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Introduction

“History is a people’s memory, and without a memory man is demoted to the level of the lower animals.”

— El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz (Malcolm X)

Muslims are viewed as having little impact on the shaping of early America, but history reveals that they engaged and influenced its shapers and also contributed, both directly and indirectly, to the making of America. In fact, as religious studies scholar Edward E. Curtis IV makes clear, “Their contributions—some famous, some unknown—have changed the course of the nation’s life.” Compelling evidence of Muslim interwovenness in major aspects of America’s early development can be found in such sources as historical newspapers, government documents, plantation records, rare books, personal papers, and presidential diaries, to name a few.

Following is a sampling of what these sources reveal about America’s rich Muslim heritage:

• Early on, Islamic values and moral virtues were sometimes used as models for social justice in America. In advocating for the humane treatment of Native Americans persecuted by his Christian brethren in 1764, Benjamin Franklin passionately invoked a story of the Prophet Muhammad rebuking a cruel Muslim for not being merciful in times of conflict. “If thou possessedst a heap of gold as large as Mount Obod [sic], and shouldst expend it all in God’s cause, thy merit would not efface the guilt incurred by the murder of the meanest of those poor captives,” the future Founding Father quoted the prophet as saying.

• Many of America’s earliest presidents, beginning with George Washington, the father of our country, engaged Muslims directly on some of the most critical issues of the day, from paramount détentes to commerce relations to abolishing slavery and more. Washington once personally wrote to the ruler of Morocco, “[W]hile I remain head of this nation I shall not cease to promote every measure that may contribute to the friendship and harmony which so happily subsist between your Empire and this Republic.”

• Framers and advocates of the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights specifically considered the right of future Muslim citizens to worship freely according to their own conscience. In a 1788 letter, the Father of the Constitution, James Madison, wrote to his friend Thomas Jefferson, “I am sure that the rights of conscience in particular, if submitted to public definition would be narrowed much more than they are ever likely to be by an assumed power.” Madison continued on, naming Muslims specifically among those whom he feared might be most likely to be negatively affected.

• The plantations of American statesmen were locations of some of the earliest Muslim communities in America, where the slave labor of Muslim men, women, and children contributed to the economic vitality and building of the nation. One congressman’s grandson described slaves on their plantation as having been “fresh from the darkest Africa, some of Moorish or Arabian descent, devout
Mussulmans, who prayed to Allah in the morning, noon and evening.”

- Muslims risked life and limb to defend and serve American interests, even helping America win her first military victory on foreign soil. When the Christian general who led the Muslims in the 1805 battle felt they were being discriminated against, he wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, “This is the first instance I ever heard of a religious test being required to entitle a soldier to his rations.”

- Muslims contributed to the completion of some of America’s greatest landmarks. One historical newspaper record described a Muslim gift to the completion of the Washington Monument as being a part of what made the eminent structure unique in the world, noting that the monument was *built up* in part “by the hands of the Grand Seignor, the head of the Mahommedan Faith.”

- Muslims even had a presence early on as defendants in the highest court in the land. One of the most famous court cases in the nation’s history, *The Amistad*, involved a group of illegally enslaved Africans who were described by a U.S. senator (later to become Secretary of State under Presidents Lincoln and Johnson) as all being able to speak the “Arabic prayers, from the ritual of the Mohammedan faith.” Former President John Quincy Adams argued so passionately before the U.S. Supreme Court for their right to freedom that the “audience were in tears” and “the judges wept.”

- Early on, Islam and Muslims influenced American policy and policy makers in diverse ways. A former Harvard law lecturer was influenced, early in his political career, by Islam’s approach to just treatment and emancipation of slaves. He once cited related Quranic injunctions as “words worthy of adoption in the legislation of Christian countries.” He later became a U.S. Senator, a staunch anti-slavery adviser to President Lincoln and a ten-year chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The people, places, events, and documents covered in the *Muslims & the Making of America* report are but a few selected insights from a much larger, rich history—the depth of which we have only begun to uncover. From them we can begin to glean a better and more complete understanding of our nation’s story, one that includes Muslims’ early presence and influence in America. Indeed, the history of Islam and Muslims in America is a part of America’s unique historical record; it is a part of what makes America beautiful.
An African Imam in the American Religious Conscience

Job Ben Solomon

One of the earliest documented acts of religious tolerance in America involved Job Ben Solomon (Ayuba Suleiman Diallo), an enslaved African imam.4

Job was the son of an influential Muslim leader from what is now Senegal. He was captured in Africa during some small participation in the slave trade himself and brought to Maryland. Job found that he could not perform his Islamic prayers without ridicule and disruption, and so, some time between 1730 and 1731, he ran away from his owner’s plantation. Colonial laws at the time dictated that a black or white servant found away from their owner without a pass be detained and returned. Hence, Job was captured and placed in jail because no one could understand him enough to determine who he belonged to.5

Job was well-educated and knew several languages, one of them being Wolof. In 1731, while still in jail, Job was able to explain his predicament through the help
of an African who lived nearby and who could speak Wolof. This led to Job being returned to his owner, who, now able to understand his slave’s distress (beyond enslavement of course), provided a place of prayer for Job. In doing so, Job’s owner established, in colonial Maryland, one of the earliest documented locations of a Muslim place of worship in America.

Job’s story does not end here. In fact, it is believed to have impacted the anti-slavery sentiments of James Oglethorpe, the founder of Georgia, who helped facilitate the captive’s freedom and eventual return to Africa by way of England.

**Georgia Founder Influenced by a Muslim**

Job’s owner allowed him to write a letter to his father in Africa. Though it never reached him, the letter, written in Arabic, set off a series of fortunate events that led to Job’s freedom and return to his homeland. It began with the intercession of General James Edward Oglethorpe, the founder of colonial Georgia, who helped to have the letter translated at Oxford University. So moved was Oglethorpe said to have been by the letter’s contents that he facilitated in raising Job’s ransom and securing his passage to England. In England, Job enjoyed the help of many benefactors of great influence including members of the royal family. According to Dr. Henry Louis Gates, Jr., by writing the letter in the Arabic language gained through his Muslim heritage, “Job Ben Solomon literally wrote his way out of slavery.”

In the “Makers of America” series volume that covered the life of General Oglethorpe, the Harvard-trained writer Henry Bruce opined in 1890 that “knowledge of Job’s history undoubtedly played” a part “in maturing General Oglethorpe’s ideas on slavery.” The Georgia founder was “determined not to suffer slavery there” and succeeded in having it banned for a time. (His involvement with the colony waned years later and the economic lure of slavery eventually prevailed.) In 2008, Michael Thurmond—honorary co-chair of Georgia’s 275th anniversary celebration and author of Freedom: Georgia’s Anti-Slavery Heritage 1733-1865—also traced the “genesis of Oglethorpe’s anti-slavery advocacy” to Job. Thurmond noted, as others had, that, before encountering Job’s story, Oglethorpe had been a director and, later, a deputy governor of a British slave trading enterprise called the Royal African Company. Around the same time of discovering the contents of Job’s handwritten Arabic letter to his father, Oglethorpe shifted from involvement in the slave trade to proclaiming it to be “against the gospel.” He severed ties with his former pro-slavery work and later was active in trying to ensure that slavery be banned from the outset in Georgia, refusing “to make a law permitting such a horrid crime.”

**Job, the Monotheist, in the American Imagination**

Job’s Arabic writings and uttering of the words “Allah” and “Mahommed,” as well as his refusal to drink wine attracted the attention of people of some influence. One of these was Thomas Bluett, a Christian missionary and judge, who later wrote a book about Job’s life entitled Some Memoirs of the Life of Job, the Son of Solomon, the High Priest of Boonda in Africa; Who was a Slave About Two Years in Maryland; and Afterwards Being Brought to England, was Set Free, and Sent to His Native Land in the Year 1734.
In his book, Bluett described Job's Islamic piety, practice, and beliefs, and, in the process, debunked a then-common notion that Muslims worship and pray to the Prophet Muhammad. According to Bluett, Job “was very constant in his Devotion to God; but said, he never pray'd [sic] to Mahommed, nor did he think it lawful to address any but God himself in Prayer.” In fact, he explained, Job did not even initially want a now well-known portrait of himself to be painted for fear of it being used for idol worship, relenting only after being promised that the panting would be used solely to remember him by. Bluett’s book, “read and translated everywhere,” became so popular that Job’s steadfast belief in the oneness of God, mentioned therein, was invoked in a New England newspaper nearly seventy years later to support a religious discursive on Unitarianism vs. Trinitarianism. The following statement positioned Job in support of the proponents of Unitarianism:

When Job Ben Solomon, the African prince (who was a master of the Arabic, and had acquired a competent knowledge of the English language) was in England about seventy years ago, and was asked, after reading the new testament [sic], if he found three Gods there: He replied, “NO, NO! ONE GREAT GOD, ONE GREAT GOOD GOD.”

The debate, written under pseudonyms and published in a series of articles over the course of more than a year, appears to have included the involvement of Maine’s first newspaper editor and Reverend Andrew Fuller, “the most important theologian of the late eighteenth-century transatlantic Baptist community.” Of interest is that Job is cited in the midst of serious religious discourse, involving key figures in America’s media and religious leadership, without further explanation. This lack of further clarification implies a familiarity with his life and beliefs, even 70 years after he returned to his homeland. The reference to him as “a master of the Arabic” suggests that discussants were well aware of his extensive Islamic knowledge. Even in the early 1800s, Americans were still reading about Job’s mastery of the Qur’an, as written about in Bluett’s book. One widely published magazine, in retelling the story of Job, informed readers that “he could say the whole Koran by heart ... he wrote three copies of it without the assistance of any other copy, and without so much as looking to one as his guide in writing the others.”

The “First American” and the First Congress in Slavery Debates

Benjamin Franklin, “the First American”

In February 1790—one month after President George Washington delivered the nation’s first State of the Union Address—Benjamin Franklin, in his role as president of the Pennsylvania Society for the Abolition of Slavery, the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage, and the Improvement of the Condition of the African Race, petitioned the First United States Congress to use its constitutionally given authority to abolish America’s role in the international slave trade and, progressively, slavery in the United States itself. Franklin’s involvement is of particular note because he has often been referred to as “the First American” for his vital contributions to the making of America, including him being the only Founding Father to be a signatory on all three founding documents that established America as an independent nation.
Franklin’s petition, introduced and read in the U.S. House of Representatives on February 12, 1790, pointed out that Congress had “salutary powers” for “promoting the welfare and securing the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States” and that this “rightfully” extended “to all descriptions of people” without any “distinction of color” being made, including “those unhappy men, who alone, in this land of freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage.”

Among the population of those “people of the United States,” “those unhappy men,” were men, women and children of Muslim heritage. In fact, people of Muslim heritage would come to number an estimated 15 to 30 percent of the American slave population over the course of slavery in colonial America and the United States. These people contributed, as had Franklin’s contemporary, Job Ben Solomon, to the making and progress of America via chattel slavery.

Franklin’s petition boldly called on Congress to remove “this inconsistency [i.e., slavery] from the character of the American people” and to “promote mercy and justice towards the distressed race” and to “step to the very verge of the power vested in [them] for discouraging every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow-men.”

Georgia Congressman James Jackson’s opposition to the petition, just one among many other voices in Congress against abolishing slavery, was both memorable and historically significant. Just a day earlier the congressman had argued, from the House floor, that slavery was one of the “rights of mankind” and that the Bible not only “allowed” but “commended” it. (In order to defend slavery, Jackson even went so far as to argue that Congress should prohibit the West India rum trade if they were going to prohibit the slave trade because it too was “injurious to the morals of mankind” being that rum had a “debasing influence on the consumer.”) The congressman had also made the case that if the slave trade were abolished it would eventually position the country “towards a total emancipation” of the slaves and that would, in turn, jeopardize the slaveholders’ “property,” their “property,” of course, being their human captives.

The intense slavery debate continued the next day with the reading of Franklin’s petition. Jackson redoubled his opposition to the point of even predicting that harm might come upon any federal judge who played an active role in ending slavery. In a later House speech that greatly agitated Benjamin Franklin, Congressman Jackson spoke about the impact that ending the slave trade would have on the American economy. He asked, “Is the rice trade to be banished from our coasts? Are Congress willing to deprive themselves of the revenue arising from that trade, and which is daily increasing, and to throw this great advantage into the hands of other countries?” This statement in particular makes clear just how greatly America’s economic stability depended, in part, on the contributions of the slave population and, by extension, those of Muslim heritage among them.

Franklin’s response to Jackson, immediate and instructive, appeared in the March 25, 1790, edition of the Federal Gazette. Writing under the pseudonym Historicus, Franklin satirizes Jackson’s pro-slavery positions. Addressing the editor, Historicus explains that Jackson’s mind-set reminded him of a 1687 speech by Sidi Mehemet Ibrahim, an African Muslim who he felt mirrored Jackson’s arguments “against meddling with the affair of slavery, or attempting to mend the condition of slaves.” Just as Jackson had argued before the House of Representatives, Franklin’s fictitious Ibrahim argues before the Divan of Algiers for the continuation of the slavery and piracy exacted on white Christians by the Barbary pirates. (See section: The Barbary Wars in
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Context.) Of particular note is how cleverly Franklin mimics Jackson’s views in the speech of the fictional Ibrahim. For example, Ibrahim questions the appeals for the emancipation of the white Christians thus, “But who is to indemnify their masters for the loss?” This is exactly Jackson’s position that the slaveholders’ “property” would be jeopardized if the country went “towards a total emancipation.” By replacing a white Christian (Jackson) with a non-white African Muslim (Ibrahim), Franklin highlights the hypocrisy of his Christian compatriots who, while demonizing Muslims for enslaving white Christians captured by pirates, believed they had a biblically-sanctioned moral high ground to enslave black Africans.

Interestingly, while some critics of Islam and Muslims coming across Franklin’s satirical piece today might assume, perhaps with some degree of smug satisfaction, that Franklin was critical of Muslims, they would in fact be missing the point that it was meant to criticize and shame his fellow white Christian compatriots. As H.W. Brands, author of The First American: The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin, explains, “Franklin was constantly inventing new personas,” providing him with the platform, “to say things that he couldn’t say as Benjamin Franklin. He would simply put the words into someone else’s mouth and he could disavow them when necessary, but it still allowed him to get a message across.”

This was not the first time Franklin used the faith and its adherents as a tool to call his co-religionists back to their own self-declared morals. These morals are made clear in his February petition to Congress: “[M]ankind are all formed by the same Almighty Being, alike objects of his care, and equally designed for the enjoyment of happiness, the Christian Religion teaches us to believe, and the Political Creed of America fully coincides with the position.”

**Persecution of Native Americans and the Example of Prophet Muhammad’s Mercy**

Benjamin Franklin seems to have had a good deal of knowledge about Islam. In 1764, he invoked the mercifulness of the Prophet Muhammad in times of war in his text *A Narrative of the Late Massacres in Lancaster County, of A Number of Indians, Friends of this Province, By Persons Unknown.* First published in Philadelphia, the piece was a passionate response to the massacre of innocent Native Americans. Men, women, and children among them had been “inhumanly murdered in cold blood.” The victims had been friends of the Pennsylvanians and under their protection, but that had not stopped a mob of Scots-Irish frontiersmen, perhaps mistakenly believing them to be allies of hostile Native Americans, from savagely slaughtering them. Franklin was “ashamed” of arguments that tried to justify the massacre by the frontiersman as a response to “the murder of their relations, by the enemy Indians, in the present war.” He could not condone the persecution of an entire people for the harm inflicted by a few. He asked:

> *If any Indian injures me, does it follow, that I may revenge all Indians? It is well known, that the Indians are of different tribes, nations, and languages, as well as the white people. In Europe, if the French, who are white people, should injure the Dutch, are they to revenge it on the English, because they too are white people?*
Condemning the actions of his fellow coreligionists, Franklin cited the Prophet Muhammad, among others, as examples of historical figures who had been merciful even to their enemies. He wrote:

> As for the Turks [i.e., Muslims], it is recorded in the Life of Mahomet, the founder of their religion, that Khaled, one of his captains, having divided a number of prisoners between himself and those that were with him, he commanded the hands of his own prisoners to be tied behind them, and then, in a most cruel and brutal manner, put them to the sword; but he could not prevail on his men to massacre their captives, because in fight they had laid down their arms, submitted, and demanded protection. Mahomet, when the account was brought to him, applauded the men for their humanity; but said to Khaled, with great indignation, “O Khaled, thou butcher, cease to molest me with thy wickedness. If thou possessedst a heap of gold as large as Mount Obod, and shouldst expend it all in God’s cause, thy merit would not efface the guilt incurred by the murder of the meanest of those poor captives.”

The “Indians,” Franklin proclaimed, would had been safer with Muslims than the “Christian white savages” among his coreligionists because “ever since Mahomet’s reproof to Khaled, even the cruel Turks never kill prisoners in cold blood.”

This point illustrates Benjamin Franklin’s familiarity with Islam and his use of Islamic values and moral virtues as models in advocating for the humane treatment of Native Americans. It also demonstrates that Franklin had studied the life of the Prophet Muhammad. Another example of Franklin’s knowledge of Islamic practices can be found in his 1790 satirical piece. In it Franklin’s fictional Ibrahim begins his speech with the following words: “Allah Bismillah, God is great, and Mahomet is his Prophet.” This is almost exactly the way a Muslim would have begun a piece of correspondence at that time. We will see, later, that Muslims appeared in his thinking as early as 1739 when, at the age of 33, he spoke of interfaith inclusion.

## Religious Freedom Debates in Colonial America

### Rhode Island Founder Includes Muslims in His Vision of America

On the occasion of receiving the Charles Evans Hughes Gold Medal of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ) in 1982, President Ronald Reagan gave a seventeenth century example of the beginnings of religious freedom in America. He referred to a 1655 letter written to the people of Providence by Roger Williams, the founder of the colony that became Rhode Island. The president explained:

> Roger Williams struggled for freedom of conscience in New England more than a century before the Declaration of Independence. He likened a free society to a ship in which Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Moslems all sailed together, subject to the same tides, winds, dangers, and responsibilities, but each free to worship God in his own way.

In choosing a Williams quote that included Muslims, President Reagan had revealed to the audience that Muslims had been positively included in some of the earliest considerations for the direction of America’s future, including the great question of religious liberty.
Ambassador Akbar Ahmad, in Journey into America: The Challenge of Islam, said of Williams that he was “the first to fight and sacrifice for the vision of a genuinely pluralist society in America.” Another example of this is Williams’ declaration, “that no persons, Papists [i.e., Catholics], Jewes [i.e., Jews], Turkes [i.e., Muslims], or Indians [should] be disturbed at their worship.” Williams understood the repercussions of doing otherwise; he had suffered persecution and exile in Massachusetts before founding the colony that became a safe haven for freedom of conscience.

Like Williams, President Reagan was a strong proponent of the right to religious freedom and full participation in the society for those of all faiths. This can be further seen in the president’s speech when he discussed full participation of the nation’s citizens in moving America forward:

> Every American, every citizen from every walk of life—rich or poor, black, brown or white, Jew, Christian or Muslim, northerner or southerner—has a full right and obligation to participate in shaping these policies and the programs designed to implement them. Our national dialog should reflect the rich diversity of our free, pluralist society, and that diversity should be one of our greatest prides.

Indeed, Islam and Muslims have been a consideration in the making of America since the beginning and American presidents like Reagan have been a part of carrying that legacy forward. (See section: A Sampling of Presidential Engagement with Muslims.) The president’s reliance on his own faith for this mind-set could not have been clearer. “For as the Bible teaches,” he shared with the NCCJ audience after giving the Williams example, “Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?”
Morocco: First Nation to Recognize the Newly Independent United States

President Reagan recognized the precedent set by the first U.S. president, George Washington, who developed positive relations with the Muslim-majority country of Morocco, the first nation in the world to seek diplomatic relations with the United States of America. Reagan contributed to the continuation of this relationship by agreeing to serve as the Honorary Co-Chair (with King Hassan II of Morocco) of the Moroccan-American Foundation, noting the special history between the two nations in an address to the foundation. The president asserted, “The relationship between our peoples has been marked by respect and esteem since the 18th century when Sultan Mohammed III and George Washington exchanged letters pledging cooperation and assistance to one another.”

(See section: A Sampling of Presidential Engagement with Muslims.)

President Reagan also welcomed positive engagement with Muslims during his presidency. He was responsible for some of the earliest appointments of Muslims to public service in areas ranging from small business development to international diplomacy. Additionally, the President was familiar with the fourteenth century Muslim historian and philosopher Ibn-Khaldun, who he readily identified as a Muslim. In fact, President Reagan directly quoted from and cited Ibn-Khaldun nearly a dozen times throughout his presidency during functions such as a Republican fundraiser, an interview with foreign journalists, a question and answer session with junior high school students, and a live White House news conference broadcast nationwide on radio and television.
Benjamin Franklin on Interfaith Engagement

In 1739, Benjamin Franklin became involved with one of the earliest documented places intended for interfaith use in America. From its inception, it was built with the idea of being inclusive of all—including Muslims. In his writings, Franklin made clear the intent:

> Both house and ground were vested in trustees, expressly for the use of any preacher of any religious persuasion who might desire to say something to the people at Philadelphia; the design in building not being to accommodate any particular sect, but the inhabitants in general; so that even if the Mufti of Constantinople were to send a missionary to preach Mohammedanism to us, he would find a pulpit at his service.  

In other words, the “preaching-house” was to be a meeting place open to people of all faiths, including a representative from the religious hierarchy of the “Muslim world,” even so far as allowing him to “preach” Islam in America.

Franklin’s was not just a passing relationship with this site; he was also a trustee. The “preaching-house” later became the first campus of the University of Pennsylvania of which he was also a trustee and the founder. As a trustee of both institutions, Franklin was able to ensure an agreement “to keep forever open in the building a large hall for occasional preachers according to the original intention.” Specifically, that it was nonsectarian in nature, something almost unheard of in higher education during Franklin’s day where the norm of educational focus was “to perpetuate a learned ministry.” Importantly, Franklin had been chosen to be a trustee of the “preaching-house” because he belonged to “no sect” and thus would likely ensure that it was held to its original intention. Accordingly, in the same city where Franklin played important roles in helping draft the Declaration of Independence (1776) and the United States Constitution (1787), Muslims had been welcome, early on, to preach their religion.

Ironically, had Job Ben Solomon remained in America, Franklin would not have had to look as far as the “Mufti of Constantinople” for someone to preach Islam in America back in 1739. Job would have been more than qualified as attested to by Reverend Jacob Henderson in Bluett’s biography of Job: “[Henderson was] a Gentleman of great Learning, Minister of Annapolis, and Commissary to the Bishop of London, who gave JOB the Character of a Person of great Piety and Learning.”

Just weeks before he passed away in 1790, Franklin explained in a letter to Ezra Stiles, then president of Yale College (now Yale University), that he had always respected others’ “religious sentiments” including things that seemed to him “insupportable and even absurd.” He went on to say that all the various religious groups in Philadelphia had benefited from his financial support in building new places of worship and that he hoped “to go out of the World in Peace with them all.” Benjamin Franklin, often referred to as “the First American,” maintained his nonsectarian public persona and commitment to freedom of conscience for all until his death one month later.
Religious Freedom Debates in the New Republic

Thomas Jefferson on Religious Protection for Muslims

Young Thomas Jefferson purchased a copy of the Qur'an in 1765 and began teaching himself Arabic while studying law under our nation's first college law professor. Eleven years later the future third president of the United States became the principal author of the Declaration of Independence (1776). Words therein, indelibly imprinted on the minds of virtually every American, promise: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

In Jefferson’s writings the same year, the Founding Father embraced the late English philosopher John Locke’s opinion that “neither Pagan nor Mahomedan nor Jew ought to be excluded from the civil rights of the Commonwealth because of his religion.” The very next year, in 1777, he drafted his famous Virginia bill for establishing religious freedom, later adopted by the Virginia General Assembly in 1786 as the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom. A few years before he died, Jefferson proudly cited Muslims among those meant to be covered “within the mantle” of the landmark statute’s protection. So proud was Jefferson of his role in authoring this bill—a bill that scholars agree played a crucial part in the guarantee of the free exercise of religion as protected by the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights—that he left instructions for it to be one of only three achievements included on his tombstone, “because,” as he explained, “by these, as testimonials that I have lived, I wish most to be remembered.” The only other two achievements the Founding Father wished listed were his authoring of the Declaration of Independence and his founding of the University of Virginia. It appeared he ranked these three accomplishments higher, even, than being president of the United States.

James Madison on Muslims’ Rights of Conscience

It was James Madison—who would later carry the titles of Father of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, Founding Father, and fourth president of the United States—who championed and helped secure passage of Jefferson’s bill. He, too, was a staunch defender of freedom of conscience. Addressing the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1785, Madison had made the case, in his widely-distributed pamphlet “Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments,” that America “exhibited proofs that equal and complete liberty” was “the true remedy” to avoiding the “[t]orrents of blood” that “have been spilt in the old world” because of religious intolerance and persecution.

Although Madison eventually became the principal author of the Bill of Rights, he originally had reservations about the need for them. One of his main concerns was that a bill of rights might actually negatively impact freedom of religion. In a November 1788 letter to his friend Thomas Jefferson, not too long after the Constitution was ratified, he wrote, “I am sure that the rights of conscience in particular, if submitted to public definition would be narrowed much more than they are ever likely to be by an assumed power.” He continued on, naming Muslims and Jews specifically among those whom he feared most likely to be negatively affected.
John Leland, Baptist Advocate for Muslims

While James Madison feared a bill of rights might narrow rights, the Baptists were among those terrified that without it religious freedom would be in great danger. Baptist evangelist John Leland, who was considered “as courageous and resourceful a champion of the rights of conscience as America has produced,” strongly supported Madison’s role in the ratification of the Constitution (1788) and the adoption of the Bill of Rights (1789). He used his influence to help Madison get elected to the Virginia ratifying convention for the U.S. Constitution and rallied Baptist support to help elect the future president to the First Congress where he could more successfully champion the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

Leland’s support did not come without conditions. Madison understood the Baptist leader’s motivation; above all, Leland desired a bill of rights that would protect freedom of conscience. For Leland, “clearest of all” was that “Religious Liberty” was “not sufficiently secured” in the Constitution and that it was “very dangerous leaving religious liberty” at the mercy of any future president and Congress, especially and most importantly without any “Constitutional defence [sic].”

Leland could have limited his concerns to the Baptists. They suffered extreme religious persecution, including being violently assaulted, dragged from their pulpits and jailed for preaching their faith, and even considered child abusers for not baptizing their children in infancy. However, he was concerned for the welfare of people of all faiths and no faith. This included Muslims, who he often made reference to in his writings. In an article published in 1790, one year before the ratification of the Bill of Rights, Leland was critical of the fact that “Constitutions of government adopted in most of the United States” still required “a religious test, to qualify an officer of state.”

Praising the absence of this restraint in the Virginia Constitution, he wrote:

All the good such tests do, is to keep from office the best of men; villains make no scruple of any test. The Virginia Constitution is free from this stain. If a man merits the confidence of his neighbours, in Virginia—let him worship one God, twenty God’s [sic], or no God—be he Jew, Turk [i.e., Muslim], Pagan, or Infidel, he is eligible to any office in the state.

Leland took great pride in the fact that the Virginia Constitution did not require religious tests; in his opinion this meant that even a Muslim could hold “any office in the state.”

In considering the case of Connecticut—where those who were not of the established Christian denomination were required to procure certificates of approval to preach their faith, and others who were non-Christian were forced to pay a tax to support the religious establishment—Leland asked, “Must a Turk [i.e., Muslim] maintain a religion, opposed to the Alkoran [i.e., Qur’an], which he holds as the sacred oracle of heaven?” In his argument, Leland held, “I now call for an instance, where Jesus Christ, the author of his religion, or the apostles, who were divinely inspired, ever gave orders to, or intimations, that the civil powers on earth, ought to force people to observe the rules and doctrine of the gospel.” Accordingly, so important was the Federal Constitution’s protection of complete religious freedom to him that he had originally withheld support of Madison and the Constitution until he had been assured it would be “sufficiently secured” in a bill of rights. His steadfast view on freedom of conscience and separation of church and state is worth quoting:
“Strange to relate! It was left for the United States of North America, to give the example to the world; to draw the proper line between church and state, religion and politics. Yes, from the beginning of Christianity, down to the close of the eighteenth century, A.D., it never prevailed among a people, of any considerable consequence, but they would either punish or pamper it almost to death: either proscribe it, or make it a principle of state policy. To say that the government of the United States is perfect, would be arrogant; but I have no hesitancy in saying, that the Constitution has left religion infallibly where it should be left in all government, viz: in the hands of its author, as a matter between God and individuals; leaving an open door for Pagans, Turks [i.e., Muslims], Jews or Christians, to fill any office in the government, without any religious test, to make them hypocrites: securing to every man his right of argument and free debate: not considering religious opinions objects of civil government, or any ways under its control: duly appreciating that Christianity is not a scheme of coercion; but only calls for a patient hearing, a dispassionate examination and a rational faith.”

It can be said that Leland helped change and shape the course of our nation, with regard to religious liberty, and Muslims were among those actively on his mind all along the way. “Government,” he once made clear, “should protect every man in thinking and speaking freely, and see that one does not abuse another . . . all should be equally free, Jews, Turks [i.e., Muslims], Pagans and Christians.”

Leland was a contemporary of Thomas Jefferson, and it appears that their respective views influenced one another. On January 3, 1802, President Jefferson, “contrary to all former practice” during his presidency, attended church services held in the U.S. Capitol and attended by members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. John Leland was the religious leader invited to deliver the sermon, the same John Leland who had fought to ensure that even Muslims could hold “any office in the government, without any religious test, to make them hypocrites.” Two days before the Capitol church service, President Jefferson had received Leland at the White House, where the Baptist leader had lauded Jefferson’s support for the “prohibition of religious tests to prevent all hierarchy.” Later that day, Jefferson penned the famous letter to the Danbury Connecticut Baptist Association assuring them that “religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship.” The letter contained the well-known phrase declaring “a wall of separation between church and state,” which the U.S. Supreme Court, in a landmark 1878 case, held “may be accepted almost as an authoritative declaration of the scope and effect of the [first] amendment.”

We can see that with the initial Federal Constitution (ratified in 1788) which established “no religious tests,” and in the Bill of Rights (ratified in 1791) which added the provisions that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” and in the text of Jefferson’s 1802 Danbury letter which was later to be recognized by the Supreme Court for its authoritative stance on separation of church and state, there was a deliberate concern for followers of all faiths, even those who did not yet have a voice. Compellingly, rooted in the social consciousness of authors of our country’s most fundamental legal documents was a concern for ensuring complete religious liberty, including for followers of Islam in America, and this, incredibly, at a time when Muslims in this country were almost all enslaved and occupied the lowest position on the socio-economic ladder.

John Leland, who in his lifetime had actively championed the right of religious freedom for all, including Muslims, and whose influence can be seen in the views of future presidents who themselves championed...
religious freedom inclusive of Muslims, wanted to be forever remembered for his role in ensuring this freedom. Like Jefferson, Leland gave instructions for the epitaph on his tombstone; it was to read, “Here lies the body of John Leland, of Cheshire, who labored ... to promote piety and vindicate the civil and religious rights of all men.”95 And for Leland “all men” included slaves as well; he regarded slavery as “a violent deprivation of the rights of nature” and a “horrid evil.”96
In 1819, Charles Willson Peale, one of America's foremost artists, famously known for his paintings of George Washington and other dignitaries from the American scene, painted a portrait of a Washingtonian Muslim. Considered "the earliest known rendering of an American Muslim and an extremely rare early portrayal of a free African," the painting depicts Yarrow Mamout, a learned African Muslim, literate in Arabic. Mamout had been a slave for 40-plus years before gaining his freedom. At the time of the portrait, he owned property and was an investor in one of Georgetown's earliest banks. It was once said of him, "He professes to be a Mahometan, and is often seen and heard in the streets singing praises to God – and, conversing with him, he said man is no good unless his religion comes from his heart." The Peale painting is said to be "one of the earliest and certainly one of the most sympathetic portraits of an African-American to be found in the history of American art." It was first displayed in the nation’s premier museum, located in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the same building where the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were drafted just a few decades earlier. Today it is part of the permanent collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, where the senior curator of American art gushed in 2011, “It’s such a wonderful picture...We’re never going to take that painting down. It will be out seven days a week. It’s such a great story.”

Recently, the story aroused the interest of Fordham University Press. In 2012, the publishing house released James H. Johnston’s book *From Slave Ship to Harvard: Yarrow Mamout and the History of an African American Family*. What makes the story even more compelling is that Mamout's family name, which is in fact Yarrow, is memorialized in the name of a village in rural Maryland by way of his daughter-in-law, who became well known there for her midwifery. This is how a white community in western Maryland came to be called Yarrowsburg, carrying the family name of a devout African Muslim, formerly a slave, whose portrait once hung in the same place where founding documents of America had been drafted just a few decades earlier, and who two centuries ago openly professed his Islamic faith undisturbed in the streets of the nation’s capital.
Civil War Era Debates and the Issue of Slavery

Job Ben Solomon’s Story in the Civil War Era

In 1808, the United States made it illegal to participate in the international slave trade, with the Act to Prohibit the Importation of Slaves taking effect on the first of January, but continued to allow slavery as a legal institution within the country. One year later, in 1809, Job Ben Solomon’s story appeared within an article in a publication “sold by booksellers generally throughout the United States.”

The article’s author, theologian Rev. Joshua Toulmin, describing Job’s saga as “too interesting and curious to be permitted to sink into oblivion,” felt that the story could be used “to rekindle the joy, which rectitude and philanthropy have felt on the abolition of an inhumane and iniquitous traffick (sic),” meaning the slave trade, of course.

It was natural, then, that Theodore Dwight, the first secretary of the American Ethnological Society (the oldest professional anthropological association in the United States), would also later pick up Job Ben Solomon’s story, given its longevity and utility, and write about him in his 1864 article entitled “Condition and Character of Negroes in Africa.” Dwight was a member of a prominent New England family. His father represented Connecticut in the Ninth Congress (1806-1807) and some of his family members served as presidents of Yale University, two of them during his own lifetime. For someone of Dwight’s prestige to write about African Muslims enslaved in America did not go unnoticed at the time and is still referenced by scholars today.

The article, written as the American Civil War was raging, at a time when slavery remained the “great question that agitates our country,” described Job as having “character of the highest kind for intelligence, judgment, morality, and kindness of the heart.” Dwight chose to use the story of Job in the same way that Benjamin Franklin had made use of examples of Muslims: as a chastisement or criticism of his Christian brethren for moral hypocrisy. Dwight’s criticism holds some considerable weight in this regard, given that his uncle was a respected minister and his maternal great-grandfather, Jonathan Edwards, is considered one of America’s “most important and original” theologians, as well as one of the nation’s greatest thinkers in general. In the paragraph, which appears immediately before his introduction of Job, Dwight, acknowledging the moral hypocrisy of slavery and its prejudices, writes:

> It certainly will bring more compunction to the hearts of the humane among us, to learn that the race which we have been accustomed to despise, as well as to ill treat, still lie under a load of evils perpetuated by the prejudices prevailing even among many of the most enlightened Christians; and it will be surprising to be told, that among the victims of the slave-trade among us have been men of learning and pure and exalted characters, who have been treated like beasts of the field by those who claimed a purer religion.

The reader will recall that General Oglethorpe ostensibly shared a similar sentiment over a century earlier. Around the same time he became acquainted with the story of the learned African Job, the colonial Georgia founder began to proclaim slavery to be “against the gospel.

Theodore Dwight extended his arguments against slavery to the realm of religion and included Muslims in the process. His article was first published in the Methodist Quarterly Review, a faith-based publication that
served as the official organ of the Episcopal Methodists of the United States. (At the time it was "recognized as one of the most learned and respectable theological reviews in the United States or in the world."\textsuperscript{113}) The editor, Daniel Denison Whedon, was a self-proclaimed "stern assailant" of slavery\textsuperscript{114} who abhorred "the stupendous volitional crime of its propagandism."\textsuperscript{115}

It is well-known that black Africans were often portrayed by whites during this time period as being ignorant of "civilized society" and of being inherently worthy of a lower station in life. In his article, Dwight used the histories of Job and other educated, African-born Muslims enslaved in America to argue against this endemic distortion. He held the “people of the United States” as “doubly blamable for their false views” on the “condition of the Negro race in Africa.”\textsuperscript{116} He lamented the nation’s two-fold blame, i.e., the wrongs of the past and the continued denial of basic rights in the present. He argued:

\begin{quote}
The people of the United States are doubly blamable for their false views on this subject, because we owe debts to that portion of our fellowmen for ages of wrongs inflicted on them for our benefit, and because, with ample means within our reach for correcting our erroneous opinions, we generally neglect them, and still persist in denying to negroes those intellectual faculties and moral qualities which the Creator has bestowed on the entire human family.\textsuperscript{117}
\end{quote}

Among the things Dwight referenced as proof for his position was the fact that “for ages” in Africa, “millions have been raised to a considerable degree of civilization by Mohammedism” and that these peoples had “long existed in powerful independent states.”\textsuperscript{118} Anticipating counter-arguments, he acknowledged the “various changes” that these Muslim states had gone through, but pointed out that it was “perhaps not so many or great as those which the principal nations of "civilized Europe" had passed through during the same periods.”\textsuperscript{119}

**Omar ibn Said, Owned by a Congressman and Governor**

At the close of his article, Dwight related the story of another African-born Muslim who was learned in Arabic. His name was Omar ibn Said and he had been an Islamic scholar and teacher in Africa for 25 years before his capture by slave traders. In America he wrote more than a dozen manuscripts in Arabic, including "the only extant autobiography written by a slave in Arabic in the United States."\textsuperscript{120} Many of his writings can be found in the North Carolina Collection of the Wilson Library at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. After becoming acquainted with some of Omar’s “beautiful writing in the Arabic language,” the editor of the *African Repository and Colonial Journal* wrote of Said, in 1825, “If we were acquainted with the characters of all who have been the victims of the slave trade, how many would probably be found, to have been revered for their knowledge and rank in their own country?”\textsuperscript{121}
Omar was owned by James Owen, a member of the prestigious Owen family. Two of the brothers in the family, James and John Owen, were among the most powerful men in North Carolina. James Owen had served as a U.S. congressman to the Fifteenth Congress (1817 - 1819) and had also been president of the Wilmington and Raleigh Railroad Company, the longest railroad in the world at the time. John Owen had served as the 24th governor of North Carolina (1828–1830).

In a fluke of history, John could have been the tenth president of the United States. William Henry Harrison, the ninth president of the United States, had, without success, sought John as his running mate. Harrison died after only 32 days in office. Had John accepted the vice-presidency offered by Harrison, the former governor would have moved up to the presidency upon Harrison’s death. This would have made him the only president with a confirmed Muslim amongst his family’s slaves. However, as the reader will see, his brother James Owen was not the only member of Congress with a Muslim slave.

According to records, Omar, though never freed, was close to, and kindly treated by, the entire family, James and John Owen in particular. He was reportedly even buried in the family cemetery, having passed away shortly before the end of the Civil War. The example of Omar, one of this nation’s most renowned and learned Africans of Muslim heritage, a slave in the family of a U.S. congressman and a governor, is an example of the interwovenness of Muslims in America’s heritage. A further example of this rich heritage, and its impact, was noted in the comments of a translator of one of Omar’s manuscripts, included by Dwight in his article:

*It affords an idea of the degree of education among the Moslem blacks, when we see a man like this able to read and write a language so different from his own native tongue. Where is the youth, or even the adult, among the mass of our people who is able to do the same in Latin or Greek?*

At the time that Dwight’s article went to print, America was in the midst of the carnage and destruction of the American Civil War, with the issue of slavery as the primary underlying cause. Dwight was among those few who were well aware that among those being “treated like beasts of the field” were Muslims who were more educated than their slave masters.

Dwight suffered an untimely death a few years after the publication of his now oft-cited article. It is believed that his final work was an 1866 translation of a letter written in Arabic to the American Ethnological Society from a Tunisian Muslim, who, as we shall see, had been lauded for his anti-slavery renown in the White House by President Johnson in 1865. The noteworthy Muslim was known to be “deeply interested in the history and amelioration of the different races of the globe.”
The Economics of Muslim Slaves in America

Dr. Jenny Bourne, author of The Bondsman's Burden: An Economic Analysis of the Common Law of Southern Slavery, is an economics professor and former economist for the U.S. Treasury Department. In an Economic History encyclopedia entry on “Slavery in the United States,” she makes the case that “Nearly 4 million slaves with a market value of close to $4 billion lived in the U.S. just before the Civil War.” According to her new research, forthcoming in 2013, if you use, as a baseline, the cost of freedom loss to the slave, instead of the usual calculations of the loss of “property” cost to the owner if the slaves were freed, then the $4 billion estimate can shift significantly higher to as much as $8 billion or more in 1860 dollars. In today's dollars that is around $104 billion to $208 billion in market value, depending on which option you choose as a baseline.

If you take those estimates into account, along with the scholarly approximations that 15-30 percent of the enslaved black Africans were of Muslim heritage, it is logical to conclude that there could have been as many as 600,000 to 1.2 million slaves of Muslim heritage contributing a possible $15.6 billion to $31.2 billion (or $31.2 billion to $62.4 billion) in market value to the economic vitality of the United States in the days leading up to the Civil War.
Early American Muslim Communities

Bilali Muhammad and Salih Bilali, Leaders and De Facto Historians

Of the many Muslim slaves that labored in antebellum America, we may never know either their names or their stories. As Dwight pointed out in 1864, “Several other Africans have been known at different periods, in different parts of America, somewhat resembling Job-ben-Solomon in acquirements; but unfortunately, no full account of any of them has ever been published.” Those enslaved Muslims whose identities we know today generally appear to be highly regarded because they were considered, as Dwight described educated Muslim “victims of the slave-trade,” “men of learning and pure and exalted characters.” Due to the limits of space, we will only highlight two more here, Bilali Muhammad and Salih Bilali.

Bilali Muhammad and Salih Bilali were devout Muslims who lived on neighboring plantations in coastal Georgia and were described as “intimate friends.” Each man had been put in charge of hundreds of slaves by their respective masters, Thomas Spalding and James Hamilton Couper. These slave owners, who themselves were friends, came from families with “power far greater than their numbers,” and, who, “[i]n many ways, it could be said that they controlled their states.” Couper and Spalding were considered “member[s] of the planter aristocracy” of the South and both appeared to allow their slaves to worship freely according to their own conscience, similar to the case of Job.

James Hamilton Couper, a Yale graduate and highly regarded scientific agriculturist, was considered “one of the largest land and slave owners on the Georgia coast.” He was also a pioneer in applying “scientific research to agricultural operations.” During the course of his lifetime he managed more than 1300 slaves on over 7000 acres of land. The resources afforded by slave labor paved the way for him to become one of the “leading scientific farmers of the Georgia coast.”

Thomas Spalding, a scientific agriculturist as well, was an American statesman, with a history of public service that included membership in the State House of Representatives (1794), the State Constitutional Convention (1798), the Georgia Senate (1799), and the U.S. Ninth Congress (1805-1806, as a Representative for Georgia). He presided as Chairman over the Georgia Convention of 1850, which resolved that the State of Georgia “will and ought to resist even (as a last resort,) to a disruption of every tie which binds her to the Union, any action of Congress upon the subject of slavery” negatively affecting the slave-holding states, including abolishing slavery. (Spalding passed away en route home from this historic convention and a year later a Georgia county was founded in his name.)

In considering their roles as supervisor of other slaves, one must remember that while Salih Bilali and Bilali Muhammad were depended upon and well respected by their masters, they were still not free and their lives, and that of their families, were subject to the whims of their masters, particularly if that master disapproved of something. Punishment or disapproval of slaves in general could be in the form of the sale of a family member, including spouses and small children, to another owner. Furthermore, it is a fact that slaves put in positions of power by their owners were sometimes known to use that privilege to ease the life of those under their charge. This could include, for example, “faking whippings” that they had been ordered to give. No matter how caring and accommodating Couper and Spalding might have been to their slaves, slavery was
not an institution they were willing to give up, even if protecting the institution meant “a disruption of every tie” binding the State of Georgia to the Union.

Couper and Spalding had an interesting connection to Theodore Dwight. All three men came from powerful families, Couper and Spalding in the south and Dwight in the north. Couper and Dwight both graduated from Yale in 1814. Dwight’s father and Spalding were U.S. Representatives in the Ninth Congress. Coincidentally, Dwight was looking for stories about learned African Muslims and here, very close to him in some regards, were people who could lead him to two very learned Africans, one of whom, as we shall see, would leave behind a rare Arabic manuscript written by his own hand and still studied by scholars today. This would have been of particular interest to Dwight, especially given that he had developed a proficiency in Arabic himself. 

Slave populations (and obviously this included Muslims) contributed to the success of their owners, and by extension the success of America, beyond the economics of free labor. (See section: The Economics of Muslim Slaves in America.) As of 2012, the Spalding County Government, in Spalding County, Georgia, describes Thomas Spalding’s “service to agriculture” as “almost limitless” going on to say that “the Experiment Stations of ante-bellum days were the plantations of Thomas Spalding and a neighbor, James Hamilton Couper.” Agricultural experiment stations, and the slaves who worked the plantations where they were located, helped advance agricultural science in America. Thus Bilali Muhammad and Salih Bilali (who were among the most trusted, depended upon, and highest ranking slaves on their respective plantations) are perfect examples of Professor Edward E. Curtis IV’s assertion that “contributions [by Muslims] ...have changed the course of the nation’s life.” James E. Bagwell illustrates in Rice Gold: James Hamilton Couper and Plantation Life on The Georgia Coast that “no planter, scientific agriculturist or otherwise, could achieve success in his agricultural pursuits without a more than adequate knowledge of slave management.” Couper and Spalding could not have been part of the “planter aristocracy” known for their “agricultural ingenuity” without the management help of resourceful slaves like Salih and Bilali.

Bilali Muhammad was an African-born Muslim first enslaved on the Spalding plantation on Sapelo Island in 1802. It is known that he recorded plantation events in Arabic and that he prayed religiously at least three times a day. His owner’s grandson recounted in 1910 that Bilali “faced the East and called upon Allah” during his prayers. Upon his death, Bilali was buried with his Qur’an and his prayer rug. He authored a 13-page Arabic manuscript, sometimes referred to as the Bilali diary, which remains of interest to scholars to this day and which can be found at the Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library at the University of Georgia. According to the late Bradford G. Martin, a Harvard and Princeton-trained professor of history, the Bilali diary “carries considerable historical weight, in spite of its slight dimensions” given that it was, at the time, “one of a very small group of original Arabic manuscripts discovered and preserved in the United States.” The word “diary” is a misnomer though, as the text discusses various forms of Islamic worship and ritual preparations, as well as draws from Islamic legal training.

According to Professor Keith Cartwright, in his book Reading Africa into American Literature: Epics, Fables, and Gothic Tales, “No single enslaved African left such a forceful impression upon the American imagination as did Bilali Muhammad.” Cartwright provides the following examples, expanded upon in greater detail by the author of this report to further illustrate the depth and breadth of historical impact:
• In 1829, a slave trader named Zephaniah Kingsley, whose former plantation is now part of a historic preserve run by the National Park Service,\textsuperscript{155} wrote about the actions taken by Bilali Muhammad and Salih Bilali to protect their owners’ interests during the War of 1812, describing it as “remarkable” that the two men were “influential negroes”; “Africans”; and “professors of the Mahomedan religion”;\textsuperscript{156}

• In 1896, and, again, in 1897, a famous journalist, fiction writer, and folklorist, considered “one of the South’s most treasured authors,”\textsuperscript{157} used Bilali’s life as a creative source for children’s books he authored;

• In 1939, some of Bilali’s descendants kept his story alive through participating in interviews conducted by the Savannah unit of the Federal Writers’ Project, a project created under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s Work Projects Administration to address unemployment through public works projects during the Great Depression. The interviews include information about Bilali’s wife, children, grandchildren, their dress, their vocabulary, and religious practice;\textsuperscript{158}

• In 1977, an African American author, who later won a Nobel Prize in Literature and a Pulitzer Prize, used events from Bilali’s life, and mentioned him by name, in her fiction novel that won the National Books Critics Award;\textsuperscript{159}

• In 1991, Bilali’s life was used as one of the creative sources for an independent film that was later added to the National Film Registry in 2004 by the Library of Congress for being “culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant”;\textsuperscript{160}

• In 1995, a Pulitzer Prize winning professor of history, who also helped create Yale’s African-American studies program during the Civil Rights movement, wrote about Bilali in his book about Sapelo Island and the descendant of slaves who still reside there. In the text, he refers to Bilali’s “diary” as “a holy object connecting Africa to America in the hand of a deeply religious man.”\textsuperscript{161}

Bilali was not the only Muslim slave on Spalding’s plantation. According to Spalding’s grandson there were “many fresh from the darkest Africa, some of Moorish or Arabian descent, devout Mussulmans, who prayed to Allah in the morning, noon and evening; all loyal and devoted to their respective owners.”\textsuperscript{162} Some of those Muslims were a part of Bilali’s own family mentioned above. Unfortunately, historians have uncovered the sparse stories on only a few. It is quite ironic that, on the one hand, slavery was banned in Georgia from the outset by the colony’s founder, who had helped free a devout Muslim slave; while, on the other, the institution of slavery was later perpetuated in the state of Georgia by someone who happened to own many Muslim slaves, at least one of whom he respected and trusted tremendously.\textsuperscript{163}

Salih Bilali was an African-born Muslim who lived on one of James Hamilton Couper’s plantations on St. Simons Island in Georgia not too far from Bilali Muhammad. He had been purchased by Couper’s father in 1800. In the early 1840s, William Brown Hodgson, known, among many other things, for owning the most slaves in Georgia right before the Civil War,\textsuperscript{164} asked Couper to send him information about Salih. This was a request from a man who had the power to get a story heard. Not only was Hodgson the son-in-law of Edward Telfair (a member of the Continental Congress (1778-1783), a signer of the Articles of Confederation, and one of Georgia’s earliest governors) but he was also ex-United States consul in Tunis and a respected scholar with language proficiency in Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Berber languages, to name a few. The story of Salih interested him both from a scholarly and experiential perspective, as he had lived and worked among Muslims. Hodgson published Couper’s letter of response in his 1844 book \textit{Notes on Northern Africa, the}
Sahara and Soudan: in relation to the ethnography, languages, history, political and social condition, of the nations of those countries. The missive included detailed “results of conversations” Couper had with Salih, including information about his character, religious beliefs and methods of worship. He writes:

"He possesses great veracity and honesty. He is a strict Mahometan; abstains from spirituous liquors, and keeps the various fasts, particularly that of the Rhamadan [sic]. He is singularly exempt from all feeling of superstition; and holds in great contempt, the African belief in fetishes and evil spirits. He reads Arabic, and has a Koran (which however, I have not seen) in that language, but does not write."  

It seems that Couper, like Spalding and Job Ben Solomon’s owner, did not have a problem with his Muslim slave reading, writing, and practicing his Islamic faith—although this should be seen as the exception, not the rule. After all, during Couper and Spalding’s day, even attempting to teach a slave, or “free person of color,” to read or write was a criminal act in Georgia punishable by a fine or whipping.

In his letter, Couper also recounted, in great detail, Salih’s personal history, capture story, and “African reminiscences.” This includes the architecture of homes and mosques, agricultural methods, diet, dress, hairstyles, weaponry, vocabulary, division of work between the sexes, law, and method of Islamic education: “all children are taught to read and write Arabic by the priests...[t]hey repeat the from the Koran, and write on a board, which when filled, is washed off.”Couper also mentions in the letter that Salih Bilali is “intimate friends” with Bilali Muhammad “who writes Arabic.” Clearly the stories of Salih Bilali and Bilali Muhammad’s education, social networks, managerial abilities, religious practices and so forth were so well-regarded that white American aristocrats of the South deemed it worthy to note it in great detail in their personal and public communications. These, and other noteworthy instances of documentation, have made these two black African Muslim slaves, despite their restrictive circumstances, a compelling and permanent part of American history.

Another point of interest about these two Muslim men is that together, with the other Muslims on their plantations, they formed one of the earliest known communities of Muslims in the United States. Because of the circumscribed nature of slave life, this community may have been loose-knit, but it was a community, nonetheless, and the members of the community, it appears, were not prevented from practicing their form of worship, Islam, and this in antebellum America, no less.

Learned and talented Muslims dotted the American historical landscape from this country’s inception and during the colonial period. Their contributions and skills have been documented, however sparse those records are. The 1734 Bluett publication about Job Ben Solomon’s life remains the earliest known recorded account of an African Muslim enslaved in America and has been referred to as “the first text in African American literature.” Because it offers insight into American history and culture, the University Library at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill provides access to a digitized copy of it through their Documenting the American South (DocSouth) digital publishing initiative. Understood within its full historical context, it, along with other accounts of Job’s life, contributes to a deeper understanding of America’s history, especially with regard to religion, politics, and literature. As we have seen, Job’s story and imprint on the American historical record was not an anomaly. It is an unfortunate fact of our country that so few Americans, including Muslims, are aware of the African imams and scholars enslaved in colonial America and the nascent republic. Men like Job Ben Solomon, Yarrow Mamout, Omar ibn Said, Salih Bilali, and Bilali Muhammad helped
make and shape America with their sweat equity, character, intelligence, and even their faith tradition. Indeed, the American slave population contained Muslims who were educated, trusted and religiously devout.
The Supreme Court and Inalienable Rights

John Quincy Adams and the Amistad Captives

An often overlooked story in America’s history, in terms of its direct relation to Islam in America, is that of former President John Quincy Adams arguing before the U.S. Supreme Court, in 1841, for the freedom of the famed slave captives who had mutinied aboard the Spanish schooner, the Amistad. In 1839, the ship was making its way to a plantation in the Caribbean. In the course of the revolt, it ended up in United States waters. Although slavery was still a legal institution in America, participation in the international slave trade had been outlawed decades before. The legal question was: Had the captives been illegally enslaved, as in recently transported from Africa despite the banned trade, hence, giving them the inalienable human right to fight for their freedom by any means necessary; and, if so, should the United States set them free? Or were they “property,” who had been slaves for some time, and thus should be returned to the Spanish authorities?

The slave captives—men, women, and children among them—were black Africans, many of whom were believed to be Muslim. Both race and religion could have been used to discriminate against the captives. Instead, John Quincy Adams invoked the Declaration of Independence in their support, arguing the case for his “fellow-men” before the great court for four hours straight, at one point, until, as one reporter described it, “The audience were in tears—the judges wept—and my own sensibilities shared the same relief.”

Arabic language proficiency of the captives had been used, in the lower court, as one of the ways to prove that they had been recently kidnapped from Africa and enslaved. Had they been slaves for some time, they would have arguably developed a proficiency of Spanish, which they did not appear to have. In a sworn deposition, well known to Adams, it had been said of the Africans:

To one of them I spoke, and repeated a Mohammedan form of prayer in the Arabic language; the man immediately recognized the language, and repeated a few words of it after me; appeared to understand...
it, particularly the words ‘Allah akbar,’ or God is great. The man who was beside this negro, I also
addressed in Arabic, saying—‘salaam aIlkoem,’ or peace be to you; he immediately, in the customary
oriental salutations, replied—‘aleckoum salam,’ or peace be on you.\textsuperscript{176}

The \textit{New Haven Record} reported that one of the captives had been identified as “the son of a Mohammedan
priest\textsuperscript{177}” who could read and write Arabic taught to him by his father. Years after the Supreme Court victory,
Senator William H. Seward, Sr. described the captives, in a speech he had planned to deliver before Congress,
as all being able to recite “Arabic prayers, from the ritual of the Mohammedan faith.”\textsuperscript{178} (This is the same
Seward who would later become Secretary of State under Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson;
who, during the Civil War, received the anti-slavery appeal of a Tunisian Muslim to end U.S. slavery; and who
would accompany a Tunisian envoy to the Blue Room of the White House, listening to President Johnson as he
praised the Muslim abolitionist for his anti-slavery renown.\textsuperscript{179})

It appears that the religion of the captives did not matter to Adams. There is no known account of him making
reference to it during the course of the case proceedings or in his diary, wherein he wrote in detail about the
\textit{Amistad} captives and their case. This was not (now Congressman) John Quincy Adams’ first encounter with
Muslims. As a U.S. senator, he had been at President Jefferson’s White House dinner in 1805 during Ramadan
with the first Muslim envoy to the United States and had recorded it in his diary.\textsuperscript{180} (See section: A Sampling of
Presidential Engagement with Muslims.) As the sixth President of the United States, he had helped\textsuperscript{181}
facilitate the freedom of Prince Abdul Rahman Ibrahima ibn Sori, an African-born Muslim enslaved 40 years in
America, who, like Job Ben Solomon, had demonstrated that he was a learned man who could read and
write\textsuperscript{182} in Arabic, which helped secure his freedom. President John Quincy Adams had written about Prince
at least twice\textsuperscript{183} in his diary, including about meeting\textsuperscript{184} with the Muslim ex-slave at the White House.\textsuperscript{1}
(Prince’s plight became well known to many notable Americans who sought to assist him and his wife and
children who were also enslaved. Francis Scott Key, most famously known today as the author of “The Star
Spangled Banner,” was among those who came to his aid.)

Hence, the discovery that there were Muslims among the \textit{Amistad} captives would not have amazed John
Quincy Adams, the son of a Founding Father who became second president of the United States, because
neither Islam nor Muslims in America were new to him. What captured his attention the most was the fact
that their inalienable rights were being violated. These thoughts appear, in his diary, as part of his record of the
events surrounding the \textit{Amistad} case.\textsuperscript{185} This view can be seen in his arguments as he stood before the
court and spoke of his destiny to defend the rights of these captives:

\begin{quote}
Little did I imagine that I should ever again be required to claim the right of appearing in the capacity
of an officer of this court; yet such has been the dictate of my destiny, and I appear again to plead the
cause of justice, and now of liberty and life, in behalf of many of my fellow-men…\textsuperscript{186}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotenum{1}
It can be argued that helping Abdul Rahman contributed to President John Quincy Adams losing his reelection for a second term.
One handbill in support of his challenger, Andrew Jackson, read in part, “LOUISIANANS! (sic) Remember that ANDREW JACKSON IS
A MAN OF THE SOUTH, A SLAVE HOLDER, A COTTON PLANTER.” (As reprinted in Kambiz GhaneaBassiri, \textit{A History of Islam in
America: From the New World to the New World Order} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 21.) Clearly, helping to
emancipate a slave did not serve the president well in the south.
\end{footnotes}
Adams declared, “The moment you come, to the Declaration of Independence, that every man has a right to life and liberty, an inalienable right, this case is decided. I ask nothing more in behalf of these unfortunate men, than this Declaration.” He believed you could determine from this founding document that “traffic in slaves is contrary to the law of nature.” Accordingly, he repeatedly called on it as the most critical foundation for his case, clearly referring to the Declaration’s emphasis on, in his words, “the Laws of Nature” being “identical with the laws of nature’s God, and as the foundation of all obligatory human laws.” The former president explained:

One of the Judges who presided in some of the preceding trials, is said to have called this an anomalous case. It is indeed anomalous, and I know of no law, but one which I am not at liberty to argue before this Court, no law, statute or constitution, no code, no treaty, applicable to the proceedings of the Executive or the Judiciary, except that law, (pointing to the copy of the Declaration of Independence, hanging against one of the pillars of the courtroom,) that law, two copies of which are ever before the eyes of your Honors. I know of no other law that reaches the case of my clients, but the law of nature and of Nature’s God on which our fathers placed our own national existence. The circumstances are so peculiar, that no code or treaty has provided for such a case. That law, in its application to my clients, I trust will be the law on which the case will be decided by this Court.

Thus, one of the most famous Supreme Court cases in the history of the United States involved a former American president, himself the son of a Founding Father and U.S. President, fighting, in the name of the “Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God,” for the freedom of black Africans who were believed to be of Muslim heritage. Clearly for John Quincy Adams, inalienable rights, guaranteed by American laws by virtue of being on American soil, trumped any consideration of race or religion.

The Barbary Wars in Context and the Hypocrisy of American Slavery

America’s conflict with the so-called Barbary powers is often cited as a counter-example to any positive history of Islam in America. In the late 1700s, the Barbary States—Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli, and for a short time, Morocco—committed acts of piracy against American ships, enslaving the white Christian Americans on board and demanding ransom for their release. They also exacted payments of tribute in exchange for “peace.” These acts led to war with the United States from 1801-1805 and again in 1815. These early conflicts are viewed by some as evidence that Islam and Muslims have always been at odds with America.

There are several arguments against this position. First, not all Muslims engaged in these acts, just as it can be said that not all Native Americans engaged in direct conflict with the Scots-Irish frontiersmen as Franklin made clear in 1764. Second, most of the conflict with the Barbary powers ended by 1815; and the total number of white Christian Americans captured, killed, or enslaved over the entire period of the conflicts numbered in the hundreds. Third, while Americans were decrying piracy and enslavement of their white Christian compatriots overseas, the United States continued to legally allow its own participation in the international slave trade until the Act to Prohibit the Importation of Slaves took effect in 1808, and, unlike their white counterparts, there was virtually no option of ransom for the release of these black captives.
which included Muslims of course. An attempt to escape, or to help one escape, had brutal consequences. For example, as early as 1712, the slave codes in colonial South Carolina stipulated:

> Any slave absconding or successfully evading capture for twenty days is to be publicly whipped for the first offense; branded with the letter R on the right cheek for the second offense, and lose one ear if absent for thirty days for the third offense; and for the fourth offense, a male slave is to be castrated, a female slave is to be whipped, branded on the left cheek with the letter R, and lose her left ear.

Owners refusing to abide by the slave code or inflict specified punishment are to be fined and forfeit ownership of their slave(s).\(^1\)

Fourth, even after America outlawed its role in the international slave trade, Africans were being illegally sneaked into the United States as slaves until at least 1860 when the last known slave ship secretly sailed into Mobile Bay carrying human cargo as property. Even on this final slave ship, Muslims were among the captives.\(^2\) Fifth, even though slaves could no longer be legally imported, slavery itself, and intra-national slave trading, remained a legal institution in the United States until 1865, only ending officially after the American Civil War, a war in which more American lives were lost than in any other war before or since. Sixth, at the time of the beginning of the war, nearly four million\(^3\) people of African descent, of whom as many as 600 thousand to 1.2 million were arguably of Muslim heritage, were living on American soil in chattel slavery under primarily white Christian control. Seventh, the Barbary powers were not alone in forcibly seizing Americans from ships. From the American colonial period until 1815, the British engaged in impressment, seizing at least 9,000 American seamen for use by the British Navy. As the kidnappings became bolder at the turn of the nineteenth century, the challenge to America’s sovereignty became greater. In fact, British impressment of American seamen was one of the issues that precipitated the War of 1812 (1812-1815) between the United States and Great Britain. During that war the British captured and occupied the nation’s capital—an act unfathomable to Americans today. They burned important symbols of American power and liberty, including the White House, the United States Treasury, the Washington Navy Shipyard, and the U.S. Capitol, which included the Supreme Court within and the Library of Congress with its thousands of volumes lost in the flames.

Therefore, to argue that the Barbary conflict period is an example of historic Muslim antagonism, with Islam as the singular great threat against Americans, in particular, is simply fallacious. Injustices were being committed freely on many sides, not just by the Muslims who governed the Barbary powers. Furthermore, the outcry at the time that the Barbary powers were capturing white Christians was especially hypocritical. During this period, slavery was widespread through the world, but nowhere did it appear to rival colonial America, and the ensuing early decades of the new republic, in its sheer brutality.

An illustration of this point can be seen in an April 6, 1799, letter written by William Eaton, U.S. consul to Tunis, to his wife in the United States. The letter describes how an encounter with white Christian slaves in Tunis broke his heart and made him feel guilty about the treatment of black slaves in America, for whose plight he had, until that point, felt neither remorse nor sympathy. He also remarked at how much better the white Christian slaves were treated in Tunis at the hands of the Muslim “barbarians” than those African slaves were treated in the United States at the hands of the “civilized” Christians. He writes:
Alas, remorse seizes my whole soul when I reflect that this is indeed a copy of the very barbarity which my eyes have seen in my own native country. And yet we boast of liberty and national justice. How frequently, in the southern states of my own country, have I seen weeping mothers leading the guiltless infants to the sales, with as deep anguish as if they led them to slaughter; and yet felt my bosom tranquil in the view of these aggressions upon defenceless [sic] humanity. But when I see the same enormities practiced upon beings whose complexion and blood kindred with my own, I curse the perpetrators and weep over the wretched victims of their rapacity. Indeed truth and justice demand from me the confession that Christian slaves among the barbarians of Africa are treated with more humanity than the African slaves among the professing Christians of civilized America; and yet here sensibility bleeds at every pore for the wretches whom fate has doomed to slavery.\textsuperscript{194}

Just a few years later Eaton questioned the American conscience again. This time, as the reader will see, it involved the treatment of a Muslim who sacrificed tremendously in service to the United States of America.
Further Evidence of a Muslim Presence in America

“Islam had no influence on the origins and development of the United States.

It contributed nothing to early American political culture, art, literature, music or any other aspect of the early nation.”

- The Washington Times, 2010

The above quote, which appeared in a major newspaper as recently as 2010, has no place in the reality of the American experience because it is patently false. It comes nearly 300 years after an enslaved black African imam impacted literary, religious, and political discussions of the day\(^1\) and a future Founding Father made clear that Muslims were welcome to teach Islam in the “preaching-house” of which he was a trustee.\(^2\) It comes nearly 250 years after a future president of the United States purchased a Qur’an and, later, took “satisfaction” that Muslims citizens were among those meant to be protected by religious freedom in a Virginia statute that preceded the First Amendment.\(^3\) It comes nearly 200 years after the anti-slavery leadership of a Tunisian Muslim was applauded in the White House\(^4\) before slavery in the United States had been officially outlawed. It comes more than 30 years after the United States Congress passed a concurrent resolution recognizing “the contribution of Islam to mankind.”\(^5\) Indeed, as we have seen, Islam’s influence and contributions “on the origins and development of the United States” abound, reaching all the way back to the earliest days of colonial America and the founding of the republic.

Farcical ideas such as those presented in The Washington Times article have been used to depict American Muslims as outsiders and Islam as a faith that is inherently at odds with the American way of life. In fact, as we have seen, American Muslims are far from alien; they share a common heritage with other Americans, whether they are descendants of the millions of immigrants that came through Ellis Island in New York, or can trace their ancestors to the patriots of the American Revolution, or are native to America, or were brought here forcibly as slaves, or emigrated here freely, full of hope, from Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe and South America. All citizens of our great country have the right to be a part of, and take pride in, the rich national heritage of this land, a heritage which includes the participation of America’s Muslims, Christians, and Jews, among many others. It is the full diversity of this nation that makes the American story unique in the world.

\(^3\) In the same U.S. Capitol where members of Congress make laws every day, Congress passed a concurrent resolution in 1979 that recognized “the contribution of Islam to mankind,” honored the 1400th year of Islam, and requested that the President Jimmy Carter forward copies of the resolution “to the Chief of State of each country where Islam has a significant following and where celebrations will mark this important international event.”
Some Physical Signs of the Presence of a Muslim Heritage

Both Islam and its adherents have an indelible presence in our national heritage in places and things that are quintessentially American. A sampling of these include the Library of Congress, the United States Supreme Court, the Washington Monument, cities and towns throughout the nation, as well as legendary weaponry of the United States Armed Forces.

Landmarks

On the dome of the Main Reading Room of the Thomas Jefferson Building in the Library of Congress—the largest library in the world and, “in effect, the library of the whole of the American people, directly serving the interest of the entire country”—there is a beautiful mural [above] called "The Evolution of Civilization." Present since the new building opened in 1897, it has been referred to as being in "the noblest and most inspiring" position in the library and as being "literally and obviously the crowning glory of the building."

The mural depicts "the twelve countries, or epochs, which have contributed most to the development of present-day civilization in this country." "Islam" is one of the epochs and its contribution to "human progress" is represented as "Physics." The depiction illustrates this contribution of Islam as: "an Arab, standing for the Moorish race which introduced into Europe not only an improved science of Physics ...but of mathematics and astronomy also. His foot rests upon a glass retort, and he is turning over the leaves of a book."
of mathematical calculations.\textsuperscript{205} Another epoch represented is “America” and its contribution to “human progress” is depicted as “Science.” According to Mohammad R. Salama, author of \textit{Islam, Orientalism and Intellectual History: Modernity and the Politics of Exclusion Since Ibn Khaldun}, of the twelve representations in the mural, “Islam and America are tied together in the sacred task of improving the human condition”\textsuperscript{206} through their contributions to the sciences.

President Jefferson’s Qur’an can also be found in the library among the books sold to the institution by the former president himself. He initiated the sale in an effort to rebuild the library’s holdings after the devastation caused during the War of 1812 when the British burned the U.S. Capitol and the Library of Congress within.\textsuperscript{207} Even after a second fire at the library years later, Jefferson’s Qur’an remains among the nucleus of books from which the rest of library holdings were developed.

We find another acknowledgement of the contribution of Islam in the U.S. Supreme Court building of which the construction was completed in 1935, permanently moving the court from the U.S. Capitol to its new location. Two magnificent friezes line the walls of the famed courtroom where historic cases are heard. “Great lawgivers of history”\textsuperscript{208} are represented from left to right on the South Wall Frieze and from right to left on the North Wall Frieze. Interspersed between them are allegorical figures of Fame, Authority, Light of Wisdom, History, Liberty and Peace, Right of Man, Equity, and Philosophy.

On the North Wall Frieze, we find a representation of the Prophet Muhammad placed halfway between the allegorical figures of Philosophy and Equity as part of the friezes’ development of law throughout human civilization theme. The Office of the Curator of the Supreme Court explains that the depiction was meant “to honor Muhammad” and makes clear to possible detractors that “it bears no resemblance to Muhammad” physically, acknowledging that “Muslims generally have a strong aversion to sculptured or pictured representations of their Prophet.”\textsuperscript{209}

In the nation’s most quintessentially American landmark, the Washington Monument, there is a marble gift from the Muslim ruler of the Ottoman Empire, who wished to honor the “father of our country” by contributing to the preeminent structure’s completion. At approximately 197 feet high inside the monument, one can find the more than five feet wide Muslim gift where it was originally placed over a century ago. The marble structure bears the imperial seal of the sultan and a dedication to the United States, “in support of eternal friendship.”\textsuperscript{210} A letter sent in 1852 to the Secretary of the Washington National Monument Association, and published shortly thereafter by the \textit{New York Times}, reads in part:

\textit{It will now perhaps strike you as being interesting to the history of the Father of our Country that, from admiration of his character and respect for his memory, his Imperial Majesty, Sultan ABD-AL-MAJID, contributes a block of marble to his monument.}\textsuperscript{211}

Other newspapers around the country reported the gesture, one referring to it as “touching,”\textsuperscript{212} and another identifying the gift as one of the things that set the Washington Monument apart as unique in the world:

\textit{Others have been erected to the honor of heroes and illustrious men, by their own countrymen; but here at the Capitol [sic] the most remarkable of all is rising, built up by the hands of the Grand Seignor, the head of the Mohammedan Faith, and the Pope, that of one branch of Christian ...}\textsuperscript{213}
Reflecting on the marble gift’s inscription, which reads in part, “in support of eternal friendship,” President Obama remarked, during a 2009 address before the Turkish Parliament in Ankara, “Over 150 years have passed since those words were carved into marble. Our nations have changed in many ways. But our friendship is strong, and our alliance endures.” He also acknowledged that the marble contribution “helped to build the Washington Monument.” The president’s words were of particular significance that day in Ankara because he was there during his premier journey aboard as president of the United States of America and he has chosen Turkey as the first Muslim country to visit. In doing so, he had chosen a nation that had honored the “father of our country” and had tangibly contributed to the making of America when it was less than a hundred years old.

The motivation for the gift (pictured at left) came from diplomatic courtesies extended to the Ottoman Empire by the thirteenth president of the United States, Millard Fillmore, which resulted in the sultan (the de facto head of the Muslim-led Ottoman Empire) learning more about America and the “father of our country.” In 1850, the president had, in the presence of all the heads of the nation’s government departments, opened the entire country to examination by Amin Bey, a representative of the sultan, with the motive that the “effect may be a greater extension of friendly and commercial relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of the New World.” In his “Second Annual Message,” on December 2, 1851, to the “Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and of the House of Representatives,” President Fillmore reported: “The Turkish Government has expressed its thanks for the kind reception given to the sultan’s agent, Amin Bey, on the occasion of his recent visit to the United States.”

Interestingly, President Fillmore’s precedent led to the Honorable Robert C. Winthrop, current Secretary of State John Kerry’s great-great-grandfather, personally giving the sultan’s representative a copy of his speech delivered “on the occasion of laying the corner-stone of the national monument to the memory of Washington.” This no doubt opened the door for the envoy and his countrymen to learn a great deal about the man known as the “father of our country.” At the time of meeting Amin Bey, Winthrop had just completed his tenure as Speaker of the House during the Thirtieth Congress (1847-1849) and was beginning his new post as U.S. senator from Massachusetts (1850-1851). It is likely that Winthrop gave the document to Bey around the time of a dinner given in honor of the Turkish representative by the merchants of Boston on November 4, 1850. Senator Winthrop delivered a speech at the event, praising the encouragement and authorization, presumably from the Fillmore administration, for increased and meaningful friendship with the Muslim power, which he now deemed “worthy of the admiration and imitation of all mankind”:

*I rejoice that events have occurred to break the spell of that hereditary prejudice, which has so long prevailed in the minds of not a few of us, towards the Ottoman Empire. I rejoice ... that, in a word, we are encouraged and warranted to look to her, under the auspices and administration of her young.*
gallant, and generous Sultan, for examples of reform, of toleration, of liberality, of a magnanimous and chivalrous humanity, which are worthy of the admiration and imitation of all mankind.\textsuperscript{219}

The United States Secretary of State Daniel Webster also spoke that night proclaiming that the Turkish envoy "had come to this country to see the United States, and not a broken and disrevered Union."\textsuperscript{220} The blossoming relationship with the Ottoman Empire, commemorated by the gift to the Washington Monument, would become crucial to the success of the Union a little over a decade later when the nation did disserver during the American Civil War. It is then that the loyalty of the relationship would be tested and the Lincoln administration would find that it had a friend among Muslims across the globe.

Cities and Towns

We already saw Yarrowsburg, Maryland, derived from the family name of the African Muslim, Yarrow Mamout. Typical Muslim words such as “Allah,” “Muhammad,” “Mecca,” and “Medina” can all be found as names of cities and towns across the United States. Space limitations do not permit a complete presentation; however, a brief look at some of the more interesting instances will suffice to represent the historic nature of the whole.

The Illinois Historical Marker, “Lincoln’s Mahomet,”\textsuperscript{221} combines the name of one of our most prominent presidents and Muhammad, the prophet of Islam. This marker commemorates the fact that, when still a lawyer on the Eighth Judicial Circuit for Illinois, Lincoln often used the Illinois town of Mahomet as a “convenient stopping point”\textsuperscript{222} on his rounds through the county seats.

One theory is that the town got its name through the Freemasons who use diverse religious symbols and terminology including those of Islamic origin.\textsuperscript{223} It is likely that the town of Mahomet, so named as early as 1840,\textsuperscript{224} acquired its appellation from the Master Masons in the town who were “some 20 of the oldest and most respected citizens.”\textsuperscript{225} In 1856, the town’s Masons became part of the newly founded Mahomet Lodge No. 220.\textsuperscript{226} Though the town had been called Middletown since 1832 and did not officially change its name until 1871, the Masons chose the name Mahomet for their lodge and identified their town of origin as Mahomet.\textsuperscript{227} Apparently, another nearby post office and town also had the name “Middletown” and so, to differentiate itself, “Middletown-Mahomet” or, simply, “Mahomet” was used freely by many and soon the post office began to officially use “Mahomet” only, even before the official change. Interestingly, Mahomet, Texas, another town carrying the name of the Prophet Muhammad, may have gotten its name from Mahomet, Illinois when the postmaster from the Illinois town relocated to Texas.\textsuperscript{228} In both locations, his home doubled as a post office.\textsuperscript{229}
Prominent Early 1800s Mayor, U.S. Senator and New York Governor: Muslims are “Friends and Brothers”

In February 1858, a letter from Mahomet, Illinois, giving a brief account of the founding of Mahomet Lodge, appeared in The Ashlar, a periodical self-described “as the only Masonic publication that has ever creditably maintained in the North-west.” Interestingly, the publication had run an article on the “Universality of Masonry” only a month before, “universality” being in reference to the Masonic views toward religion excerpted, therein, from a Masonic address given in 1793 by DeWitt Clinton. Clinton, a future governor of New York and member of a powerful political family, had delivered the speech at the time of his installation as Master of Holland Lodge No. 8 in the city of New York. (Just four years earlier when the nation’s capital was still located in New York City, this same lodge had conferred honorary membership on President George Washington.)

In his address, Clinton instructed the members of the lodge as follows: “Masonry... opens her arms to the followers of all systems of religion. The Mahometan, the Jew, the Christian and the Theist, throwing aside the madness of religious hatred, meet under her protection as friends and Brothers.” He further explained that “followers of Moses, Mahomet and Brama, may introduce into their Masonic assemblies, the Pentateuch, their Alcoran [i.e., Qur’an] and their Vedam; and yet the unit of Masonry would remain.” Clinton also spoke of universal brotherhood and how “all the inhabitants of the earth are descended from the same stock.”

In an article on “purity” and “security” of Masonry, published nearly half a year before Clinton’s piece appeared in The Ashlar, “the Mohammedan” is included among those welcomed within the “wide-spread arms” of the brotherhood. In yet another article appearing in the spring of 1858, the “religious restrictions of the Mahomedans,” with regard to art, are critiqued in an architecture discussion. Clearly, for readers of The Ashlar, including the Masons of Mahomet, Illinois, Islam and Muslims were not an unfamiliar topic of discussion, nor was it for Freemasons in general as we can see from Clinton’s speech originally delivered decades before.
DeWitt Clinton’s 1793 remarks to his Masonic Lodge specifically included Muslims “as friends and Brothers.” He also recognized the Qur’an as acceptable for use in Masonic assemblies and warned against “the madness of religious hatred.” His views are particularly significant because of the powerful role he and his uncle, George Clinton, played in early American history and because of the time period during which the remarks were made: the Bill of Rights had been ratified only two years earlier.

At the time of his address, DeWitt Clinton was serving as private secretary (1790-1795) to his uncle, Governor George Clinton. The elder Clinton’s achievements are impressive: he was one of America’s Founding Fathers; a member of the Continental Congress; a veteran of the American Revolutionary War; the first governor of the State of New York; vice president under both Presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Madison; and a good friend of George Washington, accompanying him on his first inauguration in 1789.

During the same time period that DeWitt was serving his uncle as a private secretary, the elder Clinton, then governor of New York, and Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State, accompanied President Washington on a “good-will” visit to Rhode Island that resulted in Washington’s now famous, and oft-quoted, “Letter from George Washington to the Hebrew Congregation at Newport.” Written on August 21, 1790, the president declared, therein, “May the children of the stock of Abraham who dwell in this land continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants—while every one [sic] shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid.” Considered President Washington’s “most prominent pronouncement on religious toleration,” it was written of course in reference to freedom of conscience and freedom from religious persecution for all, which would soon be guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, authored in 1789 but not ratified until 1791. Washington’s letter is widely used today to illustrate the United States’ early commitment to religious liberty. According to the Give Bigotry No Sanction: Exploring Religious Freedom and Democracy project:

George Washington’s 1790 Letter to the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, Rhode Island is a landmark in the history of religious freedom in America, and part of a founding moment in U.S. history when the country was negotiating how a democracy accommodates differences among its people.
In his role as his uncle’s private secretary, DeWitt Clinton developed a closeness to the elder Clinton (described in a letter to then President Thomas Jefferson, from George, as a feeling of “partiality for him”243). This closeness exposed the younger Clinton to Jefferson, Washington and his uncle’s strong support of religious freedom and protection from religious persecution like in the letter to the Hebrew congregation at Newport.”

DeWitt Clinton was later considered “one of the greatest statesmen produced by the State of New York.”244 In less than a decade after addressing his Masonic Lodge, he was elected to the U.S. Senate (1802-1803). He served several terms as mayor of New York City (1803-1807, 1810, 1811, 1813, and 1814), and later became governor of the State of New York (1817-1822, 1825-1828).245 Within the Masons, he served as Grand Master for the State of New York from 1806-1819.

Excerpts from DeWitt Clinton’s 1793 address were republished at least three246 times, the last known republication appearing more than half a century later in The Ashlar. In all three instances, the excerpt of Clinton’s otherwise long address begins with the following words:

\[\text{It must be made obvious to a mind of the least reflection, that were Masonry to prescribe particular tenets and opinions in religion for her votaries, that it would be utterly incompatible with the universality of the Order. For this, and the reasons before mentioned, she has wisely avoided an explicit patronage of any theological creed.247}\]

Importantly, these words are reminiscent of the struggle outside the walls of the lodges—all too well-known to DeWitt given who he was—clearly stated in the First Amendment of the Bill of Right’s adopted just two years earlier: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”248

DeWitt Clinton was an important public figure and he had powerful connections. His words would be heard by the most influential people in the nation. In fact, the 1858 issue of The Ashlar contains the following recommendation accompanying his excerpted speech: “[I]t is well for us to listen to the words of wisdom spoken by the wise and accomplished of our Order.”249 Surely, Clinton’s strong views on, “throwing aside the madness of religious hatred,” and his respect for Islam and Muslims alongside other faiths carried a lot of weight.
There are reportedly at least a dozen places in the United States named Medina and at least eight named Mecca. Medina, the second holiest site in Islam, is the city where the Prophet Muhammad and early Muslims sought refuge to escape religious persecution and where the prophet is buried. Mecca is the Prophet Muhammad’s birthplace and the site of the Muslim pilgrimage called Hajj.

Let us look at one example of the use of these place names in the American landscape. Medina, Ohio, was founded in 1818 by Elijah Boardman (1760 – 1823), a Revolutionary War veteran and (later) U.S. senator from Connecticut (1821-1823). It was originally called Mecca, but the name was changed to Medina when it was discovered that another city nearby bore the same name. Given the use of both Mecca and Medina as names, the founder clearly had to be aware of the historical relationship between these cities in Arabia. Evidence for this is found in the following explanation from the History of Medina County and Ohio, published in 1881:

> It was originally called Mecca, and is so marked on the early maps of the State, from the Arabian city famous in history as the birthplace of Mahomet. Some years later, it was changed to its present name of Medina, being the seventh place on the globe bearing that name. The others are Medina, a town of Arabia Deserta [sic], celebrated as the burial-place of Mahomet …

Another account is given by the 1966 Class of Medina Senior High School:

> The old pioneers placed a great trust in their religion when wandering into Indian country….Mohammedanism was next to Christianity in size at that time and Mohammed’s philosophy (sic) much read and known by the old timers, Boardman perhaps included. The City of Mecca in Arabia was known world over, because of thousands of pilgrims who made an annual pilgrimage there, until it came to be a by-word for travelers overland to refer to the end of their journey as their Mecca. Boardman perhaps did likewise. After Mohammed was driven from his birthplace, Mecca, he fled to Medina, Arabia, the capital. Here the pilgrims traveled as they had before to Mecca, and still do. Now, when the name of Mecca, Ohio, needed changing because of a town in Trumbull County having that name, the next most common end of the voyage was Medina in Arabia."

Interestingly, Medina was lauded as “Hometown, USA” in 1945 when a Hollywood film short about it world-premiered. The Midwestern town that had historically held two different names of Islamic origin was chosen because it was considered to be so quintessentially American.
"Allah" in the Early Twentieth-Century American Imagination

Most Americans are clear that the Arabic word for God, "Allah," is used by Muslims the world over, but few know there was a town by the name of Allah in the early twentieth-century in Arizona. Now a ghost town, it was once a place where Sunday school students used to picnic early in the day, presumably before it became too hot, enjoying the full beauty of its "great groves of cottonwoods." Perhaps its aesthetic appeal was why it was originally named The Garden of Allah, Arizona, when it was established in 1917. It later shortened to just "Allah.

The name most likely gained popularity in the American imagination from Robert Smythe Hichens’ hit novel The Garden of Allah published in 1904. It sold nearly a million copies and was eventually made into a play and three different Hollywood films.

Ordained Methodist minister George Wharton James (1858-1923), a contemporary of Hichens, was a prolific author with more than 40 publications to his name. He ostensibly appropriated Hichens’ book title several times for his own illustrative purposes about the American Southwest. “I breathed a sigh of content. I was going to the wonderland of God’s choice climate—Arizona—the real, modern, western, Garden of Allah,” wrote James in reference to traveling west to improve his health. Of the Arizona deserts he opined, “Have you felt the power of its profound solitudes, where you seemed naked in soul and mind before Allah, the Maker of Deserts,” and he described Phoenix as “the heart of the Garden of Allah—once a desolate, barren, heart-stricken waste, now one of the gardens of the world.

In fact, James had more than a passing knowledge of the word “Allah.” He was involved in interfaith relations, had Muslim friends, and even mentioned the Prophet Muhammad in his writings. Reflecting on his desire to be of “those whose every thought is to do some active good,” he included Muslims among his personal friends who were “dear to my heart, whom I love with true, pure fervor and who, I am assured, love me with an equal sincerity.” He explains his view as follows:
My business is to develop and live my own life, in harmony with my own beliefs, aims, and strivings, to the utmost, and seek the utmost good for my fellow. And in no way can I better do that than by aiding him to live his highest beliefs to the utmost, helping him in his strivings, make clearer to him the beauty of his own aims. Hence, even as I want all good men and true to bid me a hearty, an earnest, a sincere “God-speed!” in my own strivings, so do I, with all my heart, bid my many and diverse-believing, diverse-aiming friends God-speed in their endeavors.262

In an article discussing how the “environment affects mankind,”263 James even makes a direct reference to the Prophet Muhammad, reflecting on how “Mohamet spent long and weary months in the solitary places of the desert before he became the daring prophet of Allah.”264 Clearly this popular author and minister had a respect for Islam and Muslims and a creative proclivity for affectionate use of the word “Allah.”
The town of Elkader in Iowa is named after an Algerian Muslim freedom fighter, Abd El-Kader, who, as the Iowans rightly describe him today, was “a young Algerian hero who led his people in a resistance to French colonialism between 1830 and 1847.”

Timothy Davis (1794-1872), a lawyer, businessman and Republican Representative to the Thirty-fifth Congress (1857 - 1859), was instrumental in the settlement and development of Elkader, of which he had the “honor” of so naming it in 1846. According to one account:

At the time there was great excitement about the exploits of the Arabian chief, Abdel Kader, and being an admirer of that daring chief, Mr. Davis named this place Elkader. He was identified with its interests up to the time of his death. To him it was always the best place in the State.

The future congressman likely saw a lot of himself in El-Kader; Davis is said to have “lived a life of usefulness to himself and fellow men, and was an active worker for the development and prosperity of his country.” And like Abd El-Kader, he too was a freedom fighter, having “firmly and steadfastly defended the cause of freedom” when the “encroachments of the slave power rallied the Republican party of the North into existence” leading up to the American Civil War.
Abd El-Kader was a nineteenth-century Islamic scholar and military leader also well versed in theology, philosophy, horsemanship, and linguistics, to name a few. Already renowned as an Algerian Muslim freedom fighter, he skyrocketed to even more international acclaim in 1860 for saving thousands of Christian lives in Damascus. His humanitarian heroism won him recognition from some of the most influential people in the world, including Pope Leo IX, Queen Victoria, and U.S. President James Buchanan.

In the summer of 1860, fierce fighting broke out in Damascus between Christians and the Druze, a breakaway Muslim sect. Abd El-Kader risked his life to save thousands of Christians from mob violence, including giving refuge to as many as could fit within his own vast compound. At one point, he held off a threatening mob, throwing shame upon them for disgracing Islam. “Wretches!” he reportedly yelled at them, “is this the way you honour the Prophet? May his curse be upon you! Shame on you, shame!” He warned the mob, “Not a Christian will I give up. They are my brothers. Stand back, or I give my men the order to fire.”

Upon the death of Abd El-Kader, Iowa’s Elkader Register contained an obituary with this Muslim hero’s life and his significance to the town. The following is an excerpt:

The chief from whom the town derived its name, died last week in Damascus, in the seventy-second year of his age. Abd-El-Kader, Sheik-up-Islam (Sheik-ul-Islam), descendant of the prophet, Emir of Mascara, Sultan of Algeria, was born in Mascara, in 1807, and during his early years made pilgrimage to Mecca, and studied Arab philosophy in the schools of Egypt and Morocco.

One thing that becomes clear from this excerpt is that the residents of Elkader were well aware that their town was named after an Arabian hero from Africa who was a steadfast Muslim.
Muslim Imprint in the U.S. Armed Forces

In addition to names of cities and towns, the historic imprint of Muslims on the U.S. Armed forces is also an indelible part of American history. An example of this is the Mameluke Sword carried by Marine Corps officers only. It is the “oldest ceremonial weapon in use by United States forces today” and it has a historic connection to Islam and Muslims. This is of particular note because the symbols of the U.S. Marine Corps, including the swords they carry, are “steeped in history, purpose and pride,” representing the Corps’ “rich warfighting heritage” and “rich heritage as America's original defenders.” Here is the Marine Corps story behind the sword:

"Officers carry the Mameluke Sword, which was originally given to Lieutenant Presley O’Bannon in 1805 by a Mameluke chieftain in North Africa. Lt O’Bannon and his Marines marched across 600 miles of North African desert to rid the “shores of Tripoli” of pirates and rescue the kidnapped crew of the USS Philadelphia. By 1825, all Marine Officers carried the Mameluke sword in recognition of this historic battle—the Marine Corps' first on foreign soil."

This “historic battle,” known as the Battle of Derna, the Corps’ “first on foreign soil,” was fought with Muslims as allies. Though little known today, this fact was told in great detail to Congress and the American people in the months and years immediately following. (See section: Defending and Serving American Interests.) Additionally, the above-mentioned “chieftain,” a Muslim who gave the Mameluke sword to Lieutenant O’Bannon, trekked across the desert with him, leading hundreds of Muslims in the mission, fighting for American interests in battle. And the Mameluke sword, by name itself, carries a special significance for Muslims; it was a part of the distinct weaponry borne by an elite Muslim military class, called the Mamelukes, who had played a significant role in centuries of Islamic history.
Foreign Relations with, and the Influence of, Muslim Powers

A Sampling of Presidential Engagement with Muslims

So far we have seen the positive presence of Muslims and Islam among American slaves, and in the religious liberty debates during the framing of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and in the naming of American cities and towns, and the annals of U.S. military history, to name a few. Engagement with Muslims and Islam can also be seen throughout American presidential history.

Unbeknownst to some, many of our nation’s earliest presidents engaged Muslims directly on some of the most critical issues of the day, from slavery and emancipation to a détente between the United States and a Muslim power. We have already seen the impact that President Fillmore had on positive engagement with the Turkish government. Space limitations do not permit a complete presentation, however, let us take a brief look at some more compelling instances to represent the historic nature of the whole.

In 1777, Morocco became the first nation in the world to seek diplomatic relations with the United States and was the first of any Arab, African, or Muslim nation to enter into a treaty with the United States. Ten years later, the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between the United States and Morocco (1787) was signed by John Adams and Thomas Jefferson who had also helped draft it. (They later became the second and third presidents of the United States, respectively). To this day, it remains the longest unbroken treaty of its kind in U.S. history.

After our first president, George Washington, took office in 1789, one of his earliest orders of business was to strengthen America’s relationship with Morocco. In building a strong relationship with Morocco, President George Washington set a precedent for engagement with Muslim communities that is recognized and respected by American presidents even today.277 We have already discussed President Reagan’s respect for this legacy. President John F. Kennedy’s toast to the Moroccan King Hassan II during his 1963 visit to the White House is another example. The following is an excerpt:

The relationship between his country and ours goes back much further than most Americans realize. And I think his visit reminds us of a time when the United States was in great difficulties, great danger, great hazards with few friends and the first of those friends were his predecessor and ancestor, the Emperor of Morocco, who recognized the United States before others were willing to do so. . . George Washington sent to the Emperor of Morocco the American Constitution and in the letter which he sent accompanying it he said the following words, which I think still govern the policy of the United States towards His Majesty’s country. Washington wrote, “It gives me pleasure to have this opportunity of assuring Your Majesty that while I remain head of this nation I shall not cease to promote every measure that may contribute to the friendship and harmony which so happily subsist between your
George Washington, the president who was “first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen,” was also first in presidential engagement with Muslims.

Under President Washington’s administration, another historic treaty with Muslim powers, the 1797 Treaty of Peace and Friendship between the United States of America and the Bey and Subjects of Tripoli of Barbary, was negotiated, agreed upon, and translated. It was later signed by then-President John Adams, who issued a proclamation of the treaty with its unambiguous wording that America is not founded, “in any sense,” on the Christian religion and that there exists no pretext for religion-based disharmony between the two powers. Article 11 of the treaty reads:

As the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity, of Mussulmen; and, as the said States never entered into any war, or act of hostility against any Mahometan nation, it is declared by the parties, that no pretext, arising from religious opinions, shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.

The treaty, inclusive of Article 11 above, was read aloud to the Senate on May 29th, 1797, printed for review on May 30, 1797, and unanimously approved just a few days later on June 7, 1797. The terms of the treaty were published in full in the newspapers of the day. The president fully supported the implications of the treaty as can be seen in the following statement in his national proclamation of the treaty:

Now be it known, That I John Adams, President of the United States of America, having seen and considered the said Treaty do, by and with the advice consent of the Senate, accept, ratify, and confirm the same, and every clause and article thereof. And to the End that the said Treaty may be observed and performed with good Faith on the part of the United States, I have ordered the premises to be made public; And I do hereby enjoin and require all persons bearing office civil or military within the United States, and all others citizens or inhabitants thereof, faithfully to observe and fulfill the said Treaty and every clause and article thereof.

Article 11 plainly states two principles: 1) that the U.S. government is not founded on the Christian religion, and 2) that it does not harbor animosity toward Islam or Muslims. It is noteworthy that after the president signed and announced the treaty on June 10, 1797, and after it was publicized in the nation’s newspapers, there arose no outcry from the public, or any other sector, against Article 11.

We have already learned that, as a student, future president Thomas Jefferson studied the Qur’an and taught himself Arabic. We also know that he maintained a belief that Muslims, too, should have a place as full citizens in the American story and helped shape the legal documents that ensured this. As the third president of the United States, President Jefferson led the diplomatic efforts that successfully quelled the threat of eminent war with Tunis. The United States had just seen its first battle on foreign soil; the nation could have been drawn into further hostilities. In a move toward peace, the President hosted the first Muslim envoy to the
United States, a representative of His Highness the Bey of Tunis, at a White House dinner. Despite the tensions in the relationship, Jefferson’s daughter and granddaughter were in attendance. Astonishingly, the mealtime was set “precisely at sunset—it being in the midst of Ramadan,” indicating protocol that was knowledgeable and respectful of the Muslim fast during the days of the month called Ramadan. By the time the Muslim envoy departed from the United States a few months later, there existed a détente between the two powers. (The reader will recall that Senator John Quincy Adams was at the White House during the abovementioned dinner. Later, as the sixth president of the United States, he met with a Muslim again at the White House, though this time the guest was an ex-slave whose freedom he had helped secure.)

Early presidents appeared to be very open to positive engagement with Muslim powers and it greatly advanced American interests in many cases. In fact, America could not have advanced her commercial shipping and trade interests without many of the alliances that resulted from these ties. For example, according to President Andrew Jackson, in his eighth annual message to Congress (1836), a treaty with Muscat promised “great advantages to our enterprising merchants and navigators.” And according to President Martin Van Buren, in his first annual message to Congress (1837), it also gave the nation “reason to congratulate ourselves on the prospect of considerable commercial benefit.” Van Buren further reported that the nation had “received from the sultan of Muscat prompt evidence of his desire to cultivate the most friendly feelings, by liberal acts toward one of our vessels, bestowed in a manner so striking as to require on our part a grateful acknowledgment.”

President Buchanan 3 honored Abd El-Kader (See section: American President Honors Hero of Damascus) with “gratitude for his having protected the Christians of Damascus, including the American consul, during the late riots there.” The president sent “two Colt’s holster pistols, mounted with silver and beautifully ornamented with arabesque work, in a rosewood case, also silver mounted,” engraved with the message “From the President of the United States to his Excellency Said Abd-el-Kader, of Damascus.” Toward the end of his life, the New York Times ranked Abd El-Kader as “among the foremost of the few great men of the century.”

During the American Civil War, the administration of President Lincoln, sought to maintain positive relations with the Ottoman Empire and thereby thwart its cooperation with maritime piracy from the Confederate states that had become a threat to American commercial shipping and trade. The concern proved groundless; in the summer of 1861, only months after the start of the war, the “strongest assurances” were sent “on the part of the Ottoman government of its friendly sympathies” toward the Union and “its hopes” that the conflict “may be soon settled in such a manner as will preserve the Union intact.” The sultan of the empire also “expressed a warm interest in the future welfare and prosperity of the government of the United States” given that it had “received so many evidences of a sincere and disinterested friendship.”

The following summer, in July of 1862, President Lincoln proclaimed the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation Between the United States and the Ottoman Empire, signed in Constantinople in February of the same year. This treaty came at a particularly important time because it assured the “absolute and unconditional

---

3 Many historical accounts have Lincoln as the president that honored El-Kader. However, primary sources show this to be impossible given that Lincoln was actually running for president at the time and some newspapers of the day even carried mention of Buchanan lauding El-Kader on the same pages as coverage of Lincoln’s campaign.
prohibition of the entrance of privateers or any class of vessels into the ports and waters of the Ottoman dominions fitted out for the purpose of preying on the commerce of the United States of America.” One such vessel, the Confederate pirate ship the Sumter, had already engaged in “capturing, plundering, burning, and sinking merchant trade vessels of the United States” for nearly a year. Thus, this Muslim-led Ottoman Empire was a steadfast ally to Lincoln and the Union during the Civil War. It should be noted here that President Lincoln’s successor also had positive engagement with Muslims on the issue of slavery and the Civil War, but this time at the White House itself, as we will see.

The Influence of Islam and Muslim Views in the American Slavery Debate

A Muslim Plea to End Slavery in America

As the American Civil War raged during this critical period for America, there were other positive contacts between Muslim powers and the Lincoln Administration. One such example is the appeal that came from Tunis, “in the name of humanity” to end slavery in the United States. Both passionate and poignant, it was forwarded to Lincoln’s Secretary of State, William H. Seward, Sr. The letter was later published by the Department of State in its entirety, and it was included in executive documents published by order of the House of Representatives.

Amos Perry, the U.S. consul in Tunis forwarded the Tunisian letter to the secretary of state in December of 1864. The author of the letter, General Hussein, a major general and president of the Tunis Municipal Council, was described by Perry as “one of the most respected and worthy men in this regency.” The letter had been written in response to a direct inquiry from the American consul about the effects of slavery and its abolition on the Tunisian government and people since slavery had been abolished in the regency in 1846. The question of interest was “which the Tunisian government prefers as the basis of its social fabric, freedom or slavery.” In fact, thousands of Christian slaves were freed even earlier, in the course of just one day, in 1816, only seventeen years after an earlier U.S. consul, William Eaton (who we will hear much more about shortly), had lamented how white slaves in Tunis were treated better than black slaves in America. As it happens, slavery ended in Tunis before the practice came to an end in the United States.

In his accompanying letter to the missive from General Hussein, Consul Perry began by explaining to the secretary the rationale upon which the ruler of the regency had eradicated slavery:

"Ahmed Bey, then upon the throne, addressed a letter to the resident consuls, in which he employed language to this effect: ‘We are all fellow-creatures of God, and as such have no right to enslave each other. I have long felt that human slavery is cruel, and have exerted myself for its eradication, and have given orders to my governors and deputies in all my provinces that no human being be henceforth recognized as a slave.'"
This was not the first time the consul had informed the Department of State on the Tunisian position on the "cause of freedom, as opposed to slavery."\(^{302}\) In the regency, but as can be seen in Perry's words to the secretary of state, this time stood out as having more value for the American scene:

_I now have the honor to lay before the department a more full, elaborate and authoritative statement of Tunisian sentiment in regard to the great question that agitates our country...It explains slavery from the Moslem point of view, quoting from the Koran and its acknowledged expounders, and showing from what motives the proclamation for the abolition of slavery was finally issued._\(^{303}\)

The Muslim general had responded in detail to Perry’s request, outlining the history of slavery in Tunisia, the aftermath of its abolition, the guidance of the Qur’an, and even the example of the Prophet Muhammad on the matter. “Every slave ill-treated is free _ipso facto_,”\(^{304}\) was one of the things he quoted the Prophet Muhammad as saying. The general even detailed a post-slavery effort in Tunisia to get everyone on board with the new change:

_One of our distinguished writers and religious dignitaries, in a document issued to induce all those under his charge to comply with the requisitions of our late sovereign, employed the following language:_

("O, generous souls, hearts full of compassion, your law is on the side of liberty; holding men as slaves is a misfortune and a disgrace; but God, who is the author of our being, can change the order of things, making slaves masters and masters slaves.”\(^{305}\)

The consul assured the secretary of state that the general's response came “with the highest sanctions of the country, and the appeal which is made at the conclusion, to Americans, is but the utterance of a common sentiment in this region.”\(^{306}\) The following is the plea contained in the general’s letter:

_O, inhabitants of America, ye are like that nation of whom Omar Ben Elaas, the friend of our Prophet, on whom be the grace and blessing of God, said: “They are the most compassionate people in times of war and domestic trouble; the quickest to recover from misfortunes; repulsed, they return to the charge; to the poor, the orphans, and the feeble, they are most charitable; and against the tyranny of kings they are most valiant.” Such is the story of your character; and since God has permitted you to enjoy full personal liberty and to manage your civil and political affairs yourselves, while many other people are deprived of such distinguished privileges and blessings, it would not tarnish the lustre of your crown to grant to your slaves, as an act of gratitude for the favors God has bestowed on you, such civil rights as are not denied to the humblest and meanest of your citizens. You are too far advanced in civilization to imitate the example of those who, with bandaged eyes, ever turn in the same circle under the pretext of following in the footsteps of their fathers. Humanity invites you to eradicate from your Constitution all that can give countenance to the principle of slavery. Pity the slave. God loves the merciful among his worshippers. Be then ye merciful to those upon earth, that He who is in heaven may be merciful to you._\(^{307}\)

Recall that this letter, “from one of the most respected and worthy men in [the] regency,”\(^{308}\) reached Americans in the midst of a devastating civil war. General Hussein closed his letter with the following, “permit me to express my profoundest regrets for the war that afflicts and saddens your land, and my tenderest sympathies for the slaves there doomed to suffer.”\(^{309}\) According to Perry, the Tunisian appeal "drew forth
from the Hon. Charles Sumner," a legendary abolitionist senator and former Harvard law lecturer, “a very complimentary letter.”

The Honorable Senator Charles Sumner Influenced by Islam

Islam and Muslims had a direct impact on the legendary Charles Sumner’s thinking regarding slavery in the United States. Sumner had a distinguished career. He served as a U.S. senator (1851-1874) and for part of that time held the post of chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (1861-1871). He was a close advisor to President Lincoln, influencing the formulation of White House policy on ending slavery and on enfranchising former slaves. In an 1847 lecture before the Boston Mercantile Library Association, four years before becoming a U.S. senator, he spoke on “White Slavery in the Barbary States.” In his address, the future senator remarked on the comparatively better treatment of slaves held by Muslims. "The knife or branding-iron is not employed upon any human being to mark him as the property of his fellow-man," he noted. He also acknowledged that for Muslims, slavery was not a race-based “indelible mark of exclusion from power and influence” either for the slave or for his/her descendants. In fact, he pointed out, “It often happened that they arrived at eminent posts in the state.”

In more than one instance Sumner quoted from the Qur'an directly on the issue of slavery, even designating the references as “words worthy of adoption in the legislation of Christian countries.” He was also familiar with the history of Ali, a cousin of the Prophet Muhammad and one of the most highly revered Muslims in the history of Islam, and invoked an example of his character regarding treatment of slaves as well:

“And unto such of your slaves," says the Koran, in words worthy of adoption in the legislation of Christian countries, “as desire a written instrument, allowing them to redeem themselves on paying a certain sum, write one, if ye know good in them, and give them of the riches of God, which he hath given you.” Thus from the Koran, which ordains slavery, come lessons of benignity to the slave; and one of the most touching stories in Mahometanism is of the generosity of Ali, the companion of the Prophet, who, after fasting for three days, gave his whole provision to a captive not more famished than himself.

On June 4, 1860, Sumner spoke from the Senate floor on the “barbarism of slavery.” It was his first speech since returning to Congress after having been brutally caned and nearly killed in the Senate Chamber in 1856. The perpetrator was a South Carolina congressman upset with Sumner’s strong anti-slavery remarks in a previous address to the Senate. In his 1860 speech, Sumner cited Qur’anic injunctions, yet again, regarding just treatment and emancipation of slaves:

… under the mild injunctions of the Koran, a benignant servitude, unlike yours, has prevailed -- where the lash is not allowed to lacerate the back of a female; where no knife or branding-iron is employed upon any human being to mark him as the property of his fellow man; where the master is expressly enjoined to listen to the desires of his slave for emancipation; and where the blood of the master, mingling with his bond-woman, takes from her the transferable character of a chattel, and confers complete freedom upon their offspring.
Sumner’s speech appeared in full the next day in the New York Times which informed readers that the address “was listened to attentively by the Senate and most of the members of the House, who crowded in to hear him.”

The internationally influential Harriet Beecher Stowe, an abolitionist, prolific writer and famous author of Uncle Tom’s Cabin, later profiled Sumner’s life and quoted from his speech in her book The Lives and Deeds of Self Made Men. Josiah Quincy III—a former U.S. Representative from Massachusetts (Ninth through Twelfth Congresses 1805–1813), later mayor of Boston (1823–1828), and president of Harvard University (1829–1845)—considered the speech noble and informed Sumner that he rejoiced that the senator had “been permitted, thus truly, fully, and faithfully to expose the “Barbarism” of Slavery on that very floor on which you were so cruelly and brutally stricken down by the spirit of that Barbarism.” Wealthy abolitionist Thaddeus Hyatt, writing from a Washington jail on June 13, 1860, pledged to “supply the Clergy of the country, each man of them, with a copy of this, the great speech of the century.” He succeeded in publishing 40,000 copies of a “Clergy Edition” of the speech. It is remarkable that several years before arrival of the Tunisian missive pleading for an end to slavery in the United States, of which he had given “a very complimentary” response, Sumner had already been influenced by Islam’s injunctions regarding slavery, including examples of kind treatment of slaves, and its moral arc toward emancipation. Compellingly, this influential American statesman had made efforts to use these Islamic ideas to influence legislators and ordinary citizens before the start of the Civil War.

Abolition of Slavery in Tunisia and Its Influence on the American Psyche

The abolition of slavery in Muslim Tunisia happening before slavery ended in the United States had a profound impact on the American psyche. An editorial in the New York Evangelist at the time called it “one of the most extraordinary events in modern times”; “a most wonderful triumph of freedom”; and an “example for the United States”:

One of the most extraordinary events in modern times is the entire abolition of slavery by Ahmed Bey the Sovereign Prince of Tunis, throughout all his dominions. It is a noble fact, a most wonderful triumph of freedom. The thing is complete and entire, an absolute and immediate emancipation. And not only so, but the Prince has made a decree that hereafter no slave shall enter his territory, but that, the moment a captive sets foot on Tunisian soil, wherever he may be from, or whoever may be his master, he is FREE. If this be not an example for the United States to reflect upon and be moved by, we know not what event of the same nature could move us.

In a November 4, 1847, address before the Female Anti-Slavery Society of Salem, William Wells Brown, “one of the most active abolitionist lecturers” of the nineteenth century, anguished over the idea that “Christian” America might be the last in the world to end slavery, even after the Muslims:

Even the Bey of Tunis...has decreed that there shall not be a Slave in his dominions...But Christian, democratic, republican America is doing nothing at all. It seems as though she would be the last. It seems as though she was determined to be the last to knock the chain from the limbs of the Slave.
These words from Brown are compelling because he himself was once a fugitive slave who came to be considered “the most widely published, broadly pioneering African American writer of his century.”

Regarding slavery and the intra-national slave trading in the Washington, D.C., Congressman Horace Mann of Massachusetts declared on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 23, 1849: “The Bey of Tunis, acting under the light of Mahometan religion, has abolished it. The priests of Persia declare the sentiment to have come by tradition from Mahomet himself, “that the worst of men is the seller of men.” Horace Mann, the first Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, was first elected to Congress to fill the seat left by the death of former President John Quincy Adams in the Thirtieth Congress and reelected to serve in Thirty-first Congress and Thirty-second Congress (1848 – 1853). In another speech delivered in the House of Representatives, on February 15, 1850, on the “subject of slavery in the territories, and the consequences of a dissolution of the Union,” Mann proclaimed, “Tunis, a Barbary state, and, I might add, a barbarous state, has abolished slavery. Mohammedanism precedes Christianity, and sets [for] it an example of virtue.” Long before Tunisians sought to directly influence America’s position on slavery, American statesmen were already influenced by the example set by these Muslims, in the name of Islam, and did not shy from sharing it, even on the floor of the House and the Senate.

The Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution adopted on December 6, 1865, officially outlawed slavery. On December 18, 1865, Secretary of State Seward proclaimed it to the nation. This was the same Seward who had survived a brutal assassination attempt on his life in April of that year, just a few days after the end of the Civil War. President Lincoln was also attacked on that same day, but he would die of his wounds the next day.

An Anti-Slavery Muslim in the White House

On October 30, 1865, one and a half months before the Thirteenth Amendment had been adopted, Secretary of State Seward accompanied a special representative of His Highness the Bey of Tunis to the White House to meet with President Andrew Johnson. (Johnson, who had been President Lincoln’s vice-president, succeeded him to the presidency after the assassination.) The representative, Tunisian Ambassador General Otman Hashem, had travelled 5000 miles, not an easy journey (as sympathized with by the Americans) in those days before airplanes, to express the Tunisian people’s condolences on the tragic death of President Lincoln and to commend the end of America’s Civil War. He bore an official letter from the Bey for former First Lady Mary Todd Lincoln in which the ruler spoke of the widow as “the lady for whom we pray God that He would save her from trial and affliction and protect her from dangers and sorrows, both by day and by night.”

There was also an official letter for President Johnson from the Bey and a “full sized portrait” of the Muslim head of the regency as a gift of friendship between the United States and the Muslim power. The painting was later on display at the Department of State where it remained until at least the year 1891.

In the Blue Room of the White House that day, the general informed the president of the Bey’s condolences “for the tragic end of the illustrious man, Abraham Lincoln, whose death justly excited national grief, and exceedingly affected His Highness.” Regarding the end of the American Civil War, the general said, “He has sent me to appear in your presence for the purpose of expressing to your Excellency and to your people the great pleasure which he experienced on the cessation of your calamitous war, and on the restoration of peace and tranquility in your great country.” President Johnson, who appeared to be well aware of the Tunisian
sentiment on slavery, including the views of General Hashem (and most likely that of General Hussein, the author of the appeal to end slavery sent during Lincoln’s presidency), responded in part:

    You are favorably known to us as a soldier and a scholar, and, above all, as a statesman devoted to the extinction of slavery. You will be able to report to His Highness the Bey that the American nation are trying a humanitarian experiment. It is nothing less than this: Whether a people can save liberty and at the same time govern itself.”

It is not known what policy-changing impact, if any, the Tunisian appeal against slavery in the United States had on the issue of ending slavery in our nation, or on how the freedmen should be treated thereafter. But one thing is clear, the Tunisians’ clarion call to freedom, “in the name of humanity,” had been heard in the highest office in the land.

General Hashem traveled to a number of states during his visit, meeting with government members, local leaders, and ordinary citizens; the press covered his visit extensively. This was reportedly the first time since 1805 that an official representative from the Tunisian government had come to America. The last time had been during tensions and impending war between the two powers; this time, from the start, it was in the interest of peace and friendship.
Defending and Serving American Interests

From the colonial period right to today, Muslims have risked life and limb to defend and serve America and her interests. Historical records reveal Muslim veterans as early as the American Revolutionary War. Muslims on foreign soil also came to the aid of American interests, such as the Ottoman Empire’s support of the Union during the American Civil War and the critical role hundreds of Muslims abroad, from Egypt to Tripoli, played in helping America to attain victory in the nation’s first battle on foreign soil.

The Battle of Derna

Let us take a closer look at the 1805 Battle of Derna, America’s first battle on foreign soil. The battle is famously immortalized in the Marines’ Hymn with the words “to the shores of Tripoli.” The United States Marine Corps describe the events thusly:

In 1805, the United States government refused to continue paying Barbary Coast pirates to refrain from raiding American merchant ships. When negotiations for a treaty failed, President Thomas Jefferson assembled an expeditionary force of Marines to respond. Lieutenant Presley O’Bannon and his Marines marched across 600 miles of the Libyan Desert to successfully storm the fortified Tripolitan city of Derna and rescue the kidnapped crew of the USS Philadelphia. The Marines’ victory helped Prince Hamet Bey reclaim his rightful throne as ruler of Tripoli. In gratitude, he presented his Mameluke sword to Lt O’Bannon. The Battle of Derna was the Marines’s first land battle on foreign soil and is notably recalled in the first verse of the Marines’ Hymn: “From the Halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli, we fight our country’s battles in the air, on land and sea.”

What is missing in the above-quoted version is that “Lieutenant Presley O’Bannon and his Marines,” numbering less than a dozen, were alone in neither their journey nor their battle. General William Eaton, former U.S. consul to Tunis, led the mission. He could be best described, at the time, as a “Navy Agent for the several Barbary Regencies.” The reader will recall that Eaton had spoken about the disparate treatment of slaves in America versus Tunis earlier in 1799. Lieutenant O’Bannon, who maintains legendary hero status to this very day, had once reportedly said of Eaton, “Wherever General Eaton leads, we will follow. If he wants us to march to hell, we’ll gladly go there. General Eaton overcomes every obstacle. He is the great military genius of our era.”

It is General Eaton who marched the Marines across 600 miles of Libyan Desert in partnership with the Muslim leader Ahmad Qaramanli (aka Hamet Bey, the ex-Bashaw) and assisted by several hundred other Muslims. Though it was a difficult trek, with problems arising from fatigue, famine, and issues of mistrust, the fact remains that the Americans could not have survived the journey without the aid of the Muslims who traveled with them from the outset, beginning in Egypt. These details can be found in General Eaton’s diary, still a primary source accounting of this battle. As described in the above-quoted paragraph, the mission included freeing the American crew of the USS Philadelphia and restoring Ahmad to his rightful place as
leader of the regency. Victory in the ground battle in Derna was not only possible because of Muslims soldiering alongside Christian Americans and others, but also because of Muslims that helped them all along the way on the trek through the desert. Upon victory, Ahmad Qaramanli lost the throne shortly after he had regained it, but Eaton remained his lifelong friend and fought to make sure that his Muslim “friend and brother” was not slighted in terms of promises made to him by the Americans, especially since a treaty with Tripoli, in the best interest of the United States, was obtained as a result of the mission.

In the interest of his friend Ahmad Qaramanli, Eaton wrote to “the Honorable Secretary of the Navy of the United States” on August 9, 1805, requesting an inquiry into what he saw as injustices towards those who had sacrificed for the United States. He also expressed his frustration that promises, which he believed he had been given the authority to make to the now displaced Muslim ruler, had not been honored. An excerpt:

When peace was finally resolved upon, what were the provisions made for the brave men who had fought our battles in the enemy’s country, and who had contributed in rendering this moment propitious to such an event? — Supplies, indeed, are sent out for the Christians under my command; but the alternative left me to perish with the Mahometans under my command or desert them to their solitary fate and abandon my post like a coward!

This is the first instance I ever heard of a religious test being required to entitle a soldier to his rations; and the only one of an ally being devoted [i.e. doomed] to destruction with so little necessity and with so much cool blood.

Importantly, in his letter, Eaton refers to the Muslim allies as being among the “brave men who had fought our battles” and as having contributed to the success of the mission; and he makes clear that the United States should not discriminate against them on account of their faith.

In a December 5th, 1805, letter to the Secretary of the Navy, Eaton relates how he and the legendary O’Bannon had been willing to die with their Muslim comrade rather than leave him behind. An excerpt:

On entering the ground of war with Hamet Bashaw, Mr. O’Bannon and myself united in a resolution to perish with him before the walls of Tripoli, or triumph with him within those walls. In the former event we should have acquitted our duty; in the latter glorified our country.

Eaton makes clear how this act “to save the honour and the interests of the United States” would have been a satisfaction of their “duty” had it come to pass.

In a November 3rd, 1807, letter to “the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled,” Eaton expounds on his frustration regarding those left behind, including those Muslim soldiers who fought side by side with American soldiers. He felt strongly that Congress should be fully informed about what had occurred. An excerpt:

It is remarkable, for it is an incontestable truth, that, whether the claims of the ex-Bashaw, go to the justice or the generosity of the United States, the use which was made of his services contributed much, if not wholly influenced the overtures of peace on the part of the ruling Bashaw… It ought not be concealed from Congress also, that there at Malta and elsewhere sundry foreigners, Frenchmen, Greeks, and Mahometans, whose wounds received in service of the United Sates in the province of Derne [sic]
render them incapable of acquiring a subsistence, and to whose cases no provisions made by law can be extended.346

Here again, Eaton reiterates that Ahmad Qaramanli, the ex-Bashaw, had served the interests of the United States; and he goes a bit further to make the case that peace might not have even been possible without him.

It should be made clear that Eaton was a man of his time; in fact, parts of his personal diary contain pejorative references about Islam and Muslims. But it seems that his views were evolving in many ways as evidenced by his, aforementioned, growing opposition to and shame about slavery in the United States. It is also known that he developed a brotherly affection for Ahmad that turned into a lifelong friendship and a willingness to fight for his Muslim friend all the way to the Secretary of the Navy and the U.S. Congress. He even provided for Ahmad out of his own finances as he waited for the United States to come to the Muslim’s aid.347

In understanding the contribution of Muslims to what is America, it is important to point out that the famous Mameluke sword, “the oldest ceremonial weapon in use by United States forces today,”348 was given by a Muslim who had “sacrificed all” his “means” and “exposed” his “life in the service of the United States.”349 Accordingly, this symbol of the Marines, which originates from weaponry of distinct Muslim military heritage, might be seen as a symbol of the possibilities for brotherhood with Muslims not just to “the shores of Tripoli” but, also, for “brotherhood from sea to shining sea.”350

The War of 1812

Not many people know that during the War of 1812 (1812-1815), also known as the Second War of Independence, Muslim slaves stood ready to fight to protect American interests even though they had been denied basic freedom themselves. This included the slaves Salih Bilali and Bilali Muhammad.351 In the following account, Thomas Spalding’s grandson reveals just how much faith and trust his grandfather had in the leadership of Bilali Muhammad, and his other slaves, to help fend off the enemy, many of whom, according to the grandson’s own account, were devout Muslims.352 Spalding writes of his grandfather:

He had every confidence in their loyalty, so much so that, in 1813, when a British fleet lay off Sapelo Island he applied to the Governor for arms and received 80 muskets, with which he armed and drilled his negro men, saying that from the want of depth of water, only a boat attack could be carried out and that if that was attempted “he and Bu-Allah [his slave foreman] would make a good account of them.” No landing was made on Sapelo Island, though on St. Simon’s almost constant attacks, with great losses of property, were suffered.353

Spalding had armed and trained his slaves to fight for America’s second independence, so to speak, even while they remained slaves themselves. To fully grasp the significance of this trust, it must be understood that it was not deemed acceptable by many during that time to arm any black person, enslaved or free. In fact, later, Georgia even enacted a law in 1833 that declared, “it shall not be lawful for any free person of colour in this state, to own, use, or carry fire arms of any description whatever.”354 Punishment included arrest, thirty-nine lashes on the offender’s “bare back,” and confiscation and sale of the arms in question.355
The American Revolutionary War and the Civil War

In addition to the War of 1812, men with names most commonly held by Muslims, including, and in particular, “Muhammad,” served in the American Revolutionary War and the Civil War. Unfortunately, not much more is known about these men other than their names. For example, a quick search in the *Civil War Soldiers and Sailors System* computerized database alone reveals at least two people with the name “Mahomet,” two with “Hasan,” 58 with “Hassan,” three with “Rahman,” 17 with “Said,” and three with “Ali.” Presumably, a more thorough search, especially of variant spellings, will uncover more Muslim participants in these early records. The National Archives, for example, contains records for 6.3 million soldiers. In 2000, the author of this report discovered the 224-page autobiography of Nicholas Said (Mohammed Ali Ben Said) an Arabic speaking, multilingual, black African of Muslim heritage who served in the Civil War and started schools for black children in the South during Reconstruction. Until this discovery, no known scholar in any field was aware of the book originally published in 1873, although quite a few had written about him based on the little information that was available.
The Basis of Our Protection of Religious Freedom in Context

Critics point to common refrains about Islam and Muslims in early America, such as the charge that the Prophet Muhammad is a “false prophet,” to make their case that there was never meant to be a place for the faith and its adherents in this nation. To be sure, Islam-critical positions were shared by some who were otherwise strong proponents of freedom of conscience. However, being a champion of religious liberty does not require an acceptance of religious beliefs that differ from one’s own, nor should it. One need only look at the Founding Father known as “the First American” for a good example of this. Recall how Benjamin Franklin shared with the president of Yale that he had always respected others’ “religious sentiments,” including things that seemed to him “insupportable and even absurd,” and that he wanted “to go out of the World in Peace with them all.”

Still, it is critical to look at anti-Islamic statements in the early American historical record within their historical context. Intemperate rhetoric aimed at particular religious beliefs was not just limited to Islam. In an exchange between former Presidents Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, Jefferson, a religious freedom pioneer, made statements about Jesus’ birth and parentage that would greatly offend many Christians today. Colonial America’s Roger Williams, one of the most celebrated and passionate champions of religious liberty for all, was unstintingly critical of any faith he considered “anti-Christian,” but, at the same time, held the view that “forced worship stinks in God’s nostrils.” He once even spoke of a day when one might see “the Pope and Mahomet . . . flung into the Lake that burns with Fire and Brimstone.” For him, this is a day when “true” Christianity might prevail as a religion for all. While he believed it was “the will and command of God” that “the most Paganish, Jewish, Turkish [i.e., Muslim] or anti-Christian consciences and worship be granted to all men, in all nations and countries,” he also believed that their faiths should be “fought against” but “only...with that sword which is only, in Soul matters able to conquer, to wit; the sword of the Spirit—the Word of God.” That is to say, every religion that did not fit into his definition of Christian was open to attack in order to win converts as long as it was with words only and “the Word of God” specifically. While this view may seem intolerant today, it was, by far, ahead of its time when it came to promoting freedom of conscience for all. Suffice it to say that some of America’s earliest and most brilliant thinkers on liberty were staunch advocates of freedom of conscience, regardless of what they may have personally thought about other religions, or their own.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights within allow for all of these opinions while firmly protecting all people of faith and no faith in America. While there existed dissenters among key figures in the making of America who preferred government establishment of religion, or religious freedom limited to a chosen few, their positions did not prevail in becoming the supreme law of the land. Of those people whose views successfully formed the basis, support and early promotion of America’s religious freedoms, not only did they not allow their personal beliefs to prevent them from advocating for the public good with regard to religious liberty for all, they also included, in their considerations, those who did not yet have a representative seat at the table. These proponents of religious freedom, among whom were Founding Fathers, first presidents, and religious leaders, spoke often of Jews, Muslims, Catholics, pagans, and people of no faith. The Baptist John Leland, who
had fought hard for a bill of rights that fully protected freedom of conscience, once referred to “the number of Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans” in the United States as being “so small,” yet he never saw that as a reason to deny them equal and complete liberty as well.

It is important to note here that in the early years, after the nation’s founding, protections of American liberties held strong even when there was tension abroad. For example, after wars with Muslim powers there was no abdication of the rights of American Muslims of the future. Accordingly, we can let neither Islamophobia nor anti-Americanism win the day now, instead let us focus on inspiring true stories of building bridges across seemingly intractable religious and cultural divides. After all, President Jefferson led the nation through conflicts with Muslim powers; and yet he still broke bread with Muslims at the White House during these tensions—with even his daughter and granddaughter at the table.

Even among those who leaned toward, or thoroughly embraced, Christian-oriented, government establishment of religion, there were some connections made with Islam and Muslims that revealed willingness for peaceful coexistence. Two such examples include a member of one of America’s most influential religious families and a Founding Father. Cotton Mather—a prominent New England Puritan, from the colonial period, whose father was the seventh president of Harvard (1685-1692) and whose family helped found Yale College (now Yale University), of which Cotton chose the name—saw a respect for the “common good” as something he could inherently connect with Muslims on as a moral virtue. Though, clearly not a fan of Islam as a belief system, hence, for example, the “you must excuse me” in the quote that follows, he was well known to quote the Qur’an in a positive manner on occasion. In reference to his book titled Essays to do good, he proclaimed:

> Yea, you must excuse me if I say, the Mahometan also shall condemn the man who comes not into the principles of this book; for I think it occurs no less than three times in the Koran, “God loves those that are inclined to do good.”

Founding Father Dr. Benjamin Rush, who was a signatory of the Declaration of Independence, Surgeon General in the Continental Army and “father of public schools,” felt that a belief in “the attributes of the Deity” and a belief in “a future state of rewards and punishments” were views that Christians and Muslims shared. In his “Thoughts Upon the Mode of Education Proper in a Republic,” an address to the legislature and citizens of the state of Pennsylvania in 1786, he made clear that the religion he recommended “in this place is the religion of Jesus Christ,” but cited the teachings of Prophet Muhammad as among those he would rather see “inculcated upon our youth than see them grow up wholly devoid of a system of religious principles.”
Conclusion

“To me, the vision of the Founding Fathers is the vision that we have in Islam.”


Michael Chertoff, the son and grandson of rabbis, whose posts included Secretary of Homeland Security, judge for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and assistant Attorney General, believes “there will no doubt come a time that we’ll have a Muslim president.” His belief in this is based on the understanding that the citizens of the United States will one day connect with the candidate, not because of a shared faith tradition but, rather, because of shared ideals—the “ideals of freedom and toleration” which they have in common as compatriots traceable all the way back to America’s beginnings.

Over 220 years ago, Samuel Johnston, the sixth governor of North Carolina, expressed a similar sentiment, albeit rather cynically and abrasively given he was a man of his time. Johnston, who was later to become a U.S. senator to the First Congress, presided over the North Carolina ratifying convention for the U.S. Constitution in the summer of 1788. He sought to allay fears in North Carolina that, in the absence of a religious test mandated in the U.S. Federal Constitution, a Muslim, Jew, Catholic, or some other religious “sect” the delegates did not approve of, might one day become president of the United States. In his response to these fears, the governor, in a nod toward tolerance, stated that “[t]rue religion is derived from a much higher source than human laws” and warned that “no good consequences” could follow a government’s attempt “to restrain men’s consciences.” He told the delegates that non-Christians could only be elected to the Office of the President in two cases. One option was if Americans “lay aside the Christian religion altogether” and the other option was if the person “should, notwithstanding their religion, acquire the confidence and esteem of the people of America by their good conduct and practice of virtue.” Following are his words in full to give the reader a better understanding of the context:

I read the Constitution over and over, but could not see one cause of apprehension or jealousy on this subject. When I heard there were apprehensions that the pope of Rome could be the President of the United States, I was greatly astonished. It might as well be said that the king of England or France, or the Grand Turk, could be chosen to that office. It would have been as good an argument. It appears to me that it would have been dangerous, if Congress could intermeddle with the subject of religion. True religion is derived from a much higher source than human laws. When any attempt is made, by any government, to restrain men’s consciences, no good consequence can possibly follow. It is apprehended that Jews, Mahometans, pagans, &c., may be elected to high offices under the government of the United States. Those who are Mahometans, or any others who are not professors of the Christian religion, can never be elected to the office of President, or other high office, but in one of two cases. First, if the people of America lay aside the Christian religion altogether, it may happen. Should this unfortunately take place, the people will choose such men as think as they do themselves. Another case is, if any persons of such descriptions should, notwithstanding their religion, acquire the confidence and esteem of the people of America by their good conduct and practice of virtue, they may be chosen. I leave it to gentlemen’s candor to judge what probability there is of the people’s choosing men of different sentiments from themselves.
In the end, Governor Johnston left the *probability* to the present and the *possibility* to the future. And, in doing so, he unwittingly ends up on the right side of history in this matter. Like Chertoff, he envisioned judging future candidates on their character and shared ideals and not their religious beliefs. As American Jews, Chertoff and his fellow co-religionists would have been among those religious groups excluded if fears like that of North Carolinian delegates had prevailed. But they did not. The required ratification by nine states had already taken place by the time of the North Carolina convention; and Governor Johnston’s state, too, finally ratified the Constitution a year later on November 21, 1789.

In the years following the ratification of the Federal Constitution, three of the most famous Founding Fathers, comprising the first, second, and third presidents of the United States, repeatedly articulated their positions on religious freedom and engagement with people of different faiths in a manner that is just as relevant today. In 1790, President Washington assured the Jews of the Hebrew Congregation at Newport that, in America, “every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid.” In 1797, President Adams signed a treaty with Tripoli proclaiming to the nation that the “government of the United States of America ... has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility” of Muslims. In 1802, President Jefferson assured the Baptists in Connecticut that “religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship.” And even in the last years of his life, long after the nation had gone to battle with Muslim powers in the First and Second Barbary Wars, Jefferson had, post-presidency, proudly cited Muslims among those meant to be covered “within the mantle” of his landmark bill that became the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

These key Founding Fathers, and others, established a precedent and a path for peaceful coexistence of all creeds. It remains to present and future generations to preserve the protections these pioneers worked hard to ensure. “We are the descendants of the early Americans ... because we have embraced their spirit,” explains Chertoff in Akbar Ahmed’s *Journey into America: The Challenge of Islam*. The spirit he speaks of is based on the aforementioned shared ideals of freedom and tolerance. Imam Warith Deen Mohammed—referred to as “America’s Imam” in one press account when he passed away in 2008—alluded to this spirit in a 1998 *U.S. News & World Report* interview: “To me, the vision of the Founding Fathers is the vision that we have in Islam.”

President Clinton articulated this spirit in his September 21, 1998, remarks to the 53rd United Nations General Assembly when he spoke of coming together around “common values, common interests, and common endeavors.” The 42nd President of the United States said:

> As I talked to Muslim leaders in my country and around the world, I see again that we share the same hopes and aspirations: to live in peace and security, to provide for our children, to follow the faith of our choosing, to build a better life than our parents knew and pass on brighter possibilities to our own children. Of course, we are not identical. There are important differences that cross race and culture and religion which demand understanding and deserve respect.

> But every river has a crossing place. Even as we struggle here in America, like the United Nations, to reconcile all Americans to each other and to find greater unity in our increasing diversity, we will remain on a course of friendship and respect for the Muslim world. We will continue to look for common values, common interests, and common endeavors. I agree very much with the spirit expressed
by these words of Mohammed: “Rewards for prayers by people assembled together are twice those said at home.”

President Clinton was following the example of George Washington, who, as the first president of the United States, wrote a congenial letter to the Emperor of Morocco with the following promise: “while I remain head of this nation I shall not cease to promote every measure that may contribute to the friendship and harmony which so happily subsist between your Empire and this Republic.” This is where we find ourselves today, in the footsteps of the Founding Fathers.
Imam W.D. Mohammed (pictured above), a black American descendant of slaves in the United States, was the leader of the largest single constituency of American Muslims. His grandfather, a Baptist lay preacher, was born in 1868, the same year that an amendment to the Constitution nullified the Supreme Court decision that slaves and their descendants could never be citizens, and just three years after passage of a constitutional amendment outlawing slavery at the end of the American Civil War. This was a time before black men were guaranteed the right to vote. Mohammed’s father, known as the Honorable Elijah Muhammad, founder of the Nation of Islam (NOI), was born in 1897, one year after a landmark Supreme Court case upheld that racial segregation in the United States of America was constitutionally legal. Imam Mohammed was born in 1933 in an America where state and local laws defined a separate legal status for black Americans in some parts of the country. These legally sanctioned segregation practices would not end until 1965. His father’s NOI had successfully provided solutions for maintaining a dignified, productive life in the face of these kinds of racial injustices. By 1975, Imam Mohammed, building on his father’s legacy, began effectively transitioning the large religious group into a mainstream orthodox community of American Muslims.

In 1993, Imam Mohammed spoke at the inaugural interfaith prayer service for then president-elect William Jefferson Clinton. The nationally televised event marked the first time in the nation’s history that a Muslim played an active and formal role in presidential inaugural events. The Muslim leader began his address with the following words calling for universal brotherhood: “Our prophet said, he saw in a vision, the followers of
Moses, the followers of Christ Jesus, and his followers, peace be upon the prophets, in heaven, in paradise.”

President Clinton invited the imam to speak again during his 1997 inaugural prayer service, marking only the second time in U.S. history that such an honor had been bestowed upon a Muslim.

Imam Mohammed had a history of promoting the proactive view that American Muslims should have a “love-it-and-make-it-better” commitment to the United States as American citizens. In 1976, the imam flew an American flag over the community’s largest national gathering for the first time. He was among a group of Muslim leaders who met with President Carter at the White House in 1979. It was, presumably, the first meeting of its kind of a U.S. president with American Muslims in the White House. In his 1988 remarks, at the First Liberty Summit, as one of the 100 national signers of the Williamsburg Charter, in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of Virginia’s call for a Bill of Rights, Mohammed asserted:

Precious souls of Americans from the past and you who are gathered here, I greet you as Muslims greet each other, “Peace be unto you.” The following is given as an expression of Muslims’ deep-seated support of the freedom of religion.

The Founding Fathers’ classic treatment of man’s worth, and American law in its Constitutional role of championing the safety of man’s common and vital life and liberty, are no doubt concerns held in sacred regard by the international community of Muslims. Moreover, that our holy book, the Koran, and our Prophet, peace be upon him, Muhammad, represent for Muslims the living and enduring sources of our support for freedom of religion, is common knowledge with Muslims of all nationalities.

Therefore, it is in the spirit of man’s historical, classic and universal attention to human life and freedom of religion that we humbly join the Williamsburg Charter Foundation reaffirmation ceremony. With the many races and religions of America, we cherish for all others, as we do for ourselves, the first liberty. Other signers included two former U.S. presidents, a chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and Civil Rights activist Coretta Scott King, widow of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

In 1992, the same year that Imam Mohammed became the first Muslim to ever give an invocation during an opening session of the United States Senate, he also became the first Muslim to ever have the opportunity to deliver an address from the floor of the Georgia State Legislature—in the same state where his father was born to a Baptist preacher. This is the same state whose founder is believed to have initially banned slavery there due to his exposure to the plight of an enslaved Muslim, the African-born Job Ben Solomon. This is the same state where slavery became inescapable for Bilali Muhammad who could read and write in Arabic, who remained a life-long devout Muslim, and who stood ready, with his master and other Muslims to defend American interests during the War of 1812, and who left behind an Arabic manuscript that is still being studied by scholars today. In the state of Georgia today lives one of Bilali’s descendants who, though a Christian, is proud of her Muslim heritage and proclaims that attempting to ignore it would be like the “chopping of an arm.” Indeed, for America, too, to ignore its unique Muslim heritage would be akin to the “chopping of an arm.” The history of Islam and Muslims in America is a part of the body of America’s rich historical record. It is a part of what makes America beautiful, and it is inextricably intertwined with the rest of America’s historical fabric. This is where we find ourselves today.
Congressman Keith Ellison, elected as a Democrat to the One Hundred Tenth Congress and to the three succeeding Congresses and the first Muslim congressman in the history of the United States, faced tremendous anti-Islamic sentiment when he first ran for Congress. (He used Jefferson’s nearly 250-year-old Qur’an on the day he was sworn in as a Member.) He proudly identifies himself as a student of Imam W.D. Mohammed. When the imam passed away in 2008, the congressman shared a story with the American public about the man who had been called “America’s imam.” He told NPR’s host Tony Cox:

He really is a person who is calm and is a very thoughtful man. So when he said something, it was a high quality message, it wasn’t simply something to appeal to emotion and sensibility. And, you know, one of the things that I don’t mind sharing with you that he said to me is that, you know, you have to remain calm and steady despite all the tumult that may come your way. And you can not feel sorry for yourself and cannot focus on who did what to you, or who said what, but have to focus on the broader mission of really elevating humanity.400

Benjamin Franklin wanted to elevate humanity when he petitioned Congress to abolish America’s role in the international slave trade. Jefferson wanted to elevate humanity when he talked about the inalienable rights of man in the Declaration of Independence. John Quincy Adams wanted to elevate humanity when he called on that same document, over and over again, in defense of the Amistad captives, until the “judges wept” in the reality of it all. William Eaton wanted to elevate humanity when he wrote to the Secretary of the Navy of the United States of America and, on behalf of the those who served as allies under his command on the shores of Tripoli, emphatically stated: “This is the first instance I ever heard of a religious test being required to entitle a soldier to his rations”—and in all these stories is a Muslim connection as we have learned.

There is a proverb that says, “Tell the truth and shame the devil” meaning tell the truth even when you are tempted not to do so. There is nothing to hide here. There is no shame in having a rich, diverse history. There is no reason to chop of a whole arm of our history as Americans as if it never existed. This history is not told to hold one group higher than another. There are no bragging rights to be had here, only a call to action.

The people, places, events, and documents covered are but a few selected moments from a much larger rich history—the depth of which we have only begun to uncover. “Decades of research and scores of researchers will be required before we know as much about the history of Muslims in the United States as we now do about the history of Jews, Catholics, or members of any Protestant denomination in this country,” says the author of A History of Islam in America: From the New World to the New World Order.401 Still the meaning of what we do know remains true for all of America’s great heritage: That is, America’s true exceptionalism lies in the beauty of its people constantly perfecting their ability to unite as a people, and to be open to welcoming others as a people, “in order to form a more perfect union.” As such, this is really not a story about Islam and Muslims at all, but instead one of our common humanity and our struggle for meaning and purpose as human beings. That is why, in looking at this one particular aspect of American history, it was possible for the story to reach so far in depth and breadth—all with a connection to America’s unique Muslim heritage only because we are all connected as human beings and do not exist in a vacuum.

The moral of this story remains. The call to action is clear. In the words of a Baptist preacher’s grandson who would one day stand before an incoming president of the United States of America and represent the beauty of Islam and Muslims to the world and go on to advise, spiritually, the first Muslim congressman in the history of the United States: Elevate humanity.
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