



AN  
EXPOSITION  
OF  
DIFFICULTIES IN WEST BROOKFIELD,  
CONNECTED WITH  
ANTI-SLAVERY OPERATIONS.





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2011 with funding from  
Associates of the Boston Public Library / The Boston Foundation

AN  
EXPOSITION OF  
DIFFICULTIES IN WEST BROOKFIELD,  
CONNECTED WITH  
ANTI-SLAVERY OPERATIONS,  
TOGETHER WITH A  
REPLY TO SOME STATEMENTS IN A PAMPHLET PUT FORTH BY  
"MOSES CHASE, PASTOR OF THE CHURCH,"  
PURPORTING TO BE A  
"STATEMENT OF FACTS IN THE CASE OF DEACON HENSHAW."

---

BY THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE W. B. ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY

---



WEST BROOKFIELD, MASS.  
PUBLISHED BY THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.  
1844.  
O. S. COOKE, PRINTER.

O. S. COOKE, PRINTER.

O. S. COOKE, PRINTER.

## EXPOSITION OF DIFFICULTIES.

AT the last monthly meeting of our society, it was voted, that the Board of Managers be requested to take into consideration the propriety of making some reply to a pamphlet recently published by Rev. Moses Chase concerning the action of the Church in this place in the case of Dea. Henshaw, and also to make such other statements concerning the doings of our Society, and matters connected therewith as shall enable the community to judge understandingly, of the merits of the Anti-slavery controversy, as demonstrated by occurrences for the last few years in our midst.

The Board deem it their duty to make an effort to gather up the history of the past, and make it subservient to the advancement of truth and righteousness for the future.

It is however with a degree of reluctance that we enter upon this duty, well knowing that faithfulness will require of us, to disregard in some measure, the reputation and good will of individuals, and jeopardize our own credit for veracity;—and even to encroach upon forbidden ground by bringing up to review the transactions of some who sleep, and of others of whom it may be said, that their places here shall be known no more forever.

In order to a more correct understanding of the whole subject, we will commence with the organization of our Society, which took place in July 1837.—A few individuals having become interested in the subject of the abolition of slavery, proposed a meeting for the formation of an Anti-slavery Society, at which meeting a Constitution was proposed and adopted by twenty-two male members, all legal voters in state affairs—all but three, members of the Church in this place, in in good and regular standing—and mosily all of them men of mature years.

The Constitution is unexceptionable in its principles and its phraseology, excepting to slave-holders and the advocates of slavery.—It abjures resort to violence, or physical force, to accomplish its ends, and binds its members to a faithful discharge of their duties to mankind and to God, and to contend with active vigilance for the liberty and equal rights of all men in these United States. It is probable that this was the first society, professedly philanthropic, ever formed in this place without the aid or co-operation of the minister. That circumstance occasioned no great inconvenience at the outset, as a conviction seemed to have taken fast hold of mens' minds that slavery was a great sin and a great curse, and that it devolved upon them as citizens and as christians to remonstrate loudly against it. The inconveniences which have been experienced in consequence of this circumstance subsequent to

the formation of our Society, have been somewhat serious, and the relation of them will form an important part of this pamphlet.

The Rev. Francis Horton was at that time the minister in this place—he was avowedly a colonizationist, in theory at least, and in fact surely, if hostility to abolition is a main ingredient in the composition of one of that profession. Mr. Horton was warmly solicited to espouse our cause, for it was the universal idea that a religious enterprize could no more succeed without a clergyman at the helm, than could a farmer break up his fallow ground without a yoke of oxen.—But for any aid received from him in furtherance of this cause, we have no acknowledgments to make; he never blessed our meetings with his presence but twice, and then he never dropped one word of cheer, or invoked God's blessing on our enterprize, as his profession are proverbially tenacious of doing publicly for all associations and assemblies whose objects they can conscientiously tolerate, though they may not participate in them. Yet we would not be understood that Mr. Horton was not professedly an Anti-slavery man—that is, so much so as to deprecate slavery as an evil, and stoutly and eloquently to invoke God in his Sabbath-day performances to terminate it;—further than that he said not, nor did not,—neither encouraged others to do.

The Society made strenuous efforts to obtain lecturers, and were particularly desirous to get such as should commend themselves to the respect and good will of the Church and society by their good reputation, and general popularity. As almost every subject of a moral and religious nature reached the peoples' ear through the minister and through the pulpit, it was desirable that the people should hear upon this subject through the same channels. But it was not till after individuals of some prominence in the Church had exhibited a determination to incorporate this object into their system of benevolent operations, and had also shown some impatience at the restraints the minister was disposed to impose upon them, that an arrangement could be made with Mr. Horton to admit this subject into the pulpit through other individuals.

At a stated monthly religious meeting, the subject of slavery was incidentally introduced by a stranger, (Daniel Chamberlain of Westborough, formerly connected with the missionary corps at the Sandwich Islands) which excited the ire of Mr. Horton to a high degree. He resolutely protested against allusion to that subject in meetings under his control. It had become, he said, a very common practice to drag this subject into the exercises of religious meetings, and he would no longer submit to it.—He was opposed to slavery as much as any body, and had been from his childhood—that he drank in the principles of human liberty with his mother's milk, &c. &c.—The fact was, that slavery had been alluded to in religious meetings but a very few times, but being an unwelcome subject, those few instances were greatly multiplied in the recollection of those who so much dreaded its consideration. Two of Mr. Horton's deacons took very independent ground at this time, in giving the minister and meeting to understand that they could not consent to be restrained from expressing their convictions upon this subject,

and also of making it the subject of prayer, wherever they were permitted to meet God's people and to participate in the exercises. From this time, the services of these meetings were more generally performed by Mr. Horton himself, without the assistance of other individuals.

In process of time, Mr. Horton did consent to make exchanges with certain clergymen, holding different views upon the subject of Abolition, but, with the explicit understanding that they introduced Anti-slavery upon their own responsibility. In the course of four years, exchanges were made with Rev. Mr. Backus, Rev. Doct. Osgood, and Rev. Sumner Lincoln, and they each preached upon slavery, and made as much impression upon their audiences as could have been expected from the state of the public mind at that time. The temperature of their reception may be fairly judged of by this one incident.—When Mr. Lincoln arrived at Mr. Horton's on Sabbath morning, and had remained a suitable length of time under cover of his great coat, the hour of meeting fast approaching, he found it necessary to repair to the tavern to make provision for his horse.

In the spring of 1840, a meeting of the Church was held to see what action it would take upon the subject of slavery.—The minister was opposed to calling the meeting, and also every member not belonging to the Anti-slavery Society; but as it would happen, a vote was obtained to have the meeting. The meeting came, and a resolution condemnatory of slavery was offered. Allen Newell spoke to the resolution, and commended it warmly—it spoke his sentiments, and he presumed the sentiments of every member of the whole Church.—It was responded to in like manner by various individuals, and was likely to be passed, when Ebenezer Merriam expressed his opposition to its passage, because if adopted, the Church would be called upon to pass others,—which was admitted by the mover, and other resolutions withdrawing fellowship from slaveholders were read, which it would be proper to pass, provided the first be true.

Allen Newell, (who speaks the mind of the minister, and the majority, as well perhaps as any one,) said, that slavery in his estimation, was so great a sin, and that it was so abhorrent to his feelings, that he should never think of communing with a slave-holder, or of listening to a minister who was a slave-holder, and he believed the idea was so revolting to all the members of the Church, that it was unnecessary to adopt such resolutions; nevertheless, he had no objection to them.

The propriety of taking some definite action in order to have our influence felt, and to relieve ourselves from possible embarrassments, was urged upon the other side—but all to no effect; it was admitted on all hands, that slavery was a great evil, and it was sufficient for the majority to know that God could and would in his own good time terminate it;—we ourselves had nothing to do with the subject—we were clear of the guilt, and it would only make trouble in the church to meddle with it.—Ebenezer Merriam remarked that this action was premature, and moved an indefinite postponement of the whole subject, which passed by a fair majority.

Our Society plodded on its way, having occasional lectures, and preaching for the most part to plebians, publicans, and sinners, and laboring somewhat diligently in getting up petitions to the state and national authorities, to press the subject to the "extreme verge of the constitution," and thus making somewhat of a formidable display of opposition to the patriarchal institution, on paper.

In less than one year after the attempt to pass resolutions in the church, the Rev. Mr. Horton asked to be excused from the further charge of his flock, and commending them to the watchful care of the Great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, took an excursion to the south. From Mobile a member of his family wrote back a lengthy epistle, for general circulation undoubtedly, as it received such, eulogizing the country and its social institutions and congratulating herself upon her escape from a place where so much of her time was absorbed in domestic cares, to a place where she was quite relieved from those cares by a superabundance of domestics, of a very pious cast, and was enabled to devote her whole time to benevolent and religious occupations.

In the fall of 1841, the Church and Society through their pulpit committee made application to the President of Amherst College for information where they might obtain a minister adapted to the wants of this place, and he recommended the Rev. Moses Chase, then of Whately, as a minister adapted to *any* community. Some of the committee, bitterly hostile to Anti-slavery operations, made application to members of his society to know if he might be depended on as a man of "*moral courage*,"—to which query the most positive assurance was received in the affirmative.

It was well understood that there were two sets of minds in the place for a minister to cater for, if he would please all.

Three of the four Deacons in the Church thought they had been converted to Anti-slavery principles, and indulged a faint hope. The fourth, did not wish to be converted; he was impregnable to all attempts to persuade him to mingle Temperance or Anti-slavery with his religion.—His religion was of the pure sabba-day, meeting-house kind, unmingled with any thing of a political cast,—yet he was a strong politician in the proper place.

Mr. Chase was faithfully interrogated by individuals in his parochial visits, as to his views upon the subject of slavery, and the new converts in particular were overjoyed to find him sound in his Anti-slavery faith; and he gave some evidence too by coming into our monthly prayer meeting, and assuming the command deemed appropriate for ministers in religious convocations. This, too, was very encouraging to both old and young converts, as we had never had the assistance of a clergyman in conducting them, and we had been under the necessity of carrying them on in a kind of farmer like way;—it gave a zest to the performances, being more in harmony with the doings of other meetings they were accustomed to attend. There is something decidedly vulgar in the appearance of a company of laymen and women, attempting to carry on a



religious meeting in the common parlance of worldly affairs;—this defect was now remedied.

Then again it seemed there could be no mistake in Mr. Chase's Anti-slavery;—he had resided at the South, and he related incidents coming under his observation much more horrifying than we were accustomed to hear, and his abhorrence of the institution was decided and confirmed.

The situation of his affairs was such that it was necessary that he should know the result of the public mind upon his competency to be their minister, and he being somewhat of a working man, matters were brought to a crisis very soon;—in about six weeks from his introduction to the place a bargain was concluded between him and the parish very much to their satisfaction, as will appear by the fact that they voluntarily advanced his salary \$150, above what they had previously paid. At the second monthly Anti-slavery meeting at which Mr. Chase presided, which was subsequent to his settlement, it was suspected by some that he had nearly exhausted his Anti-slavery capital at the first meeting, as he seemed inclined to shift the specific charge of national guilt in oppressing, from the Negroes to the Indians.—Nor would we object that this sympathy for the Indians is undeserved;—nor that it is not kindred to slavery, and part and parcel of the same; but it looked very much like Gov. Morton's attempt to turn all the sympathies of the abolitionists over to the Marshpee Indians.—And, again, it made way for our opponents to be captious, inasmuch as it is not admissible for a true Abolitionist to entertain two ideas at one time, and this looked like attempting it.—Another circumstance strengthened the suspicion.—It happened necessary for us at this second meeting to do some business by way of making preparation for circulating petitions which evidently appeared to disconcert the minister; and it subsequently appeared that the considered it a desecration of the holy Sabbath evening to talk and labor after that fashion.—This was the last of our society prayer meetings but one, which Mr. Chase attended, and of which an account was given to the public near the time of its occurrence.\*

---

\* It will appear in the progress of this narration that Mr Chase instituted a prayer meeting in opposition to the one alluded to, with the evident intention of superceding the necessity of the first, and bringing all the meetings under his direction and control. To this end he run his appointment into the time for the regular meeting of the Anti-slavery Society; and was particular to be prompt at his post, to pray and preach to them, and tell them what to sing. But the Society were there with considerable business on hand, and it seemed very doubtful for a time, whether the praying and singing (which the parson was careful to institute in unison with the opening of the Society's meeting) should drown out the business, or whether the business should take the precedence. The minister was his own chorister; and in his haste to give us a concert, he mis-metered his subject and tune, and very soon run afoul of some semiquavers which brought him and his choir to a stand. We have said who the chorister was. The choir was made up of a good widow, who reads music very well, but *writes petitions in behalf of ministers better*, and whose first effort to assist the clergy in their unfortunate manœuvres was not now. This catastrophe put a stop to proceedings on all sides, as the pastor was determined that no other one should get into his "castle." The way was now open for a fair debate which extended two hours beyond the usual time of holding the meeting, and which we verily believe contributed to open all eyes which were not hermetically sealed with evangelical sealing wax.

We now come to the proper place to notice the first paragraph in Mr Chase's pamphlet, entitled "A statement of Facts, &c." Under the head of "Origin of Difficulties" this statement occurs,

"This was long before the settlement of the present Incumbent. He was Installed Jan. 12th 1842. On the last Sabbath in February following, Col John M. Fisk rose in the congregation, just after the Pastor had given notice of his first preparatory Lecture, and said 'I now give notice that I shall introduce a Resolution at the preparatory Lecture, *instructing* the Pastor what invitation to give to occasional Communicants.' The resolution was accordingly introduced, and the intention openly avowed and defended, to instruct the Pastor to form his invitation so as to include '*Unitarians and Universalists.*' This effort to break down the long established barriers of the communion table, was resisted by the Church, and the Pastor sustained."

We shall notice this first paragraph the more particularly as it is indicative of the whole character of the pamphlet, and shows by what trifling distortions the appearance of a transaction will be changed, and an erroneous impression conveyed.

Mr. Chase administered the sacrament to the Church the second or third Sabbath after his arrival in the place.—He gave the invitation to members of other churches to sit and commune, exclusively to evangelical denominations, whereas it had been the custom from time immemorial in this church to extend the invitation to "*Christians* of whatever name or denomination, who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth, and who are in regular standing in their own churches." John M. Fisk notified Mr. Chase immediately after meeting, of the variation in the invitation extended, to which he replied, that it was after the common form, and further, be particular to note, that he had received his information from one of the Deacons that it was the proper one to give here.—He however signified his disposition to conform to the customary usage, the discrepancy having been pointed out. At the return of another communion season he gave the invitation corresponding with the first.—On the approach of a third communion season an appointment of a church meeting for business was given out by the Pastor on some day of the current week, on which occasion John M. Fisk, not "just after the Pastor had given notice of his first preparatory Lecture" but just after he had pronounced the benediction, did not "rise in the congregation" but being upon his feet with the rest of the congregation, did not say, "I now give notice that I shall introduce a Resolution at the preparatory lecture," but, I give notice that at the church meeting for business this day appointed I shall propose to the church, &c. Now, it is very possible that he might have said that he should propose to the church to *instruct* the Pastor; it matters not; he frankly admits, that it would amount to instructing him, and why not? was he hired to come here and dictate to the church with whom they should commune, and with whom only? or did the Lord station him in this part of his vineyard for that purpose? Then why in the name of all logic did he apply to the Dea. for information upon this point?

Instruct! Ah! there's the rub. What, a church instruct their minister—and a private member propose it—in the great congregation too—and an abolitionist too—and a very obnoxious one moreover?

preposterous! Where is the Pope and his minions? asleep? no, wide awake, be assured the sequel will show.

We will make no attempt to justify a member of our society for outraging the feelings of the Church and the minister by such a presumptuous proposition; he did it on his own responsibility alone;—we shall admit the charge that he did propose to instruct the pastor.—But the said Fisk, though not disposed to quibble upon the phraseology of this sentence, is inclined to the opinion that he gave the notice as follows: “that at the church meeting he would propose to the Church to fix the terms and adopt a form of invitation to be given by the Pastor to members of other churches providentially with us at communion seasons.” For the following reasons he believes this to have been the notice.—1st, because he cannot arrange the objectionable phrase with other language which he is confident he did use, and, 2nd, because it was his object then, as it would be now to give it in the least offensive manner, both to minister and people, which he was capable of.

The probability is that there is not one idea in the passage under review, unless it be the date, which is strictly true and which does not convey an erroneous impression; and yet it is a fair specimen of the whole pamphlet, leaving out some facts about which there is no chance for discrepancy. Presuming however that this assertion merely will be considered as begging the question if we leave it here, we shall canvass other points, after giving the result of the Church meeting above alluded to.

The meeting came, and after disposing of other business, J. M. Fisk did propose that the Pastor be instructed to give the invitation to transient communicants according to the long standing form of this Church. There was hardly time for the mover to finish, before the whole body guard of the minister were upon their feet. One member, (Wm. Thompson) wished to know of the moderator by what authority Col. Fisk gave notice on the Sabbath of bringing up such a subject; for his part he trusted that we had got a minister who knew who were fit candidates for Heaven and who were not, without any advice or instructions.—He was pronounced rather fast by the moderator, but there were so many waiting to unburden their minds of similar uncomfortable feelings, that there was hardly time to get him in order,—the aspect of affairs was truly deplorable,—more wrath and bitterness could not have been exhibited without resort to personal violence. The moderator Mr. Chase, seemed to be more self-possessed and calm than those who thought him personally insulted. He signified to the meeting that he thought the subject would admit of calm deliberation, whereupon the mover was called upon to state the form of invitation which had been used, and he gave the form already quoted, and after considerable doubt and discussion he was corroborated by some of the oldest members present, (Ex Dea. Ross and Capt. Smith,) although it is possible that some credit might be due to their old age for making the admission, as none of the younger members could distinctly remember the oft repeated sentence.

He was then called upon to interpret the extent of the invitation;—to which he replied that the invitation was broad and plain, and needed no interpretation.—He was called upon to say whether Unitarians and Universalists were to be included;—he again replied that he supposed that all who deemed themselves christians, and were united with christian denominations, and walked worthy of their profession were included. It was very apparent from the remarks of Mr. Chase, the main body of the Church sustaining him, that no regard was to be paid to christian character or conscientiousness, providing they were without the pale of evangelical denominations.—Mr. Chase and others, asserted that they did not consider Unitarians or Universalists to be christian denominations.—They were desired to name them, but declined. Great horror prevailed that such a profane attempt should be made,—and a profound ignorance existed that they had ever mingled around the table of our Lord with individuals of either of the denominations named, although it was not unfrequent. The party resisting the proposed continuance of this long established and somewhat liberal invitation, were much the same if not the identical party, which a year before had refused to pass resolutions against slavery and withdraw fellowship from slaveholders; and they expressed the same dread of fellowshiping slaveholders that they now did of these unchristian denominations. The sequel was plain; they were willing to exclude ever so perfect christians, because they did not belong to their sect; on the other hand they were unwilling to disfellowship any of their sect, be they ever so vile. Against the contingency of a slaveholder coming to their communion or mounting their rostrum to preach christianity, they were decidedly opposed to taking any precaution, and against the possibility of a follower of Jesus who believed in but one God, or who believed in the ultimate salvation of all men, they were unwilling to leave an invitation of doubtful interpretation, lest he should get in.

Mr. Chase admitted that the Church had a right to fix their own terms of communion, but about instructing their minister he more than hinted, that it would be uncongenial to his feelings, but he hardly knew what was customary with congregational usage, he having been connected with the Presbyterians, &c.—and it being quite a tumultuous assembly, for reasons best known to himself declared his intention of vacating the chair and abruptly left. An effort to place some one in the chair was made, when after non-acceptance by a number of individuals Ebenezer Merriam was chosen, and forthwith repaired to the desk, and upon a motion of his own for an indefinite postponement of the whole subject, put the vote and declared it carried without any regard to the vote, or to the remonstrances against its being a vote, and left the meeting together with all other persons in the interest of the pastor, as they were wont to believe themselves to be.

The meeting terminated in a most tumultuous and unbecoming manner for a religious body; and if the reader cannot see sufficient cause of alarm in the proposition offered to the meeting to cause such disorderly proceedings, he must look to other sources for the real cause.

“This was supposed to be a Garrison measure” says Mr. Chase.

That remark should be noticed particularly. Because an abolitionist made the proposition they were justified in supposing it to be a Garrison measure. And because it was a Garrison measure they justify themselves in scouting the proposition from consideration. But the proposal had no connection with, or eye to any abolition movement, or Garrison measures.

A few weeks subsequent to this affair said Fisk publicly withdrew from the Church and gave his reasons for so doing. Whether he can be justified for such a step, is not so much our present purpose to discuss, as to set forth the conduct of Mr. Chase in the transaction.

As Mr. Chase had pronounced his conduct disorderly in giving the notice for the church meeting, and had virtually forbidden all persons giving notices on the Sabbath, said Fisk gave him a notice to read to the Church of his intention to withdraw his relation therefrom, and notifying them that in two weeks from that day he would publicly give his reasons for so doing. Mr. Chase neglected to give the notice, when, after the benediction said Fisk called the attention of the assembly to hear the notice from him. Mr. Chase commanded silence, and pronounced it disorderly and ordered him to desist, but he not complying, Mr. Chase called for the peace officers, and vociferously commanded order:—those of the congregation that were not mad were evidently frightened, and great confusion ensued;—failing in his attempt to prevent the notice being given, he succeeded in coaxing a majority of the assembly out of the house. The notice was given to those remaining.

At the time appointed for a public withdrawal, the congregation received their instructions in the prayer of the minister, and accordingly mostly left the house. The communication was made to those who remained.

This struggle to become emancipated from the Church and its minister, required all the effort necessary for a chattel slave to release himself from the grapple of his master, with a faithful driver to assist him.

Subsequently the Church through their minister, performed the farce of excommunicating said Fisk;—depriving him not only of all the privileges of the church, but of social life and friendly intercourse with the world, heaping terrible denunciations upon his head. Common report says that the anathemas pronounced upon him, were not unlike those threatened upon a Royal Arch Mason who should violate his vows of secrecy.

The next event in order was the visit of Abby Kelley to this place, to give Anti-slavery lectures.—This was a most terrible catastrophe in Mr. Chase's estimation;—consequently it was greatly deplored and deprecated by all the minister loving people. For more reasons than one, Mr. Chase dreaded this visit. 1st. He dreaded the agitation of the subject of slavery. 2nd. He had once met Abby Kelley, and heard her express her sentiments, and had given her to understand, that it was not permitted to women to speak in public, neither to lecture clergymen in a stage coach, and it would be unpleasant to have his orders disobeyed. 3rd. He feared that the Sabbath would be annihilated and the church demolished; and lastly, he probably feared that he should

oe out of business ; and as the sequel will show his fears were not altogether unfounded. Having come to the thermopylæ of the difficulties we will be particular to note their progress. The pamphlet says:—

“ At this time there was a promising Revival of Religion in progress; more than 30 persons attended the inquiry meeting. Some were rejoicing in hope; a day of fasting and prayer was profitably observed and the prospect of a general Revival welcomed by the friends of Zion.”

The information here intended to be conveyed is palpable. But instead of “ a promising revival of religion” there was a revival of the most malignant and wicked feelings to which the human heart is prone. It was a revival of the spirit which tarred and feathered Lunsford Lane at Raleigh, which scourged Amos Dresser at Nashville, which shot Lovejoy at Alton, and which hung Jesus Christ upon the cross at Calvary ; and could the designs of Moses Chase and his followers have been consummated, the moans and sufferings of the famished bondman would have gone unheeded by every christian in the land. A full investigation of this paragraph and what stands in connection with it ought to convince any reasonable mind of the truth of this assertion, which may seem uncharitable and severe. Not that all the individuals who lent their countenance and support to this attempt to “ get up a revival” were involved in all the guilt which attaches to the transaction. Many there might be, and many there were if “ more than 30 persons attended the inquiry meeting,” whose guilt will be found in the skirts of other people. Of the persons engaged in carrying on this revival, the leaders, were the bitter enemies to Anti-slavery movements, with Mr. Chase at their head,—some superannuated professors,—some pro-slavery sinners, seeking admittance to a pro-slavery church, that they might enjoy her indulgences, and finally reach Heaven, together with a class who always follow the influences of reputed Godly men, and are not morally accountable for their actions. It was a revival of opposition to Anti-slavery.—It was an effort to drown the plea of the bondman which was being poured into the ears of the people. If it was anything else, the Anti-slavery people with the assistance of Abby Kelley did destroy it. There has been no visible fruit of such a revival as Mr. Chase would have it understood “ was in progress.” There has been no additions to the Church since Mr. Chase’s mission here, save one lad about a dozen years of age. And though multitudes should have joined, that circumstance would be no evidence to us of their conversion from sin. But of those inquirers after heaven with whom we are acquainted, none of them have found it, or embraced the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, or turned from their wicked ways to serve the Lord, in the judgment of unbounded charity. Their opposition to Anti-slavery doctrine, which is the doctrine of the Bible, the surest test of conversion to christianity, is still unmitigated.

We will see how near the truth the conductor of this revival will come in his next paragraph; he says

“ On the the very evening of the day of fasting, above alluded to, he (Dea. Henshaw) brought Miss Kelley to Lecture in the Meeting House. From this time for three weeks he retained her in his family, aiding and assisting her in holding public Lectures in this and the neighboring towns, almost every evening.”

We could almost wish this statement were truth, though we could not divine where friend Chase, with his sacerdotal robes would have been at this time, could she have had access to the ears of the people. Miss Kelley came to this place on Thursday, and left town on the following Thursday.—Time must have passed slowly with Mr. Chase and his body guard surely, to have made such bad reckoning. The circumstances of her coming were as follows. Mr. Chase had excited the fears of some timid members of our society that Garrisonism was likely to overthrow the church and desolate the world of righteousness. At the annual meeting of the society, those members came forward with a proposition to make it auxiliary to the Mass. Abolition Society, or to dissolve it. We had hitherto been independent of any auxiliaryship, but had encouraged the circulation of the Liberator and the Lectures of the Mass. Anti-slavery Society's agents, as also the Abolition Society agents, but had made our contributions mainly to the old society, and were disposed to prosecute the enterprise rather as a moral than a political one. To save the church and the ministry from merited rebuke, and leave them in possession of all the piety and moral purity in the world, this high handed proposition to annihilate our society, or make it over to the Mass. Third Party political Abolition Society, was made. The sayings and resolutions offered by Abby Kelley were introduced among the most obnoxious things to be found in order to shew the baneful effects of Garrisonism. Whereupon it was proposed, and voted that Abby Kelley be invited to lecture before our society before we decided its fate. The invitation was given, and it was publicly known for six weeks that she was expected.—In this interim, though but a short time before her arrival, this revival was put to brewing. On the Sabbath preceding her arrival, notices were up of a lecture to be given on Thursday evening, and Mr. Chase was personally notified of the fact that Abby Kelley, was to be the speaker. In this situation of affairs a fast was concocted on that day to be held on the Thursday above mentioned of which the first notice was given after meeting and which notice crowded out a notice of Abby Kelley's lecture. And now Mr. Chase has the impudence to charge Dea. Henshaw with intentionally introducing Miss Kelley into his Meeting House, on the holy evening of a day of fasting and prayer, which Fast was specially appointed to meet the exigency and to draw off attention from the subject of her mission.

Nor did the efforts to draw off attention from her lecture close with the waning of the day.—The minister was exceedingly anxious that the evening should be devoted to more prayer, and that too in the very place wanted for the lecture; but that could not be had. None of the deacons but the invincible 4th advised, or assented to the proposition. Another plan was adopted, which was for the women to start an evening prayer meeting. So it will be seen the place was nearly inundated with prayers. This is no caricature of the "promising revival" Mr. Chase writes about;—and the interest in the revival did not abate for the whole week during her stay in the place. Morning prayer meetings were regularly held, and were as "profitable" for aught we know, as the "day

of fasting and prayer." But with the departure of Miss Kelley, departed the zeal for the upbuilding of Zion. The morning prayer meetings were not continued longer than would be considered decent and proper to keep the remains of a dear friend, after the spirit had taken its flight.

That pro-slavery church which would have a revival, and have it lasting, can infer surely what will be the best method to obtain one, and keep it alive.

We beg leave to quote one more sentence from the "Statement of Facts"—

"There seemed no alternative left, but to yield the ground to the Vandal spirit of the Garrison party, or to attempt resistance by the farther exercise of discipline, &c.—Accordingly, after prayer and consultation, it was agreed that a labor should be commenced with Dea. Henshaw; and brother Uriel Spooner was requested to undertake the painful but necessary duty."

Now it will be observed, that there is no date in the above, whereby to determine when this consultation was had, and labor agreed upon; but this much is certain, that it was right in the midst of the revival, for Uriel Spooner commenced the labor before Miss Kelley left town.—On the day of her arrival, the Church fasted, and on the day of her departure, commenced the labor with Dea. Henshaw, and it is susceptible of proof, that it was the intention of the "resistants" to make a short labor of it, and throw the deacon overboard long before she left, if she had stopped her "three weeks" out. Uriel Spooner had the modesty to ask the Dea. to accept of his visit as a fulfillment of the Scripture injunction, in the case of calling an offending brother to account;—in other words, to consent to forego the ceremony of a second visit, in order that the Church, being in session that day, might act upon his case. But surely, the events of the future are shrouded in great uncertainty;—for instead of despatching the Dea. that day, it took 8 months hard labor; and Uriel Spooner, who it seems, partly from the above, and conclusively from other evidence, was a mere agent in the transaction, became exceedingly exhausted and weary. But brother Uriel Spooner would fain have it understood, that the complaint originated with himself,—that it was a matter of personal grievance, that the Dea. should offend so many other of the brethren, and that he had instituted this religious prosecution without dictation from the minister, or any body of men. And the above concession that the affair was concerted in secret conclave of the minister and others was not made, until it was fairly proved before the council. But when he had got his complaint before the Church, and they had voted to entertain it, the complainant was called upon to make out his specifications of conduct by which he was aggrieved, and his christian fellowship alienated, and he declined doing any thing further about it;—he had done his part of the labor, and the Church must look up somebody else to make out a specification of his grievances.

There was a vast deal of Parliamentary etiquette in disciplining the Deacon.—The Rev. Moderator went by parliamentary rules and military customs in all his proceedings. We give a synopsis of a part only of his decisions.



After the complaint had been received by the Church, Dea. Henshaw was about making some remarks on other matters than his own case, when Uriel Spooner objected to his taking part in the debate, and Mr. Chase sustained the objection, for the reason, that it was contrary to custom to permit criminals to enjoy such privileges after arrest, and cited military usages as in point. He also decided that a member complained of was to be considered guilty until he proved himself innocent.

Rodney Dennis made a motion, which the moderator decided could not be entertained without a suspension of the business before the meeting, when the person who had been speaking proceeded with his remarks, and was called to order by the chair, for the reason he said, that he was waiting for some one to move a suspension of the regular business, in order for Mr. Dennis to introduce his resolution; this happened to be a favorite step of the pastor.

The specifications to Uriel Spooner's complaint, were after great "labor" brought forth, and were as follows:—

1st. A resolution introduced by F. W. Douglass, (a self-emancipated slave) at the Worcester Co. S. D. A. S. S. in the following words, to wit, "Resolved, that the sectarian organizations of this country called churches, are, in supporting slavery, upholding a system of theft, adultery, and murder; and it is the duty of abolitionists to expose their true character before the public."

Also another resolution introduced by Abby Kelley, at the same meeting, as follows:— "Whereas the professions of the popular Bible, Tract and Missionary societies of this country, of a desire to promote the cause of righteousness and christianity are false and hypocritical, inasmuch as they consent to hold millions of their countrymen in a heathen condition, and in many respects worse than heathen condition, therefore, Resolved, that it is our duty henceforth to withdraw all support from these societies, and bestow it in promoting christianity." Dea. Henshaw presiding and thereby giving countenance to these resolutions, not having expressed his dissent.

2d. That Dea. Henshaw gave countenance to Abby Kelley by entertaining her at his house, and carrying her to the neighboring societies for the sole purpose of enabling her to lecture, the influence of which was to bring into disrepute the church and the ministry.

3d. That Dea. Henshaw is a member of a society whose apparent object it is to strip the church, the clergy and the Sabbath of their sanctity; a society whose members profess to believe the church, the clergy, and the Sabbath are all of the devil.

4th. That Dea. Henshaw interfered with the duties of the pastoral office, and encroached upon the sacredness of the Sabbath, by giving a notice at a 3d meeting of the Church April 30th, which he knew the pastor considered improper, it being virtually for a business meeting of the Anti-slavery society on the Sabbath, the Anti-slavery society of which Dea. Henshaw is president, is accustomed to make adjournments for business at the time and the place of the regular church meetings, without consulting the pastor or the church, or duly regarding the Lord's day.

We are desirous of giving these resolutions and specifications the widest circulation possible. They contain such vital truths, together with a summary of the tyrannical usurpations and hypocritical pretensions of an incumbent of the pastoral office, that we are constrained to believe that they will eventually work out a dispassionate decision of the public mind upon the subjects brought under consideration. Who dares dispute the truth of the first resolution, setting aside the assumption therein contained that the churches do support slavery? will any one pretend that it is not upholding, and upbuilding too, an organised system of theft, adultery and murder, to uphold slavery? or will any one deny that it is not the duty of all abolitionists, and all other persons to set forth the true character of the church before the public; if pure and holy and instrumental of great good in relieving the world of

wretchedness to declare it—if base and hypocritical and imposing unyieldingly and oppressive burdens on mankind, to expose it. But who comes forward to deny the assumption, that these organizations *are* supporting slavery? are not some members of all of them, obnoxious to the charge of holding slaves, of buying and selling men, women and children, and doing all the acts pertaining to slavery, by robbing men of their rights and imbruting them

Now Dea. Henshaw is arraigned as a criminal for belonging to a society, “whose members (some of them, *it is pretended*, not proved) profess to believe that the church, the clergy and the Sabbath are all of the Devil, and the *apparent* object of the society is to strip the church, the clergy and the sabbath of their sanctity.”

Now how is it with the great mass of professing christians who belong to organizations whose members, some of whom not apparently merely, not doubtfully at all, but positively and undeniably uphold a system of theft, adultery and murder, “the vilest the sun ever saw” as Wesley stigmatizes American slavery. Can Dea. Henshaw be criminal for belonging to a society (whose definite object is a good one all will admit,) because some wicked members in it revile the churches and Sabbath, and the great body of these sectarian organizations called churches, not be equally criminal for belonging to societies whose members some of them are not merely horse thieves and swindlers, but kidnappers, and menstealers—known as such, and tolerated as such by the whole church, and also be virtually entitled to the charge of upholding slavery as “an organization, called a church.”

But the comparison is an unjust one; and Dea. Henshaw may be innocent for belonging to an Anti-slavery Society holding such wicked members as described in the 3d specification, while the member of a church organization may be criminal for adhering to a church which tolerates within its pale thieves, adulterers and murderers, or what will be more intelligible, a class of men, who are upbuilding, and sustaining a system of operations, productive of those specific crimes, beyond all computation, and which no benefits of a church organization can palliate or compensate for.

Dea. Henshaw belongs to a society whose specific and only object is the overthrow of slavery, and he holds communion with its members upon that subject only. The member of a church unites himself to a society which goes into all the details of christian duty, and each member endorses the acts of every other member, or holds him amenable to the censure of the church.

Dea. Henshaw does not come in with the plea that he is not accountable to Uriel Spooner and to the Church, for grieving them by circulating Resolutions and Newspapers, and public Lectures, inconsistent with and subversive of the Articles and Covenant of the church and for giving shelter to Abby Kelley, and transporting her from one place to another and for giving a notice at a 3d meeting on the Sabbath, (long after Uriel Spooner filed in his grievances) without leave of the minister, thus violating the Lord’s day.

To all these charges he holds himself ready to respond and does

respond that Uriel Spooner came to him with a lie in his right hand. That they are not grieved that his conduct is inconsistent with and subversive of the articles and covenant of this Church, but that his conduct is in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the articles and covenant of this Church,—and that they are mad, that his conduct tends to expose the corruptions of the Church and the ministry, and that they fear their overthrow if the truth is known.—That it is a conspiracy set on foot by the pastor, to screen himself from disgrace, and to protect the Church in her sloth and criminality, and offers to prove it. But they will not let him. He must take it for granted, that Uriel Spooner was honest, that he was grieved;—he must not impeach the character of the church, nor of the minister for they were not on trial;—he must not bring any counsel into court to assist him;—he must bring no evidence out of the church;—in fine he must prove it in the way they dictate, and in their own time; and because he could not make rapid progress, with all these hindrances thrown around him in exculpating himself from guilt, the Church voted that he should prove himself innocent, (for remember that he was to be considered guilty until he did do it,) by answering such questions as they might put to him.

But let us go back to the specifications. Who wants any further proof of the truth of the resolution introduced by Abby Kelley than is stamped upon the face of it? Who does not know that the Bible society take no cognizance of slaves? That in their vote to supply every destitute family in the land with a bible they entirely pass by twenty-five hundred thousand slaves? And by what contrivance can they do that and be consistent with their declaration? It is the simplest thing imaginable. Slavery sunders the marriage tie, and virtually annihilates the family relation,—therefore the Bible society tell you that slaves can have no families, and it is the only reason that they attempt to give for passing them by. And it is familiarly known to almost all, that a missionary in New Orleans but a few years ago was arraigned for giving a bible to a slave, and narrowly escaped punishment, by pleading ignorance of the law, and apologizing heartily for the deed, and pledging himself to sin no more.

And who ever saw a “religious” tract, from the tract mint, numbered any where from No. 1 to No. 5000 expatiating upon the sin of slavery or even hinting at it.

Or what missionary has ever been sent by the Missionary Society to shew to the benighted slave the way of life.

Then, if the Bible, Tract, and Missionary Societies have each and all compassed sea and land, the Globe over, to perform their appropriate work, and have passed by the destitute millions of slaves in our own land, without even rebuking the slaveholder who has hedged up the way perhaps, what will you denominate them? name it if you please. Can you believe that these mammoth institutions, are managed and guided by men who hope to christianize the world while this great curse to mankind is cherished in its bosom? That a portion of the world in the heart of the Christian Church can be isolated from the rest, and be cut off from all the benevolent and humane operations of

God's people while the rest of the world is converted to God? Is this possible? Is it possible that those who control these societies think it possible? if it is, then it was wrong in the Worcester Co. S. D. A. S. S. to charge them with hypocrisy and resolve "that it was their duty henceforth to withdraw all support from these societies, and bestow it in promoting Christianity."—And it might be proper for the church to discipline Dea. Henshaw for not resigning his post as chairman of the meeting, and for not striking his name from the list of members, or formally filing his protest to the promulgation of such irreverent declarations.

Be it remembered, that Dea. Henshaw admitted the facts set forth in all the specifications, save that of belonging "to a society whose apparent object is to strip the church, the clergy and the Sabbath of their sanctity, and whose members profess to believe that the church, the clergy and the Sabbath are all of the devil."—It is possible that he might at this time be under the necessity of admitting that some members of the society to which he belongs, do believe some considerable part of that 3d specification. However that may be, the society took action upon that charge against them, and through their secretary, informed Mr. Chase, that they disclaimed any such motives as he imputed to them as a society, or any such belief as he represented them to hold as individuals, and requested him to lay the same before his church and to retract the charge they had made.—But Mr. Chase declined to comply with this request. It was his pleasure that it should be understood that they held to such sentiments, whether they did or not. But Dea. Henshaw ever denied the inferences deducted from the facts, the substance of which was, that his conduct in these matters was a violation of his covenant vows.

The subject matter of the 4th specification we will simplify. It will be noticed that the matters complained of in this clause took place a month after Uriel Spooner's complaint to Deacon Henshaw. And at a meeting at which Mr. Spooner was not present and could have known but little about; and that it is in toto, a grievance of the Pastor. Nevertheless it comes in as a specification to Mr. Spooner's complaint, and as properly as any of the others, we frankly admit. Mr. Chase in his great zeal to head Garrisonism, as he would call it,—to prevent the further progress of Anti-slavery principles, we should call it, found it necessary to substitute something to attract the attention and the attendance of his devotees and all the fearful ones, from our Anti-slavery prayer meeting which was held monthly. So he institutes one of his own an hour previous, and called it an Anti-slavery prayer meeting, the first of which was held a month previous, while Abby Kelley was in the place.—The last of the series we believe was the meeting now under consideration. At this meeting Dea. Henshaw, from motives of curiosity probably, quite as much as devotion, happened to be present, and at the close of the meeting he gave notice of the regular meeting of the society which was shortly to follow; and that too, without Mr. Chase's permission, and probably knowing beyond a reasonable doubt, that Mr. Chase would consider it highly improper

to notify the meeting, or to hold it, when they had all had an opportunity to come to his Anti-slavery prayer meeting, and hear him perform to their heart's content. This "was interfering with the duties of the pastoral office, and encroaching upon the sacredness of the Sabbath."

But more than all it was a "business meeting of the Anti-slavery Society." Very true, it was. Our Society had become quite disgusted with the conduct of Mr. Chase, and his attempts to cheat and befool the people with his prayers.

Mr. Chase commenced with attending our meetings—but after he abandoned them he continued to give the notice of them, and they interfered with no church meetings, or other meetings, because they were permanent meetings, and no other meeting had been attempted to be held for years on the afternoon or evening of our meeting.—But the regular time for our meeting a month previous happened while Abby Kelly was here, and he neglected to appoint ours, and then instituted his new Anti-slavery prayer meeting, to conflict with ours, and destroy it if possible. And one of the grossest offences against the dignity of our Pastor, was the giving the notice of our meeting by the secretary after the benediction at that time.

Our society fearing that there would be more smoke than fire from such an abundance of Anti-slavery prayers as were likely to be offered, did adopt a resolution to this purport, That henceforth our meeting should be denominated "The Anti-slavery concert of prayer and action meeting; that we would fearlessly examine the influences which have a tendency to perpetuate the evils of slavery—whether in church, or state, and we would faithfully expose hypocrisy wherever we found it, and that we would substitute for the mere oblation of long prayers and psalm-singing, contributions of our earthly substance for the promotion of the cause of universal liberty, and use our influence to secure a more faithful preaching of the word of God and the gospel of his Son, as it pertains to the duties of his followers and the rights of all mankind."

The special business which is alluded to, as a desecration of the Sabbath, was the contributing money, and formally adjourning the meeting. The charge of adjourning our meeting to the time of the regular church meetings is a base fabrication; a double geared falsehood, as will appear from the fact that he got up a meeting to conflict with ours, but had not dared, as yet, to appoint it so near as to clash:—that we adjourned to the place where the church usually held their meetings we do not object.

With the foregoing Complaint and Specifications the church began and continued to labour with Deacon Henshaw from time to time, through the summer. The first step was to try to deprive him of taking any part in the discussions of the church, and stop his mouth. The next was to relieve him of the duties of his office, together with the privileges of communion.—But in fair, open fight this could not be done—too many members of the church, that were disposed to put implicit confidence in what the minister should say, could not understand that Deacon Henshaw was guilty of any conduct that should

deprive him of these blessed privileges. It was a new thing to them, to be sure, to have one of the officers of their church preside at a County Anti-slavery Meeting,—and to be President of one in their own society—and to introduce a Woman to the place to preach—and consent to her going into Mr. Chase's pulpit,—and all the while knowing that these things did not please Mr. Chase, and that if he had gone to Mr. Chase to get his consent, he could not possibly have obtained it. And others beside Mr. Thompson probably believed that they had a minister who knew, or ought to know, certainly, “who were fit candidates for heaven and proper persons to be admitted to the communion.”

There was a confusion of ideas upon the subject as there always must be among men taught to believe that adherence to their sect, and obedience to their minister is the substance of religion.

The teachers in the sabbath school had been peremptorily instructed by Mr. Chase that it was their duty to teach the doctrines of the church only.

And when Sylvester Holmes of New Bedford came into church meeting to help Mr. Chase train his flock, he told them that the voice of the church for the time being, was the voice of God to them, whether it were right or wrong. We suppose that he meant that they were to take it for granted that the church (or the sectarian body called a church) must be right until they had time to satisfy themselves that she was in an error:—this did not relieve the difficulty aimed at,—for those restless spirits whom he wished to quiet by this injunction, had already become satisfied that the church was in error.

Deacon Henshaw was denied the privilege of bringing counsel into the church to assist him in “proving himself innocent.”

On the other hand, Mr. Chase and his squadron had another able clergyman to assist him; the Rev. Rodney G. Dennis, was a temporary resident in the place, and upon women's rights and Garrisonism he was quite as orthodox as Mr. Chase. He moved into the place about the time of the commencement of labour with Deacon Henshaw by the church, and he immediately offered his credentials to the church, and was constituted a member, and forthwith entered into the contest against Deacon Henshaw. Some complaint was made that he should take so officious a part in a case of discipline, in a church of which he was but a novice. But he said “he always wished to have his interest identified with the church in whatever place he resided, and having removed his connection and become a member of this church, it was incumbent upon him to discharge his duty.”—No other member of the church, however, insisted upon the business being dispatched with such velocity as Mr. Dennis, for the reason that his time was very precious and valuable, and he could not consent to have so much of it absorbed in this trial, gratuitously supposing that the church could not dispense with his valuable services in the case. But it subsequently appeared, and did appear at this time, though unobserved, that he had just removed from Somers, where he had resided for three years as a private individual, or more properly, perhaps, as an ex-minister, and

that he had not been connected with the church in that place for the whole time, and that his membership was removed from Topsfield, his former place of residence.

Notwithstanding his strong asseverations that it was his duty to do all in his power for the support of Christ's church, he never became a member of the society here—nor contributed to the support of the minister, nor towards the expenses of the society, nor even paid for the use of a pew which he rented of the society.

After having had four church meetings, at which Deacon Henshaw's case had been brought up, they had progressed so far as to obtain the specifications to Uriel Spooner's complaint, and fix a day for the trial.

When the day for trial came, William Thompson appeared as substitute for Uriel Spooner, the complainant. He demanded of Deacon Henshaw "whether he admitted this to be a church of Jesus Christ." To this question the Deacon demurred as being irrelevant, and objected to giving an answer. The new complainant insisted upon the positive necessity of it, and was supported by Mr. Dennis and the pastor, and finally the church voted that he must answer it;—still he objected, and no further progress was made at that meeting.—The prosecutors coming to the conclusion that this case was not to be disposed of so expeditiously as was at first apprehended; at their next meeting, obtained a majority of the church to suspend him from all the privileges of a member, and then adjourned action thereon for six weeks, it being too busy a season of the year to call the church together to relieve Deacon Henshaw from the disgrace he was lying under. He strenuously objected to the delay, and requested a speedy trial.—This step of suspension was a very artful device of the leaders in the prosecution, and enabled them to obtain, step by step, what they could not by fair open propositions in the outset. We will refer the reader to the paragraph from the "statement of facts" upon this point.

"No step in the progress of this trial has been so often misunderstood and so much complained of as this, but without any good reason as it seems to me. This is not, nor was it intended to be a *censure*; it was merely debarring him from communion and other privileges of the church not necessary for his defence until the trial was brought to a close. I find in the published rules of one of the churches composing the council (and it may be so in all) "that in case of gross offences the member complained of shall be debarred from communion when the first step is taken, and in all other cases when the complaint is entertained by the church." Such we were informed by ministers of the first respectability was the uniform custom of congregational churches. Such is well known to be the rule in all presbyterian churches. This accords also with civil processes. An officer in the civil, military, or naval departments is at once suspended from official duties and privileges on being put upon trial for alleged offences: nay, sometimes deprived of personal liberty, before he is proved guilty; many considerations clearly justify and require such a procedure."

There is more specious plausibility about this passage than any one that has come under review. In our opinion there could be no broader caricature of Logic and Christianity than it comprises.—We shall review it backwards. "Accords with the usages in the military and naval departments." Indeed. And is this the rule which Jesus Christ and his apostles left as a guide to their disciples for their government through all coming time? to suspend and arrest and imprison their members, as they do such things in the army and navy? Where

did this minister of Jesus find his instructions to preach this gospel? and admitting that he has found such, where is the analogy between his treatment of Deacon Henshaw and the treatment an officer in the army or navy receives for alleged misdemeanors? The object of belonging to the church is to be admitted into communion with the saints; and is it no disgrace to be cut off from this communion, and put under the condemnation of "guilty?" But the object of belonging to the army or navy is the emoluments arising therefrom—and they go upon the principle that an officer or private is to be considered innocent until he is proved guilty,—the reverse of the principle the church (Mr. Chase's) acts upon, therefore it is no disgrace to a member of the army or navy to lie under impeachment more than necessarily arises from the suspicions engendered. They do not deprive such impeached member of the emoluments of his office, (the object of his connection with the department) until after he is tried and found guilty. On the other hand, he is relieved from any labors or duties required of him when unimpeached, yet he is entitled to, and he receives his full pay and rations. If there is any parallel between suspending an officer of the church from communion with the church before proved guilty, and suspending a military officer from command, while under impeachment, we are unable to see it. In one case the man's sword is taken from him, and all his privileges and perquisites granted him—in the other, his privileges and perquisites taken from him, and he left to prove that he is an innocent and injured man.

Moreover, Mr. Chase finds "that it is a rule in one neighboring church to debar a member from communion in the case of gross offences, when the first step is taken, and in all other cases, when the complaint is entertained by the church."—Now it is probable that this church took the gospel instructions of the New Testament for their guide when they adopted this rule, rather than the customs of the army and navy.

Admitting that Jesus Christ taught the necessity of church organizations, for the purpose among other good reasons of training his children to a knowledge of their duty, and excommunicating from within the pale of the visible church all such as transgressed his precepts and commands, we do admit that the rule of the church abovenamed may be correct if interpreted by the instructions of our Lord in Matthew 18th, which Mr. Chase pretends to take for his guide. It does not appear by that passage that Jesus Christ anticipated a case of doubtful character;—but so plain and clear was the transgression, that it was a positive trespass against a brother which admitted of neither doubt or evasion, nor needed any arbitration to determine. Accordingly, the rule of the neighboring church, and the instructions in the 18th of Matthew would be in harmony with justice;—no complaint would be entertained by a church against a brother which was not a positive offence of an immoral character,—and the entertainment of a complaint against a brother was in full view of his guilt, and his determined refusal to listen to the individual or to the church.—It was such a case that Christ seemed to contemplate, as are nine out of ten of the cases



which occur in churches ordinarily free from a persecuting spirit—where the individual complained of is callous to any feelings of moral accountability, and where he refuses to reason the case, either with the individual complaining, or with the church;—where he submits that he is in the wrong, and the church may do what they please about it. It is a mistaken notion in our opinion, that the gospel sanctions the principle that a man is to be considered guilty of a charge an enemy may choose to prefer, until he proves himself innocent of it. And the assertion in the above extract, that no censure was intended, in suspending Deacon Henshaw from the ordinances of the church will be made clear, we think, and it will appear that it was not intended for a censure merely, but, as a punishment also, for his contumacious obstinacy in withstanding the minister, and also an entering wedge to his final expulsion.

On the renewal of the trial, the prosecution commenced with reading documents from old newspapers, such, for instance, as the Worcester Palladium, which were, for the most part, caricatures of Anti-slavery meetings with which Deacon Henshaw had no connection.—He requested to know the points to be proved by such documents; when it appeared that no charges against him were expected to be proved thereby, but the general character of the Anti-slavery society disparaged.—He objected to the documents being read, as wholly irrelevant, and coming from sources bitterly hostile to all good principles, and having no connection with the complaint against himself.—The complainants were, however, sustained by the pastor, who said “that the prosecutors must have the privilege of producing any evidence which they thought would *throw light* upon the subject,” (though in fact it should tend to the reverse, and dispel what little light there was in many minds.) In order to obviate the objections of Deacon Henshaw, he was promised the privilege of producing whatever of evidence he chose when he took up his defence, “even to the reading of Webster’s old Spelling Book.” The statement of facts says,

“From this time to September 14th the church held seven half day sessions in hearing the case: two of which were occupied by the complainants, and five by Deacon Henshaw in making his defence.”

That the prosecuting officer, William Thompson, declared at the end of the second session that he should there rest the evidence of the prosecution, we admit. But that he came into court the third session and went right forward in examining his witnesses, and occupied one half the session in so doing, we affirm. Deacon Henshaw was then permitted to enter upon his defence, and one of Mr. Chase’s “facts” states that

“No other restriction was imposed than keeping to the point in hand.”

This general statement pertaining to restriction, looks very well upon paper, but was very incommodious to Deacon Henshaw, as it prevented him from offering any witnesses whatever. Another “*fact*” too, looks equally well, but conveys a very erroneous impression—it is as follows:—

“No testimony was refused but in one instance, and that was to prove “the insincerity of Mr. Spooner,” in commencing this labour; this witness was ruled out by the church on the ground that they were to judge of facts and not of motives.”

It will be recollected that Deacon Henshaw admitted the facts set forth in the complaint, mainly, but denied the inferences drawn from them. Now it will be seen that the prosecution had no facts to substantiate by witnesses, if they were governed by the usages of civil tribunals, as they pretended to be;—but they would confine themselves to the complaint. Now what could they have been examining witnesses about for two and a half church meetings? Why, it was to prove that Deacon Henshaw was a perfectionist, or that he had made declarations in the hearing of various individuals that savored of that doctrine:—and also that he had expressed an opinion that it was not an indispensable qualification, in order to preach the gospel, to receive ordination from an ecclesiastical body, and other such like charges not included in the specifications.

When Deacon Henshaw enters upon his defence and comes forward with his witnesses, objection is made that they are not professors, and all such evidence is inadmissible. But inquiry is made, if the Worcester Palladium and other like documents which were offered on the other side, were professors of religion. The reply was, that they were documentary evidence, and no such objection could lie against them. Then the inquiry was made, if the affidavits of these individuals would be admitted; to which objection could not well be made, and leave was granted. The affidavits being obtained and presented, at a subsequent meeting, inquiry was made, what was intended to be proved by them;—reply was made by Deacon Henshaw that he expected to be able to show by unguarded expressions of Mr. Spooner and others that the true object was not to reclaim Deacon Henshaw from his course and his error, but to excommunicate him and many others with him for the heretical opinions they were supposed to hold. But it was ruled by the Court, that is, the Bench, and not by “the church,” as set forth in “the statement of facts,” that no such evidence could be admitted, as that would be impeaching Mr. Spooner’s sincerity, and that could not be permitted, as “they were to judge of facts and not of motives.” But Deacon Henshaw had admitted all the facts, and the prosecution had spent two and a half meetings in proving what? Why, just what they chose, “that would throw any light upon the subject” in their estimation, and bringing forward such documents and newspapers and witnesses as they saw fit: and remember, the Deacon had been promised the same privilege, but when his turn come, every whit of testimony offered by him was rejected, and then it is put forth in the “statement of facts” that “No testimony was refused but in one instance,” and that one instance comprised some half dozen witnesses Deacon Henshaw proposed to offer, and as many affidavits.

While difficulties were pending, Mr. Chase sought a private interview with Deacon Henshaw;—and when the trial came on, the court took the stand and gave in his evidence, relating to said con-

versation. Deacon Henshaw pronounced his testimony a plump misrepresentation at the time.—We should not complain that the judge turned witness, had he not been one of the parties, virtually, and more than all, been the jury, not only through his high privilege to instruct the jury, but in his absolute power to control a majority of them. It did not look well, certainly, to the person on trial, to see judge, jury, witness and antagonist, all blended in one man. It was not in accordance with civil or military proceedings.

“After hearing the defendant for almost the entire time for five sessions, and gaining no new light, nor seeing any prospect of an end, the church sustained a motion, “to hear the remainder of the trial by question and answer.”

The “almost entire time of five sessions,” which Deacon Henshaw is charged with occupying, was spent as follows: a good part of the first session, by the prosecution, in examining their own witnesses; the remainder, in a fruitless attempt by Deacon Henshaw in offering his witnesses.—One whole session was spent in correcting the records, as it was found that the clerk had a way peculiar to himself in such matters, and that the records of the church were no indication of what had taken place in the meetings.—As an instance we will mention, that at the meeting of the church for considering the question of adopting a form of invitation to transient communicants, and other business, a clerk *pro tem*, was appointed, who made a brief record of the whole transaction, and transmitted it to Allen Newell, the permanent clerk; but he having doubts of its correctness, submitted it to his own particular friend who was present at the meeting, who substantiated the record;—nevertheless, he boldly affirmed that such a record should not go on the book, nor has it, excepting so much of it as suited his caprice;—notwithstanding, too, that the records of the clerk *pro tem*, were subsequently submitted to a committee of the church, who reported that his record ought to go upon the book.

Another instance we will give. At a time when Deacon Henshaw had made a statement before the church, he ascertained that some members had misapprehended his language, and he feared it might be the case with the clerk also; as the statement was a matter of record, Deacon Henshaw requested the clerk to read his minutes; he absolutely declined to do so, and declared it to be an imposition, and insult to request him to do it, and it was with difficulty that he could be persuaded to read it as a matter of mere courtesy.

And yet another.—In the fore part of the trial the propriety of Deacon Henshaw’s taking part in the deliberations of the church, being questioned by Uriel Spooner, Thompson and Dennis, more particularly, a resolution was brought forward to settle the Deacon’s privileges in the church in all particulars. The resolution was adopted, “That Deacon Henshaw enjoy all the privileges of the church, the same as other members.”

At a subsequent communion of the church, Mr. Chase framed his invitation in such shape as to cut off Deacon Henshaw from the communion; when Deacon Henshaw, being in his proper place at the

table, deemed it proper to remark to the church, that a vote had been adopted by the church, allowing him all the privileges of a member ; in accordance with that vote, he had come forward to unite with them in that celebration, and unless the church should see fit to reverse that decision he should feel justified in occupying his place as a member at that time. (These are the improper remarks of Deacon Henshaw alluded to by Mr. Chase, and for which he was subsequently cut off from all the privileges of a member, excepting so much as was necessary for his defence, and which must mean the privilege of coming into the church meetings to defend himself.) It became a subject of inquiry, what that vote of the church was, and the records were resorted to, to ascertain, and no vote of the kind was to be found, and the clerk declared that no such vote was passed. His memory, however, was refreshed by the Pastor, (at his place of business, and in the presence of a witness) that a vote was passed, granting unto Deacon Henshaw all the privileges of a member *in the discussion* of the church, and which vote now appears upon the church records, *interlined* for want of room to insert it in the proper place, and now under the date, and with the records of another meeting. There will be no difficulty in proving the falsity of this record, if the circumstances in the case are not sufficient to do it ; the mover of the resolution, well knows his object in moving it, and the whole purport of it, and his testimony will not be impeached by the clerk himself.

Another instance will show the necessity of keeping an eye to the record. Deacon Henshaw had been informed that a certain decision of the chair was not to be reversed, except by an appeal from the chair to the church, when Deacon Henshaw remarked that he might as well appeal to a cotton factory, as to the church, after they knew the decision of the chair, as passed transactions had fully shown, and as his experience had too often satisfied him. The record is made, that "he said he would as soon appeal to a cotton factory as to this church," omitting all the qualifications, and evidently intending to convey the idea that Deacon Henshaw had no occasion for making the remark, except to bring the church into contempt.

We will spare the clerk a more extended notice as these items will sufficiently indicate the way the West Brookfield church has of keeping its records. We think the next generation will be enabled to gather about the same amount of true information from these records, that the present generation is to gather from the Hieroglyphics, to be found in the ruins of ancient Egypt.

One session in *trying* to correct the records, accomplished little or nothing, except to expose their incorrectness. Another whole session was spent in debating a resolution of Ebenezer Merriam, to limit the time Deacon Henshaw should have in making his defence. A great portion of the remainder of the five sessions was spent in throwing obstacles in the way of Deacon Henshaw's making any defence, and raising objections, and protecting the church and ministry from aspersion—so that, in fact, Deacon Henshaw had occupied less than two sessions of the church, instead of "almost the entire time for five

sessions," as set forth in "the statement of facts." "No new light," had been gained, they say; and for a very good reason. They resisted with all their ingenuity, every attempt to throw light upon the subject, and "would not come to the light," knowing "That their evil deeds would be reprov'd." And "seeing no prospect of an end," Deacon Henshaw was called upon to stop and give way for the Rev. Rodney G. Dennis, to offer a resolution "That the remainder of the trial be heard by question and answer" and this resolution was adopted, and the trial of course closed, as Deacon Henshaw knew of no rule, in civil, military or ecclesiastical proceedings in justification of such a course, he declined lending any aid in criminating himself.

"And the next day, one o'clock was appointed for the church to give in their decision on the case; when the church decided that the *charges are sustained*, and Deacon Henshaw is not justified."

So it seems matters were brought to a focus speedily, when the church could manage things to their own liking. But the case was not terminated quite as briefly as the "statement of facts," denotes. That brevity was necessary, in order to foreclose the public mind to a correct understanding of the affair. Deacon Henshaw protested against the adoption of such a course, as depriving him of a trial, and gave notice that if the decision of the church should be unsatisfactory to him, he should appeal from their decision to an ecclesiastical council.

The Pastor had planned the work so that every one would not readily discover that they were being led in a round about way to come to a result, which would be too barefaced to come at openly and honestly. There is a flagrant misrepresentation in the above extract, from the statement of facts that "*the church decided that the charges are sustained.*" No such question was ever put, and no such decision would have been voted, as the sequel will show. The question was to be taken as the Pastor would have it, not, are the charges in the complaint against Deacon Henshaw sustained, not, is Deacon Henshaw guilty, and entitled to censure or expulsion, but "is Deacon Henshaw justified." What mere school boy cannot see the utter absurdity of such a proposition? not only on account of its indirectness, but who had any right to expect that he was justified by any demonstrations which had been had in the case? the Pastor and the prosecution had occupied more than five out of seven sessions of the church in showing that he ought not to be justified, and in preventing him from showing to the contrary. Could he have had the remaining part of the seven sessions in producing "such evidence as he thought would throw light upon the subject," which was promised him in the commencement, the church might have been prepared to vote upon that proposition, or upon one more tangible and more in accordance with "the rules of the army or navy." And more: The church voted that the question "Is he justified, or is he not" should be taken by yeas and nays, and that the members should be permitted to give the reasons for their voting as they did, or for not voting at all. And the clerk has recorded upon the church book, that the question was taken by yeas and nays, but

has neglected to state any thing more than the simple fact, that "the church voted that Deacon Henshaw is not justified."

The church pretend to adhere to parliamentary usages, as well as military. And we understand the custom to be in all deliberative bodies, when the Yeas and Nays are taken, universally to record each vote separately and individually. Upon the question "is Deacon Henshaw justified," the result of the vote was as follows; Eighteen voted Nay, One voted Yea, and Nineteen were not prepared to vote, and for the most part, gave as a reason, that there had been no trial of the case.

There is one thing worthy of remark in this place. Mr. Chase found, after he had got to fighting abolitionists for their Anti-slavery measures, that it was necessary for him to keep up his own pretensions to Anti-slavery principles; and having decoyed some few of the members of our society, and put them into communion with other individuals, quite pro-slavery, he started an abolition society on his own hook, and made it auxiliary to the new organization. The member who voted Yea, that Deacon Henshaw is justified, gave as a reason for his vote, that he considered it a war upon the old organization merely, as Mr. Chase and his friends, some of them, belonged to a society holding quite as severe language towards the church and clergy, as the society of which Deacon Henshaw was a member; and in proof of this assertion, he cited the official paper of their society, from which he read copious extracts. The Rev. Rodney G. Dennis and others returned thanks to God that they were not members of any Anti-slavery society in the land, if this was a fair description of their sentiments. The society itself was about making a move to take up its auxiliaryship—but the Bantling died a premature death.

The next step was to admonish Deacon Henshaw, through the pastor, in the name of a committee of the church, by a long letter, which we will not denominate any thing, for fear we may be considered blasphemous.—We refer the reader to the pamphlet containing it, and fearing it may not be at hand, we will merely give the requirements it contains, in order that Deacon Henshaw may enjoy the fellowship of the church.

"1st. That you disclaim fellowship and support of all resolutions, and doings of societies, conventions and individuals, that deny or call in question the divine appointment of the ministry, the church or sabbath, as understood by this church, and the Christian churches generally.

2nd. That you declare that you solemnly believe this to be a church of Jesus Christ, and that its covenant and articles are in accordance with the word of God, and that the Sabbath, ministry and church organizations are of divine appointment.

3d. That you acknowledge that it was unwise and wrong, and a sufficient cause of grief to the brethren, that you aided and countenanced Miss Kelley in her visits to this and the neighboring towns, last spring; also the impropriety of giving notices at the close of public worship, over the heads of the pastor and the church.

In fine, that in these things you confess that you have done wrong, and now ask forgiveness of God and this church, intending in future to give no just occasion of complaint or grief to the church of God."

Deacon Henshaw paid no regard to this admonitory letter, nor to the requirements it contained. It was put in his possession, Sept. 22,

1842, and he had from that time to Jan. 12th, following, to make his acknowledgments. That was the first anniversary of Mr. Chase's installation in this place, and he seemed to deem it meet to offer a sacrifice on the occasion. But he did not come forward and recommend nor advise that Deacon Henshaw be excommunicated,—No, not at all—But the church being convened and ready for business, the pastor read the following paper, which resolution, he said, had been handed in to the chair.

“Whereas, Deacon Josiah Henshaw has “neglected to hear the church” by not returning *any* answer to the final decision of the church.—And whereas, the course of conduct pursued by him during the trial, and subsequent thereto, has aggravated the cause of grievance in the minds of the brethren: Therefore resolved, that unless Deacon Josiah Henshaw make satisfaction to the church, within two weeks from this date, by lodging with the clerk, a written acknowledgment, as required and specified in the above named communication, that the clerk enter on the records of the church, this Preamble and Resolution, together with the final decision of the church, passed Sept. 22, 1842, which shall terminate his connection with the church in this place.”

A. NEWELL, Clerk.

Whether “A. Newell, Clerk,” was attached to this document when offered, as it now stands in the “statement of facts,” we are at a loss to determine. But we are sure the paper was all fitted and prepared to go upon the church book and to accomplish its design.

Inquiry was made from what source the resolution sprang.—But the pastor was unable to give any further information than that one of the brethren handed it to him, and that brother said that another brother requested him to hand it in, he did not know any thing at all about it himself;—and the last named brother was not present to trace it any further, but he subsequently gave in his testimony in writing, to the council, that he wrote it at Mr. Chase's request.

So it will be seen that it was thought best, at this late day, after having so nearly accomplished the job, to proceed with great caution. Not propose to excommunicate and cut off the Deacon, as had been done with other sinners who had committed flagrant acts,—but propose to “terminate his connection with the church of Christ in this place,” if he did not comply with the pastor's demand within two weeks;—So the resolution was adopted, and the Deacon having been all but executed before this, scarcely gave an expiring gasp. It was so gradual, that the death struggle was scarcely perceptible, and occasioned no uncommon solemnity among the lookers on; for in fact the sentence was not fully executed under two weeks, and then it executed itself without further effort;—and again there was a contingency about it that took off the edge.

It is worthy of remark, too, that there was quite an effort by the pastor to stir up the members to be out at this meeting to do their duty;—two members, at least, were present, who had never attended a meeting of the church during the trial, and were entirely ignorant of the circumstances in the case, and voted for the Deacon's expulsion.

But Deacon Henshaw had, long before this, filed in his protest to the action of the church, and appealed the case to a mutual council. From the “statement of facts” it would appear that Deacon Hen-

shaw's appeal to a council was immediately acceded to by the church. Far different from this was the case. No notice was taken of his request for a council, by Mr. Chase, and consequently, not by the church. Deacon Henshaw filed his protest to the proceedings of the church, and his request for a council Sept. 22nd, and used strenuous but ineffectual efforts to bring it before the church, from that time to Dec. 1st, when by perseverance the church were made to hear it. He had repeatedly solicited the pastor to call a meeting of the church to consider this request, and so had various other individuals been to him on the same errand; but he evidently was very reluctant to have the subject agitated, and neglected to do any thing about it. Mr. Chase had so arranged his matters, that it was very difficult to bring any business before the church. There was a weekly prayer meeting at which business might be done, provided notice be given of such business the Sabbath previous; as Deacon Henshaw could not get Mr. Chase to give notice, he gave notice himself, after the close of meeting, that at the next meeting of the church, he should propose to them to unite with him in calling an ecclesiastical council. At the church meeting, Mr. Chase came to Deacon Henshaw and persuaded him to omit bringing up his business at this meeting, as they wished to make it a special prayer meeting, and get into a better state of feeling;—he did it by promising to notify the business for the next meeting and then attend to it. When he gave the notice for the next meeting, he neglected to notify Deacon Henshaw's business, whereupon, Deacon Henshaw inquired from his pew if it was expected that his request would be brought up at that time, and Mr. Chase, instead of deigning a reply, spread forth his hands and craved the blessing of our "Lord Jesus Christ" upon the congregation. After the benediction, Deacon Henshaw again gave notice that he should present his business at the church meeting. But when the meeting came, Mr. Chase pronounced it disorderly to propose the business and ordered the Deacon to desist.—This was not the only instance in which Mr. Chase forfeited his word and disappointed the expectations of Deacon Henshaw and his friends, by refusing to appoint a meeting, or notify the business of a meeting.

At the meeting above named, however, the business was forced before the church, and a resolution offered "that the church unite with Deacon Henshaw in calling a mutual council," to which the minister opposed his influence, and repeatedly asserted that it was inexpedient to call for a council till the church had completed her action in the case.

An amendment was offered to the resolution "that if the church did unite with Deacon Henshaw in a council, it should be taken from within this association," and the amendment was adopted. Deacon Henshaw objected to this limitation, as it would not then be mutual. But the church did not vote that they would adopt the resolution as amended, and so the matter rested until Jan. 12th, when the church took final action. Deacon Henshaw then (after his time of probation had expired) renewed his application for a mutual council, and Mr. Chase,



though he had plead the impropriety of such a step before the final action of the church, was still as unwilling as ever to give his consent to such a measure,—and discouraged the church from entering into such an arrangement. No subsequent efforts were successful in persuading Mr. Chase and his party to unite in a mutual council.

But the church had obtained the credit of having offered a council from within this association from the circumstance of having adopted such an amendment to the resolution, when in fact they had made no offer, and were unwilling to have any kind of a council.

It was through accident or by mistake of Mr. Chase, that a council was finally obtained. He was willing that it should be understood that the church had offered a council, and that he and they were still willing to grant one. But when Deacon Henshaw had abandoned all hopes of procuring a mutual council, he concluded to accept of any council the church would grant, and accordingly signified his wish to Mr. Chase to call a meeting for that purpose—and other individuals applied to Mr. Chase, and urged the necessity of the step. As an evidence of the difficulty which was experienced in bringing it about, and to give a clue to the duplicity displayed, we shall here insert a letter of Mr. Chase to some of the brethren who had interested themselves in procuring a council: although he had given these brethren to understand that he was perfectly willing to acquiesce in a council, he writes as follows:

*Brothers Putnam & S N. White*

If you are dissatisfied and grieved with the whole course of the church in the case of Deacon Henshaw, it is perhaps unnecessary you should specify. But as the object of laying your grievances before the chh is first to settle the matter without a council if possible, but if we cannot then submit the points where we differ to the advice of friends.

If however you are dissatisfied with the *whole course* of the church, and do justify the Deacon's whole course, there is not much reason for a council. For the minds of the church as they have expressed them, are made up and satisfied in the main that they are right and Deacon Henshaw is wrong, and if your minds are equally made up in the matter, why ask advice of a mutual council? It is not thought respectful to make up our minds and then ask *advice*.

If I understand the usages of Congregational churches, an excommunicated member cannot be a party in calling a council, nor can he be admitted to appear before them. The church has no connection with an excommunicated member, nor can mutual councils if I am rightly informed. If you usk my advice as to the proper course for the aggrieved members of the chh to pursue it is for them to state their case or views fully before the chh; 1. What there is in the conduct or sentiments of the excommunicated member they disapprove of if any thing and 2nd, what in the doings of the chh they are grieved with. And if a council must be called, it must be called in the name of the aggrieved and of the church, and the aggrieved

and not the excommunicated person must appear before the council to state and defend their complaint.

Yours Respectfully

M. CHASE

To J Putnam and S N White, Brethren

This letter was received February 8th, nearly a month after Deacon Henshaw's expulsion. It will be recollected that before the final decision of the church, Deacon Henshaw's application for a council was set aside on the ground that it would be the more suitable time after the decision of the church, and now that is done, he cannot be heard at all, and the responsibility and labour must all be thrown upon those interested in his behalf.

There was no possibility in bringing about a council by Deacon Henshaw's intercessions with the pastor, or of those who sympathized with him. But the Deacon had appealed to the sympathies of some of Mr. Chase's friends who could not understand why he should not have a hearing before a council of such men as the church had intimated they would grant him, (by their amendment to the resolution) and through their influence, a petition was got up, to Mr. Chase, and signed by Mr. Chase's particular friends, to call "a special meeting of the church to grant Deacon Henshaw a council of not less than eight clergymen, with their delegates, from within the Brookfield association, providing he and his friends were willing to pay the whole expense."

Deacon Henshaw was enabled by this move to obtain a council with the limitation expressed, that it should be taken from within the bounds of this association; that was the restriction of the church, and amounted to virtually the same thing as submitting the whole selection to Mr. Chase and his friends. The church selected their part of the council where it best suited them, and compelled Deacon Henshaw to select his from within the Brookfield association. It was mutual so far as the assent of the parties was concerned, and no farther, though it should be understood that it was also mutually agreed that Deacon Henshaw was to bear the whole expense. It will be seen by the Letters Missive sent out by Mr. Chase alone, that Deacon Henshaw was to be a party before them—that they were to be a mutual council to advise the parties.

The council met, March 14th; and Deacon Henshaw appeared before them as plaintiff in the case, with counsel of his own selecting; and after the reading of the records of the church, and presenting their doings with their final action, Deacon Henshaw, by his counsel, offered the following plea as the ground of his complaint: viz.

We shall contend that the difficulty between the church and Deacon Henshaw originated in a conspiracy between a few individuals, to put a stop to Anti-slavery movements in this place, for the reason that said individuals were apprehensive that if they were continued, the minister would lose his authority and influence, and also his place.

That the pastor was the projector of the movement—that it was carried on by his direction, and terminated in conformity with his wishes.

2nd. That the complaint is fictitious and has no real foundation in fact—as may be shown by the following positive and circumstantial evidence, viz. 1st. That the nominal complainant is not the real one. 2nd. That it was not his object to reclaim the offending brother from any heretical opinions, or to reform him in his practical life; but to bring him to submit to the dictation of the church, or to leave the church with her anathemas on his head.

3d. That the church took false issue upon the complaint made against the accused, and did not try him upon the complaint, but upon charges not contained in the complaint—some of which had not transpired when the complaint was served—all of which were irrelevant to the original charges.

4th. That the proceedings of the church during the trial, although predicated upon gospel authority, ecclesiastical usage and parliamentary rules, were, in fact, a palpable and outrageous disregard of them all, and a caricature and burlesque upon righteousness, justice and equity, as may be proved by the following items. 1st. An unwarrantable assumption of authority by the moderator in determining the order of proceedings, and proscribing the accused and all who offered arguments in his defence or in opposition to those who were operating against him, and in the repeated violation of rules and decisions suggested and adopted by himself. 2nd. The unfaithfulness of the clerk in keeping the records of the proceedings of the church, and his unfairness in refusing to conform them to the understanding and approval of those most interested, by refusing to read them.

5th. That the pastor dishonored his sacred office by demanding of the accused, submission, and conformity to rules and usages of the church in contradistinction to obedience to the revealed will of God—And also by nurturing a partizan feeling in the church, in becoming the leader of a party—by forestalling the understanding and judgment of members of the church, and by exerting his whole influence to control the decisions of the church and to put down such as opposed themselves to his wishes.

6th. That the church is chargeable as a body with maladministration in its judicial capacity, by countenancing and encouraging and entertaining a complaint brought forward under the sanctity of a personal desire, by the complainant, to promote the best interests of the accused, and to discharge his own duty, when the introduction of said complaint was under circumstances indicative of selfish and unholy purposes—was prosecuted in an unchristian and unfair manner, and brought to a close in palpable violation of the repeated assurances of the moderator, that the accused should have ample opportunity and facilities for adducing evidence and making his defence: And in completely frustrating the attempt of the accused to dispel the erroneous opinion existing with some of the members of the church that the influences resulting from his course were unfavourable and detrimental to the interests of true religion.

Deacon Henshaw, by his counsel, proposed to substantiate, *this statement of facts*, by calling upon the complainant and individuals

associated with him, and such other witnesses as could be obtained, who were knowing to the facts in the case.

At this stage of the proceedings, the committee of the church to manage the case in their behalf, did as the "statement of facts," says, "enter a formal" verbal "protest against going into a defence of the church of Christ with excommunicated persons, and the open and avowed enemies of the institutions of the gospel." This they did through the champion of their committee, the Rev. Rodney G. Dennis, who most eloquently poured a most uncontrollable torrent of denunciation upon the heads—the characters and prospects of the "Foreigners and Infidels" whom the Deacon had employed as his counsel, together with the Deacon himself, and also a young man who had taken some notes during the trial, and whom the statement of facts denominates one of the Deacons "assistant counsel."

The committee of the church consisted of the Pastor, the Rev. Rodney G. Dennis, the complainant Uriel Spooner, William Thompson, and Allen Newell. Mr. Spooner did not deem the case of sufficient importance to him to be present—and Mr. Newell was sick, and necessarily absent;—many other persons who had taken a deep interest in Deacon Henshaw's trial so far as to dislodge him from the church, were not present;—notices were sent to them to appear as witnesses; but it was not until the council had passed a resolve, "That this council deem it important for them to state, that in their opinion, members of this church who are invited to appear before them as witnesses, ought to feel themselves bound in duty thus to appear and give in their testimony," that they could be obtained. Said resolution being attested by the scribe and served upon the members, they were prevailed upon to come forward, though with apparent reluctance.

Deacon Henshaw proposed to call upon Mr. Chase to testify with regard to the origin of the complaint.—He did not exhibit any strong relish for being a witness and the council decided that Mr. Chase and Deacon Henshaw should both be excused from testifying.

He next proposed to offer the complainant, Uriel Spooner, who was present. It was proposed to put the witnesses upon their oaths. The council voted that each witness might be requested to be put under oath.—Mr. Spooner declined being put upon oath. He was requested to give his reasons for being unwilling to be put upon his oath—but refused to give any—and remarked, that he was not under obligations to give his reasons. He was inquired of if he had conscientious scruples against taking an oath, to which he replied that he had not, but that he could tell the truth as well without being sworn, as with. He positively refused to be put upon his oath upon any considerations whatever, and as positively asseverated that he could tell the truth as well without an oath as with, and that if we could not believe him without an oath we could not with. Mr. Dennis was also vehemently opposed to members of a church of Christ, being put under oath by such men, and entered his protest again. Deacon Henshaw had no power to compel him to swear and of course was under the necessity of submitting to Mr. Spooner's inflexibility. So he proceed-

ed to propound the same questions which he would if Mr. Spooner had been upon oath:—but Mr. Spooner having listened to Mr. Dennis's castigation of Deacon Henshaw's counsel, on account of their infamous principles, declined being put into communication with them—he would not condescend to contaminate himself by replying to their questions. He said that he was a member of Christ's church, and he wished to know if the persons who were to question him believed in the existence of the Christian church. The council stated to him that the merits of Deacon Henshaw's case could in no way depend upon the character of his council, that he had a right to come forward with good, bad, or indifferent as he chose, and that he, Mr. Spooner, was in duty bound to answer the questions they might propose—but he could not assent to it. The questions proposed to Mr. Spooner were calculated to draw from him the origin of the complaint, &c.—to these questions he not only objected to answering the “Deacon's attorneys” but also objected to answering the questions either to them or to the council. Mr. Chase at this stage also objected to the asking witnesses personal questions. Nothing could be drawn from Mr. Spooner with regard to the origin of the complaint. He consented to say that he wrote it, but refused to answer whether he were the author.—He admitted that he did not hear Abby Kelley lecture—that he did not hear the Deacon give the notice mentioned in the fourth specification—that he did not know whether it was before or after the complaint;—he admitted that he did belong to an Anti-Slavery Society a short time, but did not now. He refused to answer whether he ever heard an Anti-slavery lecture, or whether slavery in his opinion was a Bible institution.

Although this witness refused to be put under oath, and refused to answer the most important questions put to him, he was after all appreciated as a very efficient instrument in disclosing the source from whence the complaint originated, and Deacon Henshaw was perfectly satisfied to submit that part of the case without further testimony. So evident was the fact that Mr. Spooner did not originate the complaint, that subsequently when the Pastor made his plea, he thought it would appear, the better part of valor to confess what we have quoted from “the statement” that at some time and place unknown, “after prayer and consultation” “it was agreed to commence a labor with Deacon Henshaw.”

Mr. William Thompson, the complainant's assistant, volunteered his services to throw light upon the subject which was being investigated before the council.—He was requested to receive the oath but peremptorily declined, and as peremptorily declined giving any reasons; but admitted that he had not any conscientious scruples in being sworn.

It was very remarkable to see these opponents of Nonresistance, refuse to comply with their own darling system and refusing to give any reasons therefor; and the only intelligible conclusion that could be come at, we humbly believe to be, that had they solemnly bound themselves by an oath, they would not only have been under obligations to tell the truth, but to tell the *whole* truth, which in their unsworn state they could tell or let alone as best suited their convenience.

Numerous other witnesses from each of the parties were called upon as witnesses, who made no objections to being sworn to tell the whole truth. We trust that we shall not be understood as complaining that any witness did not tell the truth, but as merely suggesting, that some might have told more truth if they had been so disposed.

The testimony before the council it is unnecessary here to recapitulate, and it would be tedious and voluminous. No witnesses were called upon the other side to set aside the evidence or to establish other facts. The counsel for the church however took an active interest in cross-examining the witnesses brought forward.

"Thus four days, (says the "Statement of Facts,") and large portions of the nights were consumed in hearing Dea. Henshaw's advocates prove that the Pastor of this church was a *tyrant* and *hypocrite*—the clerk of the church a liar, and the church the mere tools of the "foul plotting" pastor."

This is a statement which modesty would here forbid our making, but as the pastor has made it and procured the sanction of the church to the truth of it, we do not feel called upon to contradict it. The next sentence however, that

"Not only the official acts but the private character of the pastor was permitted to be shown up, though in vain as to truth, yet not as to effect, to substantiate the greatest crimes charged upon him by these devouring wolves, not disguised in sheep's clothing,"

we shall pronounce an unblushing falsehood, which he has not the shadow of an excuse for making and for suborning the church to attest to. There was no imputation against the private character of Mr. Chase in a single transaction or remark, and no investigation had been or attempted to be had concerning it, nor any permission granted by the council to do it. We presume that Dea. Henshaw's counsel will feel obliged to the author of the "Statement of Facts" for exonerating them from the suspicion which attaches to some characters of being "disguised in sheep's clothing."

At the close of the third day as the "statement" says, Mr. Chase occupied somewhat more than one hour in an eloquent plea in defence of the course pursued by the church. He represented that infidelity was stalking abroad under the convoy of Anti-slavery professions, and making disastrous havoc with the morals of society, and sowing the seeds of moral death in the minds of the young. That the unprincipled, the intemperate and the dissolute were the patrons if not the leaders of the Anti-slavery cause in this place. That the Bar-room was the favorite resort for the conclave to meet to espouse their cause, and to ridicule and blaspheme the church and her ministers and ordinances and all that was sacred. And he made a most felicitous appeal to the sympathies of the council in behalf of our bleeding zion, and besought them to consider well whether they could justify the transactions which had been spread out before them, and the doings of which they had been eye witnesses.

In the evening James Boyle addressed the council in behalf of Deacon Henshaw. He made no attempt to apologise for the acts charged upon him, but went into a minute investigation of the Worces-

ter resolutions, and endeavoured to show their validity. He analyzed the specifications throughout, and argued their emptiness and utter absurdity, and made a close and scorching application of the evidence adduced.

On the following day J. M. Fisk made some remarks before the council upon the same side of the question, and with a few additional remarks from Mr. Chase, the council took possession of the case, and in the evening delivered the following result.

### RESULT OF COUNCIL.

“The council,—having given a long and patient hearing to the case, submitted to their investigation and advice, to the full satisfaction of all concerned, find the proceedings in the premises to have been such, that they have come to the following Result ;

“It is the unanimous opinion of this council in view of all the facts and circumstances of the case, that this church ought to remove all censures, under which Deacon Josiah Henshaw lies, and receive him again into their fellowship and communion.

“And it is our unanimous opinion, that Deacon Henshaw, when so received, ought to give his brethren, when asked, all such explanations respecting his views and sentiments, as may tend to remove from their minds any grievances or misapprehensions they may entertain respecting him ; and that Deacon Henshaw, and all the members of the church ought to adopt all conciliatory measures calculated to effect an entire reconciliation.”

And now for the “astonishment” and “amazement” which has developed itself in Mr Chase’s “statement of facts” some six or eight months after the Result was given. Mr. Chase and his church having neglected to comply with the recommendations of the council, deem it necessary to throw dust in the eyes of the people and try to fill their own also. We shall take the liberty to review some of the “remarks” which are “respectfully submitted to the members of the council and all others who shall feel interest sufficient to read them,” in the Statement of Facts. It says,

“A work of acknowledged authority says, “The business of councils is not to pass decrees, but to give light.”—“They are considered by the churches, as *expositors* of what is right ; expediency and duty, in particular cases, submitted to them.” “This result tells us clearly enough, what the parties “ought” to do, but this is mere dictation.”—“No sentence from the Vatican or the Star Chamber was ever more emphatically by “authority” than this result.”—“A decision without reasons or explanation !” “a summary decree ! sent to a pastor and a church, in the land of the Pilgrims.”—This result, by its silence and by its supposed justification of the accused, sustains the defence set up by the Deacon’s attorneys.”

Indeed it does ! Now let us look at this mighty and overwhelming argument “respectfully submitted to the council and all others,” in “The statement of Facts.”

Mr. Chase and his friends had the control of selecting a council to suit themselves :—they would not permit Deacon Henshaw to go out of the bounds of the Brookfield association for his part of the council,

for fear he should bring in some Garrison clergymen, with their delegates, if they were to be found elsewhere. It was certain that no such ministers were to be found within these limits.—With a council selected under such restrictions; with the leading clergyman in the association and in the council, in full fellowship and communion with Mr. Chase himself, upon Garrisonism and Perfectionism and Women's rights, and all such outlandish notions; having himself had a sprinkling of Abby Kelley's infidel denunciations in his own society and from under his own pulpit; and there being but one clergyman at the board professing Anti-slavery principles, and not more than two of the delegates, and neither of these three, Garrisonians, but all belonging to the same order of Abolitionists to which Mr. Chase professed to belong, (new organizationists) it would seem that he had secured a most favorable position for a triumphant result. And it was so understood by Deacon Henshaw, and his friends, that they had.—He had contended against submitting it to such an ex parte tribunal as this in fact would be, till he found there was no other alternative but to take that, or call an ex parte one himself;—so he chose to submit to this.

Now let us see what was the business of this council, and how they were called; we copy from the "statement of facts."

"To the Congregational Church in North Brookfield, the Congregational Church in West Brookfield,—sendeth Greeting.

Brethren;—In accordance with a vote of this church, granting unto Deacon Josiah Henshaw a mutual council; I hereby invite you to meet in council, by your Rev. Pastor and Delegate, at the meeting house in this place, March 14th, 10 A. M. to consider and advise us in regard to the difficulties existing between this church and Deacon Henshaw, and others.

Respectfully Yours, M. CHASE, Pastor.

Now let us recur to the decision of the council and see if they appear to understand what the proper business of a council is. They say, "having given a long and patient hearing to the case submitted to their investigation and advice, It is the unanimous opinion of the council, in view of the facts and circumstances in the case, that this church ought so remove all censures under which Deacon Henshaw now lies, and receive him again into their fellowship and communion." And this is said by the "statement of facts" to be "a summary decree! sent to a pastor and church in the land of the Pilgrims"—"this is mere dictation"—"it tells clearly enough what the parties "ought" to do". But it dont advise us. "No light is given; neither the understanding, nor consciences of the church are addressed." "Their business is to give Light."

But in casting about for some crevice to creep out from under such a burdensome decision as this was, it seems Mr. Chase got a clue at something that would shelter him from the astounding result in some degree.

"The words (in the result) 'proceedings, premises, facts and circumstances' lead some to conjecture that the trial was irregular"

(in some trifling informalities, probably) and but for that, Deacon Henshaw's doom would have been confirmed by the council. But that would not work, for "it leaked out" (the statement of facts says) that



the council were almost unanimously of the opinion that the trial was regular. Now they seem to be involved in "profound darkness" for the want of some reason from the council why they gave such a result. The idea that the council should tell the church that "they ought to restore Deacon Henshaw" and assign no other reason for so doing, than that it was their unanimous opinion, is very unsatisfactory. "Your unanimous opinion!" As though that was any reason why we should restore him.

Another difficulty complained of is,

"That this result is inconsistent with itself. By it Deacon Henshaw is acquitted, and not acquitted at the same time."

This is a terrible calamity. "This is putting the cart before the horse." Why? why because when Deacon Henshaw was arraigned before the church for certain misdemeanors, and put upon trial, he refused to tell them whether he believed this to be a church of Jesus Christ or not, for the reason that that was not one of the charges preferred against him and had nothing to do with the trial; and the council advise him, not command him, that when he is received to his former standing "he ought to give to his brethren when asked all such explanations respecting his views and sentiments, as may tend to remove any grievances or misapprehensions they may entertain respecting him." They clearly mean to be understood, that it is not necessary or proper that it should be made a condition of his being received back, for he has not been regularly complained of for such a denial, and it is highly improper to call upon a man to criminate himself—and moreover it may not be a crime to believe this is not a church of Jesus Christ, and though he deny that it is, he may be enabled to give them such explanations respecting it, if they are Christians, and zealous for the glory of God, rather than for sectarian organizations, as entirely to relieve their minds.

This does not look to us as though the council partially acquitted the Deacon and left him as the "statement of facts" expresses it

"With a rope round his neck, in the hands of those he regards as his enemies" nor that it was a device by which the council meant to throw off the responsibility, of meeting the case."

But that it is a sheer cavil of Mr. Chase because he could not find some intimation of a censure for Deacon Henshaw in the result of the council. This is sufficiently evident from the fact that Mr. Chase in his "respectful remarks" deeply laments, that this result by its silence and by its *supposed* justification of the accused, sustains the defence set up by the "Deacon's Attorneys."

"The trial being regular and the issue from the premises just," (as Mr. Chase would have it, and not the council) "on what could this result be based but the merits of the case?"

Why, nothing to be sure, if you mean the result of the council. The council based their decision upon the merits or the case, and decided that the church based their decision upon any thing else but the

merits of the case, and it is no marvel at all as the "Statement of facts" would make it appear, that

"all the enemies of religion and every infidel in West Brookfield understands it so."

Mr. Chase and his own church understand it so, and cannot possibly help it, and make every shift and turn possible to get rid of the conclusion that this council, selected for the especial purpose of confirming the decision of this church, have in direct violation of the well known opinions and sympathies of its members with Mr. Chase against Garrisonism and all other hateful isms, justified Deacon Henshaw, and left an indirect censure upon Mr. Chase and his church.

But how unkind and severe it is in Mr. Chase to insist upon these Brethren in the Ministry who were in the same category with himself as regards Garrisonism, &c.,—giving their reasons in detail for their decision. He evidently understands that these old friends of his have actually exposed themselves to all the encroachments of Deacon Henshaw and Abby Kelly, which he has been suffering under; for he tells the churches under the care of these nine ministers, that "if they sustain the doings of their Pastors and delegates," they must look out for breakers. And "if the Church in West Brookfield is to receive Dea. Henshaw into fellowship, they must to be consistent restore Col. Fisk and J. A. Howland." (That is a mistake, it does not follow that if they restore one they must the other two—for the two last named left of their own accord, they were not pushed out.) But, says the "Statement of facts,"

"Dea. Henshaw has but to present this result at the door of any of the nine churches, to gain ready admission,"

"and you must take him with his whole company and submit to all the annoyances to which I have." Certainly, this is correct reasoning, and we have no doubt that every member of the council understood, that under the same circumstances, Deacon Henshaw would have the same right to do the same things in their societies, that he had done in West Brookfield, and not be chargable with any criminality.—Why attempt to frighten the members of these nine Churches?

These considerations seem to be an insuperable obstacle in the mind of Mr. Chase to coming to the conclusion that the council meant what they said; and yet he cannot possibly persuade himself that they did not mean to be understood to say, that they could not discover by the evidence in the case, that Deacon Henshaw had done any thing worthy of bonds or excommunication from the church, and that they were of opinion that the church had missed a figure in following the dictation of the minister; for he would fain persuade himself at least, that

"they did not understand the case. Had they, they could not have come to such a result."

But he might as well try to make himself believe that statement, as the next one he penned, viz. That

"the church did not appear before the council,"

when he himself and his second right hand man, William Thompson, were in diligent attendance. The Rev. Mr. Dennis, his first right hand man was there and labored with such energy as to excite much merriment in the audience, and with such unflinching determination to set the council right, as almost to dissolve it; and having completely exhausted himself and resigned his commission as committee of the church, because the council behaved so, he called upon the spectators to fill the vacancy occasioned by his resignation. His first left hand man Uriel Spooner did not seem to want to be there at first, as he was wanted as a witness, but after the examination he was there pretty constantly. His second left, Capt. Newell, was unwell and could be there but a small part of the time. — The first intimation that was ever given that the church was not there by their committee to attend to the case in behalf of the church was in the “Statement of Facts,” and we presume that was the first knowledge the council had of the fact.

But, to return,—This subterfuge, “that the council did not understand the case,” does not answer the purpose of a dernier resort—for it probably occurs to the writer of the “statement of facts” that he and his assistants had ample opportunity to make them understand it. And moreover, the council reported that they had “given a long and patient hearing to the case, submitted to their investigation and advice, *to the full satisfaction of all concerned;*” and they neglected to demur that they had not been heard to their full satisfaction. And again the urgency to be heard more at length than the council were wont to deem necessary, was altogether upon the other side. The Deacon and his “attornies” were fearful the council might not understand the case, and advocated a lengthy and full investigation.

But the dernier resort of Mr. Chase with his flock is a very remarkable one, taken in connection with his admissions and all the circumstances in the case.

Mr. Chase admits that when the council gave in their result, he “was strongly inclined, at first, to accede to this opinion,” which he in another place calls “a summary decree,” and declares it not a whit behind a “sentence from the Vatican.” And may it not be that his judgment was clearer, and that he had more “light” when he was “strongly inclined” to submit, than he had six months afterwards, when he concocted the “statement of facts.” Is it not possible that when the case was all spread out before Mr. Chase and his church, a great part of whom were present, that the council were conscious that they possessed light sufficient to understand what would be right for them to do, and that the “simple opinion of the council,” of what “they ought” to do, accompanied with a full exhibition of the case, would supersede the necessity of giving the whys and wherefores at full length at every point. And it is sufficiently evident that Mr. Chase comprehends the answers that would have fallen upon his ears, had his fearful list of interrogatories been answered in detail. Instead of being denied the privilege of putting the following very significant questions, he had no occasion for it; neither could he bring his own mind to the

absurd position of proposing them until six months had elapsed and he had succeeded in mystifying his own mind and others also, by raising groundless surmises and subterfuges, and then he comes forward with his knock down arguments.

“May we not ask on what grounds the council issued the case? No. That the proceedings in the case were regular, has leaked out; but the result does not inform us.”

What a poser this for Moses Chase to put. Is it any advantage to his argument if the council did decide that the proceedings of the church in point of legality, were regular? We think not. For Deacon Henshaw believed that in submitting his case to the judgment of a pro-slavery council, as he had reason to suppose that it would be, that though they might be disposed to acquiesce in the decision of Mr. Chase and his church, yet their better judgment would prevent their stamping their approbation upon the ridiculous proceedings of that body in coming to that result, and thereby something might be gained to the cause of justice.

But according to Mr. Chase's declaration, that they decided “that the trial was regular, or at least so regular so as not to vitiate the result” there remains no occasion for asking the question “on what grounds they issued this case.” It is conclusive that they come right up to the merits of the case and decided that Deacon Henshaw had done nothing censurable under the circumstances, and that the action of the church, though “regular,” was totally subversive of justice, equity and impartiality in its final decision. It is the last question that we should have supposed that Mr. Chase would have put forth, expecting to have an answer. And those following, are in the same category with the above;

“May we not ask whether the Garrison defence set up and argued four days, was approved or disapproved.”

Instead of being responded to, “No,” as he would have it, he would have been replied to that he had taken an ample part of those “four days” in warning the council against the heresies of Garrisonism, and that the council decided with a full understanding on that subject, and that the “Garrison defence” was approved.

“May we not ask whether the church had any just grounds of complaint against Deacon Henshaw, who has waged a continual war against the church, and employed the known and sworn enemies of the Sabbath, and the church, ‘to curse us!’ No;”

Who says you may *not* ask such a question if it will be any gratification to you, but yourself? And the reply would come, “My Dear Sir, you must understand that we not only decided that the church had no just ground of complaint against Deacon Henshaw, but that Deacon Henshaw had just ground of complaint against the church, and we were unanimously of opinion that you ought to restore him to his former good standing.”

“May we not ask whether the rejection of testimony to prove the “insincerity” of the complainant, of which so much has been said, was justifiable? No. May we

not ask whether we are authorized, in the opinion of the council, in debarring the accused from communion while on trial? No."

If it would have been any consolation to Mr. Chase to have known more officially the opinion of the council upon the regularity of the trial than the "leak out" evidence he has picked up, we should have been much gratified to have had him asked the questions in the proper time, though the counsel might have corroborated what has "leaked out."

"May we not ask whether the pastor is bound to give all notices thrust into his hands, and whether, if he declines, any one may do it? No."

Now, really, Mr. Chase, you may ask this compound question, and we would have been much obliged to you if you had asked it before, and obtained a response to it from the council; for we feel interested ourselves, in the reply you might obtain, though whatever it might have been, we should not have received it as a "summary decree from the Vatican," but as advice from an ecclesiastical council, selected by a pro-slavery church, whether it was admissible for a private individual to give notice of some meeting for a benevolent purpose after the minister declined giving it. It is a very pertinent question; and you would do well to have asked it before the council was called, or before there was any occasion for calling one.

"May we not ask whether the church ought to open her doors to the Garrison Lecturers Deacon Henshaw is continually crowding upon us?"

Though you say no, we say yes, ask it; and do not remember to forget to tell whoever you ask, that the "doors of the church" belong to the parish, and it may be the parish will be willing to have the gospel of salvation preached therein, if the church is not; see what the council "decree" about that if you please.

"And finally, May we not ask any reasons or explanation of the sentence passed upon us?"

It is too bad, indeed, to be put off with nothing but the "unanimous opinion" of the council after setting down to an investigation of "four days" to the full "satisfaction of all concerned."

"It is 'our unanimous opinion!' that is all the light or reason we give;"

so says Mr. Chase of the result of the council. We really wish that this demand for "more light" had come a little earlier. It would have given the friends of Dea. Henshaw great pleasure in contributing what they might of "light," and they would have been greatly rejoiced if the council had been permitted to pull open the eyelids of Mr. Chase and his friends a little more. They undoubtedly were mistaken in supposing that light enough had been shed upon their minds in the investigation, to render superfluous any very nice performance in anatomizing this subject. They ought to have been more particular, and requested of Mr. Chase that he proceed with them, as he was wont to with Deacon Henshaw, in the question and answer style, and then probably Mr. Chase would not have been under the necessity of writing a book to warn the constituents of these clergymen to beware lest Dea-

con Henshaw and Abby Kelley break into the inclosure of their churches, as their pastors had let the bars down.

In bringing our review of the "statement of facts" to a close, we will notice some few of the remarkable admissions and assertions therein contained.

1st. That the "council was distinguished for age, experience, and weight of character" and "we love our brethren, and have confidence in them but we believe they did not understand the case." "We desire to know and do our duty" and "we are sinners" and esteem that man or council, our best friend, who will point out our sins and lead us to see and feel our guilt. "Far be it from me to intimate that the council as a council, or as individuals generally, have the least fellowship, or favor for such radical and destructive positions" and "yet the result spreads its broad shield" over all the Deacon's acts and takes him into fellowship with themselves and their churches, "and virtually censures the church for having testified their abhorrence of these doctrines and measures, and for being grieved with a brother who fully sustains, and adopts the whole." "The main ground of the defence was the truth and righteousness of the charges alleged against the Deacon, and admitted by him to be true," and "on what could this result be based but the merits of the case." "And it was as one member said it would be, the result would astonish us all." And yet "the result specifies nothing; it covers up the whole in such general terms, that nothing definite can be known, only by conjecture." "In what we have done in this matter we have been prompted by a sense of duty. We have done it conscientiously. We feel no ill will, or prejudice. It is a matter of conscience, whether we fellowship Garrisonism." And now "shall we reverse our decisions, and change our conscientious judgments on the unanimous opinion of a council." "Councils possess only advisory powers," yet "No sentence from the Vatican, or the Star chamber, was more emphatically by "authority" than this result. "The decision sustains the defence of the Deacon's attorney," "We desire to recognise the hand of God on this trying occasion" but "an unreserved reference of matters of conscience, say the standards, to another person or body of persons, is repugnant to the scriptures, which make our consciences amenable to God alone."

And could we be permitted to ask a question or two, it would be after this fashion.—Mr. Chase have you not changed your creed since you began to discipline Deacon Henshaw? since you required of sabbath School Teachers, to teach the doctrines of the church and nothing else? And were you of the same opinion as now, when you would have Deacon Henshaw submit to the voice of the church, and accept it as the voice of God? If the local church to which he is amenable is the voice of God to him, what earthly tribunal is the voice of God to you? or do you have immediate access, where other sinners may not approach? You confess for yourself and your friends that you are sinners in general terms, though you "specify nothing." Do you take it patiently when your advisers "specify" that you are sinners in this matter plain enough? You are understood to say in your "statement of facts," that the council decided that it was no sin or fault in a member to deny the Christian name and character to all the evangelical churches in the land which are like your own church, and to denounce them as hypocrites. Do you really believe that these nine Clergymen, whom you duly appreciate for their "experience and weight of character," with their delegates have really gone over to the enemy, and now demand your strongest efforts to counteract the destructive influences which they are exerting to overthrow the evangelical churches. We are happy to be advised of this circumstance in the "statement of facts." It is an omen for good if a council of your

own selection has been convened, who have proclaimed it through you to the world, that sinners against God, truth, civil and religious liberty, can no longer shelter themselves from merited rebuke, by assuming the sanctimonious title of evangelical churches and Christians.

2nd. Mr. Chase has made some very palpable misstatements in his "statement of facts," which in themselves are of no great moment, but which deserve a passing notice.—He very well knew who Deacon Henshaw announced to the court as his counsel, and yet he takes the liberty to add two more to the list who were in no sense engaged or employed as such.—He evidently wishes to show off an array of council that will nearly equal that of the church for numbers.

Of one of Deacon Henshaw's council he says "Who is James Boyle? and before he answered the question, he would have done well to have informed himself.

"Common fame (he says) declares him to be a Foreigner, and once a Roman Catholic, who obtained ordination by Oneida Presbytery, and was by them deposed from the ministry for heresy."

James Boyle may be a Foreigner and once a Roman Catholic, and have been ordained by Oneida Presbytery for ought we know, and we cannot see that any stigma would affix to his character thereby—we have never inquired his origin, and know not whether he was born in Europe or America, nor whether he is entitled to citizenship, in this realm or not:—we know him only as a minister of Jesus Christ, to all climes, and conditions and complexions;—we know not that he was ever a Roman Catholic, but we know that he renounces Popery now, and Protestantism too, as far as it is inconsistent with the principles of Christianity.—We know too that he would rejoice at being deposed from the ministry for heresy by any sect in Christendom, bearing any semblance, to the Roman Catholic, and count it an honor to suffer shame from the enemies of Christ for preaching his doctrine—but we do not know that he does enjoy the honor of being deposed.

Of the other of Deacon Henshaw's counsel, Mr. Chase says,

"Col. J. M. Fisk, the son of Rev. John Fisk, is well known in this community. He was recently excommunicated from this church for substantially the same offences as were charged upon Deacon Henshaw; he is a Garrison Abolitionist of the first water, the High Priest of Comeouters in this region, who came out and denounced the church of Christ in the true S. S. Foster style."

It requires but little sagacity to discover that here is some truth told that was not intended;—"recently excommunicated from this church," for what? for being a "comeouter." The story would have been more intelligibly told, had he said—That the scapegoat broke out of the fold, and the church "put up the bars" to prevent his breaking in again.

But the statement is not all truth, nor intended to be, though thrown into the market as such:—said Fisk never "denounced the church of Christ" nor renounced it; he only removed his connection from the sectarian corporation of which Mr. Chase is general agent, to the church of the living God. But Mr. Chase is pleased to put a feather in his cap which he declines wearing; he is not entitled to that honor.

The honor of being "the High Priest of Comeouters in this region" certainly belongs to another—to a stripling in years compared with himself, who walked unceremoniously out of this "sectarian organization called a church" six months before he was prepared to let go his hold upon this supposed "ark of safety."

As to the other charge of being "a Garrison Abolitionist of the first water" he makes no objection. He will make no effort to shake off the opprobrium which attaches to him from having his name associated with Garrison or any other man infinitely below him in reputation, who advocates true principles with a moiety of his devotion. If he may be permitted to select for himself of the honors which this world proffers, it will be to enjoy the honor of "suffering shame" with Garrisonians for the adoption of those principles which Jesus Christ proclaimed and which ever have received contempt and ridicule from Scribes and Pharisees, from priests and parasites of the ungodly to the present time.

But to what a distressing dilemma must Mr. Chase have been driven to be under the necessity of bringing under review, the characters of Deacon Henshaw's counsel, together with spectators sympathizing with him, in order to make out a "statement of facts" connected with the trial of Deacon Henshaw. The petty fling of "the Deacon's attorneys" is surely amusing—and then the inimitable description—one a broken down Catholic Priest, and the other an insignificant Comeouter. As though one of his excommunicated Deacons might not, after being debarred any counsel before the church, employ "attornies" before the council if he chose. And whom did this reverend Divine employ, after periling his own standing by rejecting the advice of the council, when he had occasion to appear before a subsequent council to shew cause why he should not be dismissed from the church under his charge. Did he employ an attorney?—and was that attorney a Christian? If Unitarians are Christians, he might have been. But Mr. Chase says Unitarians are not Christians,—and now this man who sneers at the "Deacon's attornies," and refuses to hold communion with Unitarians, gets a Unitarian Lawyer to advocate his case and plead for his right to lord it over the Church and Parish this year out at least.—Not that we would be understood to reflect upon his judgment in this case, or upon his "attorney" in the slightest degree, but merely to show up this pink of consistency do we allude to these things.

The remark which Mr. Chase imputes to Wm. B. Earl of Leicester, as having been made at his house in the presence of his family,

"That if you must have it, I must say, that I am of those who believe that the Sabbath is of the Devil,"

Mr Earl pronounces to be false, and is sustained in that assertion by two competent witnesses who were present at the time.

Mr. Chase sheds some crocodile tears when he says, that

"Sorrow hath taken up her abode in some parental hearts, over children ruined and reckless, or on the borders of it. The most painful anxieties agonize the Christian heart to see the barriers of the Sabbath, the ministry of the gospel, reverence for religion, and the counsels of the aged, and respect for civil laws rudely assailed and destroyed."



This doleful description has allusion to the parents of one young man only, instead of half or two thirds of the parish as some may infer. Joseph A. Howland, whom Mr. Chase denominates one of the Deacon's assistant counsel was present before the council, with notes taken at the Deacon's church trial, and might be more properly spoken of as a witness than as counsel—He is the one and the only one alluded to as having almost broken the hearts of his parents. But could the truth be known, it would appear that these broken hearted parents have more respect for, and confidence in the principles and conduct of their deluded son, than they have in Mr. Chase or those who worship at his shrine.

We have been thus particular in alluding to transactions which have taken place in connection with the operations of our society, and in explanations of remarks and allusions in the "statement of facts" from the circumstance that such a confusion of ideas generally prevails upon the principles by which we are actuated in our organized capacity as a society, and also from the prevalent predisposition of the community to judge of our principles and measures from the favor they may receive from the clergy, and from such as hang on to their skirts.—We are fully aware of the impracticability of surmounting this difficulty,—of removing this stumbling stone out of the way by any argument we may make :—nevertheless, we must let the truth do its work—upon our lives, and not upon our professions or our theories, depends the general adoption of our principles.

Through the operations of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, and through the operations of our own society, however insignificant they may appear to others, important principles have been developed, and disclosures made, which would have shocked our sensibilities before we had been made acquainted with the delusions which had fastened upon our own minds in connection with the prevailing theology. It is an impulse which we have received from the Anti-Slavery discussion which impels us to disregard our former veneration to the sacred office, and the rites and ceremonies of a church whose pretensions to be the true church of God rest not upon any inherent evidence in her works or her influence, but in her power to compel her high assumption to be respected.—Every step we have advanced in vindication of the rights of man has disclosed some new link in the chain which binds men to custom, and to the traditions of the church, and makes them mere appendages to the colossal sects which fill christendom.

Mr. Chase is careful in the outset of his remarks to rid himself of the responsibility of originating the commotions which have unsettled him and rent his church in twain. If he has any fears upon that point we feel able to relieve him.—He had forerunners who prepared his way ; he is chargeable only with touching the torch to the ordnance which others loaded, and loaded so heavily that it has done admirable execution both front and rear.

Mr. Chase, be it known is not the man for whom we have less respect as a professed minister of Christ, than others who have cast their influence around us. He is by no means a singular instance of clerical audaci-

ty within the circumference of our knowledge;—he may have less prudence and less artfulness than others, but he has more boldness and perseverance to counterbalance those deficiencies.

West Brookfield has been peculiarly blessed with what have been termed revivals of religion for more than thirty years; and it had become so proverbial, that a minister from abroad never lifted up his hands in prayer when he arrived in this place, without blessing God for the wonderful works he had wrought here. That the laudable efforts of ministers and private Christians to turn sinners from their evil ways to serve the Lord were fully blessed, we have not a doubt; but we as firmly believe on the other hand, that with this desire to convert sinners and to magnify the Lord, was mixed a desire to magnify the church and to intrench the minister within so formidable a phalanx as to be able to withstand all opposition.—This disposition would necessarily lead to “teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,” and the effect must ultimately be an explosion, as we have witnessed.—While the church could be lulled to repose, in the enjoyment of peace and harmony with the ungodly within and without, she would be complimented on all hands as a peaceable, orderly, quiet, spiritual body; but when her soundness come to be probed by the application of some vital principle, it might be expected that she would writhe and squirm and inflate with the consciousness of her own dignity and importance, and finally explode.

Mr. Chase had a prototype precede him in the ministry in this place, in the person of the Rev. Joseph Ives Foot. It will be unnecessary, and undesirable on our part to go into his history at much length;—suffice it to say, that the same desire to subject every thing to his will, and to bring the church to bow to his mandate, was manifested by him that has been by Mr. Chase, and similar results followed.—And it is the false position which professing christians were made to take at that time which has terminated in sundering them wide apart; not on account of any christian principle on either side, but for the lack of it on both:—they followed the instructions given them, and cherished any thing but the cultivation of christian principles.

Mr. Foot became disaffected with all four of his Deacons, and took a notion into his head that the welfare of Zion and the purity of the church, as well as his own interest demanded that they be cashiered. To effect this, instead of making a cat's paw of Uriel Spooner, he appoints a church meeting and brings forward a petition from the four oldest members of the church, to the effect that the church would displace the Deacons. These four petitioners were all superannuated—incapable of attending upon the ordinances of the sanctuary, and just ready to go to their final resting places.—Three of these very soon completed their pilgrimage, and the fourth survived a few years longer to add his testimony to thousands before him, that they were years of “labor and sorrow.”

And while we pen these lines as a history of the past, we can write almost the same thing of the present:—Although this church is rent in twain, and is destitute of a shepherd; at the demand of Mr.

Chase she now musters but one Deacon, and that one retains his office only by virtue of his fidelity to his pastor, and not by virtue of any high pretensions to moral principle, or claims to practical godliness.—The process by which these two clergymen attempted to effect their purposes was somewhat different, as well as the circumstances preceding; but their purposes and aims were one,—the effect upon their pupils the same, and the ultimate inglorious defeat of the one, will probably be the same as the other. And if vital piety makes any progress within the jurisdiction of such Pretenders, it must be more in consequence of the exhibition of the antagonist principle, than the tendency of any christian precept or example which comes from those who are looked upon as the exponents of practical religion by multitudes around them.

We are constrained to say that we believe the cause of the present distracted state of this church to be in consequence of a misapprehension of the nature of true religion, not only on the part of private members of the church, for they have embraced the very religion which has been taught them, but on the part of those who have set themselves up, and hired themselves out as religious teachers. The religion of Jesus holds out no prospects of quiet and harmony to his followers in any compromises they may make with his enemies;—they have an unending warfare with all such, and it will be a religion from some other source that will reconcile them;—it will be a religion that might as well trample under foot every vestige of christianity, as one of the fundamental principles of it. We believe such to be the character of the religion now prevalent here, which is striving to bring together the conflicting elements that now distract the church, and make them harmonize.

We verily believe that the present animosity and hatred existing in this church, are the legitimate fruits of the religion they possess: and we sincerely rejoice that the time has come when its “true character” shall be exposed. We rejoice at it, not for the pain it gives—or for the injury it does to any—but for the hope it inspires that a better era is drawing nigh.

We now beseech the reader to take a retrospective view of this whole subject, and spread it out in clear perspective before his own mind.

A large and reputedly devout church is suddenly shivered and dispersed to the four winds. How is it done? Simply by the introduction, and application of a Bible principle, yea, of the Christian principle that God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth, and commanded mankind mutually to respect each others rights, and interdicted any partiality, or the adoption of any course whereby a violation of this principle would ensue:—and as an infallible security to test our position, he has commanded to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us. This is all. The application of this principle the church could not bear, nor would not. It matters not that a Deacon of the church presided at a meeting which denounced the church and her benevolent operations, or that a woman preached this doctrine and held the church and the ministry up to the gaze of the

multitude ;—these are mere incidents. The whole substance of the matter is contained in the fact that the church could not tolerate this doctrine which Jesus Christ left the bosom of the Father to come and proclaim.—They repudiated it, and cast out of their synagogue, all who maintained it.

It is not the Anti-slavery principle in the church which has dismembered it; they have thrust that all out, and now float high and dry above its polluted waters, and are left with nothing to contend about but their own pro-slavery predilections. All their attention is now directed to the all-absorbing topic of how they shall repair their Jugernaut and put it in the condition that this fanatical notion that a Negro is a man, and he who enslaves and imbrutes him is a sinner against High Heaven, found it ; in a condition to do equal execution with that other Jugernaut which crushes its victims with such celerity beneath its ponderous wheels.

One faction demands that the minister resign ; the other that the Deacons resign ; and a compromise is set on foot that they have a Priest who shall be sovereign, and hold himself the keys of the Pagoda, and lock out every thing which is offensive to their idol, and suppress all notices of Anti-slavery discussions and convocations—and sweep out from the conference room the subject of slavery or any other subject not purely religious. And who, think you, is arbiter to arrange this bargain? A Bramin? Ah No! It is an evangelical Doctor of Divinity near at hand. God grant that the day be far distant when another compact shall be consummated in this place which shall swallow up another generation in such a vortex of delusions.

To show to our neighbors that we are not censorious beyond what is demanded, we call their attention to the fact that since the first introduction of resolutions into the church three years ago, to purge it from all its connection with the peculiar institution, not an adhering member has made an effort, or lifted his voice to have the church right themselves upon this subject. And since the decision of the “mutual council” so called, that the decision of the church in the case of Deacon Henshaw was arbitrary and unjust, not a voice has been raised in any quarter in vindication of that decision, or in behalf of Deacon Henshaw, as a persecuted man. If this is not sufficient to satisfy the most captious, that we are not querulous in this matter, without reason for it, we can go further and state that not a private member from either party has extended to Deacon Henshaw the right hand of fellowship, or espoused his principles which have drawn out this church action, and which the “mutual council” could not gainsay, and as Mr. Chase says, have stamped their approbation upon, and thereby completely immersed him and his flock in Egyptian darkness.

That there was a strong sympathy in the minds of many members of the church in the commencement of, and during the progress of the difficulties of the church, for Anti-slavery principles, we are happy to admit. But we have been permitted to be witnesses of the solution of the problem, whether the mass belonging to a “sectarian organization called a church” would prefer that slavery stand and their organiza-

tion remain unimpaired, or that slavery fall and all else that contributes to the enslavement and degradation of mankind fall with it. The transactions of the last year in our own midst have confirmed our minds in the belief that there is no delusion and superstition the world over, more formidable to the progress of Anti-slavery principles than that bigoted belief that the church is to be protected and defended and sustained and perpetuated at the expense of, and in violation of the most sacred principle of God's government.—To come out from the church and renounce its Phariseisms is most revolting to the great mass ;—no exigency can demand it,—no circumstances can palliate or atone for it. The evil and guilt of enslaving two and a half millions of human beings in our own land bears no comparison with it. Even the oracle of Oberlin (Professor Finney) has given out his fiat that “of all the reformers who need reforming, there is none this side of hell who so much need it as ‘Comeouters ;’” meaning those who renounce the church for her faithlessness.

But whether or no, this “organization called the church,” is to stand ;—and if Moses Chase, and the present Deacons cannot keep it together and make it draw at the word given, we must have somebody that can and will. That is the upshot of the story with Christians whose Christianity is all made subservient to the interests of a body which they can make out to be “a church of Jesus Christ” only by their own vote, and scarcely by that. And the clergy who are divinely appointed of Heaven to control and guide this infallible corporation receive their due proportion of veneration and homage.

Among the individuals now connected with the church in this place, are numbers who are members of our society, and who have once before, not only given comfort and aid to the enemy, but have formally resigned their membership.—When trouble and persecution arose, they forsook Jesus and fled. But when reason and their better judgment had resumed the throne, and when they could look upon their advisers, and the cause they had abandoned without the interposition of evangelical goggles, they voluntarily returned; fully persuaded that they had deceived themselves, with a little assistance from others. These individuals and many more with them who profess Anti-slavery principles, are throwing all their influence against the progress of the cause of human rights. They do it unawares, and in consequence of the dominion which bigotry and superstition exercise over them in their theological thralldom. We feel confident that in due time they will return, many, if not all, to the post which Christianity has assigned to her votaries. It may not be till after a long night of darkness and of doubt. We know they are now wending their way where the sun of righteousness shineth not, and to the same point from whence Mr. Chase and his flock send forth their mournful lamentations, that they cannot decypher “the hand of God on this trying occasion.”

“We sought (say they) to humble ourselves by prayer and fasting before the council was convened, as the pious Jews did at the River Ahavah “that the Lord would grant a way for ourselves and our little ones.”

But it seems the Lord did not grant a way to suit them although he

did to the Jews : and they confess themselves surrounded by darkness impenetrable, and have compiled a lamentation from the writings of David and Jeremiah as applicable to their own condition.

"The daughter of Zion is afflicted, and she weepeth sore in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks; all her friends have dealt treacherously with her; they are become her enemies; she dwelleth among the heathen; she findeth no rest. The ways of Zion mourn, all her gates are desolate; her priests sigh, her virgins are afflicted, and she is in bitterness; her adversaries are chief; her enemies prosper; her *children are gone into captivity before the enemy*. our enemies laugh among themselves, they say, aha! aha! so we would have it; the Lord hath forsaken them, let us persecute and take them."

The last expression in the quotation seems to have fired them with zeal to prolong the contest, and there are not a few indications that they may come off victorious; and subdue all their enemies, especially those who cling to the church as their life-boat to save themselves from the torments of a prospective purgatory.

In the above compilation of detached passages to make out a lamentation applicable to their case, Mr. Chase seems intentionally to have left out a sentence which, in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, you will find stands thus, "*her enemies prosper; for the Lord hath afflicted her for the multitude of her transgressions; her children are gone into captivity, &c.*" This makes better sense to our minds, and forcibly illustrates the *cause* of her depressed condition.

But though we anticipate this backsliding of members from truth and duty, what we write and what we do is with a view to accelerate the day when we shall see eye to eye with those brethren who are now struggling with their prejudices in favor of a corrupt Priesthood, and who are living yet to learn, we trust, that their devotion to a man-made religion is entirely cast into the shade by the fidelity of the Papist, the Mohammedan or the Hindoo to their various systems, which we believe Christianity will place not far out of line with a pro-slavery protestant church. It may be thought by some friends and by many foes, that we have taken too unwearied pains to spread this subject on paper. We are inclined to believe, ourselves, that we have been too prolix and tedious: our occupation does not qualify us to condense and arrange within proper limits, a narration of this affair. We feel however, the propriety of exposing the whole transaction. What we do, shall not be done in a corner—and what our opponents do in secret or elsewhere, we feel at liberty to proclaim upon the house tops. Our motto will be "Without Concealment—Without Compromise."

In conclusion, we exhort all, both male and female to look at, and examine the principles which our ancestors put forth to the world as the basis of their freedom and independence, and which our generation also adopts and claims to make their governing rule of action; and to decide in their own minds whether there is not a responsibility resting upon each individual in the nation to contribute their influence and aid to redeem our common country from the disgrace which she is now suffering under in consequence of our national disregard of human rights, and the plain violation of the doctrine upon which we assume to be free and independent, and scorn to be the slaves individually or

collectively, of any earthly power which may interpose itself between the authority of God and the "inalienable" rights of man.

Especially to professing christians do we appeal for their aid and co-operation in removing this political evil and crying sin. And so long as you profess the christian name, whatever may be your divisions and broils and discords and perplexities, we shall not cease to implore you to consult the charter from whence you draw all your authority for assuming the title with which the followers of the great expounder of human rights were first baptized at Antioch. We shall point you to the defection of your religious sects and of your political parties while you continue to associate and co-operate with them in trampling under foot, practically, the essential truths of christianity and republicanism.

And may God give us wisdom to administer all needful rebuke, and fortitude to resist the temptations to relax our determination to persevere in contending for the dissemination of universal freedom, and the deliverance of our fellow men from the shackles imposed by a corrupt and wicked policy, connived at and sustained by the existing religious sects.

We feel sanguine, that the acquisition of correct views upon the subject of human brotherhood, would greatly allay the angry feelings now existing between brethren in this religious community, and reconcile to one another all the friends of Jesus, and destroy their present vocation of contending with each other about the empty forms and ceremonies and shadowy substances which are now palmed upon them for the essence of practical godliness; and from warring with one another, they would turn upon the common enemy of God and man with united zeal, and glory in brandishing the bloodless weapons of truth and love, till our land shall be free from the foul stain of slavery, and its interminable consequences averted.

If the disclosures here made relating to the impeachment, trial, and expulsion of Deacon Henshaw, together with other incidental doings of the church, do not tend to expose a wrong state of feeling and of heart in Mr. Chase, and the mass of those co-operating with him; generated we believe by adhering to an approved system of theology, which we conceive to be a spurious system of christianity, that aspires to no higher motive than to keep the present organizations of society from going to pieces, and of necessity contends against the introduction of reforms indispensable to the removal of existing evils, and to the regeneration of the world, with a conservatism plainly discountenanced by true christianity: then may our conclusions be wholly untenable and worthless. If what we have written shall not have the effect to convict our opponents of maintaining a false position, it will surely have the opposite effect to expose a false position in ourselves. We are willing to come to the light, that if our deeds are evil they may be reprov'd. We are more than willing to expose ourselves to the criticisms and rebuke of the wise and the good. Rebuke from the timeserving, obsequious and sycophantic, we expect to receive if our faces are but heavenward. We will study to discriminate between

the sources from which approbation or censure may issue, without indulging in an over-weening regard to our own infallibility, or our capacities for comprehending and appreciating the truth.

In behalf of the Board of Managers of the West Brookfield Anti-Slavery Society.

JOHN M. FISK.

*West Brookfield, Jan. 20, 1844.*



## APPENDIX.

For the information of the curious, it may not be amiss to state, that the decision of the council in regard to Deacon Henshaw, instead of reconciling the conflicting minds, has resulted in a temporary division of the church and society. Mr. Chase having received his discharge from the society, and his pastoral relation with the church being forcibly terminated by an exparte council, has retired from the majority of the society, with that portion of the church and society partial to him, and provided themselves with a Hall in which they worship "the Great Spirit." It has been reported that they were likely to get the start of the other society in passing resolutions to exclude slaveholders from their communion.

The other portion retain the meetinghouse and have taken unwearied pains to procure a better Driver. The last one they discharged, was obtained from the Far West, at an expense of eighty dollars passage money, for the purpose of having a pure Anti-slavery minister. He came strongly recommended as such, and evidently thought himself so. About his last performance was to decline giving notice of an Anti-slavery concert, because they did not have prayers enough, and yet he never showed his face there to offer up his petitions, or let scarcely any of his forces come.

It is very difficult to ascertain just what degree of Anti-slavery a minister must have to suit this society. But for the information of candidates, we offer it as our opinion that they want just enough to supersede Mr. Chase's Anti-slavery, and not quite enough to restore Deacon Henshaw to their fellowship. We feel warranted in this opinion from the fact that they have entertained the following propositions made to them by Mr. Chase's society for a re-union, at not less than two, if not three meetings of the church; thereby exhibiting a strong propensity for consolidating their orthodox forces. The great negotiator in this case is the Rev. Doctor Snell of North Brookfield;\* it is understood that the propositions, in their present form, are as they came from his hand revised. Here they follow, with a few notes appended.

*To the members of the first church of Christ in Brookfield, who worship at the Meeting House.*

Dear Brethren.

Understanding that it would be desirable on your part to have us return and worship with you, and that you wish us to make some overtures respecting the matter, we hereby comply with your wishes, pleased

\* The place from whence the "Brookfield Bull," so called, emanated.

with the thought of again enjoying together the ordinances of the Gospel in the House our Fathers built for God. See note(a)

You will allow us to be frank, and yet we mean to be both candid and kind, for otherwise if we come together again our union will be short lived.

One declaration we make in the outset, viz. if Deacon Henshaw as he stands before the church is to be restored, we cannot think of returning—we had rather never return.—It is necessary that that matter be decisively settled.(b)

Hoping that your views of this subject correspond with our own, we proceed to state what would meet our wishes and afford us satisfaction.

1st. In future we wish it may be left discretionary with the Pastor of the Church to give notices of the meetings to the assembly on the Sabbath without having the assembly disturbed by such notices being given by others.(c)

2nd. We wish to have it left to the Pastor of the church to regulate his own exchanges, and withhold or extend his invitations to what ministers he pleases to occupy his pulpit.(d)

3d. We wish you to say that you consider this church in its organized capacity to be a church of Christ, to whose government you are in duty bound to be in subjection, and that you will not belong to any society who deny this.(e)

4th. We wish to be assured that you will not disturb our conference meetings by introducing the subject of Slavery, or any other subject for remark foreign to the object of the meeting.(f)

5th. For the sake of greater peace and more general satisfaction in the church, it is our desire that Dea. White and Spooner will vacate their office by resignation, that others may be chosen in their stead.(g)

6th. We wish to be assured that according to the long established usage of the orthodox churches in Massachusetts, you will maintain the right of the church as a body distinct from the Parish in first moving in the settlement and dismissal of the Pastor, and then request the Parish to concur.(h)

7th. We wish to have the Articles of Faith and church Covenant which have been adopted in almost all of the churches in this vicinity, adopted also by the first church in Brookfield in lieu of those we now have.(i)

8th. We wish to be assured that if the church shall vote to hold their business meetings with closed doors, they may peaceably do so.(k)

9th. We wish you to say whether it is right for any of the Brethren having grievances supposed to be created by the pastor, before making such grievances known first to their Brethren, to form an alliance with the Parish and avail themselves of their strength, and voting with them to dissolve the connexion with the Parish and the pastor and proceed to enforce such action by compelling the church to call a council to dissolve the relation between the pastor and church against the known wishes of the majority of their Brethren. (*l*)

10th. It is our request that you erase from the church Records that part of the Letter Missive by which the late ex-parte Council was convoked, which has a serious bearing on the character of the Pastor and is in these words—"And whereas his ministerial and moral conduct has been such as to destroy confidence in him as a worthy minister and an upright man,"—"That they lay before that Council facts affecting the ministerial and moral character of the Pastor,"—and that you give notice of the erasure to the churches composing said Council. (*m*)

Now Brethren, we claim no power or right of dictation what you shall consent to in order for a reunion; but since you have desired to know what overtures for this purpose we were disposed to make, we have hereby complied with your request, and now wait the time when you shall communicate to us officially the result of your consultation.

EBENEZER MERRIAM,

*Chairman of Committee.* (*n*)

## NOTES.

(*a*) Whoever the House may have been originally built by, or whom for, matters not, as it has quite recently been thoroughly rebuilt and reconsecrated. Hubbard Winslow, (a family connection of Ebenezer Merriam and Uriel Spooner) consecrated it to the "will of the brotherhood," and almost the first act of the brotherhood was to decline to abjure the vile principle of slaveholding;—and very soon after to purge their body of such as did abjure it for themselves individually.

(*b*) This amounts to no more nor less than setting aside the recommendations of the council and pronouncing it unrighteous judgment. It may appear to some, remarkable that one of the leading members of the council should consent to be the bearer of such a pious proposal; but would it not be the more remarkable if it should be made to appear that the proposition in its present form is the production of his pen?

(*c*) As mere spectators in this scene we may be permitted we trust, to feel some curiosity to know how this proposition shall be terminated. We supposed that it always had been left discretionary with the Pastor to give notices, or not give them, as best suited his taste.—But who is going to be responsible that the assembly shall not be disturbed by some one else giving them, provided the Pastor chooses not to give them, is what we are curious to know. Will any of our orthodox Anti-slavery brethren sign that bond?

(*d*) Have Mr. Chase's exchanges been intermeddled with? or does this refer to Mr. Horton's consenting to exchange with Rev. Doctor Osgood and others for the gratification of some of his supporters? We cannot understand that this request if confirmed, will prevent any person from interceding with the Pastor about his exchanges, though it leaves him perfectly free to regulate them himself, as he always has been. Nevertheless, it gives him absolute control of the pulpit. Catholic Priests are said to withhold the Bible from their subjects because they do not know how to read it right.

But it seems that these Protestants doubt their own competency to select an occupant for their pulpit and make a committee of the pastor do it for them.

(e) But Christ's government in this place must surely be in a prostrate condition if it is embodied in the organized church, one wing of which holds forth in Mr. Prichard's Hall with a deposed Pastor for their guide, and the other wing musters at the meeting house with not so much as one Deacon to call the roll. What say you, brethren? Do you confess this to be a church of Christ to whose government you are bound to be in subjection? and do you promise, that you will not belong to the Anti-slavery Society—for Mr. Chase cannot get it or any of its members to confess that it is a church of Jesus Christ, and that he is Governor General over it.

(f) It seems by this that you have been rather disorderly children when you were once members in Christ's family.—You ought to have known better than introduce the subject of slavery into a religious meeting. It is very foreign to the object. A religious meeting is not for such objects. It is to pray for the heathen—for the Hindoos and the benighted kingdoms of the world; and that the Lord would open the hearts of the people to pour more money into his treasury to print tracts, and make more ministers and send more missionaries; "How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings." And they sing too at religious meetings, and the *minister* preaches. You should not talk about slavery. If you say any thing, you must talk about religion and not introduce foreign subjects. If you can give us some assurance that you will behave yourselves, you may come into the family again.—That is the fourth condition.

(g) There is quite a number expecting some reward for their fidelity to the minister, and for ousting Deacon Henshaw; and it has taken so much time and labor that his vacancy will be nothing but a bone of contention between the faithful. Therefore "for the sake of peace" the two Anti-slavery Deacons will resign and give us a chance to bestow the patronage of "Christ's church" on our numerous proslavery expectants. If these "righteous" brethren are to be "recompensed in the earth" now is the proper time; and they will give more general satisfaction undoubtedly than the old ones; they, may go over to the "comeouters" if they want office.

(h) Mr. Chase had a bare majority of friends in the church; therefore it was of no avail for his non-admirers to move in the matter of his dismissal. But the parish had made the contract with him for his services, subject to termination at any time when a majority of the parish should vote it; and the parish took advantage of this proviso, and mustered a majority to terminate the connection, which left the church with a pastor on their hands, but no parish to pay him. Friend Chase does not call upon his customers to "come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." Not he.

(i) This requirement is probably put in to make out a variety; for they required not only that Deacon Henshaw "declare, that he solemnly believed this to be a church of Jesus Christ," but "that its covenant and articles are in accordance with the word of God." If this is true why change it? Have you any new revelation gentlemen? Or do you think you can keep the new one better than you did the old one?

(k) Mr. Chase is determined to hold the Anti-slavery members responsible for all the lawless depredations committed against the church. When Deacon Henshaw's trial was going on, his prosecutors thought to hold the court in secret, with closed doors. This move created a wonderful curiosity to look in upon the Sanhedrim; and some of the lawless of the world's folk would not consent to be bolted out, and very much annoyed the pastor and his friends by their presence. Who will be security for their not doing the same again, under the same circumstances, is more than we can predict.

(l) This is a mere continuation of the 6th proposition. It is a very tender point and will not bear to be borne down upon too hard in one spot. The fact was, that Mr. Chase was determined from the beginning of the question, whether he should stay or go, that he would unite in no council whatever, unless the parish would be a party to it, and the question of compensation should be submitted to their arbitration. But the parish were aware that they settled that point when they made the bargain, and they declined to have any concern with a council. They knew that many a minister had feathered his nest out of such councils, and they did not want even the sugges-

tion "that it was expected of them that they would be very honorable in adjusting pecuniary matters with their pastor who was about removing to another field of labor in the providence of God." They had enjoyed some experience of that sort.

(m) With regard to the 10th proposition, we have little to say. It refers to a council called by the church in October last, to dissolve, and which did dissolve the pastoral relation between it and Mr. Chase. Our "astonishment" is no less than was Mr. Chase's after he had digested the result of the mutual council. That the clerk of the church should permit any thing to go upon the records that should implicate the moral character and fidelity of the pastor, is the cause of our surprise. Even, since the result of the mutual council, this officer has pledged himself to stand by Mr. Chase till his last enemy was vanquished. How he came to turn such a summerset, we know not. Certain we are that the wind has shifted; or such a record would never have gone on the church book. When you erase this record from the book, Mr. Clerk, please to draw some black lines round those other records alluded to in the "exposition," but do not erase them; that would be "unparliamentary."

(n) Although this document comes out under the flag of the colonized church with the veteran advocate for nonintercourse with all "Nigger subjects" in the church, as chairman; it will be understood that Mr. Chase is still the presiding genius of the concern; and that they are undoubtedly indebted to him for the original draft of these modest proposals. The venerable bearer of this dispatch may be entitled to some credit for improving upon it—that is more than we know. But we say, "honor, to whom honor is due." We would not pluck a single laurel from the brow of any man who had a hand in the composition of it, were it to keep us from freezing.





