

A LETTER

FROM

AN ELDER

IN AN

Old School Presbyterian Church

TO

HIS SON AT COLLEGE.

*τί γὰρ, εἰ ἠπίσθησάν τινες ; μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν
πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσῃ ; μὴ γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ
ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης.*

ROMANS III. 3, 4.

טוב לַחֲסוֹת בַּיהוָה מִבְּטוֹחַ בְּאָדָם.

PSALM CXVIII. 8.

NEW YORK.

1863.

A LETTER

FROM

AN ELDER

IN AN

Old School Presbyterian Church

TO

27. 5
HIS SON AT COLLEGE.

*τί γάρ, εἰ ἠπίστυσάν τινες ; μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν
πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσῃ ; μὴ γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ
ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης.*

ROMANS III. 3, 4.

טוב לַחֲסִית בַּיהוָה מִבִּטָּח בַּאֲדָם.

PSALM CXVIII. 8.

NEW YORK.

1863.

LETTER.

NEW YORK, *April* 22, 1863.

MY DEAR SON:

In a recent letter you remark, "Wayland is down on Slavery, and tries to prove that it is wrong from the Bible." You know that I regard Anti-Slavery as a false god, which, forewarned as you have been, you will not surely worship. As the views I entertain on this subject are the result of at least twenty years of careful thought and study, and form a part of my religious faith, you can imagine the importance I attach to them. In full view of my accountability to my Maker, I shall proceed to give you my conclusions upon this subject, with some reasons therefor; and I demand of you, as you shall answer at the great day, that you give the profoundest consideration to what I shall write, and determine its truth or falsity by a comparison with Scripture alone. The fashionable way is to interpret the Bible so as to conform to the accepted theories of the age. I would have you bring them all to the Bible, and accept them only wherein they conform to its teachings. Wherein they differ, reject them, though you are thus placed at

variance with the so-called scientific men of your time. Don't think your Professors infallible. Many of the dogmas of the past have been found erroneous, and some of those of the 19th century will be repudiated in time to come, especially those relating to geology and ethnology.

In studying the question of Bible Slavery, say to yourself beforehand, "Let God be true though every man be made a liar;" and determine that a "Thus saith the Lord" shall be final and conclusive, prevailing over every apparent argument. Remember that when, in Job's time, the sons of God assembled together, "Satan went up also" with them. He has ever since continued the same practice. He is a subtle logician. He laid his plans to corrupt the primitive church, and succeeded. He has been laboring for the subversion of the churches of the Reformation in various ways, ever since the times of Luther and Calvin; and I verily believe that he is now succeeding, by new tactics, in causing them to apostatize also.

For four thousand years he had never interfered for the abolition of Slavery. He was no doubt restrained until these last days, when the faith of God's people is to be sorely tried. As the "God of this world," he was permitted to incite men to show their depravity by an abuse of their rights as masters, as he has led them to abuse every other gift of God; but toward the close of the 18th century, he adopted the new tactics of which I have spoken, employing as his co-laborers Paine, Voltaire, Hume, Robespierre, &c.

They taught morality as a science very plausibly ! Their text was Human Rights. Satan always employs great talent. It was needed, to subvert the opinion on this subject which the Church and the world had held for ages, and to pervert the word of God to the support of the new doctrine. Quere : Might it not have been an " Angel Rights " theory that he thought was interfered with, which led him and those who fell with him into their open rebellion ?* Tom Paine was the earnest advocate of the new theory. He was a prime mover among infidels, and his real object was to make infidels. He very justly thought that the best way of so doing was to preach Human Rights—knowing that it flattered the natural heart, corrupted man's integrity, and militated against God's sovereignty. Whether taught by the deluded Christian or the God-defying infidel, the effect produced is the same. Now, what has its effect been upon the Church and the world ?

I will not answer this question fully ; for that would lead me into a political discussion. Let it suffice to look at the Church of which we are members, which has been, hitherto, the soundest and most conservative body of Christians in the land. In 1787, the first action on the subject of Slavery was had by the Presbyterian Church. Its highest court decided in favor of its members doing " everything in their power, consistent with the rights of civil society, to

* See Hopkins' " Divine Attributes " (vol. i. ch. 7), for some interesting speculations as to the probable cause of the fall of the Angels.

promote the abolition of Slavery." This action was mainly based, not on the teachings of God's word, but on the conviction (!) that "*the rights of human nature* are too well understood to admit of debate." No debate ensued, no reasons were assigned for the "conviction" they had arrived at. It was thought to be a self-evident proposition that every man had an inherent right to his liberty; practically ignoring God's discrimination against a portion of the race in depriving them of this very right.

This was the first fruit in our Church of this Human Rights stratagem. It was practical infidelity.

The arguments by which our successful rebellion against the mother country had been justified, and the wish to prove that not infidels alone were "philanthropists," as they loved falsely to call themselves, made the pious, conservative, God-fearing men of those days the ready victims of this captivating but pseudo-philanthropic doctrine. They were thus thrown off their guard and did not see the hand of Satan in it. Our subsequent history, ecclesiastical as well as political, and the present calamitous state of things in our country show it, however, to my mind, as the necessary sequence of cause and effect.

In the Assembly of 1818, the subject was again discussed and reported on at length, the report being unanimously adopted. I extract as follows: "We consider the voluntary enslaving of one portion of the human race by another as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of Human Nature,"

and “as (hence?) utterly inconsistent with the law of God.” Further on: “Still the slave is deprived of his natural right,” and again: “It is *manifestly* the duty of all Christians “to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavors to correct *the errors of former times*, and as speedily as possible to efface this *blot* on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of Slavery throughout Christendom, and, if possible, throughout the world.” This is the position assumed by the Presbyterian Church on the Slavery question as determined by its General Assembly! Adopting the natural right theory of Tom Paine, it was easy enough for them at one stroke to sweep away that good, old-fashioned, God-honoring, man-humiliating “doctrine according to godliness,” which prevailed in the Church in all previous ages. No wonder, that under such influences they should think those who had gone before them were very erroneous interpreters of God’s word, and that it was *their* duty “to correct the errors of former times.”

This second deliberate action of the Church exhibits the more effectual working of the diabolical strategy alluded to. The conscience of the Assembly sustained them in this action, not, as the language employed shows, from the plain letter of Scripture, not from any “thus saith the Lord” on the subject, but by assuming that, as a basis of their reasoning, which is not fact; that which contravenes the Bible, physical facts, and all human experience. They had been instructed in this belief before they were old enough to

read. It was taught in the nursery songs and primer books. As a first principle it was a higher law. It was, practically at least, paramount to the Bible, for its teachings had to be explained away when they conflicted with this fundamental axiom. The reception of this equality doctrine, upon which Tom Paine lectured and wrote for fifty years, led them to conclude that Slavery violated the Golden Rule, and hence was "totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ," and a "paradox in the moral system," forgetting, or utterly failing to perceive, that that rule was never intended to *abolish* the relations of master and slave, but to *adjust* them according to the standard of the Christian religion.

This Equality and Human Rights theory being false, all the conclusions they have drawn from it are false likewise. If it succeeds in overthrowing Slavery, it will illustrate itself practically in such a way as to convince all Christendom what its true character is. It would then lead to Agrarianism, and practical Socialism and Fourierism. I could, if I would, write much in proof of this position, and show also, as already intimated, that the relation of master and slave does not violate the Golden Rule, which was first given by Moses (Lev. xix, 18) in connection with his laws pertaining to Slavery, but I must keep myself within the bounds of a letter.

This Human Rights doctrine having been accepted, under the circumstances which I have stated, was, naturally enough, embodied in the treatises which were

subsequently written on moral science, and has been taught in our colleges and theological seminaries. Hence, almost every liberally educated man in our country has been trained in these two beliefs, the one the consequent of the other—Human Rights and Anti-Slavery. Alas! how few independent thinkers are to be found among them! They reason eloquently and earnestly, never seeming to question the soundness of their premises, regarding them as self-evident.

These men, whose name is legion, are now the formers of public opinion. They are our governors, legislators, judges, presidents, and directors of our colleges and seminaries, ministers, editors, lawyers, doctors, &c. The *οἱ πολλοί* follow these leaders. The result wrought out by the reception nearly a century since of one erroneous principle into the moral science of the land is, to my view, a world in arms against the sovereign decrees of God Almighty—a union of hearts and hands between Atheists, Deists, Sceptics, Fourierites, Robert Dale Owenites, Unitarians, Universalists, *et id genus omne* on the one hand, and the churches of Christ on the other. Sad picture! “A person is not only *known* by the company he keeps; but he is morally *made* by it.” “What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?” If we do not get rid of this Anti-Slavery imposture, which is rank treason against the moral government of God, the most seductive and dangerous form of idolatry, we shall become, to a moral certainty, a nation of infidels.

Let me illustrate, by a case in point, the practical

effect of this false principle upon the better class of our citizens: A short time since I was discussing the Slavery question with a merchant of refinement and education, brought up in one of the wealthier of the Reformed Dutch settlements near our city, when, on hearing my defence of the institution as a part of the plan of God's moral government, he exclaimed: "if that is the doctrine of the Bible, I would as soon fight God Almighty as Jeff. Davis!" This is the legitimate, the necessary effect of this pernicious error. The members of our churches, especially those of the Congregational and New School Presbyterian, will be ready by and by to say likewise, for the elementary part of the work has been done. Tell them of their danger now, and they would be shocked, and each would cry out: "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?"

Most of the educated men at the South are graduates of our colleges. They *were* Anti-Slavery too; and under their teaching the whole Southern people were, until, driven by the persecuting passion of Northern men and legislatures, they were compelled to examine the subject *de novo* for themselves. They would have remained Anti-Slavery for ever, from the force of their early training, but for our malignant persecution. We have made them Pro-Slavery; and, against our intention, helped on the cause of Truth.

But I proceed now to give you what I deem the Bible view of Slavery. I believe—

1st. That in the beginning God created Adam, with

whom he covenanted, as the federal head of all men, and that all the existing races are his descendants.

2nd. That all mankind did constitute a single race or species down to Noah's time.

3rd. That there has since been a supernatural interposition, by which a portion of the race were made negroes, specifically distinct from and subject to their white brethren.

4th. And finally, that to deny the claim of the owner to the services of his slave, or even to omit to advocate it when assailed, is to stand charged, by the words of Jesus Christ himself through his servant Paul (1 Tim. vi, 1, 3), with the crime of blasphemy.

Of these four propositions, the first two need no proof. They will not be disputed by Christians. The third seems to me beyond doubt, for the following reasons. I look upon God as a great moral governor; upon man as his rebellious subject, as having been represented in, and as having fallen with his first father Adam. I see the mercy of God withholding the execution of the penalty, and allowing him a dispensation of grace. I then see that mercy trifled with, and the wickedness of the world bringing down a destruction of the race, save eight souls. With these circumstances borne in mind, for they have a bearing on what follows, let us come to the reading of the 9th chapter of Genesis. We are there informed of Ham and Canaan's sin. When, in addition, we hear the curse of perpetual slavery pronounced by God's prophet on the children of Canaan, and then find them occupying

Ethiopia, "the land of Ham" (Ps. cv, 23), with marvellous changes in their physical and mental constitution, and God himself subsequently avouching the authorship of the Ethiopian skin (Jer. xiii, 23), I think I am warranted in the conclusion that the change produced was God's miraculous performance, by way of preparation for, and adaptation to, the practical execution of Noah's curse. The change did not come by chance. It was not the result of natural causes. It could not have had any other author than God the Creator. It exhibits as great power as did the original creation of man. It was a new creation in fact. To deny that it was God's act is to deny his omnipotence. No power could effect any radical, constitutional change in God's creature without being equal to God himself. If it did exist it might operate to change other parts of God's creation, and continue to do so through eternity. The absurdity is apparent of charging it to any other than the Creator of the Universe. The physiological differences between the white man and the negro, with striking internal as well as external proof thereof, alone, without any Scripture bearing on the case, would make it obvious that none but an Almighty power could be made responsible therefor. Noah was, to those who lived before the flood as well as to those after it, a prophet. The prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Standing as the second head of the race, and acting as God's medium of communication with man, his words were divinely inspired, and his proclamation,

“Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren,” partook as much of the legislative and judicial character as did the words of Moses on many similar occasions. As it was God’s curse, and hence could not have been merely formal, it implies the actual infliction of the woe denounced, with such organic changes as a merciful being would see to be necessary to make the creature contented and happy in his new relation; and this we find in the negro.

When the great God utters a curse, some visible manifestation following is naturally looked for. The serpent was cursed, and a learned commentator says: “There has been a general belief, both among the ancient Jews and early Christians, that the serpent, before the fall, was not only gentle and innocuous, but in form and appearance among the most beautiful of creatures.” Whatever transformation took place was a consequence of the curse. The ground was cursed, and is now sterile and brings forth briers and thorns. Here, too, the believer sees cause and effect. When the Saviour cursed the fig tree, a visible effect was seen when it withered away. These were all supernatural interventions, accompanied by external manifestations. If it be admitted that Noah was God’s prophet, then the circumstances of this case are analogous to those, and the same inference is forced upon us, viz.: that it was a supernatural interposition by which one portion of the race were made negroes. I see nothing strange in it; on the contrary, I think adequate cause is assigned. Can the negro be accounted for in any other

way without denying the Bible? Hold then to this theory, which is, at all events, honoring to God, till a better one is presented.

Nature instructs us that without Divine interference there could and would have been but one complexion, and that like the first parents. Nature is consistent with herself. Like begets like. The complexion of Adam and Eve was white. From "the three sons of Noah was the whole earth overspread" (Gen. ix, 19), and since they had a common parentage, all men are descended from one pair. That negroes are, however, specifically distinct from the white race, is not only patent to our senses, but is proven by physiology—by the color, hair, figure, brain, &c. A respectable author says, "The entire bodily structure of the negro, down to the minutest atom of elementary matter, differs just as widely as the color of the skin or other external qualities from those of the white man." If the sciences of anatomy and physiology present such *facts*, what ignorance is shown in the popular impression that the difference between the white and black man is merely one of color!

It has been the commonly received opinion of all ages that the negroes are the descendants of Canaan. Our knowledge of history prior to the Grecian Empire is very imperfect, too much so to prove or disprove this point with certainty. The traditional belief of all ages and peoples on this subject is, in view of the circumstances, sufficient to satisfy my own mind; but I quote for your benefit from Dr. Rees' Cyclopædia, un-

der the head of "Canaanites": "Joshua extirpated great numbers, and obliged the rest to fly, some into Africa and others into Greece. Procopius says they first retreated into Egypt, but advanced into Africa, where they built many cities, and spread themselves over those vast regions which reach to the Straits, preserving their old language with little alteration. In the time of Athanasius, the Africans still said they were descended from the Canaanites, and when asked their origin, they answered 'Canaani.'"

If you think with me that the Divine Lawgiver spoke by the mouth of Noah, and that the black skin and woolly head, &c., are the miraculous attestations or rather consequences thereof, you will naturally infer that the change must have affected the organism of the creature so as to fit him for his new and altered condition. This is necessary, since this law of adaptation is found in all God's works. All His works are perfect. But, aside from Scripture and physiology, history shows the negroes to be incapable of self-government. It shows that they are not, never have been, and I may add, never can be, the equals of white men. They are imitative beings; when men, possessing the mental powers and capacities of white children. History and statistics prove that they are happier, more moral, religious, and multiply faster in slavery than in freedom. Negro Slavery was legislated into existence by a Divine decree, and by the same authority it is to continue "for ever and ever." It is, therefore, the normal condition of the negro. This view is supported

by physiology and history. If this be so, then opposition to it is hostility to the manifest will of God. It asserts man's right to rule himself. In so far as self is enthroned, God is dethroned. This desire of independence flows from the "secret atheism" in the heart of every unrenowned man. Hear old Dr. Charnock: "The great controversy between God and man hath been whether He or they shall be God; whether His reason or theirs, His will or theirs, shall be the guiding principle."

The *reason* of this malediction upon the line of Canaan's descendants, is one which every human being should inquire into with deepest reverence and awe, to see what God would teach man by it. This, the essential point, is the one which has been almost, if not entirely, overlooked. Like the handwriting on the wall, it should be considered. The nations of the earth ought to inquire into the meaning of this providence with national fastings, and every minister should see in it, as a part of his vocation, the duty of teaching men God's sovereignty, His hatred of sin, His determination to punish it, and should improve it to inculcate humility, and to warn a sinful race to prepare for the awful reckoning of the Judgment day.

The objection made that negro slavery is too terrible a punishment for the cause assigned, cannot be an objection to Christians who accept the total depravity of the race as a result of Eve's eating the forbidden fruit. Infidels may cavil at this, but not believers who are taught by the Spirit to see the "deep things of

God." To the question why God should not punish any act of disobedience to his law in an equally fearful manner, it might be answered that our first parents and Noah's family stood in a peculiar relation to the race. In Noah's case a whole world had been destroyed for wickedness, and he and his three sons had been saved in the most miraculous manner, and yet one of his sons deliberately makes a mock at his father, though knowing that he was a prophet of God and had been saved from destruction for his great piety. The son had also been saved when a world was destroyed, and that not because of his own, but of his father's righteousness; and yet he finds it in his heart to set light by this God-honored father and to endeavor to hold him up to the contempt of his brethren. When we consider that the relation of children to parents is typical of the relation the whole human family bear to a common father, we are not surprised at the explicit declarations made in God's word that we should honor our parents, or at the punishments denounced against those who would despise parental authority. Neither can we wonder that this act of disobedience to God, following so soon after a display of God's hatred of sin in the destruction of a world, should bring down upon the guilty actors, who had just received so signal a mark of divine favor, a curse, which should descend to the latest generations.

My fourth proposition is proven, as it seems to me, from 1 Tim. vi, 1. Paul, the aged apostle, writing to the young bishop Timothy, enjoins it upon him as one

of "these things (to) teach and exhort" (v. 2), to preach "Let as many slaves as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor." This is Pro-Slavery doctrine. And this doctrine must be preached "lest the *name* of God and his *doctrine* be *blasphemed*." "These things teach" is the command. The *omission* to do what he was enjoined would have been sin—the sin of blasphemy, at least constructively; while preaching the contrary doctrine would have been real blasphemy, because it "consents not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness" (v. 3). How do you suppose Timothy preached on this subject with the apostle's letter before him? God forbid, my dear son, that you should ever advocate the Anti-Slavery sentiment. No matter who are its friends, hate it, oppose it, fight it, for the honor of God's name and doctrine. If you do not you will be guilty of the sin of blasphemy. What more dreadful position can a poor sinner stand in at the great and terrible day than that of a blasphemer? Be loyal then to the teachings of God's word. It is disloyal to try to get away from their obvious meaning.

When you look at the Scriptural passages bearing on slavery, you will nowhere find it or the slave trade denounced; nor would I dare to condemn either. The abuses of both I would remedy as far as practicable. But the relation of master and slave is honorable, and the slave trade, mercifully carried on, is righteous in God's sight. Solomon considered the

slave trade right, for he was engaged in it. Noah gave Shem and Japheth the *right* to slaves, enumerated among his blessings (Gen. ix, 26, 27). Jehovah blessed Abraham with the gift of men slaves and women slaves (Gen. xxiv, 35). Noah's curse was recognized by Moses at Lev. xxv, 45, and the twelve tribes were allowed by God to have and to hold property in man! The property principle was sanctioned in that the slave was regarded as the owner's money (Ex. xxi, 21); and *the separation of husband and wife, parent and child was directly ordered* in obedience to this property principle (Ex. xxi, 4). How distressing that in the view of such *Bible facts*, good men can persuade themselves into the belief that slavery is wrong on the ground that the Bible cannot sanction slavery, and therefore does not; or, that it is inconsistent with what they call the general principles of Scripture, and therefore the Pro-Slavery teachings are to be explained away!

While holding that the normal condition of the negro is slavery, I am equally certain that the normal status of that portion of the race which were *blessed* in their progenitors remains what it was at the creation, viz., that of ruler. God gave Adam *dominion* (Gen. i, 28) "over every living thing." When the curse fell there was implied an alienation, but only from those affected by it, of this previously granted right. It was never intended that the enslavement of the descendants of those who were blessed should be permanent, as it never has been. The depravity of

mankind made it necessary and merciful because it has kept the nations incessantly at war, and prisoners were either put to death or sold into slavery. It was allowed for this reason and as a means of national chastisement by the great Ruler, but no portion of the white race have ever remained for any great length of time in slavery.

The passages of Scripture relating to the treatment of servants of the Hebrew race have confused and misled a good many superficial readers. Hebrews only were freed at the Jubilee. Other white slaves were not, much less the negroes. Hebrews were not to be sold as bondmen, but to a temporary and kinder service, never exceeding seven years. They could not be treated as bond-servants might justly be. Why this discrimination in their favor if the Human Rights theory of our day be a sound one? Passages from the 5th of Nehemiah, 58th of Isaiah, and 34th of Jeremiah have been so often misapplied by Anti-Slavery enthusiasts that the public have ignorantly come, at last, to believe that they are proofs denunciatory of the system; but the context of these passages will show this to be untrue. The Bible nowhere condemns that which it sanctions; neither is God liable, like man, to change. In the chapters alluded to, the commands to "let the oppressed go free" (Isai. lviii, 6), "proclaim liberty," and "that every man should let his man servant and every man his maid servant, being an Hebrew or Hebrewess, go free" (Jer. xxxiv, 8, 9), were alone applicable to Jewish men and

women, and under peculiar circumstances. The rich Jews were holding in servitude their Hebrew brethren *after* the expiration of the seven years lease, which was in disregard of God's law, and for which they were justly punished. They were simply commanded to free the slaves the law had made free. It was called an oppression by the prophet because, in the particular case, it was an illegal holding. It was lawful to hold all other than Hebrew slaves "for ever," not only beyond the seven years, but beyond the Jubilee. *Their* enslavement was legal, by divine law; and it is nowhere in Scripture called an oppression. To admit that slavery is an evil or an oppression is to put it out of your power to combat the abolitionists. Consistency will, after a while, lead you to go with them. To do so is virtually to deny the Bible, and to reproach and calumniate its Holy Author.

The authority of God as delegated to masters is honored when they are honored, and despised when they are despised. To denounce the lawful exercise of this God-granted power, or to take it away by human enactments, is to resist the authority of God, and impliedly to say—"Stand by: we are holier than thou."

Another misapplied text is that of Deut. xxiii, 15, viz.: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." Clark, who was an English abolitionist, comments correctly on this verse, referring it to "a servant who left an idolatrous master that he might join himself to God and his people. In any other case it would have

been an injustice to have harbored the runaway." Apply it, however, as the Anti-Slavery people do, and Paul violated this very law when he sent Onesimus back to Philemon. What, too, under that view, shall be said of the conduct of the angel (Gen. xvi, 13, shows him to have been Jehovah) in the case of Hagar? He addressed her as *Sarai's maid*, but "to remind her that she was the *property* of another," and to say, "Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hand."

Still another misquoted text is that of Ex. xxi, 16. It is, however, explained by Moses himself at Deut. xxiv, 7, to be a law against stealing and selling these privileged Hebrews: "If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel and maketh merchandise of him," &c. As the buying and selling of men was lawful, it was necessary to guard against such an abuse as the stealing and selling. This the eighth commandment forbade; yet God saw fit to make a special law, with the death penalty attached, for the peculiar benefit of this favored people.

Some, in order to get rid of certain of the Old Testament passages justifying slavery, say the Hebrew word *eved* does not mean slave. This is as poor a shift as they could make. It does mean it. No one who reads Hebrew will deny it, if he is candid and sane. You have a proof of this being its meaning at Ex. xii, 44, 45. There *eved* and *sachir* are antithetically placed; *eved* denoting the servant bought with money, while *sachir*, derived from *sachar*, to hire for wages, means hired servant. These are the Hebrew nouns properly

describing these two conditions of servitude. See, too, at this place, a most beautiful recognition of and sanction to the relation, in that the slave must be circumcised and must eat of the Passover equally with the members of the family, while the hired servant was forbidden.

A good deal of what I have written, you may notice, goes to show that God did not regard the Human Rights and Equality doctrine of our day as entitled to any respect. Then it must be a bad, a devilish doctrine, shall I say? Yes; I do say it. Experience shows us it deifies the creature, and arrays him in hostility to the Creator. See how God ignores the doctrine at Ex. xix, 5. There he proposed to the Jews, through Moses, to make them a *peculiar* treasure, *above all people*, if they would only keep covenant with Him; and he justifies himself in making the offer by saying, “for all the earth is mine;” asserting His right to do with mankind as He will—to love one people and hate another, elevate and cast down at His pleasure. He “hath mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth.” This doctrine is not very gratifying to the natural man, for “the carnal mind is enmity against God.” It will not, cannot receive the truth in the love of it. Try every fundamental proposition in morals by this test, given to me by your venerable grandfather when I was a youth, viz.: “Does it honor God and abase man?” If you can answer it affirmatively accept it; but if not, reject it. In the latter case there will be a fallacy in it, though you may not see it. The human heart loves that philosophy that exalts the creature. Hence it is

that the Anti-Slavery heresy will continue fashionable down to the day of the Lord's appearing. "When He cometh, shall He find faith on the earth? I tell you, nay."

As in the family of the first head of the race there was a Cain, so in that of the second head we find a Ham. May they not, in view of the curse resting on them in this life, be regarded as Old Testament types of that lost portion of our race represented in the New Testament under the figures of the "Tares" and "Goats" in their respective parables, who are doomed to be cursed in the world to come—bond slaves to Satan for ever and ever?

The Civil War, in which we are now plunged, I regard as God's punishment upon the country for the *blasphemy* involved in our Anti-Slavery utterances and legislations. Knowing that we of the North have been vastly greater sinners in this respect than the Southern people, I am fearful that the time to come will bring us sorer punishments than they are now suffering. The period denoted by the "distress of nations" is at hand, and as God is preparing by his Providence to pour out his hot displeasure upon the nations, I think I hear him saying to them as to Israel, when reproving them for their sins, by Amos (ix, 7) "Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me?"

That no man may spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ, is the prayer of

Your affectionate
FATHER.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 012 027 488 0

