

Payne, Buckner H 15⁰⁰
11

THE NEGRO:

WHAT IS HIS ETHNOLOGICAL STATUS?

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

By ARIEL.

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

SECOND EDITION.

CINCINNATI:
PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR.
1867.

(Copyright secured according to law.)

put into the gun, yet we *know* by this "logic of facts," that it was in the gun. It is the strongest evidence of what is true; of any testimony that can be offered.

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

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

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

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

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

Before proceeding with the examination of the subjects involved in the caption to this paper, we will for a moment, notice the prevailing errors, now existing in all their strength, and held by the clergy, and many learned men, to be true, which are: 1. Ham's name, which they allege, in Hebrew, means black; 2. The curse denounced against him, that a servant of servants should he be unto his brethren; and that *this* curse, was denounced against Ham, for the accidental seeing of his father Noah naked—that this curse was to do so, and did change him, so that instead of being long, straight-haired, high forehead, high nose, thin lips and white,

as he then was, and like his brothers Shem and Japheth, he was from that day forth, to be kinky-headed, low forehead, thick lipped and black skinned; and that his *name*, and this *curse*, effected all this. And truly, to answer their assumptions, it must have done so, or the case would not fit the negro, as we now find him. And they adduce in proof, that Ham's name in Hebrew (tCHam), means *black*, the present color of the negro, and that therefore Ham is the progenitor of the black race. They seem to forget, or rather, they ignore the fact, that the Bible nowhere says, that such a curse, or that any curse whatever, was denounced against Ham by his father Noah; but that this curse, with whatever it carried with it, was hurled at Canaan, the youngest son of Ham. But it is of little consequence, in the settlement of these great questions, *which* was intended, whether Ham or his youngest son Canaan. But if it be of any value in supporting their theory, this meaning of Ham's name in Hebrew, in designating *his* color to be black, and *black* it must be, to answer the color of the negro, then the names of Shem and Japheth should be of equal value, in determining *their* color; for each of the brothers received their respective names a hundred years or more before the flood, and were all the children of the same father and same mother. Now, if Shem and Japheth's names do not describe their color (which they do not), upon what principles of logical philology or grammar, can Ham's *name* determine his color? How many of this day are there who are called, black, white, brown, and olive, all of whom are white, and without the slightest suspicion, that the *name* indicated the color of their respective owners. Is it not strange, that intelligent and learned men, should be compelled to rely on such puerilities, as arguments and truly supporting such tremendous conclusions? But they say it was his name in conjunction with the curse, that made him and his descendants the negro we now find on earth. It is an axiom in logic, that, that which is not in the constituent, can not be in the constituted. We have seen, that the making of Ham a negro, is not *in* the name, which is one of the constituents, now let us see, if it is in the other constituent, the *curse*. Now the *curse* and *name* changed Ham, if their theory be true, from a white man, to a black negro. If the curse, were capable of effecting such results, it is to be found in the word *curse*, and not in the words, that a servant of servants should he be, as he and his descendants could, as readily be servants,