that would be perfection hating perfection, and Adam did partake of the divine nature to some[Pg 30] extent; and therefore the *man* here referred to could not have been Adam's posterity; and must have been, from the same logic of facts, the *man*, negro, the beast, called by God, *man before he created Adam*. Now, it must have been some awful crime, some terrible corruption, that could and did cause God to repent, to be grieved at his heart, that he had made man. What was this crime? what this corruption? Was it moral crimes confined to Adam's race? Let us see. It was not the eating of the forbidden fruit; for that had been done long before. It was not murder; for Cain had murdered his brother. It was not drunkenness; for Noah, though a preacher of righteousness, did get drunk. It was not incest; for Lot, another preacher of righteousness, committed that. It was not that of one brother selling his own brother as a slave, to be taken to a strange land; for Joseph's brethren did that, and lied about it, too.

It was not—, but we may go through the whole catalogue of moral sins and crimes of *human* turpitude, and take them up separately, and then compound them together, until the whole catalogue of *human* iniquity and infamy is exhausted, and then suppose them all to be perpetrated every day by *Adam's race*, and as they have been *before* and *since* the flood, still we would have but one answer, and that answer would be, *It is none of these, nor all of them combined*, that thus caused God to repent and be grieved at his heart, that he had made *man*; but add one more—nay not *add*, but take one crime alone and by itself—one *only*, and that crime Adam's children, the sons of God, amalgamating, miscegenating, with the *negro—man—beast, without soul—without the endowment of immortality*, and you have the reason, *why* God repented and drowned the world, because of its commission. It is a crime, *in the sight of God*, that can not be *propitiated* by any sacrifice, or by any oblation, and can not be forgiven by God—*never* has been forgiven on earth, and never will be. Death—death inexorable, is declared by God's judgments on the *world* and *on nations*; and he has declared death as its punishment by his law—death to both male and female, without pardon or reprieve, and beyond the power of *any* sacrifice to expiate.

That Adam was especially endowed by his Creator, and by him commissioned with authority to rule and have dominion over everything created on earth, is unquestioned; that to mark the extent of his dominion, everything *named by him* was included in his right to rule them. His wife was the *last thing* named by him, and consequently under his rule,[Pg 31] government and dominion. But a being called man existed before Adam was created, and was *named man* by Adam, and was to be under his rule and dominion, as all other beasts and animals. But did God call Adam *man*, after he had created him? Most certainly he did not. This fact relieves us of all doubt as to *who* was meant as the *men* of whose daughters the sons of God took their wives, independent of the preceding irrefragable proofs, that it was the negro; and the crime of amalgamation thus committed, brought the flood upon the earth. There is no possibility of avoiding this conviction.

But this will be fully sustained as we advance. Cush was Ham's oldest son, and the father of Nimrod. It appears from the Bible, that this Nimrod was not entirely cured, by the flood, of this antediluvian love for and miscegenation with negroes. Nimrod was the first on earth who began to monopolize power and play the despot: its objects we will see presently. *Kingly power* had its origin in love for and association with the negro. Beware! Nimrod's hunting was not only of wild animals, but also of *men*—the negro—to subdue them under his power and dominion; and for the purposes of rebellion against God, and in defiance of his power and judgment in destroying the world, and for the *same sin*. This view of Nimrod as a *mighty* hunter, will be sustained, not only by the facts narrated in our Bible, of what he did, but to the mind of every Hebrew scholar, it will appear doubly strong by the sense of the original. We see that God, by his prophets, gives the name *hunter to all tyrants*, with manifest reference to Nimrod as its originator. In the Latin Vulgate, Ezekiel xxxii: 30, plainly shows it. It was Nimrod that directed and managed—ruled, if you please—the great multitude that assembled on the Plain of Shinar. This multitude, thus assembled by his arbitrary power, and other inducements, we shall see presently, were mostly *negroes*; and with them he undertook the building of the tower of Babel—a building vainly intended, by him and them, should reach heaven, and thereby they would escape such a flood as had so recently destroyed the earth; and for the *same sin*. Else why build such a tower? They knew the sin that had caused the flood, for Noah was yet living; and unless they were again committing the *same* offense, there would be no necessity for such a tower. That the great multitude, gathered thus by Nimrod, were mostly negroes, appears from the facts stated in the Bible. God told Noah, after the flood, to subdue the earth[Pg 32] "for all beasts, cattle," etc., "are delivered into thy hands." The negro, as already shown, was put into the ark with the beasts, and came out of it along with them, as one. If they went into the ark by sevens, as is probable they did, from being the head of the beasts, cattle, etc., then their populating power would be in proportion to the whites—as seven is to three, or as fourteen is to six; and Nimrod *must* have resorted to them to get the multitude that he assembled on the Plain of Shinar; for the Bible plainly tells us where the other descendants of Noah's children went, including those of Nimrod's *immediate* relations; and from the Bible account where they *did* go to, it is evident *that*

they did not go with Nimrod to Shinar. This logic of facts, therefore, proves that they were negroes, and explains why Nimrod is called the *mighty* hunter before, or *against* the Lord, as it should have been translated in this place. David stood *before* Goliath; but evidently *against* him. The whole tenor of the Bible account shows these views to be correct, whether the negro entered the ark by sevens or only a pair. For, when we read further, that they now were all of one speech and one language, they proposed, besides the tower, to build them a city, where their power could be *concentrated*; and if this were accomplished, and they kept together, and acting in *concert*, under such a man as the Bible shows Nimrod to have been, it would be impossible for Noah's descendants to *subdue* the earth, as God had charged they should do. It was, therefore, to prevent this *concentration* of power and numbers, that God confounded their language, broke them into bands, overthrew their tower, stopped the building of their city, and scattered or dispersed them over the earth.

Let us now ask: Was not their tower an *intended* offense to, and defiance of, God? Most certainly. If not, why did God destroy it? Did God ever, *before* or *after*, destroy any *other* tower of the many built about this time, or in any subsequent age of the world, made by any *other* people? No. Why did he not destroy the towers, obelisks and pyramids, built by Mizraim and his descendants, on the banks of the Nile? And why prevent *them* from building a city, but for the purpose of destroying concentrated power, to the injury of Noah's children, and their *right* from God to rule the earth? The Bible nowhere tells us where any of the beasts of earth went at any time: hence, the negro being one, it says not one word about where any of them went. But we are at no loss to find them, when we know their habits. The negro,[Pg 33] we know from his habits, when unrestrained, never inhabits mountainous districts or countries; and, therefore, we readily find him in the level Plain of Shinar. The whole facts narrated in the Bible, of what was *said* and *done*, go to show that the positions here assumed, warrant the correctness of the conclusion that the main body of these people were negroes, subdued by and under the rule and direction of Nimrod; that the language used by them, why they would build them a tower, shows they were daily practicing the *same sin* that caused God to destroy the earth by a flood; and that, actuated by the fear of a similar fate, springing from a *like cause*, they hoped to avoid it by a tower, which should reach heaven; that their confusion and dispersion, and the stopping of the building of *their* city by God—all, all go to show what sort of people they were, and what sin it was that caused God to deal with them so *totally* different from his treatment of *any other* people. The very language used by them, on the occasion, goes plainly to prove that those Babel-builders knew that they were *but beasts*, and knew what the effect of that sin would be, that was being committed daily. They knew it was the very *nature* of beasts to be scattered over the earth, and that they had *no name* (from God, as Adam had); therefore they said, "one to another, let us make brick, and let us build *us* a city, and a tower whose top may reach heaven; and let us make *us* a name (as God gave us none), lest we be *scattered abroad*." *Name*, in the Hebrew scriptures, signified "power, authority, rule," as may be readily seen by consulting the Bible. And God said: "And *this* they will begin to do, and nothing will *be restrained from them* which they have *imagined to do*; let us, therefore, confound their language, that they might not understand one another." This language is *very peculiar*—used as it is by God—and there is more in it than appears on the surface, or to a superficial reader; but we will not pause to consider it now. The confusion of language *was confined to those there assembled*. Why should God object to *their* building a city, if they were the descendants of Adam and Eve? But it is plain he did object to *their* building one. Did God object to Cain's building a city?—although a fratricidal murderer. Did he object to Mizraim and his descendants building those immense cities which they built on the Nile? No. In short, did God ever object to any of the known descendants of Adam and Eve building a city, or as many as they might choose to build? Never. But, from some cause or other, God did object to those people[Pg 34] building *that* city and *that* tower. The objection could not be in regard to its locality, nor to the ground on which it was proposed to build them; for the great City of Babylon and with higher towers, too, was afterward built on the same spot—but *by another people*—Shem's descendants. Then, what could be the reason that could cause God to come down from heaven to prevent *these* people from building it? It must be some great cause that would bring God down to overthrow and prevent it. He allowed the people of Shem, afterward, to build the City of

Babylon at the same place.

Reader, candid or uncandid, carefully read and reflect on the facts described in this whole affair. Then remember that, on one other occasion, God came down from heaven; that he talked with Noah; that he told him he was going to destroy the world; that he told him the reason why he intended to destroy it. Reader, do not the facts here detailed, of the objects and purposes of these people, and this *logic of facts*, force our minds, in spite of all opposing reasons to the contrary, to the conviction that *the sin* of these people was the identical sin, and consequent *corruption* of the race, as that which caused the destruction of the world by the flood; and that sin, the amalgamation or miscegenation of Nimrod and his kindred with beasts—the daughters of *men*—negroes. But, this view of who it was that attempted the building of the tower and city of Babel, and their reasons for doing so, will be confirmed by what is to follow.

The Bible informs us that Canaan, the youngest son of Ham, settled Canaan; and that it was from him the land took its name, as did the land of Mizraim, Ham's second son take its name from him, of what is now called Egypt. It was against this Canaan (not Ham) that the curse of Noah was directed, that a servant of servants should he be to his brethren. There is something of marked curiosity in the Bible account of this Canaan and his family. The language is singular, and differs from the Bible account of every other family in the Bible, where it proposes to give and does give the genealogy of any particular family. Why is this, there must be some reason, and some valid reason too, or there would be no variation in the particulars we refer to from that of any other family? The account in the Bible reads thus—"And Canaan begat Sidon his first born, and Heth." So far so good. And why not continue on giving the names of his other sons as in all other genealogies? But it does not read so. It reads, "And Canaan begat Sidon his first born, and Heth,[Pg 35] *and the Jebusite*, and the *Amorite*, and the *Girgashite*, and the *Hivite*, and the *Arkite*, and the *Sinite*, and the *Arvadite*, and the *Zemarite* and the *Hamathite*, and who afterward were the *families* of the *Canaanite* spread abroad." With all *other* families the Divine Record goes on as this commenced, giving the names of all the sons. But in this family of Canaan, after naming the two sons Sidon and Heth (who settled Sidon, Tyre and Carthage, and were *white* as is plainly shown) it breaks off abruptly to these *ites*. Why this suffix of *ite* to *their* names? It is extraordinary and unusual; there must be some reason, a *peculiar* reason for this departure from the usual mode or rule, of which *this* is the only exception. What does *it mean*? The reason is plain. The progeny of the horse and ass species is never *classed* with either its father or mother, but is called a *mule* and represents neither. So the progeny of a son of God, a descendant of Adam and Eve with the negro a beast, is not classed with or called by the name of either its father or mother, but is an *ite*, a "*class*"—"bonded class," *not race*, God intending by *this distinguishment* to show to all future ages what will become of *all such ites*, by placing in bold relief before our eyes the *terrible end of these* as we shall see presently. Reader, bear in mind the end of these *ites* when we come to narrate them. These *ites*, the progeny of Canaan and the negro, inhabited the land of Canaan; with other places, they occupied what was then the beautiful plain and vale of Siddim, where they built the notorious cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim. Like all *counterfeits*, they were ambitious of appearing as the genuine descendants of Adam, whose name they knew or had heard meant "red and fair" in Hebrew; they, therefore, called one of their cities *Admah*, to represent this "red and fair" man, and at the same time it should mean in negro "Ethiopic" "beautiful"—that kind of beauty that once seduced the sons of God, and brought the flood upon the earth. About the time we are now referring to, Abraham, a descendant of Shem was sojourning in Canaan. He had a nephew named Lot who had located himself in the vale of Siddim, and at this time was living in Sodom. One day three men were seen by Abraham passing his tent; it was summer time. Abraham ran to them and entreated that they should abide under the tree, while he would have refreshment prepared for them; they did so, and when about to depart one of them said, "shall we keep from Abraham that thing which I do (God come down again), seeing he shall[Pg 36] surely become a great and mighty nation, *for I know he will command his children and household* after him, *and they shall keep the way of the Lord*;" that is, keeping Adam's race pure—a mission the Jews are to this day fulfilling.

And they told Abraham of the impending fate of these cities. Abraham interceded for them, and pleaded that the righteous should not be destroyed with the wicked. God ultimately promised him, that if there were ten righteous in all these cities that he would not destroy them. What strong foundation have we people of the United States in God's mercy and *forbearance* in this incident? Will we prove worthy? The angels went to Sodom and brought out *all* the righteous, being only Lot and his two daughters (and their righteousness was not in their morality), his wife being turned into a pillar of salt. This done, God rained fire upon these cities and literally burnt up their inhabitants alive, and everything they had, and then sunk the very ground upon which their cities stood more than a thousand feet beneath, not the pure waters of the deluge, but beneath the bitter, salt, and slimy waters of Asphaltites, wherein no living thing can exist. An awful judgment! But it was for the most awful crime that man can commit in the sight of God, of which the punishment *is on earth*. Exhaust the catalogue of human depravity—name every crime human turpitude can possibly perpetrate, and which has been perpetrated on earth since the fall of Adam, and no such judgment of God on any people has ever before fallen, on their commission. But one crime, one *other* crime, and that crime the same for which he had destroyed every living thing on earth, save what was in the ark. But now he destroys by fire, not by water, but by fire, men, women and children, old and young, for the crime of miscegenating of *Adam's race with the negroes*. Noah was a preacher of righteousness to the antediluvians, yet he got drunk after the flood. Lot too was a preacher of righteousness to the cities of the plain, and he too not only got drunk but did so repeatedly, and committed a double crime of incest besides. Then we ask, what *righteousness*, what *kind* of righteousness was it that was thus preached by such men? We speak with entire reverence when we say that the logic of facts shows but little of morality—but it does show, as it *was intended to be shown by God*, that, though frail and sinful in a *moral sense* as they were, yet, being *perfect* in their genealogies from Adam and Eve, *they* could still be *his*[Pg 37] preachers of righteousness, they themselves being *right* in keeping from beastly alliances.

But the Bible evidence to the truth of these views does not stop here. God appeared unto Abraham at another time, while sojourning in the land of Canaan, and told him that all *that* land he would give to him and to his seed after him forever. But the land was already inhabited and owned by these *ites*. If they were the natural descendants of Adam and Eve, would they not have been as much entitled to hold, occupy and enjoy it as Abraham or any other? Most certainly. If these *ites* were God's children by Adam and Eve, it is impossible to suppose that God would turn one child out of house and land and give them to another, without right and without justice; and which he would be doing, were he to act so. Nay! but the Lord of the whole earth will do right. But God did make such a promise to Abraham, and he made it in righteousness, truth and justice. When the time came for Abraham's seed to enter upon it and to possess it, God sent Moses and Aaron to bring them up out of Egypt, where they had long been in bondage, and they did so. But now mark what follows: God explicitly enjoins upon them, (1.) that they *shall not* take, of the daughters of the land, wives for their sons; nor give their daughters in marriage to them. Strange conflict of God with himself, if indeed these Canaanites were *his* children! To multiply and replenish the earth, is God's *command* to Adam; but his command to Moses is, that Israel, known to be the children of Adam, shall not take wives of these Canaanites for their sons—nor shall they give their daughters to them. Why this conflict of the one great lawgiver, if these Canaanites were God's children through Adam? It could not be to identify the Messiah, for that required only the lineage of one family. But mark, (2.) "But of the *cities* and *people* of the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive *nothing that breathes*, but thou shalt *utterly destroy* them, namely the Hittites, Canaanites," etc., naming all the *ites*—this is their end. Why this terrible order of extermination given? and given by God himself? Will not the Lord of the whole earth do right? Yes, verily. Then, we ask, what is that great and terrible reason for God ordering this entire extermination of these *ites*, if indeed they were his children and the pure descendants of Adam and Eve? What crimes had they committed, that had not been before committed by the pure descendants of[Pg 38] Noah? What iniquity had the little children and nursing infants been guilty of, that such a terrible fate should overwhelm them? There must have been some good cause for such entire destruction; for the Lord

of the whole earth does right, and only right. Let us see how God deals with *Adam's* children, *how bad soever they may be, in a moral sense*, in contrast with this order to exterminate. The Bible tells us, that when the Hebrews approached the border of Sier (which is in Canaan), God told them not to touch *that* land nor its people, for he had given it to Esau for a possession. Yet this Esau had sold his birthright for a mess of pottage, and he and his people were idolaters, and treated the children of Israel with acts of hostility which some of these *ites* had not. Again, they were not to touch the land of Ammon, nor that of Moab, although *they* were the offspring of incestuous intercourse, and were, with the people of Sier, as much given to idolatry and all other moral crimes, and as much so as any of these Canaanites whom God directed Moses to exterminate. Why except those, and doom these to extermination? Was not Canaan, the father of these *ites*, a grandson of Noah, and as much related to the Hebrews as were the children of Esau, Moab and Ammon? Certainly. Then, their destruction was not for want of kinship; nor was it because they were idolaters more than these, or were greater *moral* criminals in the sight of Heaven; but *simply because they were the progeny of amalgamation or miscegenation between Canaan, a son of Adam and Eve, and the negro; and were neither man nor beast*. For this crime God had destroyed the world, sown confusion broad-cast at Babel, burnt up the inhabitants of the vale of Siddim, and for it would now exterminate the Canaanite. It is a crime that God has never forgiven, *never will forgive*, nor can it be propitiated by all the sacrifices earth can make or give. God has shown himself, in regard to it, *long-suffering and of great forbearance*. However much our minds may seek and desire to seek other reasons for this order of extermination of God, yet we look in vain, even to the Hebrews themselves, for reasons to be found, in their superior *moral* conduct toward God; but we look in vain. The very people for whom they were exterminated were, in their moral conduct and obedience to God, no better, save in that sin of amalgamation. The exterminator and the exterminated were bad, equally alike in every moral or religious sense—save one *thing*, and *one* thing only—one had not brutalized himself[Pg 39] by amalgamating with negroes, the other had. This logic of facts, forces our minds, compels our judgment, and presses all our reasoning faculties back, in spite of ourselves or our wishes, to the conclusion that it was this one crime, and *one crime only*, that was the originating cause of this terrible and inexorable fate of the Canaanite; being, as they were, the *corrupt* seed of Canaan, God destroyed them. For, if these Canaanites had been the full children of Adam and Eve, they would have been as much entitled to the land, under the grant by God, of the whole earth, to Adam and his posterity, with the right of dominion, and their right to it as perfect as that of Abraham could possibly be; but, being partly *beasts* and partly *human*, God not only dispossessed them of it, but also ordered their *entire* extermination, *for he had given no part of the earth to such beings*. This judgment of God on these people has been harped upon by every deistical and atheistical writer, from the days of Celsus down to Thomas Paine of the present age, but without understanding it. This crime must be unspeakably great, when we read, as we do in the Bible, that it caused God to repent and to be grieved at his heart that he had made *man*. For, the debasing idolatry of the world, the murder of the good and noble of earth, the forswearing of the apostle Peter in denying his Lord and Saviour—all, all the crimsoned crimes of earth, or within the power of man's infamy and turpitude to commit and blacken his soul—are as nothing on earth, as compared with this. Death by the flood, death by the scorching fire of God burning alive the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, death to man, woman and child, flocks and herds, remorseless, relentless and exterminating death—is the *just judgment* of an *all-merciful God, for this offense*. The seed of Adam, which is the seed of God, must be kept pure; it *shall be kept pure, is the fiat of the Almighty*. Man perils his existence, nations peril their existence and destruction, if they support, countenance, or permit it. Such have been God's dealings with it heretofore, and such will be his dealings with it hereafter.

But we have said before, that we intentionally selected Canaan, the youngest son of Ham, and for a purpose. This we will now explain. Had Noah named Ham instead of Canaan, when he declared that he should be a servant of servants to his brethren, the learned world are of the opinion that it would have forever, and *satisfactorily* settled the question, in conjunction with the meaning of his name in Hebrew, *that Ham[Pg 40] was the father* of the present negro race—that if *this curse* had been *specifically* and personally directed against Ham, instead of his youngest son Canaan, then, no

doubt could exist on earth, but that Ham was, and is the father of the negro. This is the opinion of the learned. But, why so? Could not the curse affect Canaan as readily? If it could affect Ham in changing his color, kinking his hair, crushing his forehead down and flattening his nose, why would it not be equally potent in producing those effects on Canaan? Surely its effects would be as great on one person as another? It was to relieve our learned men from this dilemma, among others, that we took up Canaan, to show, that although this *curse* was hurled specifically and personally at Canaan, by Noah, that a servant of servants should he be, yet it carried *no such effects* with it on Canaan or his posterity. Then, if it did not make the black negro of Canaan, how could it have produced *that effect* on Ham, Canaan's father? Canaan had two *white* sons, with long, straight hair, etc., peculiar alone to the white race, and not belonging to the negro race at all, which is proof that the curse did not affect his hair or the color of his skin, nor that of his posterity. Canaan had two white sons by his first wife, Sidon and Heth. They settled Phœnicia, Sidon, Tyre, Carthage, etc. The city of Sidon took its name from the elder. That they were white, and belong to the white race *alone*, we have before proven, unquestionably. But we will do so again, for the purpose of showing what that curse was, and what it did effect, and why this order of extermination. Canaan was the father of all these *ites*. Nine are first specifically named, and then it is added, "and who afterward, were the families of the Canaanite spread abroad." Was not Canaan as much and no more the father of these *ites*, than he was of Sidon and Heth? Certainly. Then why doom them and their flocks and herds to extermination, and except the families of Sidon and Heth, his two other sons? Were they morally any better, except as to their not being the progeny of amalgamation with negroes? They were not. Then why save one and doom the other? If these *ites* were no worse *morally* than the children of Sidon and Heth, then it is plain, that we must seek the reason for their destruction, in something *besides moral delinquency*? Let us see if we can find *that* something? The Bible tells us, that God in one of his interviews with Abraham, informed him that all that land (including all those *ites*) should be his and his seed's after him[Pg 41]—"that his seed shall be strangers in a land not theirs, and be afflicted four hundred years, and thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; *but in the fourth generation* they shall come hither again, *for the iniquity of the Amorites*" (these representing all the *ites*), "*is not yet full.*"

In the fourth generation their cup of iniquity would *then* be full—in the fourth generation God gave this order to exterminate these *ites*, and to leave nothing alive that breathes. If this filling of their cup, referred to *moral* crimes to be committed, or to moral obliquity as such, then it is *very strange*. If this be its reference, then these people were, at *that* time (four generations previous to this order for their extermination), *worse* than the very devil himself, as it was not long before they did fill *their cup*, and the devil's cup is not full yet. If this filling up of iniquity, referred to their *moral conduct* in the sight of God, how was Moses or Joshua to *see* that it was full, or *when* it was full? Yet, they must *know* it, or they would not know when to commence exterminating, as God intended. How were they to know it? As in the case of Sodom they had a few Lots among them, and the *color* would soon tell when their iniquity was full, and neither Moses nor Joshua would be at any loss when to begin, or who to exterminate. Consummated amalgamation would tell *when* their cup of iniquity was full. The iniquity of the Amorites (these representing all) is not *yet* full, is the language of God—in the fourth generation it will be full, and *then* Abraham's seed should possess the land, and these *ites* be exterminated. Let us inquire? Does not each generation, morally stand before God, on their own responsibility in regard to sin? Certainly they do. How then, could the cumulative sins of one generation be passed to the next succeeding one, to their *moral* injury or detriment? Impossible! But *the iniquity* here spoken of, *could be so transmitted*; and at the time when God said it, he tells us that it required *four generations* to make the iniquity full. What crime but the amalgamation of Adam's sons, the children of God, with the negro—beasts—called by Adam *men*, could require four generations to fill up their iniquity, but this crime of amalgamation? None. Then we *know the iniquity*, and what God then thought and yet thinks of it.

Nor is this all the evidence the Bible furnishes, of God's utter abhorrence of this crime, and his decided *disapprobation of the negro*, in those various attempts to *elevate* him to *social, political* and

religious equality with the white race. In the laws delivered by God, to Moses, for the children of Israel, he expressly enacts and charges, "that no *man* having a *flat nose*, shall approach unto his altar." This includes the *whole negro race*; and expressly *excludes* them from coming to his altar, for *any act of worship*. God would not have their worship then, nor accept their sacrifices or oblations—they should not approach his altar; but all of Adam's race could. For Adam's children God set up his altar, and for their benefit ordained the sacrifices; but not for the race of *flat-nosed men*, and such the *negro race is*. And who shall gainsay, or *who dare* gainsay, that what God does is not right? The first attempt at the social equality of the negro, with Adam's race, brought the flood upon the world—the second, brought confusion and dispersion—the third, the fire of God's wrath, upon the cities of the plain—the fourth, the order from God, to exterminate the *nations* of the Canaanites—the fifth, the inhibition and exclusion, by *express law of*[Pg 42] God, of the *flat-nosed negro* from his altar. Will the people of the United States, now furnish the sixth? *Nous verrons*.

There remains now but one other point to prove, and that is—That the negro has no soul. This can only be done by the express word of God. Any authority short of this, will not do. But if God says so, then all the men, and all the reasonings of men on earth, can not change it; for it is not in man's power to *give* a soul to any being on earth, where God has given none.

It will be borne in mind that we have shown, beyond the power of contradiction, that the descendants of Shem and Japheth, from the present day back to the days of our Saviour, and from our Saviour's time back to Noah, their father, that they were all long, straight-haired, high foreheads, high noses, and belong to the white race of Adam. In the case of Ham, the other brother, there is, or has been, a dispute. It is contended, generally, by the learned world, that Ham is the progenitor of the negro race of this our day, and that, such being the case, the negro is our social, political and religious equal—*brother*; and which he would be, certainly, if this were true. The learned world, however, sees the difficulty of how Ham could be the progenitor of a race so distinct from that of Ham's family; and proceed upon their own assumptions, but without one particle of Bible authority for doing so, to account why Ham's descendants should now have kinky heads, low foreheads, flat noses, thick lips, and black skin (not to mention the exceptions to his leg and foot), which they charge to the *curse* denounced by Noah, not against Ham, but against Ham's youngest son—Canaan. But, to sustain their theory, they further assume that this curse was *intended* for Ham, and not Canaan; and they do this right in the teeth of the Bible and its express assertions to the contrary. Forgetting or overlooking the fact that, confining its application to Canaan, as the Bible expressly says, yet they ignore the fact that Canaan had two white sons—Sidon and Heth—and that it was impossible for the *curse* to have made a negro such as we now have, or to have exerted any influence upon either color, hair, etc.; as these two sons of Canaan, and their posterity, are shown, unequivocally, to have been, and yet are, in their descendants, white. The learned world, seeing the difficulties of the position, and the weakness of their foundation for such a tremendous superstructure as they were rearing on this supposed curse of Ham, by his father, undertake to prop it up by saying that Ham's name means black in Hebrew; and, as the negro is *black*, therefore it is that the *name* and the *curse* together made the negro, such as we now have on earth. And, although the Bible nowhere *says*, and nowhere charges, or even intimates, that Ham is or was the progenitor of the negro; and in defiance of the fact that *no such* curse was ever denounced against Ham, as they allege—nor can it be found in the Bible; yet they boldly, on these *assumptions* and contradictions, go on to say that Ham *is* the father of the negro of the present day. Contradicting the Bible; contradicting the *whole order of nature* as ordained by God himself—that like will produce its like; contradicting the effect of every curse narrated in the Bible, whether pronounced by God, or by patriarch, or by prophet; and assuming that it did that, in this case of Noah, which it had never done before nor since—that it did change Ham from a white man to a black negro. Forgetting or setting aside the declaration of the Bible, that Ham and his brothers were the children of one father and one mother, who were perfect in their genealogies from Adam, and that they were white, they assume again, that the Bible forgot to tell us[Pg 43] that Ham was turned into a negro for accidentally seeing his father naked in his tent. Tremendous judgment, for so slight an offense! We do not ask if

this is probable; but we do ask, if it is within the bounds of *possibility* to believe it? Did not the daughters of Lot see the nakedness of their father in a much more unseemly manner? Ham seeing his father so, seems altogether accidental; theirs deliberately sought. And on this flimsy, self-stultifying theory, the learned of the world build their faith—that Ham *is* the progenitor of the negro! While, on the other hand, by simply taking Ham's descendants—those *known to be his descendants now*, and known as much so and as *positively* as that we know the descendants, at the present day, of Shem and Japheth—that by thus taking up Ham's descendants of this day, we find them like his brothers' children—with long, straight hair, high foreheads, high noses, thin lips, and, indeed, every lineament that marks the white race of his brothers, Shem and Japheth; that we can trace him, with history in hand, from this day back, step by step, to the Bible record, with as much positive certainty as we can the descendants of his brothers; that, with the Bible record after, we can trace him back to his father, Noah, with equal absolute certainty, no one will deny, nor *dare* deny, who regards outside concurrent history, of admitted authenticity and the Bible, as competent witnesses in the case; that the testimony in regard to Ham and his descendants being of the white race, is more overwhelming and convincing than that of Japheth—and none doubt Japheth's being of the white race; that God himself, foreseeing the slander that after ages would attempt to throw on Ham, as being the father of the kinky-headed, flat-nosed and black-skinned negro, caused a whole nation to do one thing, and that *one* thing had never been done before, nor by any other nation since, and that he caused them to continue doing that one thing for centuries, and for no other purpose in God's providence, that we can see, but for the *alone* purpose of proving the identity of Ham's children, from the flood downward, for more than twenty-three centuries, and that they, thus identified, were of the white race; and that this embalment of Ham's children was so intended, as evidence by God; that like, as the Jewish genealogical tables served to identify Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, so this embalming of the children of Mizraim, the second son of Ham, serves to identify his descendants as belonging to the white race; and that, like the Jewish tables of genealogy, when they had accomplished the end designed by God, they both ceased, and at one and the same time.

Mizraim settled what is now called Egypt. He embalmed his dead. Where did he get the idea from? No nation or people had ever done it before; none have done it since. It was a very difficult thing to accomplish, to preserve human bodies after death; and to preserve them to last for thousands of years, was still more difficult. How did Mizraim come to a knowledge of the ingredients to be used, and how to use them? Yet he did it, and did it at once. The only satisfactory answer to these questions, is, that God *inspired him*. Then, it is God's testimony, vindicating *his son Ham* from the aspersions of men—that he was a negro, or the father of negroes.

Ye learned men of this age—you who have contributed, by your learned efforts, and by your noble but mistaken philanthropy, innocently, honestly and sincerely as they were made, but wrongfully done—to fix and fasten on Ham this gross slander, that he is the father of the present race of negroes, must reexamine your grounds for so believing [Pg 44]heretofore, and now set yourselves right. God's Bible is against your views; concurrent history is against them: the existing race of Ham is against them: *God's living testimony* is against them, in the *dead* children of Mizraim, embalmed ever since the flood, but now brought forth into the light of day, and testifying for Ham, that he and his descendants were and yet are of the white race. You must now come forth and abandon your fortress of *assumptions*, for *here that citadel falls*; for, *if Ham is not the father of the negro* (which is shown *to be an impossibility*) then the negro came out of the ark, *and as we now find him*; and if he came out of the ark, *then he must have been in the ark*; and if he was in the ark, which, by the logic of facts, *we know* he was—now let us read the Bible, the divine record and see whether or not the negro has a soul. It reads thus: "When the long-suffering of God waited, in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is *eight souls*, were saved;" the negro being in the ark, was not one of those eight souls, and consequently he has *no soul to be saved*—the Bible and God's inspiration being judge. Carping is vain, against God. His order *will stand*, whether pleasing or displeasing to any on earth. But God only promised to *save eight*—Noah and his wife,

and his three sons and their wives. These *had souls*, as the apostle (Peter) testifies, and *all that were in the ark that did have souls. The negro was in the ark; and God thus testifies that he has no soul.*

One point more. God has set a line of demarcation so ineffaceable, so indelible besides color, and so *plain*, between the children of Adam and Eve whom he endowed with immortality, and the negro who is of this earth only, that none can efface, and none so blind as not to see it. And this line of demarcation is, that Adam and his race being endowed by God *with souls*, that a *sense of immortality* ever inspires them and sets them to work; and the one race builds what he hopes is to last for ages, his houses, his palaces, his temples, his towers, his monuments, and from the earliest ages after the flood. Not so the other, the negro; as left to himself, as Mizraim was, he builds nothing for ages to come; but like any other beast or animal of earth, his building is *only for the day*. The one starts his building on earth, and builds for immortality, reaching toward Heaven, the abode of his God; the other also starting his building on earth, builds nothing durable, nothing permanent—*only* for present *necessity*, and which goes down, *down*, as everything merely animal must forever do. Such are the actions of the two races, when left to themselves, as all their works attest. Subdue the negro as we do the other animals, and like them, teach them all we can; then turn them loose, free them entirely from the restraints and control of the white race, and, just like all other animals or beasts so treated, back to his native nature and wildness and barbarism and the worship of dæmons, he *will go*. Not so with Adam's children: Starting from the flood, they began to build for Eternity. Ham, the slandered Ham, settled on the Nile, in the person of his son Mizraim, and built cities, monuments, temples and towers of surpassing magnificence and *endurance*; and here, too, with them, he started all the arts and sciences that have since covered Europe and America with grandeur and glory. Even Solomon, whose name is a synonym for wisdom, when about to build the Temple, instructed as he was by his father David, as to how God had told him the Temple was to be built; yet he, notwithstanding his wisdom, was warned of God, and he sent to Hiram, King of Tyre, for a workman skilled in all the science of architecture and cunning in all its devices and ornaments, to raise and build that structure designed for the visible glory of God on earth.[Pg 45] And Hiram, King of Tyre, sent him a widow's son, named Hiram Abiff; and who was Grand Master of the workmen. He built the Temple and adorned it, and was killed a few months before Solomon consecrated it. This Hiram, King of Tyre, and this Hiram Abiff, although the mother of the latter was a Jewess, were descendants of *this slandered Ham*. Now, we ask, is it reasonable to suppose that God would call, or would suffer to be called, a descendant of Ham to superintend and build his Temple, and erect therein his altar, if Hiram Abiff had been a negro?—a *flat-nosed negro*, whom he had expressly forbidden to approach his altar? The idea is entirely inconsistent with God's dealings with men. God thus, then, testifying in calling this son of Ham to build his Temple, his appreciation of Ham and his race.

Now, let us sum up what is written in this paper: We have shown, (1.) That Ham was not made a negro, neither by his name, nor the curse (or the supposed curse) of his father Noah. (2.) We have shown that the people of India, China, Turkey, Egypt (Copts), now have long, straight hair, high foreheads, high noses and every lineament of the white race; and that these are the descendants of Ham. (3.) That, therefore, it is *impossible* that Ham could be the father of the present race of Negroes. (4.) That this is sustained by God himself causing Mizraim to embalm his dead, from directly after the flood and to continue it for twenty-three centuries; and that these mummies now show Ham's children to have long, straight hair, etc., and the lineaments alone of the white race. (5.) That Shem, Ham and Japheth being white, proves that their father and mother were white. (6.) That Noah and his wife being white and perfect in their genealogy, proves that Adam and Eve were white, and therefore *impossible* that *they* could be the progenitors of the kinky-headed, black-skinned negroes of this day. (7.) That, therefore, as neither Adam nor Ham was the progenitor of the negro, and the negro being now on earth, consequently we *know* that he was created before Adam, as *certainly* and as *positively* as we *know* that the horse and every other animal were created before him; as Adam and Eve were the last beings created by God. (8.) That the negro being created before Adam, consequently he is a *beast* in God's nomenclature; and being a beast, was under Adam's rule

and dominion, and, like all other beasts or animals, has no soul. (9.) That God destroyed the world by a flood, for the crime of the amalgamation, or miscegenation of the white race (whom he had endowed with souls and immortality), with negroes, mere beasts without souls and without immortality, and producing thereby a *class* (not race), but a *class* of beings that were neither *human* nor *beasts*. (10.) That this was a crime against God that could not be expiated, and consequently could not be forgiven by God, and never would be; and that its punishment in the progeny is on earth, and by death. (11.) That this was shown at Babel, Sodom and Gomorrah, and the extermination of the nations of the Canaanites, and by God's law to Moses. (12.) That God will not accept religious worship from the negro, as he has expressly ordered that no man having a *flat nose*, shall approach his altar; and the negroes have flat noses. (13.) That the negro has no soul, is shown by express authority of God, speaking through the Apostle Peter by divine inspiration.

The intelligent can not fail to discover who was the tempter in the garden of Eden. It was a *beast*, a *talking* beast—a beast that talked *naturally*—if it required a *miracle* to make it talk (as our *learned* men[Pg 46] suppose, and as no one could then perform a miracle but God only and if he performed *this* miracle to make a snake, a serpent, talk, and to talk only with Eve, and that as soon as the serpent (?) seduced Eve into eating the forbidden fruit, God then performed another miracle to stop his speaking afterward, that if this be true), then it follows beyond contradiction, *that God is the immediate and direct author or cause of sin*: an idea that can not be admitted for one moment, by *any* believer in the Bible. *God called it a beast—"more subtle than all the beasts the Lord God had made."* As Adam was the federal head of all his posterity, as well as the real head, so was this beast, the negro, the federal head of all beasts and cattle, etc., down to creeping things—to things that go upon the belly and eat dust all the days of their life. If all the beasts, cattle, etc., were not involved in the sin of their federal head, why did God destroy them at the flood? If the crime that brought destruction on the world was the sin of Adam's race alone, why destroy the *innocent* beasts, cattle, etc.? When all things were created, God not only pronounced them good, but "very good;" then why destroy these innocent (?) beasts, cattle, etc., for Adam's sin or wrong-doing? But, that these beasts, etc., were involved in the *same* sin with Adam, is positively plain, from *one fact alone*, among others, and that fact is: That before the fall of Adam in the garden, all was peace and harmony among and between all created beings and things. After the fall, strife, contention and war ensued, as much among the beasts, cattle, etc., as with the posterity of Adam; and continues so to the present time. Why should God thus afflict *them* for another's crime, if they were free and innocent of that crime? God told Adam, on the day of his creation, "to have dominion over everything living that moveth upon the earth:" but to Noah, after the flood, he uses *very* different language; for, while he told Noah to be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, the same as he said to Adam, yet he adds, "and the fear of *you* and the *dread* of *you* shall be upon every beast of the earth, etc., and all that moveth upon the earth, etc.; into *thy* hands are they delivered". If these had continued in their "*primeval* goodness," wholly unconnected with Adam's sin, is it reasonable to suppose that God would have used the language toward *them*, that he did in his *instructions* to Noah? It is impossible! The intelligent can also see the judgments of God on this "*unforgivable*" sin, at the flood, at Babel, at Sodom and Gomorrah, and on the Canaanites, and in his law; and they may profit by the example. They can see the exact time (A.M. 235), *when men*—the negro—erected the *first* altar on earth; *they* had seen Adam, Cain, Abel, and Seth, erect altars and call on the name of the Lord. They, too, could *imitate* them; they *did* then *imitate*; they then built *their* altars; they *then* called an the name of the Lord; they are yet *imitating*; they are yet *profaning* the name of the Lord, by calling on his name. And *you*, the people of the United States, are upholding *this* *profanity*. Who was it that caused God to repent and to be grieved at his heart, that he had made *man*? Will *you* place yourselves alongside of that being, and against God? All analogy says *you will*! But remember, that the righteous will escape—the hardened alone will perish.

The ways of God are *always consistent*, *when understood*, and always just and reasonable. It is a curious fact, but a fact, nevertheless, and fully sustained by the Bible; and that fact is this; That God *never conferred*, and never *designed to confer*, any great *blessing* on the human family, but what he

always selects or selected a white *slaveholder* or [Pg 47] one of a white *slaveholding nation*, as the *medium*, by or through which *that blessing* should reach them. Why he has done so, is not material to discuss now; but the *fact*, that he *always* did so, the Bible abundantly proves. Abraham, the father of the faithful, and in whom and his seed all the families of the earth were to be blessed, is a notable instance of this truth. For Abraham owned three hundred and eighteen *slaves*. And the Saviour of the world was of a white *slaveholding nation*; and they held slaves by God's own laws, and not by theirs. And how has it been in respect of our own nation and government, the United States? A government now declared by thousands of lips, latterly, to be the best, the very best, that has ever been in the world. Who made this government? Who established it and its *noble principles*? Let us appeal to history. The first attack on British power, and the aggressions of its parliament, ever made on this continent, was made by a slaveholder, from a slave state, Patrick Henry, May 30, 1765. The first president of the first congress, that ever assembled on this continent, to consider of the affairs of the thirteen colonies, and which met in Philadelphia, September 5, 1774, was a slave owner from a slave state, Peyton Randolph. The only secretary that congress ever had, was a slave owner from a slave state, Charles Thompson. The gentleman who was chairman of the committee of the whole, on Saturday, the 8th of June, 1776, and who, on the morning of the 10th reported the resolutions, that the thirteen colonies, of right ought to be free and independent *states*, was a slaveholder from a slave state, Benjamin Harrison. The same gentlemen again, as chairman of the committee of the whole, reported the Declaration of Independence in form; and to which he affixed his signature, on Thursday, July 4, 1776. The gentleman who wrote the Declaration of Independence, was a slave owner, from a slave state, Thomas Jefferson. The gentleman who was selected to lead their armies, as commander-in-chief, and who did lead them successfully, to victory and the independence of the country, was a slave owner, from a slave state, George Washington. The gentleman who was president of the convention, to form the constitution of the United States, was a slave holder, from a slave state, George Washington. The gentleman who wrote the constitution of the United States (making it the best government ever formed on earth), was a slave owner, from a slave state, James Madison. The first president of the United States, under that constitution, and who, under God gave it strength, consistency and power before the world, was a slave owner, from a slave state, George Washington; and these were all white men and slave owners; and whatever of peace, prosperity, happiness and glory, the people of the United States have enjoyed under it, have been from the administration of the government, by presidents elected by the people, of *slave holders*, from *slave states*. Whenever the people have elected a president from a non-slaveholding state, commencing with the elder Adams, and down to Mr. Lincoln, confusion, wrangling and strife have been the order of the day, until it culminated in the greatest civil war the world has ever beheld, under the last named gentleman. Why this has been so is not in the line of our subject. We mention it as a matter of history, to confirm the Bible fact, *that God always* selects *slaveholders*, or from a *slaveholding nation*, the media through which he confers his blessings on mankind. Would it not be wisdom to heed it now?

One reflection and then we are done. The people of the United States have now thrust upon them, the question of negro equality, social, political and religious. How will they decide it? If they decide [Pg 48] it one way, then they will make the *sixth* cause of invoking God's wrath, once again on the earth. They will begin to discover this approaching wrath: (1.) By God bringing confusion. (2.) By his breaking the government into pieces, or fragments, in which the negro will go and settle with those that favor this equality. (3.) In God pouring out the fire of his wrath, on this portion of them; but in what way, or in what form, none can tell until it comes, only that in severity it will equal in intensity and torture, the destruction of fire burning them up. (4.) The states or people that favor this equality and amalgamation of the white and black races, *God will exterminate*. To make the negro, the political, social and religious equal of the white race by *law*, by *statute* and by *constitutions*, can easily be effected in *words*; but so to elevate the negro *jure divino*, is simply *impossible*. You can not elevate a *beast* to the level of a son of God—a son of Adam and Eve—but you may depress the sons of Adam and Eve, with their *impress* of the Almighty, *down to the level of a beast*. God has made one for immortality, and the other to perish with the animals of the earth.

The antediluvians once made this depression. Will the people of the United States make another, *and the last*? Yes, they will, for a large majority of the North are unbelievers in the Bible; and this paper will make a large number of their clergy deists and atheists. A man can not commit so great an offense against his race, against his country, against his God, in any other way, as to give his daughter in marriage to a negro—a *beast*—or to take one of their females for his wife. As well might he in the sight of God, wed his child to any other beast of forest or of field. This crime *can not* be expiated—it never has been expiated on earth—and from its nature never can be, and, consequently, *never was forgiven by God, and never will be*. The negro is now free. There are but two things on earth, that may be done with him now, and the people and government of this country escape destruction. One or the other *God will make you do, or make you accept his punishment*, as he made Babel, Sodom and Gomorrah, and the Canaanites, before you. You *must send him back to Africa or re-enslave him*. The former is the best, *far the best*. Now, which will my countrymen do? I do not say *fellow-citizens*, as I regard myself but as a sojourner in the land, whose every political duty is now performed by obeying *your* laws, be they good or bad—not voting, nor assisting others in making *your* laws. Will my countrymen, in deciding for themselves these questions, *remember—will they remember*, that the first law of liberty is obedience to God. Without this obedience to the great and noble principles of God, truth, righteousness and justice, there can be no liberty, no peace, no prosperity, no happiness in any earthly government—if these are sacrificed or ignored, God will overturn and keep overturning, until mankind learn his truth, justice and mercy, and conform to them.

To the people of the South, we say, *obedience* to God is better than all sacrifices. You have sacrificed all your negroes. It was *your ancestors*, that God made use of to form this noblest of all human governments—no others could do it. Do not be cast down at what has happened, and what is *yet to happen*—God will yet use you to reinstate and remodel this government, on its just and noble principles and at the *proper time*. The North *can never do it*. These are perilous times—the *impending decisions will be against you, and against God*. But keep yourselves free from *this sin—do not by your acts, nor by your votes, invite the negro equality—if it is forced upon you*, as it will be—obey the laws—remembering *that God will protect the righteous*; and that his truth, like itself, will always be consistent, and like its Author, will be always and *forever triumphant*. *The finger of God is in this. Trust him*. The Bible is true.

July, 1840.

December, 1866. ARIEL.

Note 1. Any candid scholar, wishing to address the writer, is informed, that any letter addressed to "Ariel," care of Messrs. Payne, James & Co., Nashville, Tennessee, during this summer and fall (1867), will reach him and command his attention.

Note 2. Some few kinky-headed negroes, have been found embalmed on the Nile, but the inscriptions on their sarcophagii, fully explain who they were, and how they came to be there. They were generally *negro traders* from the interior of the country, and of much later dates.