

**VOLUME I**

**I. Josiah P. Smeltzer Papers**  
(Before Newberry College Presidency)

**II. Josiah P. Smeltzer, Newberry College Years  
in Newberry (1861-1868)**

**III Confederate and Civil War Papers**

**IV. Josiah P. Smeltzer and the Walhalla Years**  
**Newberry College in Walhalla (1868-1877)**  
**Walhalla Female College (1877-1886)**  
**Real Estate Documents for Newberry College Property  
in Walhalla**

**V. Deaths of Josiah P. and Anna E. Smeltzer**

**VOLUME II**

**VI. Notes, Drafts, and Comments on Sermons and Speeches  
of Josiah P. Smeltzer**

**VII. Poetry and Music by Josiah P. Smeltzer**

**VIII. The Smeltzer Family**

**IX. Miscellaneous Documents**

smeltzer documents 6/08/04

**VOLUME I**

**I. Josiah P. Smeltzer Papers**  
**(Before Newberry College Presidency)**

**L. Josiah P. Smeltzer Papers**

**(Before Newberry College Presidency)**

1. September 9, 1837  
Court of Equity, Carroll County Maryland  
Document relating to real estate of George Smeltzer (Josiah P. Smeltzer's father)
2. November 7, 1840  
Teaching Certificate to teach in the Primary Schools of Frederick, Maryland  
Qualified to teach Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Grammar, and Geography
3. November 7, 1842  
Renewal of Teaching Certificate for Frederick, Maryland Primary Schools
4. July 1845  
Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?
5. Undated  
Notes for a student debate while a seminary student
6. September 20, 1848  
Statement from Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, certifying J.P. Smeltzer as a duly enrolled student.
7. November 16, 1848  
Notification of election to honorary membership in the Excelsior Literary Society, Wittenburg College, Springfield, Ohio
8. Undated  
Memories of his youth in Maryland
9. October 19, 1848  
Licensure from the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland
10. May 21, 1849  
Court document from Jefferson County, Virginia, authorizing J.P. Smeltzer to perform marriage ceremonies that are not incestuous or otherwise unlawful, to prevent forced or stolen marriages, and not to participate in the crime of bigamy.
11. October 23, 1849  
Ordination papers issued by Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Maryland  
Called to Evangelical Lutheran Church, Harpersferry, Virginia
12. July 4, 1853, 1854, and undated  
Fourth of July Speeches
13. September 20, 1860 and December 19, 1860  
Notification of election to honorary membership in the Ciceronian and the Demosthenian (?) Societies of Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia
14. March 18, 1861  
Membership Certificate to the Roanoke Division of the Sons of Temperance

Test. J. P. Reed, W. P. and R. S. 19



To whom it may concern.

This certifies that Brother J. P. Reed  
whose signature appears in the margin in his own hand writing was on the  
21 day of Jan 1861 regularly admitted a member  
of Roanoke Division No. 22 located in the Town of Salem  
and working under a legal and unforfeited Charter granted by the Grand  
Division of Virginia on the 24  
day of Jan 1845  
Having paid all demands against him up to the 18 day of  
March 1861 and being under no charge whatever we have granted  
him this withdrawal Card and recommend him to the due regard of all  
true Sons of Temperance

In Witness whereof We have caused this to  
be signed by our W. P. and R. S. and the Seal of our Division to be  
attached in the Town of Salem the 18  
day of March one thousand eight hundred and 61

Philip Reed W. P.  
Jacob Parish R. S.



J. P. Reed, W. P.

EVERY  
PV119G

Poanoke College

Sept. 20, 1860

Dear Sir,

As corresponding Secretary of the Grecian Society it devolves upon me to inform you of your unanimous election to an honorary membership in said Society.

We hope you will do us the kindness to accept the appointment and give us the aid of your influence in our efforts to promote the cause of education and especially the noble art

which rendered our noble  
patron the first man  
of his age.

Please reply at your  
earliest convenience

With the greatest respect

I have the honor to be

Sir your most Obedt. Servt.

J. A. Foster Cor. Sec. C. S.

Josiah P Smeltzer  
vs  
Sarah Smeltzer  
others

Sitting as a Court of Equity.

September Term 1837

THE above cause standing ready for hearing and being submitted  
the Bill Answer and all the other proceedings were,  
by the Court, read and considered—

It is thereupon this 21st day of September in the year  
eighteen hundred and 37 by Carroll County Court, sitting as a Court of Equity,  
**Adjudged, Ordered and Decreed, That**

the Real Estate of George Smeltzer Dec'd in the proceedings mentioned which lies in Carroll County in the State of Maryland be sold and that Josiah P Smeltzer of Carroll County

be and he is hereby appointed Trustee to make said sale, and that the course and manner of his proceedings shall be as follows: he shall first file with the Clerk of this Court, a Bond to the State of Maryland, executed by himself, and a surety or sureties, to be approved by this Court, or some one of the Judges thereof, or by the Clerk of this Court, in the penalty of three thousand Dollars, conditioned for the faithful performance of the trust reposed in him by this Decree, or to be reposed in him by any future Decree or Order in the premises: he shall then proceed to make the said sale, having given at least three weeks notice by advertisement, inserted in some newspaper published in Carroll County, and by such other mode as he shall think proper

of the time, place, manner, and terms of sale, which shall be one third of the purchase money shall be paid to the trustee on the day of sale or within ten days thereafter and the balance in two equal annual payments, the purchaser or purchasers to give bond with good security or securities to be approved by the Trustee bearing interest from the day of sale to be annually paid on the whole sum due

and as soon as may be convenient after any such sale or sales, the said Trustee shall return to this Court a full and particular account of his proceedings relative to such sale; with an affidavit annexed of the truth thereof, and of the fairness of said sale; and on obtaining the Court's ratification of the sale, and on the payment of the whole purchase money, (and not before,) the said Trustee shall, by a good and sufficient deed, to be executed, acknowledged, and recorded according to law, convey to the purchaser or purchasers, his, her or their heirs, the property and estate to him, her or them sold, free, clear and discharged from all claim of the parties hereto, Complainant and Defendant and those claiming by, from, or under them, or either of them: And the said Trustee shall bring into this Court, the money arising from said sale, to be distributed under the direction of this Court, after deducting the costs of this suit, the expenses of said sale, and such commission to the said Trustee as this Court shall think proper to allow, in consideration of the skill, attention and fidelity wherewith he shall appear to have discharged his trust.

Geo B Derry  
Rich D Brewer

AVERY  
PV119G

We, the undersigned, Inspectors of Primary Schools for ~~Districts~~  
~~for~~ in the County of Frederick, do certify that we have examined  
*M. J. P. Smeltzer* and do believe he is of good  
moral character, and of sufficient learning and ability, and in all other  
respects well qualified to teach a Primary School. We further certi-  
fy that said *J. P. Smeltzer* is well qualified to teach  
the following branches, viz:—Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Gram-  
mar and Geography. *Being of the first and lowest*  
*Grade and to be revised annually*

Given under our hands at Frederick City the *7* day of *November*  
in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and forty  
*John Bartholomew*  
*Henry Buhman*  
*Noah Phillips*

2. November 7, 1840  
Teaching Certificate to teach in the Primary Schools of Frederick, Maryland  
Qualified to teach Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Grammar, and Geography



We the undersigned, inspectors of Primary  
Schools, for Frederick County Maryland, do certify  
that we have examined ~~Asiah~~ ~~Wm~~ ~~Melber~~  
and do believe he is of good moral character and  
of sufficient learning and ability and in all other  
respects well qualified to teach a primary school

Given under our hands at the city of Frederick  
on the seventh day of Nov. in the year of our Lord  
one thousand eight hundred and forty two.

Robert Brooks } Inspectors of  
Iden Anderson }  
Wm Sadd }  

---

Solice Cook

note by  
U. P. C. H.

3. November 7, 1842

Renewal of Teaching Certificate for Frederick, Maryland Primary Schools

Napoleon



Debate

Delivered before Prof. Daughner  
July - 1845

Question

Was the English justifiable in banishing  
Napoleon to St. Helena?

*[Handwritten signature and scribbles]*

4 July 1845  
Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon  
to St. Helena?

AVERTY #  
PV119G

Q. "Were the English justifiable in banishing Napoleon to the Isle of St. Helena?" Is the question chosen for our discussion this morning.

Without making any preliminaries as regards an introduction, we would say ~~yes~~ the English were justifiable, and shall endeavor to sustain <sup>them</sup> (the English) in banishing Na. to the Isle of St. Helena.

In order to arrive at the justice or injustice of the British Parliament in reference to this banishment, it would be indispensable necessary to view the whole life & character of Na. Bt; but this would be a task too laborious too extensive for the time allotted us on this debate. We only intend to glance, as it were, at the principal features of his character.

Nap. Bt. was a warrior, one of the best Generals of his age, His own countrymen could not deny the fact when my hundreds the froze on the winter

plains of Russia, He fought many battles & conquered many. Neither were his battles of the defensive order but always was himself the principle aggressor.

Even from the time of the death of Louis 14 until the memorable battle of Waterloo, his life was one of continual scenes of bloodshed & horror. The constant victories which won for him such wreaths of Laurel such Crowns of Fame, made his ambition & like an Alexander of Old, determined to conquer the world.

But the battle of Waterloo ended the military career of N. Bt. In this battle his brave Frenchmen fought courageously. While standing on some rising ground his countenance fell when he saw assured of his defeat. After this battle he proceeds to France. But was not received as before, that courtesy which a prince demands was not extended to him, but was asked to abdicate the crown which he did on condition

4. July 1845  
Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?

that his son should be stiled King  
Thus the grand Council refused. Then he  
was requested by some of his friends  
to take cautionary means lest those  
faction parties of the French should  
injure his cause or his person.

The French becoming more & more exas-  
perated with their brave & noble Leaders  
wished to terminate these wars. Under  
these circumstances Mr. thought it advised  
to submit to English Laws to give him  
self as a prisoner, knowing his  
safety was never under Britton's  
protection than any where else  
England, for reasons which we will  
mention, did not permit him to place  
his foot on her soil, but banished him  
to St. Helena. These are some of the cir-  
cumstances which transpired a short time  
before his banishment; & which it is indis-  
pensably necessary to know in order to  
discuss the question rightly. Then we  
arrive at the point was it just to

banish Mr. to the Isle of St. Helena  
It was just because no other place  
would have been safe & banishment was  
necessary. What was Mr. design in going  
to England, but to be secure until he  
could undermine or destroy that govt  
Think you he would have placed him-  
self under the protection of the British  
govt his inveterate enemy, the one  
who wish his destruction? if he had  
not some future design in view, certainly  
not. Why not go to his father-in-law?  
Why not to Russia? Either because he  
was certain of forming worse or he had  
some secret design of destroying the govt  
A Mon Like Mr. was not to be trusted  
he broke a solemn treaty before &  
would do the same again in order to  
to satisfy his ambition or to satisfy his  
appetite for blood. No well knew that  
if he was permitted to reside in England he  
could superintend the affairs of France  
or at least he could see how Russia  
was arranged matters

4. July 1845

Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon  
to St. Helena?

As soon as an opportunity offered itself would violate the treaty return to France & carry on his devastating wars again, fill Europe again with mourning. Again N<sup>o</sup>. was a Prisoner. He gave himself into the hands of the enemy while carrying on war. & the laws of nations in this respect are very specific. Kettle says, an author so much quoted of late, that Nations have a right to the enemy's person, & that he must be treated well. but he says a particular case is excepted where the enemy has been guilty of violating the Law of nations. Where is this more exemplified than in the case of Napoleon. He has trampled on the laws of nations with impunity, he has violated treaties boldly & daringly. Armon under these circumstances could be justly put to death but England acting more leniently toward him, saved his life but banished him to the Isle of St. Helena.

Another reason which justifies the British Government in banishing Napoleon is that <sup>they</sup> ~~he~~ escaped from Elba <sup>the British</sup> ~~was~~. He ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> severely censured for not banishing him when in their power to a more secure place. It might be asked why not grant N<sup>o</sup>. a home in the Emerald Isle? But we rely on the word of a soldier or one so lately a Sovereign. The Treaty of Fontenoy shows too clearly that N<sup>o</sup>. word was not to be trusted, & it was N<sup>o</sup>. plan to go to England & there the opportunity to violate that treaty & act as he did before. The wise you can discern but once.

4. July 1845

Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?

Sir

"Was it just to banish Napoleon to the Isle of St Helena," is the question for discussion this morning. It is a question fraught with ~~interest~~ information, but cannot be discussed, with that feeling & interest, nor can it, <sup>produce</sup> that degree of excitement & attention, which it could have done about 25 years back. Although, Na. has passed the portals of death, the great excitement & agitation of Europe has been quelled, & his bones are now mouldering on his own beloved country's jet. We desire to obtain some information, while we examine his warlike actions, scrutinize his brilliant career, in order to ascertain the right ~~the~~ British Parl. had in banishing <sup>him</sup> ~~to~~ to the Isle of St H. To examine correctly the causes, which justify the English Govt in the measure of ~~the~~ Banishment; or ~~the~~ order to arise at the justice or injustice of Parliament in reference to this banishment; it would be absolutely

necessary to present a perfect delineation of his character, to give a full & correct view of his military career, from his first political association with the Jacobins, or those splendid victories in Italy, which spread his name like magic over Europe, down through a long series of wars, rapine, & blood, until the battle of Waterloo quelled his mad ambition, & slaked his thirst for blood & ended <sup>his</sup> the military glory of ~~the~~ ~~Napoleon Bonaparte~~. But this would be a task too laborious, too extensive for the time allotted us in this debate. We will present only the principle features of his character, so that we may know ~~who~~ <sup>he</sup> Na. was, & ~~what~~ he was before ~~he~~ was compelled to abide on St. H., & to ascertain whether the Eng. Govt. justly banished him there. Napoleon Bonaparte was evidently an extraordinary man. His name 14 years resounded through Europe, & filled the world with wonder & amazement.

4. July 1845  
 Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
 Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?

EVERY  
 PVT19G

This enterprising Genius, his fond & restless desires, his unbounded & unlawful ambition, his dauntless energy, his love of power & glory, had rendered him the most powerful & gigantic man of modern times.

As a General he never saw his equal. As a Warrior he was almost constantly in some engagement. Many battles he fought & many victories he gained. His own country men assure us of his military ambition, when by hundreds they pray on the windy plains of Scipio. ~~And~~ <sup>his</sup> battles were generally of the desperate kind. His object was power & conquest. The tears & entreaties of widows, the miseries & sufferings of orphans, never affected his callous heart, when power & dominion were attainable. From the battle of Monte Notte, to the memorable scene of Waterloo, which ended his ambitious career; <sup>his</sup> life was a scene of almost continual bloodshed & honor. The constant victories which he gained, wore for him such wreaths of

renown & crowns of fame, that made his already callous heart, more ambitious & more susceptible of praise & renown: who like an Alexander determined to subdue the world & bring it under his power. N. B. as a man was dishonest.

The shameful violation of the treaty of Fontenoy will prove him to be such, & which we will clearly point out before we close. His pernicious conduct toward Charles <sup>IV</sup> Ferdinand VII when allured by deceitful pretenses to Bayonne, clearly demonstrates the <sup>his</sup> character of ~~him~~ or at least it shows that he would stoop to meanness to obtain power. The disgraceful repudiation of his wife Josephine is another stain on his character, a dark blot on the page of his history which neither time nor age can efface. In a word, N. B. sprung from obscurity was elevated to supreme power by the sword & bayonet. Obtained his empire by victories through tears & blood.

4. July 1845

Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon  
to St. Helena?

Yes, even dared to conceive the idea of Universal Monarchy & may be said to have realized it, when Waterloo, the battle of Waterloo ended his victorious career, & he fell, <sup>his fall</sup> the world against him, after having raised his banner upon the walls of nearly every Capital in Europe.

We have faintly described some of the principle features in No. Six, until he made that short but notable speech to his Frenchmen, 3 days before he took his station on the La Belle Alliance. Then on these nights <sup>he</sup> witnessed the deadliest struggle, the most bloody engagement of all his battles. Thousands lay dead & dying on the field, throwing one half of England & France in mourning.

He viewed his army & the thunder of his artillery with calmness, seeming to be assured of victory. But when the Prussians closed in on the right his countenance fell, because like a

corpse, exclaiming, "all is lost for the present" & fled.

On the second <sup>day</sup> after he had measured himself with the Duke of Wellington, <sup>as he expected it</sup> he arrived at Paris a vanquished General, <sup>but</sup> ~~long~~ received with that <sup>degree of</sup> courtesy which a Prince demands. <sup>he</sup> perceived that he was no longer the object of public confidence — that the love of the French had turned to hatred — that his military career was now terminated — resigned the crown in favor of his son, whom he called Napoleon III. The Chambers received his abdication, but passed over the proposition in reference to his sons unnoticed.

But finds that he does not exist in the affections of his people as he once did; & they did not manifest that kindness towards him, as he imagined ought to have been extended unto him. He therefore issues his farewell address to <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ army, & prepares to leave France

4 July 1845

Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania

Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?



The first object contemplated by Nap. was to make the U.S. his future abode here, upon Columbia's soil, (if we are permitted to conjecture) & among Col. umbia's free-born sons, sons so averse to despotic power; ~~but~~ <sup>he</sup> expected to reign or return in power to his own country. But, England, ~~had~~ <sup>intercepted</sup> him in his visionary course at Rochefort, which was closely blockaded, & all attempts to allude their vigilance was in vain. He threw himself on <sup>British</sup> protection & they claimed him as their prisoner, & appointed the Isle of St Helena as his future home.

The question now, ~~is~~ in consideration of N.B. Character, his military career, his defeat & resignation, & other circumstances, which if we had time might have mentioned, <sup>is</sup> had the Eng. Govt. a right to banish Napoleon to the Isle of St Helena. The question is one of right. The deed has been

committed, & our opponents is bound to prove clearly & satisfactorily, the injustice of the act, of laying hands on Na., condemning him to exile, surrounding him with guards, & compelling him to end his days on the rocky Isle of the Ocean. To prove the right the Eng. Govt. had in the measure of ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> banishment; or to show that, that measure was justifiable, appears to us to be a work easily accomplished. N.B. was a prisoner. He surrendered himself to British power, & in his case by the Law of Nations was justly banished, as we shall presently see, but should it be denied by our worthy opponent that Na. was a prisoner, we contend that we can prove him to be such. Na. surrendered himself to the Eng. Govt. when ~~he was not~~ <sup>it was not</sup> in his power to escape. Why did he not flee to his father-in-law in Austria? The answer, He knew it would be for worse. Why with his few faithful Frenchmen, who still clung to their Leader did he not quell the different political

4. July 1845  
 Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
 Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?

EVERY  
 PV119G

factions, which were at that time undermining his power? Because he, with not a prophet's eye clearly saw that his political career was terminated. He evidently perceived that the edifice of power & tyranny, which for 12 years he had created had fallen from its foundation & was crumbling into dust. The U.S. <sup>as he imagined</sup> was the only spot on which he dare place his foot in safety. The only harbour to which he dare direct his barge & in which he dare cast anchor. England banished those chimerical ideas, <sup>from his visionary mind.</sup> Compelled him to surrender, which he did reluctantly, hoping to find some comfortable home on the Emerald Isle, an asylum there where correspondents might be kept with France & he, at the first favourable opportunity, return. He as much as acknowledges himself Prisoner, in a letter, to the Prince Regent, in which he justly remarks I come ~~as~~ like Themistocles to

seek the Hospitality of the British nation. Well, might he have said so, when there was no possibility of his escaping elsewhere. Well, might he have said so? When safely secured on board the Bellerophon. But like Themistocles who had such tender regard for his native Land; & who would rather die than take up arms against it; so Na. could not forget his Frenchmen, they would still exist in his affection & the first opportunity defend their cause. We then repeat, that this compulsory surrender, with his own acknowledged ~~letter~~ <sup>without the shadow of a doubt</sup> clearly prove him to be a prisoner. ~~He was without the shadow of a doubt~~ a prisoner. It next becomes us to examine the Law of Nations respecting prisoners. ~~Dr. B. says in his law of Nations, that~~ Prisoners should be treated well & returned to the enemy after war. ~~but expressly says, that~~ Life may be denied an enemy who surrenders

4. July 1845  
 Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
 Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?

When he has been guilty of some enormous breach of the Law of Nations & particularly if it be the violation of the Law of War. Clearly proving that the Conqueror has a right to the person of such a Prisoner, & power to end his existence, or exile him to a desolate place. If we now can point you to the broken treaties & violated Law of War in <sup>the</sup> Case of N<sup>o</sup>. then have we undeniably shown the right the Eng. Gov<sup>t</sup> had in banishing him to the Isle of St Helena. The broken treaty of Fontenbleau. signed by his own hand for the dismemberment of Portugal, stands against him in glaring Character. That treaty he broke, & if we could point you to none other, that treaty would present him to us. as a man, whose neither ~~any~~ <sup>solemn</sup> treaties, nor honour pledged would restrain ~~his~~ ambition when Power & dominion were attainable. The Law of reprisals. or of a kind of retaliation

practised in war will give the Eng<sup>l</sup> Gov<sup>t</sup> a right to banish nap. Bonaparte says on this point insubstantially if not in words "that if Prisoners are mistreated by one party the opposing party can justly retaliate." Apply this to the case of N<sup>o</sup>. & he should have been shot before he was received on board the Northumberland; Because the platform of the Duke de Angouleme presents to us a similar scene of savage cruelty. Admitting that it was unjust to banish N<sup>o</sup>. (which is done only for the sake of argument) what let me ask would the Eng<sup>l</sup> Gov<sup>t</sup> have done with? Grant him his request to remain in England? England well knew that <sup>he</sup> N<sup>o</sup>. was not to be trusted. But it might be urged, that it might be urged that the pledged word of a soldier, & particularly of a Sovereign, ought to be received as a guarantee for his observance of treaties, But former actions with England & other nations must absolutely <sup>be</sup> considered

4. July 1845

Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania

Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?

to ascertain what confidence could be placed in him. Then the experiment of Elba was enough to convince Britain that no reliance could be placed in Na. We only wished to be near France & hoped that the eyes of the French would be opened - that they would return to him with full confidence & under his banner enable him to save their country. The English gov<sup>t</sup> was censured for not taking stronger precautions to prevent his escape from Elba & certainly ~~it~~ she would be more censurable if he would be placed in a situation that he could have again escaped.

We anticipate some of the arguments that will be presented by our opponents. He no doubt will hold up to view, in his accustomed elegance the enormous guilt of the Eng<sup>s</sup>, the black crime of depriving a man of his liberty, & dooming him to exile on the rocky Isle

of the ocean. You I point you to his suffering while an inhabitant of that Isle. But <sup>we</sup> must confess that we see an almost imperative duty in Eng. to act as she has acted; & our sympathies for the fallen Emperor are indeed wayward & untractable: When we would carry our sympathies to the Solitary Isle, & fasten them on this illustrious & renowned victim of Brit. cruelty: They will <sup>not</sup> tarry there, they will not remain with the suffering Emperor, nor follow him in his misfortunes; But on dove-like pinion take their flight across the Mediterranean to the cruel scenes of Loppa, & thence across the Atlantic to platform of the Duke of Enghem, back again to the dungeon of Tausaint on the frontier of the Alps. These cruelles rather claim our sympathies.

4. July 1845

Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania  
Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon to St. Helena?

AVERY  
PV119G

When words of pity are raised in  
behalf of Bt, there are drowned by  
groans & execrations, which fill  
our ears from every <sup>region</sup> which he  
traversed. We have no tears for  
fallen greatness, we reserve our  
sympathy for human nature  
in its humble form, for the im-  
poverish peasant, the widowed mother  
the isolated virgin. If we rejoice  
that the ocean has prison-house  
where the author of these misdeeds  
may be safely lodged!

4. July 1845

Text for student debate while enrolled in Gettysburg Seminary, Pennsylvania

Debate Question: Were the English Justified in Banishing Napoleon  
to St. Helena?

luted with such a report, and as our worthy thinks ought to be convinced that the target has been struck; and also anticipating the 30 pounder, sufficiently loaded and suitably primed, which will follow; you might say sirs, we had better lay down our Blunderbus, and give the contest over. But as it is also loaded and primed, by taking dead rest, we may succeed in driving the nail.

Can there be a disinterested act? We unhesitatingly answer in the affirmative, and shall endeavor to sustain that side of the question.

It is true, that human nature is fallen far below that state in which she left her maker's hand, when she unmolested held converse with Paradiseon flowers: but in her fall, we cannot believe, that she has

single solitary action, without being influenced by selfish motives, or having that darling passion self continually rankling in her bosom.

It is also true, that self is a principle characteristic of man, and some men are decidedly selfish; but to affirm that the motives which actuate every man ~~are~~ selfish, or that every act of every man is instigated by a principle of self interest, is taking a further step than we can consent to.

The question is easily understood and has been properly defined.

In addition, we would only remark, that we understand disinterestedness to be diametrically opposite to selfishness, or any action the motive to which is animated by self-interest.

Des. Acts. appear to be the result of

of the soul, and which distinguishes  
man from the Barbarian and the  
brute, and one principle ingredient  
and constituent part of all Holy  
Religion: While, on the other hand,  
Selfishness, unrestrained selfishness,  
that heart-sickening characteristic  
of man, the marked insignia of  
the dark ages, generated by fallen  
nature; though firmly rooted in the  
human heart, yet disperses, like  
fog and mist, before the effulgent beams  
of benevolent actions.

Go this our opponents may object,  
for say they that actions of self  
interest are often laudable and  
praise worthy. This indeed may be  
true; we do not intend, nor shall  
we argue that disinterestedness is  
a ruling passion, nor that dis.  
Acts. are often performed: but while



we aimed, for the question is, "Can there be a disinterested act?"

If we prove the existence of one dis. ac. it certainly will convince all that a thousand similar ones, *Ceteris paribus*, could be performed.

Let us first consider the Possibility.

And as we expect this to be the principle ingredient of that anticipated Carabine we must give it a popping notice.

Is the motive which actuates every volition of man self interested?

We answer No! Volition, or the power of willing is a principle given to man, by which every action is determined & formed. This principle was given to him by the Creator of all things: and since

us some power to perform them.  
We will present one illustration  
which, we think, will set the matter  
forever at rest. When Pythias was  
unjustly condemned to death by a  
cruel tyrant, Damon his friend of-  
fered to die for him. The motive  
which prompted him to this act  
were pure & disinterested, which  
can be proved by the Language of  
our Savior. "Greater love hath no  
man than this that he lay down  
his life for his friend?" Sum  
up all the <sup>selfish</sup> motives which could  
induce a man in his situation  
to die for his friend, and test  
them by some well tried touch-  
stone, and the love and friend-  
ship for his friend, will appear  
tenfold more refined. The very  
same arguments which will prove

5. Undated

Notes for a student debate while a seminary student

interested.

Again: It is not a necessary consequence, that because every man is immediately interested in every action; that the motives which actuate these actions are self interested.

We mean this: the gratification and pleasure, which results from some kind and generous actions, are not the motive which induced the individual to perform them.

For we believe, that just as certain as God has unchangeably joined happiness with a holy life, and misery with sin, so certain has he joined pleasure and joy with disinterested acts.

Take for an example the case of the young man recently from

accidental circumstances altogether unavoidable to him to be thrown into company, which was not such as would aid and assist an unknown traveller, but soon landed him in the prison at Sing-Sing. His sister, although reduced to poverty, yet by industry and perseverance obtained his liberty. She travelled on foot to the Governor & with tears and entreaties, after having laid open to his Excellency the case prayed for a pardon and obtained it.

Now it is true, that as she was the principle actor, she was gratified and rejoiced in his liberation, but these were the necessary results of the act, and never once entered into the motive which prompted her at first. Pleasure and joy will and must follow deeds of

her to liberate her brother.

Now let us suppose a case. Suppose man placed in such a situation, that unless aid is shortly received he must perish. An individual steps forward, and rescues him from the jaws of death, and immediately departs for some distant land, neither sees nor hears anything from him, the case is possible.

Is it reasonable to suppose this a self interested act? Yes. our opponents say, he was gratified, he received a pleasure, from the fact that he rescued his fellow man. But this gratification and pleasure necessarily followed & never once entered the motive which prompted him to stretch

Who must sit down and consider  
the gratification and self interest  
before he can render aid to suf-  
fering humanity.

Or take a <sup>nother</sup> real case. The case  
of the Good Samaritan he offered  
aid to his fellow man, without  
an expectation of receiving aid in  
return. The Motive which prom-  
pted him was a disinterested one  
& consequently was a disinterested  
act. If such actions as these can  
be proved self interested which we  
have mentioned, then can our wor-  
thy opponents & equally prove the  
flight of the bright angel from the  
throne of the Eternal I Am to David  
in the Lion's den a self interested one  
and not done for the honor and  
glory of God. Yea! They can

denouncement, and every Miracle,  
performed by the prophets and  
apostles, self interested actions,  
though the power was given by  
Him, at whose fiat, worlds on  
worlds were ushered into being.  
Again, we believe, and think we  
have already shown, that man can  
perform a disinterested act; since  
the first motive which actuates  
must be regarded as the prime  
mover of every action. But doubt-  
ly so must it be regarded, when  
he sipped the nectar of ambrosial  
flowers in the garden of Eden.  
We know not whether our oppo-  
nents, with arguments arrayed in  
metaphysical garb, will deny the  
existence of a disinterested act there.  
If so with the same kind of so-  
phistical reasoning could they  
prove that God himself could

ested nature, while clothed in  
the moral image of God, and by  
his fall brought selfishness in  
the world; The Christian, who  
according to the Apostle, is partly  
restored to that image can per-  
form also disinterested actions.

Let us now consider some of those  
acts which we think dis.

Friendship, or that attachment  
which one friend has towards  
another, often calls forth actions  
of a disinterested character. It is  
true it is often self interested, but  
not always. What self interest  
could have induced Jonathan to  
have so tenderly regarded David?  
He did all he could to reconcile  
the difference between his father



Can only be regarded as actuated  
by motives of disinterestedness

Again: Benevolence whose very  
name means good will towards  
men is a disinterested act. View  
it as you will, and acts of Benevo-  
lence can be performed, the mo-  
tive being purely disinterestedness.  
Take the act of personal benefit,  
and you have a Howard, who  
went from prison to prison, vis-  
iting the unfortunate inmates,  
and doing them good. It certainly  
was not the pleasure nor the  
gratification which actuated him  
in his noble enterprise? No. He  
saw their condition & went to  
do them good.

of God in Heathen lands. Where  
can self in this act find a foot-  
hold? Yes true he is gratified  
but this cannot, no, no self, enter  
enter into the motive, which con-  
duce the true Christian to bestow  
a righteous gift.

<sup>Pi.</sup> Truly, all act of worship. Our  
opponents must prove self inter-  
ested before they can say there  
is no disinterested act. We  
believe there are many acts of  
Christian worship not at all  
selfish, though we will only  
mention one. It is prayer.  
It is true that prayer is mostly  
performed & in accordance  
with the word of God. having

adoration of his God.  
And he who contends that every  
act of Christian worship is  
self interested, has yet to learn  
the sweetness of the Christian yoke  
With these considerations we  
leave firmly convinced that man  
can perform a disinterested

Act  
Ye Ye Ye Ye