



No. 4265585



GIVEN BY

Dr. Jeffery R. Brackett





Price 12½ Cents.

Truth against Error.

A

DEFENCE OF SLAVERY: )

BEING A

4265.585

REVIEW OF A LETTER

WRITTEN BY THE

REV. CHARLES T. TORREY,

NOW CONFINED IN THE BALTIMORE JAIL, UPON THE CHARGES OF ABDUCTING  
SLAVES FROM THEIR MASTERS, IN MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.

BY J. GRAVES,

ALEXANDRIA, D. C.

BALTIMORE:

PRINTED BY WOODS & CRANE.

1844.



Truth against Error.

---

A

DEFENCE OF SLAVERY:

BEING A

\* 4265.585

REVIEW OF A LETTER

WRITTEN BY THE

REV. CHARLES T. TORREY,

NOW CONFINED IN THE BALTIMORE JAIL, UPON THE CHARGES OF ABDUCTING  
SLAVES FROM THEIR MASTERS, IN MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.

---

BY J. GRAVES,

ALEXANDRIA, D. C.

BALTIMORE:

PRINTED BY WOODS & CRANE.

1844.

RECEIVED

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dr. Jeffery R. Brackett  
June 28. 1917

RECEIVED  
JUN 28 1917



# DEFENCE.

~~~~~  
"They that have turned the world upside down have come *hither* also."  
~~~~~

REV. CHARLES T. TORREY:—Having noticed in the Baltimore Sun of August 30th, a communication to the public, in which you complain of being confined in prison, here, upon the charges of being instrumental in aiding slaves to escape from their masters to some free state, which you consider acts of charity and mercy, and to which I take the liberty to offer a reply.\*

You seem to pride yourself on being a northern man, collegiately educated in a free state; but you did not tell the public that the state which gave you birth was once a *slave-holding* state. Pray, sir, have your prayers and tears fully atoned for the sin, as you term it, of enslaving the black man at the north, that you can be spared to come here with your negro sympathies, commencing first with the blacks who are in servitude here, causing them to escape from their masters and owners, thereby raising strife and contention between the north and the south? If this was your chief aim, (which in your letter you did not deny, but said as much as to admit it,) then you are not deserving the sympathy you speak of, *even though you should ask it*, but on the contrary you have merited such punishment as the law *will* inflict, should these charges be proven upon you.

You say, that from a veteran soldier you learned to hate slavery in all its forms. What! hate that which God, in his all-wise providence saw fit to create? and a *minister of the gospel* too, whose duty it is to love God's word, and so loving it, should teach others to love it also; which would be more in accordance with a *true christian* spirit than the course that you, and the rest of your *clique* of religious *levellers* are pursuing at the present time.

But, you say, that "from a veteran soldier you learned to hate slavery." Is *this* the basis of your knowledge relative to this subject, and the only foundation upon which you have to build those fabricated stigmas which you are constantly amassing upon the

\* This reply was not written to refute argument, for in your communication I find none; but of abuse there is much. That, and that alone, has called forth my remarks.

devoted heads of the southern people, who struggled as hard for the independence of America as did your famous abolitionist preceptor? Is *his* word the only *authentic* source of information to be relied upon? I answer *no*; *nor is he to be believed*, if he preaches such doctrine as that.

You seem to pride yourself on being born in Massachusetts, that hot-bed of fanaticism, which gives birth to all the *isms* that are spreading through the length and breadth of this country, the *pernicious* influence of which, is contaminating the minds of our innocent citizens to an alarming extent.

I am a northern man also; but, *thank God*, I am *no* abolitionist. Having had a desire to inform myself on this subject, I have sought a different source for information than the *bare word* of *one mortal man*. As this subject is one of considerable antiquity, and the bible being considered the oldest and most authentic source of information relative to ancient times, I have had recourse to it; and in this ancient work I find much valuable information relative to this, as well as *other* subjects. If you read this book *carefully*, you will find that negro slavery exists as *one* of *God's judicial decrees*, and *no human law* can abolish it, any more than it can abolish the *curse of death* that was passed upon all men, through Adam, for partaking of the forbidden fruit. As we *daily*, and perhaps *hourly*, lose by death, many lives that to us seem as ornaments to the world, would it not be for our benefit to petition congress to pass a law that *death* should be forever abolished? the *curse of death* is of the same origin with negro slavery, and if one is *severe*, the other is *ten-fold* more *terrible*; consequently, if the curse of slavery can be abolished by *human* legislation, then is it not necessary to enact a law to abolish death, *which* is the *greatest* terror to the human family.

In order to answer some of the questions asked in your communication, it becomes necessary to look into the history of the human family at the earliest times of their existence after the flood.

In the family of Noah, was born three distinct races; such as red, white and black; to whom Noah gave names according to their striking appearances, the meaning of which you can be no stranger to. As your letter does not treat upon the antideluvians, I have no call, on this occasion, to look into the history of the human family *prior* to the flood. After the waters of the flood had become evaporated, or otherwise dispersed, and Noah having cultivated a vineyard and partaken of the juice of its fruit, he fell asleep; and Ham discovering him lying in his tent in an unseemly manner, made light of his father, which conduct was so indecorous, that Noah, when he awoke, being made sensible of what his youngest son had done, was moved by the spirit of prophecy, to curse Ham's posterity forever.—Gen. ix. 25.

On this passage, see Clarke and Newton, (it is presumed that *they* understood the ancient Hebrew,) they, if I mistake not, refer you to the Arabic bible for the true sense, which reads, cursed Ham. But, whether it should read, cursed Ham or cursed be Canaan, is all one to me, for I consider, that for the innate wickedness of Ham, was *cursed his seed to all eternity*, for aught that appears to the contrary.

In the following two verses, 26, 27, we find his two brothers, Shem and Japhet, or their posterity, blessed with the privilege of enslaving Ham, or his posterity. This curse upon Ham could never have arisen in the mind of Noah, naturally, for he was a righteous man in the sight of God, and to have uttered such a *dreadful* malediction as *this* upon his youngest son, was more than his nature could have borne; for so *terrible* was it in its nature, that, however heinous the crime might have been, the most hardened in the civilized world would have shuddered at the thought of announcing it. But God prompted, and Noah obeyed.

*Thus* we find that it was God who instituted negro slavery, but *why* he should create that race for slavery, is unknown to man; we might as well ask *why* he should create Adam *perfect*, seeing that he *knew* that Adam would sin; or we might inquire *why* he created the two *entire* different races from the *first* man of his creation, and many other questions *equally* mysterious, and that too, to no purpose. It is enough, therefore, that we know that three distinct races were created, and that one race, for some wise purpose, was created to serve the other two. Ham was the father of four sons, Cush, Mizraim, Phut and Canaan. Now, to ascertain the character of Ham's family, and their descendants, it becomes necessary to connect ancient history with the bible. The historian that I shall introduce, is Josephus; you cannot object to *him*, since you ministers quote him in your pulpits. Josephus, then, speaks of the family of Noah in his "Jewish Antiquities," book i, chap. iv. sec. 1, page 29. "But they were so ill instructed, that they did not obey God; for which reason they fell into calamities, and were made sensible, by experience, of what sin they had been guilty. For when they flourished with a numerous youth, God admonished them again to send out colonies; but they, imagining that the prosperity they enjoyed, was not derived from the favor of God, but supposing that their own power was the proper cause of the plentiful condition which they were in, did not obey him."

Now, I firmly believe, that the people above spoken of, were none other than the Hamites; as the races of Shem and Japhet, whom Noah blessed, could not, as soon as this, when under the instruction of their patriarchal father, have transgressed his holy injunctions, knowing, as it is evident they did, that their brother

was cursed for his wicked propensities. With this circumstance before them they could not have disobeyed God. But we may infer, that, owing to the natural wickedness of the Hamites, that *they* were the people spoken of by the historian; for he says in the 2d section of the same chapter: "Now it was Nimrod who excited them to such an affront and contempt of God." Thus we see, that in the earliest times of Ham's family, their object was to stray from all *true* godliness, depending on their own strength; worshipping *gods* of their own invention, rather than worship the *true* Author of their existence.

In the same section, Josephus further states, that "he, [Nimrod,] also said, he would be revenged on God if he should have a mind to drown the world again, for that he would build a tower too high for the waters to be able to reach; and that he would avenge himself on God for destroying their forefathers." From the testimony of the bible, Josephus, and other ancient historians, who might be quoted, can any one for a moment *doubt* the wickedness of this Nimrod, the son of Cush, and grandson of Ham, and bold defier of God's power? Here was the origin of *all* idolatry, the germ of those seductive rites so universal among the heathen in ancient times, the effects of which remain even to the present day.

Notwithstanding you *curse* the practice of slavery, Abraham saw fit to indulge in it to a considerable extent, for in Genesis xii. 16, is an account of his having men servants,\* and maid servants, and are spoken of as items of property, in connection with *brute beasts*, as showing the immense wealth that Abraham, by the blessing of God, had accumulated. In Genesis xiv. 14, is an account of Abraham having an *army* of slaves, three hundred and eighteen in number, all born in his house, and trained for war, which he armed, and with them pursued the Assyrian, and from them rescued Lot his kinsman. According to *your* views of slavery, as expressed by yourself, this man Abraham must have been a *very wicked* person to have kept three-hundred and eighteen sprightly negroes in bondage, exposing them to war, which, by so doing, would place their lives in jeopardy; but for all this he was considered righteous in the sight of God, and living so near the time of the announcement of the curse upon Ham, that he knew *full well* that it was *his privilege* to enslave *that* people if he chose so to do.

The people spoken of above, as being Abraham's servants, were Egyptians, the descendants of Mizraim, the second son of Ham; for Hagar, who was the hand-maid of, or slave to Sarah, the wife of Abraham, and born in his house, was an Egyptian woman,

\* Servant, as spoken of in the bible, Dr. Adam Clarke says, everywhere means slave, and, says he, servant is the highest possible term that can be used for the word slave.

and the rest of his slaves were, doubtless, of the same nation with her.

The Egyptians, as a nation, were severely chastised by ten awful displays of God's power upon them, in consequence of their idolatrous conduct and hatred towards God. These Egyptians had been entreated to forsake their sinful and polluted course of life, and follow the instructions given them by the righteous descendants of Shem and Japhet, through the inspiration of Divine wisdom and mercy; yet they would not hearken unto such exhortations, for, so vastly different was this doctrine from the instruction which they had received from their great idolatrous tyrant, Nimrod, that they could not yield to such virtues as the religion of God required; so fondly were they attached to their lascivious and darling religion, by which they are every where characterised in the bible.

In Genesis xxvii. 46, we find an account of the daughters of Heth, the son of Canaan, who was the fourth son of Ham, who, undoubtedly, was as fair and virtuous, naturally, as are the female portion of Ham's race at the present time; and yet we find Rebecca complaining that she was "weary of her life because of the daughters of Heth." Such an *aversion* had she to *that* race, that the idea of having *their* blood mingled with the blood of *her* family, that she says, (after meditating, no doubt, upon the *horrible* consequences of such an union,) "what good shall my life do me?" Was not this the voice of God to Rebecca, telling her to *despise* the *accursed* race, and not let the curse and the blessing be mingled together by amalgamation; but rather pursue the course pointed out by the Divine Being, as he had, for certain purposes, *cursed* that race to *serve* the other races of men, and that the amalgamating of the *two* races would take the *curse* from, or extend *to* them a part of Shem and Japhet's blessing, or create a new race of beings? either of which could not be in accordance with His Divine Will.

It seems that the patriarch Isaac saw the force of his wife's complaint, and realized the *strict* necessity of keeping forever separate from his race the blood of Ham; for, after calling Jacob to him, and blessing him, he *strictly* says, "thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan." Gen. xxviii. 1. How widely different is the doctrine of this ancient patriarch from that which your coadjutors preach at the present time, who say, that the black man is every way equal with the white man, and would as soon have your son or your daughter marry with that people as with the whites, were they persons of respectability. *This doctrine has been preached by negro admirers like yourself, and you cannot deny it.*

Ezekiel xxiii. 20, says, that "their flesh is as the flesh of asses,

and their issue as the issue of horses." If you like such flesh as *that*, you are welcome to it.

In the law of Moses, which was given by God, the Israelites were allowed to have slaves, and punish them too, even unto death; and that, too, without being called to an account for it, if so be, that the slave so punished should survive his wounds for a day or two, for the very reason, that the slave so punished was "his (the Israelite's) money." Exodus xxi. 20, 21.

In Exodus, we have an account of the Israelites, who, when about to take their journey to the land of the Amorites and the Hittites, &c., which, according to the bible, consisted of six, Josephus says, "seven nations," all negroes, of the house of Ham; God promised them, the Israelites, that he would send his angel before them, and bring them into that land, and that he would cut them, the seven nations of negroes, off. God forbid the bowing down of the Israelites to the gods of those nations, or worshipping after their manner in any respect, commanding them to "utterly overthrow" those nations, "and quite break down their images." So few were the Israelites, when compared with the multiplicity of the inhabitants of those nations, and the numerous hordes of wild beasts that roamed the forests in that country, and God wishing to provide for the security of his people against those devouring animals, for which cause he would not drive those nations out in one year; but he would send "hornets" before the Israelites, and drive those nations out "by little and little," until the Israelites should become so numerous, by increase, as to inherit the land in safety. God *strictly* forbid the Israelites from making any covenant with those nations, or with their gods. He also forbade the Israelites to allow those nations to dwell in that land with them, as tribes or nations, lest those nations should cause them to sin against God; for if they served the gods of those nations, or tribes, it would be a snare unto them, the Israelites. See Exodus xxiii. from the 20th to the last verse, inclusive.

*This* is the people, as shown above, with whom you *affect* to sympathise so deeply; a people who were so wicked in all their actions, that God would show them *no* mercy, but ordered them to be exterminated by frequent wars, and those that escaped such wars, He ordered to be enslaved; and *you*, sir, have had the audacity to *curse* the acts of God towards this wicked and merciless race. *You* pretend to hold them to be equal with the white race in every respect; only remove the prejudice that has arisen against them on the account of their having been enslaved. *This is not so, and you know it!* Their form is not so perfectly modelled, their countenances are not so fair, their manners are not as graceful, and, in point of intellectuality, they are far inferior; for,

it is a well known *fact*, that they have not as much brain, by one-eighth, as has the white man. *This* proves your doctrine *false*, when you say that they are created equal with the white race.

Does it not grieve you when you read the above named passages, in connection with others that I shall presently introduce, to think that there could not have been a society of thorough-going abolitionists present, at the time that Moses received those laws, to have said, Moses! Moses!! Moses!!! do not receive those laws, even though God is the author of them; for, do you not see that they permit, and, in some instances, do even *command* the buying of those lovely negroes by which we are surrounded; and behold, too, the command is, to hold them in bondage, through posterity, for ever. See Leviticus xxv. 44, 45, 46, as follows—“Both thy bond-men, and thy bond-maids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bond-men and bond-maids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that *are* with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bond-men forever; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor.”

The people of whom the Israelites were to *buy* bond-men and bond-maids, were negroes of the race of Ham; for God would not have allowed the Israelites to have bought and enslaved the race of Japhet, the people whom he had blessed with enlargement, any more than he would allow the children of Israel to enslave their *own* people. All the people above spoken of, that infested the Jews, were negroes, possessing all the peculiarities of that class of people at the present day; and were the descendants of the family of Ham, whether Egyptians, Colcians, Lybians, Phœnicians, Africans, Ethiopians, Zidonians, Tyrians, the ancient Carthagenians, Moors and the Calantion Indians, all of whom, together with many more nations that might be mentioned, were negroes, some of whom had long, straight hair, and others, short and curly, or woolly, all of which belonged to the black or Hamethian race, and were alike subject to the curse that God pronounced upon Ham by the mouth of Noah.

Herodotus\* says, vol i. book ii. chap. 104, page 246, “The Colcians are of Egyptian origin, because they are black, and have hair short and curling.” Volney says, “That the Egyptians were real negroes of the same species with all the natives of Africa, and though, as may be expected after mixing so many ages with the

\* This historian lived 450 years before Christ; who, for his candor and correctness as a historian, is styled “Father of History.”

Greeks and Romans, they have lost the intensity of their first color, yet they still retain strong marks of their original conformation." I offer the above as proof to what I have said respecting those nations being negroes, to whom God would show no mercy.

Thus far, I believe, I have shown briefly, that slavery exists as one of God's *judicial* decrees. Now for the application of it by way of answering some of the questions asked by you in your letter to the public.

You ask, if it "is a crime at all by the law of God, by the common law, or the constitutions of the states of Maryland and Virginia to help a man out of slavery." If he is a *Shemite*, the law of God is strictly against enslaving him, or if he is of the race of *Japhet*, the bonds of slavery have no right to him, for God did not create him for that purpose. But if he is of the race of *Ham*, then the law of God *sanctions* his state of servitude, and a man so enslaved is the *legal property* of the person owning him, whether he received him by purchase, or as a present, and the laws of both *God* and *man* make it so.

The constitution of the United States recognizes the southern states as slave-holding states; and gives to every state the right to enact such laws as best suits their convenience, providing that they do not, in such enactments, infringe upon the power that guarantees to them this privilege. Now, as the constitution of the United States has not infringed upon the *law* of God, neither have the states of Maryland and Virginia, in their enactments, infringed upon the constitution of the United States, and as the laws of Maryland and Virginia *do* recognise negro slaves as *property*, then *it is a crime* to help a man out of slavery.

Now if you are guilty of the charges alleged against you, then you are a *thief*, just as much so as you would have been had you have stolen from the owners of these negroes the amount of *money* that it would have taken to purchase them from their owners, and ought not to complain about your felonious associates, even though you *are* a minister. God's law (which I presume you have often quoted to your congregations) says, "thou shalt not steal." Exodus xx. 15. The laws of these states say, that if thou *dost* steal, and it is proven upon thee, *then thou shalt* be punished according to the nature of the offence. The answer to your question, then, is, that it *is a crime*, both by the *law* of God and the *common law*, to help a man out of slavery *unless* you buy him.

You ask the public the following question: "Will you, in order to maintain slavery?" &c. I will let St. Paul answer this question: he says, Ephesians vi. 5, "Servants obey them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your hearts as unto Christ."



This great preacher taught the negroes of *his* time, a different doctrine from that which *you* preach to them. Your doctrine is, go my *very worthy* man, and if you cannot escape without, *steal your master's horse*, and should human life impede your progress, *take that* also; do *any* thing that will *aid* you in your flight for liberty. Oh! what *righteous* men these abolitionists are, or rather they wish the world to *believe* them so.

"Will you condemn a man of blameless life, and unspotted christian character, to your prison, as a common felon?" As this question is connected with slavery, I shall introduce a passage from the Old Testament for an answer—"Thou *shalt* not covet his man-servant nor his maid-servant." Exodus xx. 17.

You boast that Maryland and Virginia *shall* go to trial before the civilized world. Do not trouble yourself about that, for Maryland and Virginia *will* go to trial before the civilized world, to use your own phrase, and if the charges for which you are held in custody are proven against you, those states *will* show the civilized world that *they dare* punish a *thief* or a *robber*, however *high* he may estimate his *christian character*.

Do you think, that, because you are a minister, you can brow-beat the judge of that law which has been violated, (the breach of which you are held responsible, unless when put upon your trial you can prove yourself innocent,) into that softness of heart as to mitigate your sentence in the least, by saying that you had rather be the prisoner than the judge who may sentence you? It is my opinion, that if these charges for which you are held in custody are proven upon you, you *will*, before you get through with this affair, *be glad* to exchange places with the judge who *will* sentence you.

In your letter to the public, you have introduced two resolutions which you say were passed by the people of Massachusetts, near Bunker Hill. The *fanatics* of Massachusetts, then, have become so *exasperated* against the people of Maryland and Virginia for keeping inviolate the laws that have been enacted to protect their lives and their property, that *they* must select *classic ground* as the only *fit* spot to draft resolutions for the purpose of *abusing* an innocent people for imprisoning a minister of the gospel upon the charges of *stealing* their property at sundry times. Would the soidisant honest and merciful people of Massachusetts have done *less*, had a minister from the south have introduced himself among them, and when, after having been there a short time, should have stolen from one a pair of horses, and from another a yoke of oxen, and that, too, for the mere sympathy he had for them, as they were used to draw *burdens* heavier than they were able to bear, owing to the scanty meals with which they were provided, and, at the same time, did not

possess the organs of speech to tell how much they *suffered* under the *goadings* of such *severe* task-masters as their owners were? *No, sir, common sense* teaches every one, that the owners of such property would have complained to the authorities for redress, and the laws of *that* state would have given them satisfaction, even though the person so offending had previously been engaged in instructing people, congregated under his charge, *not to steal*.

In one of the resolutions which you have quoted in your letter, I find a clause of the Declaration of Independence adverted to, which is, "That all men are created equal, and endowed, by their Creator, with an inalienable right to liberty." Now, sir, I am not *such* a fool as to think that these fanatics believe that *this* clause in the Declaration of Independence had any reference to the negroes of *this* or *any other* country. No, sir, *fanatical as they are*, they know better than *this*; for, are not the aggrivances which caused our forefathers to draft this soul-stirring instrument, separately spoken of, and in the most *pointed manner*, too—and in all of the complaints spoken of in that instrument, the question of negro slavery is not even *intimated*, much *less* spoken of as being one of their reasons for declaring themselves free from the government of England. No, sir, had *that* have been the case, the framers of the constitution of the United States would have inserted a clause directly *prohibitory* to the enslaving of the negro man, so long as that instrument should remain *binding* upon the inhabitants of this country; for negro slavery existed *then, and in the presence, too*, of a people who were, in every respect, as *righteous* as are your negro sympathisers at the present day. No, sir, the negroes were no more an item of *their* consideration at *that* time, than the *Ourang-Outang* would be in the minds of the people at the present day in framing a similar instrument. But, *suppose* that *they* did consider the negro's freedom in that instrument, could *that* abolish *God's* law; which, as I have shown, says, that "thou *shalt* buy bond-men and bond-maids, and hold them as your possession for you and your children after you *for ever*." This is the law that God gave to Moses, and *I bid you defiance to find*, between the two lids of the bible, a *passage* where Christ ever *abolished* that law during his ministry in this polluted world.

If, then, *Christ*, as being God, *did not* abolish the law that God gave to the Israelites by Moses, which may, with equal right, be applied to the Gentile as the Jew; for Ham was cursed to serve both; and God gave laws regulating the practice of it in one race, and Christ *not* abolishing it in the other race; then *who are you* that *dares* to *curse* the perennity of that institution which God saw fit to create; or, *where* is the instrument of human invention that is of sufficient strength to *annul* God's word!

You ask this question, also, "How will it affect the value of Maryland stocks in anti-slavery Europe, to find such proof of a fierce zeal to sustain that slavery which is the bane of your prosperity?" &c. Now, sir, from the clamor that England has raised in the world on the subject of negro-slavery, I presume that you mean *her* when you speak of "anti-slavery Europe." If so, that people, as a nation, or, at least, those who legislate for the nation, together with the nobility, do not possess sufficient moral virtue to think of, or *care* for, *human* liberty and *human* happiness, for if they *did*, they would not suffer their own subjects to *starve* to death by *millions*, as it is a well known *fact* that they do; for the sanguinary wars that were carried on by them produced a famine in the Bengal Provinces, which *swept* off *three millions* of the inhabitants that were too poor to buy the corn that was hoarded up by the speculators at the prices that they held it at. The Rev. J. Piermont says: "Go with me into the north-west provinces of the Bengal Presidency, and I will show you the bleaching bones of *five hundred thousand* human beings, who *perished* of *hunger* in the *short* space of a few months," This occurred in British India, in the reign of Victoria the first.

This is the people to whom you refer in your *affected* concern for "Maryland stocks in anti-slavery Europe," a people who are not *just*, *wise* and *merciful* enough to preserve their own people from starving to death, when they have it in their *power* so to do. Do the southern people treat their *negroes* thus?

You say that "liberty may be taken from you, but your good name cannot," &c. Notwithstanding your endeavors, through your letter, to show yourself to the world to be the most *immaculate* person that ever lived, you have been guilty of an attempt to break jail, for which act you are deprived of that *little* liberty that you before enjoyed. Is it not reasonable to suppose, that, by your having *powder* and *ball* in your possession, you were *determined* to escape from that trial, which you had threatened to show to a civilized world in such *glaring* colors, even though you had to take life to effect it? If this be so, then, like the man in the fable, you can blow both hot and cold; that is, in order to effect your *base* purposes, you can be a *saint* or a *fiend*, as circumstances may require. As a minister, by so doing, have you not somewhat tarnished that *unspeakable* effulgence of your character? The devil, it is said, when engaged in leading innocence astray, will *sometimes* show his cloven foot.

"But I am willing to be judged by my enemies, so far as they themselves belong to the reputable portion of society—slave traders and their abettors do not." Is the crime of slavery any greater now than it was in the time of the ancient patriarchs; and will you pretend to say that Abraham and Solomon were

not respectable? I instance these two, for the reason that they dealt more extensively in the traffic of the negro race than any other of the ancients, and yet one was styled the father of the faithful, and the other was considered to be the wisest among men. By Abraham's being called the father of the faithful, affords sufficient proof, I think, that he must have been an honorable man, and yet he was a dealer in negro slaves; and as being a righteous man, he must, by so doing, have influenced others to engage in the same traffic, if they chose to do so; consequently he must have been an aider and abettor in the practice of slavery. Will you say that he did not belong to the reputable portion of society? No, sir, such an expression as *that*, is more than you *dare* give utterance to. Solomon, the man whom God chose to build his holy temple, prayed for wisdom, and any one that has ever read his Proverbs and Book of Wisdom, must feel convincing proof that his prayer was heard and answered of God; for if those two books are read with an attentive mind, the impression will be, that in them is comprehended all that need or *can* be said to instruct the human family in either morals or religion. So comprehensive was his mind, that in four chapters he has given a history of the cosmogony of the world, showing the wickedness of, and mentioning, separately, the calamities that the offending idolatrous nations fell into, in consequence of transgressing God's holy will; showing, at the same time, how those that kept his counsels were favored and blessed by him. All this is comprehended in his prayer for wisdom, furnishing a volume of history in almost every line. Read Solomon's Book of Wisdom, from the 9th to the 13th chapter, inclusive. Do abolitionists comprehend as much as this in their invocations for the negro's liberty?

In speaking of Solomon's wisdom, Josephus says, book viii., chap. 2, sec. 5, page 164, "He also composed books of odes and songs, a thousand and five; of parables and similitudes, three thousand; for he spake a parable upon every sort of tree, from the hyssop to the cedar; and in like manner also about beasts, about all sorts of living creatures, whether upon the earth, or in the sea, or in the air; for he was not unacquainted with any of their natures, nor omitted inquiries about them, but described them all like a philosopher, and demonstrated his exquisite knowledge of their several properties." To do this, would require a very extensive knowledge of the animal kingdom, and is it to be supposed that a man possessing such an inquiring mind about trees, beasts, birds and fishes, would have neglected to have inquired about subjects relative to the human family? No, to charge the neglect of such an important subject as *this*, to so great a mind as *his*, would be absurd in the extreme. Rather than neglect *such* a subject, he would trace it to its origin, making it his chief aim to understand

the history of his forefathers, together with the nations by which they were surrounded, else how could he, as a king, have known how to govern the people of his time, seeing that it is by the knowledge of the history of the past, that all *wise* men are guided in their counsels relative to the future. From the writings of Solomon, as furnished us by the bible, it is beyond a doubt that he understood the history of the world from the creation up to his time, which, according to Josephus, was three thousand, one hundred and twenty-two years, and from the deluge, one thousand, four hundred and forty years, and from the time Abraham went out of Mesopotamia into Canaan, one thousand and twenty years, and five hundred and ninety-two years after the exodus out of Egypt. So sacred were the writings of the ancients kept, and so free from spurious history too, that Solomon could rely upon all the testimony that those writings furnished him, without the extreme labor of reading and comparing author with author, in order to arrive at the truth; that, notwithstanding the lapse of time, as shown above, it was but the labor of reading the history of the lapse of one hundred years of the spurious writings furnished us at the present day. I say, then, that Solomon understood the history of the ancients, and knew the full force of the curse of Noah upon the posterity of Ham, or he would not have treated that people with the severity that he did, if he had not known that it was God's permission for him to do so, if he chose. For the severity of Solomon's treatment towards the Hamethian race, see Josephus, book viii., chap. 6, sec. 3, page 172, "But king Solomon subdued to himself the remnant of the Canaanites that had not before submitted to him; those, I mean, that dwelt in Mount Lebanon, and as far as the city of Hamath; and ordered them to pay tribute. He also chose out of them, every year, such as were to serve him in the meanest offices, and to do his domestic works, and to follow husbandry: for none of the Hebrews were servants in such low employments; nor was it reasonable, that when God had brought so many nations under their power, they should depress their own people to such mean offices of life, rather than those nations: while all the Israelites were concerned in warlike affairs, and were in armor, and were set over the chariots and the horses, rather than leading the life of slaves. He appointed also five hundred and fifty rulers over those Canaanites who were reduced to such domestic slavery, who received the entire care of them from the king, and instructed them in those labors and operations wherein he wanted their assistance."

Here is an account of the *wisest* man, who was an aider and abettor in negro slavery on a large scale; so much so, that it required five-hundred and fifty men to keep the *lazy* negroes attentive to their work; when, if a southern man has as many ne-

groes as to require three superintendents, it is thought that he has a pretty large stock of slaves; yet he does not indulge in the practice of slavery to the extent that Solomon did.

As you style yourself an unspotted christian, and are willing to be tried by your enemies, if they are reputable, and, as I have shown that persons who, if possible, were your superiors, did give countenance to the practice of negro slavery, it becomes necessary to inquire who you mean by your reputable enemies.

Notwithstanding the people of the south do practice the enslaving of the negro man, it is to be supposed that in every denomination of the christian church, at the south, there are to be found persons, who, for their exemplary piety, are equal with the furious abolitionist members of the christian churches at the north, who in their phrensy, appoint days of fasting and prayer to Almighty God for the negro's liberty at the south, which conduct can be but little short of an insult to Deity, seeing that he created them to fill a servant's place. This course of theirs is different from that which the great preacher, St. Paul, pursued, and are they wiser than he? The institution of slavery, as practised at the south, is regulated by a certain code of laws. Now, to enact those, is required a senate and house of representatives, the members of which are chosen by the people, and it is to be supposed that the members of christian churches at the south, as well as those at the north, go to the polls, and there vote for such men as they think best qualified to legislate for the interests of the several states in which they live; and inasmuch as the persons thus voting, are the aiders and abettors of negro slavery, your *reputable* enemies are not to be found among this class of people. Who then, are they? The answer is obvious. They must be found among the *addlepatented makebates* who are just *wise* enough to listen to your *pseudo* arguments, willing to be led about by the nose, by an abolitionist lecturer who is receiving from five to eight hundred dollars a year, for the purpose of going about the country preaching equality of the negro with the white man, the doctrine of which is *absurdly false*, and those who preach it know it to be so! yet there are those who are willing to listen to your *fulsome* speeches rather than be guided by *right* reason or *common* sense.

"Can Maryland, who voted public thanks and swords of honor to those who delivered a few of our countrymen from slavery in Tripoli, make it a crime to help *her native born citizens* to escape from slavery on her own soil? Do the waves of the Atlantic change the nature of justice, mercy, humanity, and make them crimes and felonies?"

I answer no; it is the nature of the two *extreme* cases that does this. The first case is that of our own race being taken prisoners

by a barbarous nation, and reduced to slavery, which, according to the law of God, they had no right to do; and *we*, whose duty it was, as a christian people, ought to have done every thing in our power to liberate them from the state of degradation in which they were unfortunately placed. But the second case of which you speak so *emphatically*, refers to negro slaves; *not* native born *citizens*; but native bred *property*, the same as *hogs, sheep, and horses* are at the north, and the crime of setting one free in your *treacherous* way, is as great as it would be for you to cause a valuable horse to escape from his enclosure in such a manner as that the owner should receive no further benefit from him. Here, then, is the crime, the nature of justice *not* changed by the waves of the Atlantic, as you term it; but by some *marble-hearted* monster in human form, ye called abolitionist, who is engaged in *stealing* and abducting negro slaves from their owners; for, as I have shown, there is *no* crime in *enslaving* a negro man; *else* there is *no truth* in the bible.

The very commencement of your letter, which I will here repeat to you, is couched in such language as to convince every one who has read, or may read it, that you naturally possess a malicious disposition; and that because you have been detected in your *unprincipled* career, you must give vent to your *unhallowed* feelings in *violent* bursts of *abusive* epithets upon a people who are pursuing a course *more* honorable than that of *stealing*.

The undersigned, a prisoner in the city jail, in Baltimore, asks your attention to the following statements: If I was as widely known to the good people of this state, as I am to the citizens of New England, New York, and several of the western states, it would be of very little importance to me that a class of persons, such as traders in slaves, professional fugitive hunters, and subordinate officials, with a few slave-holders of the violent and *fanatical* class, should employ the venom of tongues, reckless of truth, to assail my character and make christian men deem me a *fit* associate for felons, or of men of their own grade in society." "If I was as widely known to the good people of this state," &c. As I have before shown that none but abolitionists are reputable, according to *your* views, and as those who are not reputable cannot be good people, strictly speaking, then you must refer to the abolitionists, who, like Lot of old, are residing in Sodom. How many of those good people do you think there are in Maryland. Do you think, that if you should, like Abraham, undertake to number them, you could find enough to save the city? It appears, that with *their* aid, your intent was to escape and flee to Zar. But, happily for Maryland and Virginia, you were detected. Yes, sir, the very commencement of your letter is *replete* with abuse; and from this fact, together with that of your attempt-

ing to break jail, and having also in your possession, those instruments of death, and the letter (which you tore up) of instructions to your accomplices without, who, like yourself, were *black-hearted* abolitionists, who, to accomplish their purposes, will not shrink from committing the basest crime; are, with yourself, equally culpable in your attempt to escape from justice; furnishes sufficient proof that you, and your posse with you, are fit candidates for the gallows. Lest you may say that it is none but some inconsiderate person that would address you thus, I shall introduce to your notice, a paragraph which I take from the *Christian Index*, a paper that is devoted wholly to christian purposes. "Rev. Mr. Torrey, confined in the Baltimore jail, charged with attempts to abduct slaves, was detected, a short time since, in an attempt to break jail. Numerous implements to aid him in breaking out were found on him. On being arrested, he tore up a letter, which, on being put together, was found to be addressed to a friend out side, and in a part of it, mention was made of *swords, pistols, &c.; powder and bullets* were found in his trunk. This clerical abolitionist seems to have been cut out for a highway robber, but probably mistook his calling. He has always professed a willingness to stand his trial! If there were no abolitionists in disguise in the south, as some would have us believe, would an abolitionist in jail find a friend without to assist in his escape?"—*Christian Index, Penfield, Ga., October 4th, 1844.*

You speak of "tongues reckless of truth, having been employed to assail your character." Such an one as that, would, beyond a doubt, fit very well in your mouth. But to employ these tongues, it does not become necessary, since your own acts have done more to assail your christian character than all that might have been *said* injurious to your reputation as a christian. I wish to be understood, that the name of *christian* I revere; and such as those who are worthy of bearing that name, I deem the *salt* of the earth, the *best* of citizens. But one like yourself, and many more, who are embraced in the abolition phalanx, who assume the name of christian as a cloak to your *hell-bred* principles, practicing upon the credulity of innocent people, by appearing among them as "wolves in sheep's clothing," seeking an opportunity to accomplish your ignominious ends at the expense of those who are unsuspecting of your designs; all *such* persons, I hold in utter contempt, and spurn them from my presence, as being *base* hypocrites, the *meanest* of the *mean*, and *vilest* of the *vile*; fit only for the rewards that the bible promises to all such persons. I judge, as I have a right, the tree by its fruit.

The following quotation is taken from your communication, and refers to the abusive resolutions which you say were drafted near Bunker Hill. "Nor are the persons who express such views



abolitionists merely. Few men can be found in the entire north, who cherish, *none* who will avow any other sentiments, unless it is to serve some base purposes of a partizan political nature."

I take the liberty of giving a flat denial to this assertion of yours; I know it to be absurdly false. There are those that do not believe the doctrine of the north meddling with the south by way of abolishing slavery as practised at the south; and these men are far from being guilty of serving *any* political party, to accomplish any base purposes whatever; they hold that this is a confederated government, and that the general legislation should be, to promote alike to all, the interest of the several states. The following proverb was used by a man, who, by wise men, was considered to possess a great mind. "He that cannot reason is a fool, he that will not, is a bigot, and he that dares not, is a slave." In the north is to be found four classes of people; the first three of which, belong to the abolitionists, the fourth does not. The first is the fool, who cannot reason, and however void of truth your doctrine may be, he knows no better than to believe it. The second is the bigot, who will not reason; but for money, he will make many declamations against slavery, abusing all who are not of his way of thinking. The third is the slave, who, though possessing many conscientious scruples, dares not reason, lest he shall bring upon him, the ire and indignation of this austere bigot; for so great is his fear of this mighty personage, that he stoops in quiet submission, to take the woolly-headed, thick sculled, flat nosed, thick lipped, black skinned, ill scented negro by the hand as his equal. The fourth class is that which does not belong to the abolitionists, and are capable and willing to reason with their fellow man, and give credit to all meritorious opinions that may be advanced. This is the class of people, that in your assertion, you point out to serve some base political party purposes; a people who would rather *die* than be guilty of a mean act.

The following is a quotation from your letter: "I said, I make no appeal to public sympathy. Let *the guilty* do that!\* I shall give the eminent counsellors who plead my cause, in the courts, but one instruction: it is, that they make no admission, even by way of argument, that it *can be a crime* to aid one of God's children, formed in his image, to escape from slavery. The crime is, to make God's child a slave!"

To this part of your letter I have to remark, that howmuch-soever you instruct your counsellors, either to admit, or not to admit, it can make no difference in the eye of the law; for if by convincing proof you are found guilty of the charges that those states have brought against you, the sentence of the law

\* To all appearances, you are the very one that should ask sympathy.

will be the reward for your self-styled merciful acts; and by the time you have satisfied both states, I think that you will become convinced that you have paid dear, *very* dear, for the "whistle." As it regards the negroes being "God's children, formed in his image," *it is not so!* We read in Genesis, chapter i. verse 27, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." This man that was created in the image of God was, in all probability, called Adam; whom Josephus says, was created out of "red earth, which he calls virgin or pure earth," and could not have been a negro, from the very reason that all the antediluvians were a red or copper colored people. It was Adam, then, whom God created in his image, the meaning of which I understand to be this; that Adam was created perfect, in purity and holiness, and was, prior to his fall, endowed with a rich quantum of intellectuality, in which case he would be the image of God; that is, he would resemble God, as God is mind, or intelligence. But the negroes, as I before remarked, were created imperfect, both in body and mind, and as you ministers tell me, that all wicked persons, such as I have shown the negroes to be, belong to the devil, proves your assertion to be without foundation, or, at any rate, it proves that the negroes are not created in the image of God, neither are they God's children, unless they repent and turn to him; and even in *that* case, Dr. Adam Clarke says, "that the christian religion never absolves the relationship of property." Taking this view of the subject, it places you before the public as a person who is calculating upon instructing your eminent counsellors to *lie* you out of difficulties. Surely that would not be right, You say, that "the crime is to make God's child a slave." I have before shown that it was God who appointed this people to slavery; but as I did not give the text, I will introduce it here. "And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son (Ham) had done unto him. And he said, cursed *be* Canaan;\* a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his (Shem's) servant. God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his (Japhet's) servant." See Genesis ix. from the 24th to the 28th verse, inclusive. Here we find that Ham was cursed, not only to be a servant merely, but to be a *servant of servants*, making the malediction doubly strong, binding it upon his posterity forever; while, with the same breath, Shem and Japhet were blessed with the privilege of carrying into practice this awful annunciation; and from the fact of the righteous patriarchs of old, having enslaved that people, by hundreds and thousands, furnishes sufficient

\* It is reasonable to suppose that the curse was pronounced upon Ham, as Canaan was not born at that time.

proof, that, to enslave the negro man, there was *no* crime, or they would not have done so themselves, nor would they have suffered it to have been done by others. But the proof of the practice of slavery does not stop here, for Plutarch says, that "the Greeks and Romans used to treat their slaves with the utmost rigor, selling, for the least trifle, all those that they could, who had become infirm, either by age or sickness, for the purpose of getting rid of the burden, that such slaves were to them; and those that they could not sell, were put in irons and treated with the most barbarous cruelty." If Christ had abolished slavery, would St. Paul have looked on this spectacle of inhuman treatment, without saying: my countrymen, this practice of yours is sinning against the law of God? You must not persist in it; release those men forthwith, and let them go free, for, although, our forefathers used to indulge in the enslaving of this people, Christ, our Redeemer, has abolished, or atoned for their original sin on Mount Calvary, and you must no longer hold that people in bondage. But instead of doing this, he sends slaves, who had previously runaway, back to their masters, and exhorts others to serve their masters with fear and trembling. All that St. Paul could say on this subject was, to exhort masters to be merciful to their slaves, as they also had a master in heaven. From what has been said above, it is shown that it was God who made them subjects for slavery, and men hold them in servitude only by the permission which God has given them. Does not this unsaddle the hobby, upon which you ride in so much triumph?

Having spent the most of my life at the north, and among the abolitionists too, I understand all the positions that you take, relative to the subject of slavery, and the manner in which you dupe the public in your lectures; but I cannot set them forth to the world in so small a work as this: nor is it necessary, since Mr. Priest has written so extensively upon the subject of slavery by way of replying to the abolitionists, showing to the world the manner in which you proceed to work upon the sympathetic feelings of the north; also showing wherein you, in order to sustain your positions, array Scripture against Scripture, leaving upon the minds of your hearers erroneous ideas, relative to the Bible. Every course that is pursued by the abolitionists is by him carefully examined, and pertinently replied to. To such as are desirous of investigating subjects relative to ancient times, this work of his, (as it treats upon subjects relative to the human family, from Adam to the present time, embracing much valuable historical information,) is highly recommended. But to return from my digression. As this pamphlet may fall into the hands of those who may not have the opportunity of procuring the above named work, I feel it my duty to notice here, *some* of the positions which you take in your insignificant harangues. Relative to the Egypt-

ians, you say that they were punished for the enslaving of the Israelites; and say you, does not the awful chastisement which they received for having thus enslaved the Children of Israel, speak like tones of *thunder* in our ears; the warning voice, not to enslave the negro man, lest we, for our reward, in such a course of conduct, receive the like afflictions? To this I answer, *no!*—The Israelites were never slaves to the Egyptians in the *bond-men* sense; they were vassals to the Egyptians in the same sense that the Canadians are to the British. While the Canadians are allowed to hold property as their possession in the Canadas, they are at the same time subject to a tribute to Great Britain, and this tribute, when exacted, must be payed, and that too without any regard to the people of whom the tribute is exacted, whether their sufferings be little or much. The Israelites were similarly circumstanced; for, while they were subjected to those severe tributes, they possessed flocks and herds; for the proof of which, see Exodus x. 24, “And Pharaoh called upon Moses, and said, Go ye, serve the Lord; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed.” If they had flocks and herds, then it necessarily follows that they must have owned land too, which they cultivated; for without that, what would be the use of flocks and herds? This privilege of theirs was *never* allowed to *bond slaves* in this or any other country.

In your lectures on abolitionism, you instance the Egyptians as being a nation renowned for their wisdom, and assert that we are indebted to them for our knowledge of the arts and sciences. It is true that you may bring proof for this, in some measure, both from sacred and profane writings. But, what of all that? What though the bible says that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt; and what though Herodotus says, that from the Egyptians, the Greeks obtained a knowledge of the arts and sciences; it does not prove that the Egyptians were the authors of those arts and sciences; or that they cared in the least about cultivating them. The arts and sciences must have been known and cultivated long before the flood, for in Genesis iv. 22, we read of Tubal-cain, who was an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron. Mechanism must have been known in those days, or how could they have built harps and organs, as we read in Genesis iv. 21, that Jabal “was the father (which may be understood instructor) of those that handled (or played upon) those instruments.” The principle of architecture must have been known in those early ages too, for in Genesis iv. 20, we read of Jabel, who “was the father of such as dwelt in tents, and of such as have cattle.”—Now as the construction of tent building is a species of architecture, then those that built such tents must have been architects; and as there were those too, who possessed cattle, it presupposes

that there must have been farmers in those days, which gives rise to the idea, that they must of necessity, have built sheds or barns, to shelter their beasts from the inclement seasons, or to secure their produce from falling weather. These precautions are but natural to the life of a farmer. I know that Herodotus says that Cadmus, the Phœnician, first brought the knowledge of letters into Greece. Admit that he did; does that simple fact prove that the Phœnicians were the inventors of those letters? May we not suppose that, as God gave to Adam the power of uttering articulate sounds, he also gave him a knowledge of characters, the use of which would represent those sounds? Having a knowledge of those characters, would not Adam, when he became a father, have instructed his children in the use of them? As a human being, and endowed with the intellectuality that Milton, in his *Paradise Lost*, imagines him to have been, and knowing too that all men, through him, were cursed to "earn their bread by the sweat of their face," he must have felt it a duty incumbent on him to instruct his family in all the knowledge that he possessed; urging upon them the strict necessity of improving their minds in the arts and sciences, that must inevitably be brought into use in the support of the human family: for, by the increasing multitude, various occupations and pursuits in life must necessarily be called for, in order that the interest of one may not conflict with the other; which, without a knowledge of literature, art and science, would be the case in such a rapidly increasing population, as there must have been at that time; for Josephus, in speaking of Jarad, who was the son of Enoch, says, that "by two wives, Silla and Ada, he had seventy-seven children." As God commanded Adam to be fruitful and multiply, it is reasonable to suppose, considering the extreme age to which he lived, that Adam might have been the father of as many children as was Jarad, for Josephus, when speaking of Seth, says, "that Adam had many other children, but to name them would be tedious."\* If they increased in this manner, they must of necessity have had a knowledge of the arts and sciences; which, from the bible and ancient history, I think I shall be able to prove was the case.

In speaking of Cain, Josephus says that he "was the author of weights and measures; he first of all set boundaries about lands; he built a city and fortified it with walls." Without a knowledge of architecture, how could Cain have built a city and fortified it with walls? surely this could never have been done without a knowledge of the arts and sciences. Josephus says, when speaking of the descendants of Seth, the third son of Adam, "They

\* "The number of Adam's children, according to old tradition, was thirty-three sons and twenty-three daughters."

also were the inventors of that peculiar sort of wisdom which is concerned with the heavenly bodies and their order." Here is an allusion made to astronomy, the deepest of all sciences; and if they understood this, is it not reasonable to suppose that they understood characters too; by the aid of which, they could communicate ideas to each other when at a distance? Whiston says "there is no reason to imagine that men were not taught to *read* and *write* soon after they were *taught* to *speak*: and perhaps all by the Messiah himself, who, under the Father, was the Creator and Governor of mankind; and who frequently in those early days appeared to them." To have built an ark five hundred and twenty-six feet long, eighty-seven feet six inches wide, and fifty-two feet six inches deep, would have required an extensive knowledge of the arts and sciences, which Noah possessed; and in the ark, that knowledge was preserved, and by Noah, Shem and Japhet, all the innocent arts and sciences were transmitted to us. Ham's course was the reverse; he remembered the manners and customs of those wicked nations of old, whose lives were devoted to bestiality, murder, sodomical practices, robbery, incest, and every other thing that was vile, for which cause the world was drowned. No small offence could have occasioned this. While Ham remembered these things, he soured the minds of his posterity towards God, by instructing them in the wicked propensities of the ancients. All the idols and obscene paintings and practices by which the Egyptians, and all other negro nations were characterized, were, doubtless, of antediluvian origin, and by Ham introduced in the new world.

It is true that it is said of the Egyptians that they were learned. Admit that they were; what did their learning consist of? Were they of themselves ever known to aspire to any thing profound, whereby they, as a nation, might be looked up to for their wisdom? No! all the scientific knowledge that they possessed was derived from other sources than of themselves; for Josephus, when speaking of Abraham's going into Egypt, says that "they gave him, (Abraham,) leave to enter into conversation with the most learned among the Egyptians, from which conversation his virtue and his reputation became more conspicuous than they had been before. For whereas the Egyptians were formerly addicted to different customs, and despised one another's sacred and accustomed rites, and were very angry one with another on that account; Abraham conferred with each of them, and confuting the reasoning they made use of, every one for their own practices, he demonstrated that such reasonings were vain, and void of truth; whereupon he was admired by them, in those conferences, as a very wise man, and one of great sagacity, when he discoursed on any subject he undertook; and this not only in understanding it, but in persuad-

ing other men also to assent to him. He communicated to them arithmetic, and delivered to them the science of astronomy; for, before Abraham came into Egypt, they were unacquainted with those parts of learning, for that science came from the Chaldeans\* into Egypt, and from thence to the Greeks also.

As wise as the Egyptians are represented to have been, Abraham was competent to instruct the most learned of them, not only in matters which concerned their religion merely, but in the science of astronomy and mathematics; which until that time, they, with all their wisdom, had formed no conception of. This shows that the refinement (as spoken of in history) that the Egyptians possessed, when compared with other negro nations, only existed by the fostering care of the race of Shem; who, by their influence, overpowered the instructions which they had previously received from the source of Ham. The fact of the Hebrews having lived among the Egyptians in those ages, furnishes sufficient proof that their virtues must have had an influence upon the minds of those negroes which kept up, in some degree, the virtuous impressions that Abraham had formerly made; which fact alone accounts for the refinement that they possessed: for a negro was then, naturally, what they are now, incompetent for accomplishing any thing meritorious, unless urged on by those who possess superior minds to theirs. This then must unhinge the idea that the Egyptians and Phœnicians were of themselves, in ancient ages, before all others, the most learned.

But, says one, an admirer of negro intellect and ingenuity: look to the massive pyramids of Egypt, their towering height, how permanently built, though the ravages of time have been wearing upon them for thousands of years, yet they stand as monuments of matchless skill to all nations. Who can look upon them without admiring the magnificence of their appearance, and the gigantic minds of the architects who superintended their construction?—What of all that. The architecture of the beaver, though an amphibious animal, is to be admired also. Who can look upon the work of their ingenuity without admiring the industry and untiring efforts of those creatures? To furnish ponds for their sports, which their natures cannot do without, they set themselves to work in building dams across streams of water, and having no knowledge of the use of tools, for the axe to fell the tree, they substitute their teeth, and in lieu of a shovel, they use their tails, which being flat or broad, they throw up gravel with much dexterity. In this way they build their dams, by which means they provide themselves with ponds of water, without which they could not live. What

\*The Chaldeans were the descendants of Arphaxed, the third son of Shem, and were red men.

person with a reflecting mind, can look upon this species of architecture without feeling a degree of wonder and surprise at, or admiration of this ingenious piece of workmanship which those industrious creatures have produced. But, says one, this is nothing but a bank of logs and earth thrown up, which any one could have done. Admit it; so also with regard to the Egyptian pyramids: they are nothing but a mass of stones placed one on the top of another, the labor of which cost them no more trouble than it did the beaver to build his dam; and like the beaver's dam, they are monotonous in their appearance, having no variation in their construction. This shows that the Egyptians borrowed their knowledge of this science from a type of other people's inventions, which in all probability, was of the race of Shem; for if the Egyptians had, of themselves, possessed sufficient natural ingenuity to have invented or conceived the idea of the construction of those pyramids, that same ingenuity would have prompted them to have made some improvements in their architecture by way of a variety; relieving the eye from a continued massive pile of stones. If they borrowed their knowledge from others, are they worthy of the encomiums that history is constantly bestowing upon them? To which belongs the meed for improvement, the inventor or the imitator? When his revilers had satisfied themselves that they could not do it, Columbus made the egg stand upon its end; which, when accomplished, the rest could imitate. In this case, who manifested the greatest mind, Columbus or his revilers? By every sensible person this question is answered in the affirmative. So in regard to the Egyptian architecture: what knowledge they possessed relative to that science, they borrowed from the Chaldeans and Hebrews, and did not possess sufficient ingenuity to deviate in the least, by way of improvement, from those whom they patterned after.

After much careful investigation, I cannot find where the Egyptians have ever been the inventors of any thing worthy of note.—Disrobed of their having been the authors of the arts and sciences, the Egyptians and Phœnicians appear to the world destitute of any thing meritorious, except in the manner of keeping their history, and even in this case they copied the Chaldeans and Hebrews, who were of the race of Shem. This was done, not of their own natural inclination, but through the influence which the other race had upon them. Thus much for the credit that you give to the Egyptians and Phœnicians.

You say that it is pure philanthropy that prompts you to act in behalf of the negro slave. Suppose that it is; are you justifiable in surrendering your judgment to inconsistency? Suppose that a judge, on account of the sympathy which he had for the criminal, should refuse to deliver the sentence of the law; would that change the disposition of the criminal, and make a wholesome citizen of



him? So in regard to your philanthropy; you may free as many negroes from bondage as you choose, you cannot change their natures by doing so; nor do you better their condition: for while they are in servitude, they have some one to look after them, whose interest it is to see that they are well provided for; and when sick, which is seldom the case with those in servitude, they have some one to attend to them, by way of administering to their wants. But at the North, where they are free, it is not so!—Though they live among that people who have been so instrumental in getting them out of servitude, they are suffered to idle away their time, by which means they are unprovided with the necessary comforts of life. Disregarded, we see them in a filthy condition staggering through the streets of our cities and villages, the true representatives of their incapability to rise in the world when left to provide for themselves.

In your discourses on abolitionism, you make great speculation out of the idea of the traffic in human flesh and blood. Who, that possesses the least particle of humanity, can behold this awful spectacle of separating kindred relations, by taking from the fond embraces of a father and mother, their children, and selling them to strangers in a foreign land, far removed from them; in which case, they are deprived of the privilege of caressing the objects of their affection; or when sick or in distress, the hand of an affectionate mother cannot reach, to comfort them in their affliction? Look at this ye husbands and ye wives, brothers and sisters too, all, all of you; reflect upon this awful practice, and then say whether you could bear up under such awful scenes of inhumanity. Ask yourselves, whether you could bear the idea of having one of your connexions torn from your presence in this way. Who is there among you, that will not now, from this time henceforth, publicly raise your voice against slavery, until such times as you shall have accomplished the desired object—the abolishment of negro slavery in this free and independent America?

To reply to such an argument, I have first, to introduce the treatment of the English towards that people, of whom it is proverbial, that if a poor person, one of their own color, is seen to be carrying a goose or a turkey on his way home, he is stopped by the authority of a constable and inquired of, as to how he came by it; and having given satisfaction that he did not steal it, he is then allowed to take it to his family. Philanthropic England is said to be guilty of this servility towards her own people. Now let us see how she treats the negroes. Such regard have they for the liberty and social feelings of the negroes, that the English will go to Africa after them; and from there, they bring negro children to England, and apprentice them in a strange land; which, as they say, is for the purpose of bettering their condition, by making mechanics of them. By doing this, do not the English sever

those children from the embraces of fond and tender parents and kindred connexions? Is it any worse to sell a negro to a second person, to be his property, than it is to force them from their homes to a distant country, to be the apprentices of a second person for life? I know that the English pretend to have a form of binding them for only fourteen years; but who will tell them when they are free? Suppose it to be the fact, that they enslave them no longer than that term of years; what right have they to do even that, for the law only requires seven years for a white person to serve as an apprentice; what right have they then to make this distinction between colors and nations? If the black man is as good as the white man, why double his time of servitude? Possessing so much philanthropy, how can the English be the spectators of such a scene of grief, as would be manifested on such an occasion, by beholding fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers, all in tears, holding each other by the hand, kissing and caressing each other, and when about to depart, to hear by the stronger, the deep and heart-felt groan, and by the weaker, the shrill and piercing cry, on beholding five hundred of their kindred being borne away, by the gentle breeze, out of their sight to a foreign land, and whom they may never see again? Is not this, as well as the other, an awful spectacle to behold? This is what the philanthropic English are guilty of. But, says one, this case has no bearing on the other, by way of comparison, for the parents consent to this as a contract between them and the English; that their children shall be well provided for, and when having served fourteen years, they are to be furnished with a knowledge of mechanism, as a reward for their services.

Admit it: it only serves to establish a point that I shall endeavor to prove. It is this: the negroes have no more regard for their offspring than the beasts of the field; and sometimes I am constrained to think that they have not as much; for the cow will look after her calf when in a helpless state, and so will the lioness look after her whelps, and protect them too, even though it is at the risk of her life, which is more than the negroes do for their helpless children. In view of what has been said above, respecting the negroes apprenticing their children to the English, I have to inquire, what white woman, being a mother, could coolly and deliberately, let her child be taken to China to live among strangers in a strange land, that by so doing it may become learned in some branches of their arts and sciences; and to accomplish which, would require a separation of fourteen years, during which time she could hear no tidings from it, whether it was comfortably provided for; whether, if sick, it received tender care, or if, when well, its morals were guarded in such a manner that it imbibed no profligate habits? With all these keen sensations, together with the natural ties that bind a mother to her child, where is the woman

to be found that would do it? The response to this must be, by every white person, there is none, no not even one that is so much beneath the brute, as to consent to such a separation. For proof of this affair of the English in their apprenticing the negro, see *New York Express*, June 21, 1842. These apprentices are, I firmly believe, made bond-men of, during their natural lives, and the English are, if I may be allowed the expression, whipping the devil around the stump; for while they are trumpeting to the world their liberality in setting their slaves free, they yet hold them as bond-men in the disguise of apprentices.

In regard to what I have said above, relative to the negroes caring less for their offspring than the white race do for theirs, I shall introduce the testimony of Herodotus. He says, when speaking of the nations that Cyrus made tributary to him, that "the Ethiopians and Calantion Indians once in every three years presented the king with two hundred blocks of ebony, twelve large elephants' teeth and five Ethiopian youths. The people of Chalcos and their neighbors, as far as mount Caucasus, imposed on themselves the payment of a gratuity. Every five years the nations above mentioned, presented the king with a hundred youths and a hundred virgins, which had continued to his time." Here we have an account of the negroes giving their children to the king as a tribute with the same freedom of mind, as they did a block of wood, or an elephant's tooth, which shows that they have not as much affection for their offspring, as you abolitionists pretend that they have; for was that the case, they would not, when unasked, have given away their children by the hundreds, as Herodotus says was the case. Being destitute of the natural philo-progenitiveness that the whites possess, they part with their children, as being the objects of their least concern. Incapable of reflecting upon the helpless condition of their children, or the rigors that they may be exposed to, they sell them to any body who may offer them the least trifle, should that chance to please their eye. This they do with less concern than a farmer would sell a horse that had been a pet in his family. When the nature of a negro is rightly understood, the sale of them, from which you draw such painting, for operating on the sympathetic feelings of the white people, by holding up to them, the heartless inhumanity of separating husband from wife, parents from children, all of which you bring to bear upon their minds in the most forcible manner that you can invent; all that you have said, or may say, can have no bearing; for, only for the moment, they care no more about being sold than a dog. For further proof that they have not that fine conscientious and sensitive feeling that white people possess, we will hear what Herodotus farther says concerning them. "The Thracians," Herodotus says, "have a custom of selling their children to be carried out of their country: To their

young women they pay no regard, suffering them to live indiscriminately with the men. The most honorable life with them is a life of indolence: the most contemptible is that of a husbandman. Their supreme delight is in war and plunder." Is not this practice of theirs, in selling, voluntarily, their own children, equally as bad as it is for other people to sell them? For others to sell their children, they can have the excuse that they were compelled to submit to it. But when of their own accord, they sell their own children out of their country, there is no palliative to their more than brutal natures. Destitute of any regard for decency, the sexes are allowed to live in the same open, and unrestrained manner as do the brute creation; having no shame for such an unchaste manner of life, nor any feelings of amity for one another. They glory in the destruction of their own flesh and blood; possessing no misgivings for the unhallowed lives they lead. Are not such persons better off in slavery, even if to accomplish it, they have to be sold? Surely, as God has commanded all men, that are in health, to labor six days in a week, it is no more than right that those indolent negroes, who esteem the life of a laboring man contemptible, should be made to fulfil that command.

But you say, that they are flesh and blood like ourselves. That they are flesh and blood, I admit, but that they are like ourselves, I deny; for they possess a carnivorous appetite, a desire to feed on raw flesh, and in many instances that of their own species, in which case, they are *worse* than *dogs*, for they will not feed upon the flesh of their own species. For the proof of what I say here, read Herodotus. He says that "there are other Indians who live on raw flesh, and are said to observe these customs: If any man among them be diseased, his nearest connexion puts him to death; alleging in case, that sickness would waste and injure his flesh. They pay no regard to his assertions that he is not really ill, but without the smallest compunction deprive him of life. If a woman be ill, her female connexions treat her in the same manner. The more aged among them are regularly killed and eaten; but there are very few who arrive to old age, for in case of sickness they put every one to death."

Will you pretend to say, that these people are equal to the white race? Where can you find, in any age, a race of white people that have been as low in the scale of civilization, as the people above mentioned? During the darkest ages of barbarism, there was never found a white people thus degraded. The Turks with all the *barbarity* that they every possessed, are far superior to those negroes. The Goths and Vandals, of whom history speaks, as being the lowest grade of white people, were *never* guilty of leading such a *low* and *degraded* course of life as this people, whom you pretend to love so dearly.

Here is a portrait of that people of whom you are raising so

much clamor about, to the very great annoyance of a large portion of the people in this country; not those at the South merely, for those at the North, who possess reflecting minds, are imposed upon, and in many instances, are grossly insulted by your *nefarious* conduct towards them; nor do the people of the South feel less affected at your *fervidity* in *filching* their property from them. The people spoken of above, are of the same source with those that Solomon speaks of in his Book of Wisdom, xii. 5, 6.

“And those merciless murderers of children, and devourers of man’s flesh, and the feasts of blood; with priests out of the midst of their idolatrous crew, and the parents that killed with their own hands, souls destitute of help.” This is the people that you hold up to the world as being equal with the white race. If you hold yourself to be no better than this people, then in the language of the bible, I would exhort you to “lay your hands upon your mouth, and your mouth in the dust, and cry, unclean.” Separate yourselves from the better portion of our race, and forever dwell among the negroes, whom Solomon says in his Book of Wisdom, xii. 11, “was a cursed seed from the beginning.”

Perhaps you may say, that they are not all cannibals. Grant that they are not. Herodotus says, “that there are other Indians, who, differing in their manners from the above, put no animal to death, sow no grain, have no fixed habitations, and live solely on vegetables. If any of those Indians be taken sick, they retire to some solitude, and there remain; no one expressing any concern about them during their illness, or after their death.”

Here we find such as do not *eat* human flesh; but do they manifest any symptoms of that mutual sympathy that the white race possess? Where is the family of white people that could suffer their relations, such as father or mother, brother or sister, wife or child, to retire from their presence with all the symptoms of a death-bed sickness, without a desire of being ever present with them, with an ever ready and willing hand to administer to their relief, such things as the nature of their disease required; and when dead, see them decently interred, moistening the grave with a tear of affection for their departed friend. This is more than a negro is capable of doing when unassociated with the influence of the white race.

Perhaps you may say that I have been setting forth that savage race of Indians who know and feel no mercy, instead of those poor negroes, in whom *we* can see prodigious germs of intellectuality. To ease your mind from any unfairness in that respect, I will bring Herodotus to qualify what I have written. He says, “that among all of those Indians, whom I have specified, their communication is open and unrestrained. They are all of the same complexion, and much resembling Ethiopians.” This is what Herodotus says of them; and as he was among them, he surely ought to know.

You say, that independent of the color of their skin, they might be made to cope with the whites in any respect. A lump of blown salt, in its appearance, resembles that of loaf sugar, and at a little distance, by the eye, the difference cannot be discovered; but to the taste, it cannot be disguised without decomposing it. Yet both are good in their place, one is good to season a dish of tea, and the other to preserve a mackerel. So with the two races in question, the negro is good in a servant's place, and all that you can bestow upon him can never elevate him to equality with the white man.

You say, that they are a portion of God's creation, and as being such, they should be the objects of our consideration. Admit it. The rattle snake, one of the most poisonous of the reptile species, is a portion of God's creation; and as such, in its place, we should admire it; but that does not prove that we should take it to our bosom as we would a dove!

There is no plausible argument why you should be the instrument of so much confusion in the world on the subject of negro slavery, for the very negroes themselves do not even thank you for it; for if they did, their subsequent lives would manifest it, by their turning their attention to the study of the arts and sciences, as preparatory to bringing their own people out of a state of bondage, without leaving it to be done by others.

But, instead of that, they manifest no disposition for industry, lounging about days in idleness, waiting for night to approach, that under its cover, they may sally forth from the haunts of vice and immorality, where they have spent the day in debauch, to pilfer the earnings of the industrious, hard working white man.— With but few exceptions, the free negro at the North will not seek the improvement of his condition, by applying himself to labour, unless urged on by the white people. These are *stubborn facts, and you cannot deny them.*

I hope sir, that while in prison, your mind may be brought to bear on this question in a manner that becometh an American citizen; blotting out, for ever, from your mind, the puerile notion that your veteran soldier taught you concerning slavery as practised in this country; remembering that the Bible gives to *every* man that chooses, the privilege of enslaving the Hamethan race, whatever the abolitionists of England or America may say to the contrary.

Should you make up your mind to this effect, and preach "Christ and him crucified;" by taking *such* a course, you would be the instrument of doing more good in one day, than though you should preach abolitionism all your life.

I am, sir, for *preserving* the Union of this country, as all our *temporal blessings* are based upon it.









**Boston Public Library**  
**Central Library, Copley Square**

**Division of**  
**Reference and Research Services**

**The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.**

**Please do not remove cards from this pocket.**



