

E 449

.W66


Copy 2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00001740167





A

REPROOF

OF THE

AMERICAN CHURCH.

BY THE

BISHOP OF OXFORD.

EXTRACTED FROM A

“History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America,”

BY SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, A.M.

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION

BY AN AMERICAN CHURCHMAN



NEW YORK:

WILLIAM HARNED, 5 SPRUCE STREET

1846.

7725A1

4.

S. W. BENEDICT,
Ster. and Print., 16 *Spruce Street.*

E 449
.W66
COPY 2

INTRODUCTION.

It is not probable that the reader has ever seen the History mentioned in our title. That a History of the American Church, from its earliest date down to the death of Bishop White, written by a dignitary of the mother Church, distinguished alike by his honored name and elevated rank, should be almost unknown in this country, is a singular and very peculiar fact. No people are more sensitive than ourselves to the opinions of foreigners; and American Episcopalians naturally feel much interest in the views entertained of them by their English brethren. Indeed, the interest is not confined to such views, but extends to whatever affects the English Church. The parties which agitate the Establishment are reflected in our controversies; and the tracts and volumes issued by the theological combatants on the other side of the water, are republished and eagerly perused on this. Yet here is a history of ourselves, in no small degree eulogistic, and on various accounts claiming our attention, which has been virtually suppressed.

It is indeed true, that as soon as the book reached our shores, one or two of our "enterprising publishers" announced their intention of reprinting it, and one of the proposed editions was to have been introduced to the notice of the Church under the auspices of a RIGHT REVEREND Editor. But these announcements have been followed by "expressive silence." More than twelve months have elapsed, and the Church is still without an American copy of the History. This concealment of Dr. Wilberforce's work is obviously intentional, and not accidental. The very title of the book and the name of the author would have secured a rapid sale for the reprint. Some weighty motive must have induced our publishers to abandon their original intention, at the sacrifice of pecuniary interest. The motive is obvious, and probably one or more Southern

Bishops have exerted their influence. The author of the History, in the course of his work, advances certain doctrines on the subject of SLAVERY, and of CASTE IN THE CHURCH, which it is thought inconvenient to discuss, and which cannot be admitted in this Republic without sealing the condemnation of almost every Christian sect among us, and overwhelming our own Church with shame and confusion. There are, it is to be feared, but few among our twelve hundred clergymen, who, on reading the History, would not find their consciences whispering, "Thou art the man," and who would not be anxious to conceal the volume from their parishioners. Hence its suppression.

It is common to personify the Church, and to speak of her as of some spotless celestial being; and yet she, in fact, consists of her clerical and lay members, each one of whom must personally answer at the bar of Christ for his participation in every sin committed by the Church. Surely, it would be more becoming Christian men to inquire how far they are individually guilty of the offences charged upon them by Bishop Wilberforce, than to endeavor to stifle investigation, by burying in oblivion the faithful and Christian rebuke of their English brother.

Religious establishments tend to render the clergy obsequious to the civil ruler, and our voluntary system tempts them to do homage to the most capricious and irresponsible of all tyrants, the will of the multitude. Let us see what true and faithful allegiance our "Primitive and Apostolic Church" has borne to this American despot.

On the 21st August, 1831, occurred the negro insurrection and massacre at Southampton, Virginia. This disastrous event necessarily directed public attention, both at the North and the South, to the subject of Slavery. In one portion of the Union, stronger fetters were forged for the bondman, and greater efforts made to banish to Africa the free colored man, whose presence it was supposed quickened the aspirations of the slave for freedom. In the other portion, this insurrection impressed on a few pious and reflecting minds a conviction both of the moral and political evils of slavery, and of the duty of combined action for its total abolition. In 1832 the New England Anti-Slavery Society was formed, and the succeeding year witnessed the organization of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Auxiliary associations sprang rapidly into being, funds were liberally bestowed, presses were established, and publi-

cations portraying the abominations of the system were abundantly scattered throughout the land.

This agitation both alarmed and irritated the slaveholders; and while on the one hand they endeavored to intimidate the Abolitionists by their murderous violence, they appealed to the selfish passions of the Northern community, by promising their votes and their trade to such only as would aid in suppressing the discussion of slavery. Immediately, our contending factions and our commercial cities rivalled each other in demonstrations of sympathy for their "Southern brethren," and of abhorrence for Abolitionists. The clergy, yielding to the blast, generally observed a prudent silence, while a few, to prove their freedom from fanaticism, assailed the Abolitionists for their violence and rashness, protesting, however, against being considered the advocates of slavery "in the abstract."

On the clergy of the South, however, a more onerous task was imposed. The Northern movement was a *religious* one, impelled by a belief of the sinfulness of slavery. Hence it became important that Southern consciences should be encased in mail, impenetrable to anti-slavery missiles. The fabrication of such a panoply was consigned to the ministers of Christ, and significant hints were given them that they must not shrink from the work. A meeting of slaveholders in Mississippi, after resolving that any individual who should circulate anti-slavery papers in the State "is justly worthy, in the sight of God and man, of IMMEDIATE DEATH," voted "that the CLERGY of the State of Mississippi be hereby recommended at once to take a stand upon this subject, and that their further silence in relation to this subject (slavery) will, in our opinion, be subject to *serious censure*."

This pastoral admonition from the Lynchers was received with due reverence by those to whom it was directed. Presently two Mississippi Presbyteries passed resolutions in favor of the Christian character of slavery. A Mississippi divine published an elaborate vindication of the system, and a Methodist periodical in the State announced that it would "recognize the right of man to hold property in man."

In other slave States the clergy were suddenly aroused to a new energy in vindicating the *divine* institution of human bondage. Presbyteries, Methodist conferences, Baptist associations, individual ministers, were busily at work descanting on the sin of Ham, and

the curse pronounced on Canaan, discussing Hebrew servitude, and proving that negro slavery was not forbidden in the New Testament. As a specimen of the fulminations launched by some of these servants of the Most High against Abolitionists, we may cite the peroration of an address to a meeting of slaveholders in South Carolina by the Rev. Mr. Postell, of the Methodist Church. "Shun abolition as you would the DEVIL. Do your duty as citizens and Christians, and in heaven you will be rewarded, and delivered from abolitionism."

In this mighty rivalry in preaching smooth things to the slaveholders, "the sects" were not permitted to gain a triumph. On the 27th November, 1836, the Rev. George W. Freeman, after morning service, ascended the pulpit of Christ Church, Raleigh, North Carolina, and announced to his delighted hearers the good news that the slavery of white men and of black men, of the wise and of the simple, of the learned and of the ignorant, was sanctioned by God, and approved by Jesus Christ and his holy Apostles. This commissioned ambassador of the Redeemer proclaimed, "THAT NO MAN NOR SET OF MEN IN OUR DAY, UNLESS THEY CAN PRODUCE A NEW REVELATION FROM HEAVEN, ARE ENTITLED TO PRONOUNCE SLAVERY WRONG; and that SLAVERY AS IT EXISTS AT THE PRESENT DAY IS AGREEABLE TO THE ORDER OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE."

The fact that any institution involves *duties*, proves its lawfulness, since no duty can attach to a sinful practice. Hence our preacher, after employing the morning of the Lord's day in expounding the *divine rights* of the slaveholders, devoted the afternoon of the same holy time in proclaiming their *duties*. The slaveholder was reminded that he was under a moral obligation to punish his slaves when they deserved punishment; but he must not be too severe, nor chastise when in a passion; nor ought he to overwork them. He is bound, moreover, to have the slave children baptized, and *orally* taught to say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. "It is not necessary," said the man of God, "that they should be taught to read;" but, nevertheless, the master was declared to be as responsible for the souls of his slaves as for those of his own children! Such are the duties which spring from this Scriptural Institution; duties which, fortunately for the master's convenience, involve no regard for the marriage of his slaves, no respect for their conjugal or parental rights, and impose no restrictions on the sale of men, women, and children in the market; at least, no obligations of this sort were adverted to by the preacher.

These two sermons certainly formed the most acceptable offering which any clergyman had yet laid on the altar of slavery. The hints about the bondage of *white* men, the necessity of a *new revelation*, before slavery could be pronounced *wrong*, and the connection of *religious duties* with the institution, could not fail of convincing the slaveholder, that in the EPISCOPAL CHURCH he would find an asylum from the taunts and reproaches of the civilized world; that from her altars he could gather balm for his wounded conscience, and that in her courts, he could, without distraction, form his schemes of traffic in human beings and forge the chains by which they were to be held in subjection. It was, of course, important that slaveholders generally should participate in the joyful intelligence imparted to the congregation of Christ Church. The news might be spread by the press, but what assurance could be given that the gratifying declarations made by Mr. Freeman, a private and obscure Presbyterian, were authorized by competent ecclesiastical authority? The sermons were published under the imposing title of "THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF SLAVEHOLDERS," and bore the following *imprimatur* from the Bishop of the Diocese :

"RALEIGH, Nov. 30, 1836.

Rev. and Dear Brother—I listened with *most unfeigned pleasure* to the discourses delivered last Sunday, on the character of slavery and the duties of masters. And as I learn a publication of them is solicited, I beg from a conviction of their being urgently called for at the present time, that you will not withhold your consent.

With high regard, your affectionate friend,
and Brother in the Lord,

L. S. IVES.

To the Rev. GEORGE W. FREEMAN."

This letter was obviously written, not for its professed purpose of overcoming Mr. Freeman's reluctance to appear in print, but to let the slaveholders of North Carolina know, that although their Bishop was a Northern man, his conscience was thoroughly acclimated; and that bold and startling as were the doctrines of the Raleigh preacher, they would be maintained in all their length and breadth by Episcopal authority. The CHURCH in North Carolina, by this authoritative publication, far exceeded all the "sects," in the slave region, in her fearless championship of slavery in the "abstract," and "as it exists at the present day." But the diocese was not permitted long to enjoy this proud pre-eminence. Her sister of South Carolina quickly shared it with her. The society for "the

advancement of Christianity," (!) consisting of clergymen and laymen, with the Bishop at their head, seized upon Freeman's pamphlet, and reprinted it, *imprimatur* and all, as a *religious tract for gratuitous distribution*.

But there was still one circumstance, which, in times of alarm and despondency, was calculated to weaken the confidence of the slaveholder in the strength and permanency of the fortress which had thus kindly opened its gates to receive him. Most of the religious denominations of the South were connected with their northern brethren by general ecclesiastical judicatories. Already had alarming discussions occurred in the Presbyterian Assembly, and the Methodist Conference, and the Baptist Mission Board, and it was painfully apparent that in these bodies "the rights and duties of slaveholders" were viewed in very different colors from the glowing tints in which Freeman had painted them. The Episcopal Church at the South was subject to the jurisdiction of the GENERAL CONVENTION, and what security could be given that a body embracing Northern as well as Southern delegates, would not repudiate the doctrines of the Raleigh Sermons? Lynch law could indeed control the Southern pulpit as well as the Southern press; but the consciences and the characters of the slaveholders were assailed from the North. *There* the *Dissenters* were gradually abandoning the cause of human bondage. Under the strong pressure of public opinion, and in utter contempt of the well-known sentiments of the Church of England, and indeed of the moral sense of Christendom, could it be hoped that the Northern section of the Episcopal Church would, in General Convention, tolerate, much less approve of the extreme, ultra pro-slavery views of the Rev. George W. Freeman?

All questions of this sort were most explicitly answered by the last Convention, as appears by an extract from the minutes of the House of Clerical and Lay Delegates :

"The following message was received: 'House of Bishops, Oct. 22, 1844. The House of Bishops inform the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, that they have nominated the REV. GEORGE W. FREEMAN, D.D., rector of Immanuel Church, Delaware, a missionary BISHOP, to exercise Episcopal functions in the State of Arkansas, and in the Indian Territory, south of 36 1-2 degrees of parallel of latitude, and to exercise Episcopal supervision over the Missions of the Church in the REPUBLIC OF TEXAS. Attest, Jonathan M. Wainwright, Sec'y.'

"On motion of Rev. Dr. Tyng, the nomination of the Bishop of Arkansas and Texas (as above) was UNANIMOUSLY assented to."

It was not enough thus to elevate the reckless defender of slavery to the high and holy office of a Bishop in the Church of God, but he must be selected as an apostle to Texas! There was, indeed, a peculiar significance in this selection. The odium in which the people of Texas were held by the Christian community at large, arose not merely from their general profligacy, but also, and chiefly, from their conduct in relation to slavery. Taking possession of lands belonging to Mexico, they re-established slavery upon the very soil from which it had been recently banished by that Roman Catholic government. To secure to themselves the unmolested enjoyment of their human chattels, they raised the standard of rebellion, and with the aid of Southern slaveholders erected themselves into an independent Republic. Having thus, as they professed, achieved their own liberty, they adopted a constitution rendering the bondage of others hopeless and perpetual; and outraging alike the dictates of nature and of justice, ordained that no free mulatto should ever live in Texas, thus dooming their own colored offspring, for all time to come, to slavery or to exile!

The Southern slaveholders were exceedingly anxious that Texas should be admitted into the Union, for the double purpose of strengthening the slave interest, and opening a new market for the benefit of the breeding States. For the same reasons, in addition to the odious character of the Texans, the proposed annexation was resisted by the almost united moral feeling of the whole North. The question of annexation was agitating the nation when the Convention assembled, and the selection of Freeman as Bishop of Texas was virtually, whether so intended or not, a repudiation by the Protestant Episcopal Church in General Convention assembled, of the *moral objections* urged against the admission of that Republic into our confederacy. The Church sent to the Texans a man who, she knew, would confirm and strengthen them by apostolic instruction and benediction in those great principles of their constitution, which had excited the execration of the Christian world.

Let us now take a view of that institution, which, the Texan Bishop assures us, enjoys the approval of Christ and his Apostles. He tells us, "There was in general no distinction of *color*, no prevailing difference in the conformation of the features and limbs, no striking dissimilarity in the intellectual powers, to mark the line of separation between the masters and their bondmen, and stamp them as different races of men. No peculiarity of this kind existed which

would have prevented those who were slaves, had they been placed in other circumstances, from taking rank in society, and looking forward to the highest distinctions in the community. Had they not been slaves, they would have become magistrates, nobles, or rulers; respected by multitudes as equals, or venerated as superiors."

Here, it will be observed, we have none of the usual nonsense about the curse of Canaan, nor of the usual blasphemy about negroes being created by God for slaves. Jesus Christ and his Apostles approved of the bondage of *white* men as intelligent as their masters; and of course the whole of our present bench of Bishops, including Bishop Freeman himself, might, under certain circumstances, be lawfully reduced to slavery, and righteously held as chattels by Christian men.

We are expressly referred in the Sermons, to Roman Slavery, as that which enjoyed the sanction of the great Head of the Church. And what was ROMAN SLAVERY? Our answer to this question is taken from a very learned work, whose statements are all verified by references to Roman authorities.*

"The slave had no protection against the avarice, rage, or lust of the master, whose authority was founded in absolute property; and the bondman was viewed less as a human being subject to arbitrary dominion, than as an inferior animal, dependent wholly on the will of his owner. At first, the master possessed the uncontrolled power of life and death. He might kill, mutilate or torture his slaves, for any or no offence; he might force them to become gladiators or prostitutes. The temporary unions of male with female slaves were formed and dissolved at his command; families and friends were separated when he pleased. The laws recognized no obligation upon the owners of slaves, to furnish them with food and clothing, or to take care of them in sickness. Slaves could have no property but by the sufferance of their master, for whom they acquired everything, and with whom they could form no engagements which would be binding on him. The master might transfer his rights by either sale or gift, or might bequeath them by will. A master selling, giving or bequeathing a slave, sometimes made it a provision that he should never be carried abroad, or that he should be manumitted on a fixed day; or that, on the other hand, he should never be emancipated, or that he should be *kept in chains for life*.

* Blair's "Inquiry into the State of Slavery among the Romans, from the earliest period, to the establishment of the Lombards in Italy."

While slaves turned the handmill, they were generally chained, and had a broad wooden collar, to prevent them from eating the grain. The *furca*, which in later language means a gibbet, was, in older dialect, used to denote a wooden fork or collar, which was made to bear upon their shoulders or around their necks, as a mark of disgrace as much as an uneasy burden. Fetters and chains were much used for punishment or restraint, and were, in some instances, worn by slaves during life, through the sole authority of the master. Porters at the gates of the rich were generally chained. Field laborers worked for the most part in irons posterior to the first ages of the Republic. Some persons made it their business to catch runaway slaves.* The runaway, when taken, was severely punished by authority of the master, or by the Judge at his desire; sometimes with crucifixion, amputation of a foot, or by being sent to fight as a gladiator, with wild beasts; but most frequently by being branded on the brow with letters indicative of his crime. Cruel masters sometimes hired torturers by profession, or had such persons in their establishments, to assist them in punishing their slaves. The noses, and ears, and teeth of slaves were often in danger from an enraged owner; and sometimes the eyes of a great offender were put out. Crucifixion was very frequently made the fate of a wretched slave for trifling misconduct, or from mere caprice. By a decree passed by the Senate, if a master was murdered, when his slaves might possibly have aided him, all his household within reach were held as implicated and deserving of death; and Tacitus relates an instance in which a family of four hundred were all executed."

Such was the slavery which the Bishop of Texas tells us was found "extensively established in the Roman Empire, embracing nearly all the civilized world, by our Saviour, when he appeared on earth; and that neither He, nor his inspired Apostles after him, ever expressed any disapprobation of it, or left on record a single precept directing its discontinuance; and what then is the conclusion? Why, surely this much, if nothing farther, that no man nor set of men in

* This profession is not unknown among ourselves, as appears from the following notice in the *Summer County* (Alabama) *Whig*.

"NEGRO DOGS.

"THE undersigned having bought the entire pack of Negro Dogs (of the Hay and Allen stock) he now proposes to catch runaway negroes. His charges will be Three Dollars per day for hunting, and Fifteen Dollars for catching a runaway. He resides three and one-half miles north of Livingston, near the lower Jones' Bluff road.

WILLIAM GAMBEL.

"Nov. 6, 1845--6m."

our day, unless they can produce A NEW REVELATION FROM HEAVEN, ARE ENTITLED TO PRONOUNCE IT WRONG "!!

Let us next endeavor to acquire some idea of the *number* of the bondmen, whose prison-house, if we believe the Right Rev. Texan Father in God, was barred and bolted by Him who gave his life a ransom for many. Gibbon estimates the whole slave population of the Roman Empire in the reign of the Emperor Claudius at SIXTY MILLIONS (I. 53), and Blair regards this estimate as much too *small*.

It is important to ascertain *how* this prodigious multitude were reduced to bondage; because, as our spiritual champions of slavery invariably omit to explain the Scriptural process of converting free men into slaves, we are left to seek instruction in this branch of our duty from the Romans; since, as in no one instance were they rebuked by Christ and his Apostles, for any of their various contrivances for manufacturing slaves, the conclusion is, surely, "this much, if nothing further, that no man nor set of men in our day, unless they can produce a new revelation from Heaven, are entitled" to pronounce any of the Roman methods of making slaves, "wrong."

The most prolific source of slavery was WAR. Livy informs us that after the fall of the Samnites at Aquilone, about 36,000 prisoners were sold; and Plutarch, that 150,000 of the people of Epirus were sold for the benefit of the army under Paulus Æmilius; and we learn from Cicero, that when Pindenissus was taken, the inhabitants were made slaves. Hence, should a Mexican force hereafter make an incursion into Texas, and carry off the Bishop, his wife and children, and sell them to different masters, under whom they should be compelled to spend their days in unceasing toil—condemned to all the misery and degradation of Roman bondmen,—the Bishop would have the consolation of knowing that the treatment he experienced was in perfect consistency with that Gospel which he had himself preached.

COMMERCE was another mode of acquiring slaves. A prodigious slave-trade was carried on in the countries bordering on the Euxine, with various Provinces in Asia, with Thrace, and even with Spain and Britain. Here we learn how presumptuous it is, to denounce the African slave-trade as sinful.

THE PROFESSION OF CHRISTIANITY was occasionally visited by the Romans with slavery. At the present day, it affords no security against American slavery, nor deliverance from it.

There were still four other modes of acquiring slaves, which are

particularly interesting to us; because, having been copied by us from the Roman law, we can have no scruples about their lawfulness: for had they been wrong, Christ and his Apostles, according to Bishop Freeman, would have condemned them.

1. The sale of children by their fathers—with us the privilege is confined to the sale of children by a slave-mother. In the Bishop's Diocese, this privilege was nearly converted into a necessity, by the constitutional provision which required the bondage or expulsion of every mulatto child.

2. Selling persons convicted of crimes. Among the Romans, persons convicted of certain offences were sold as slaves, and their posterity after them were doomed to bondage. Similar laws for converting free negroes and mulattoes into slaves are in force in several of our States. Thus, in South Carolina, if a free negro "entertains a runaway slave," he forfeits ten pounds; and if, as must generally be the case, he cannot pay the fine, he is sold. In 1827, a free woman and her two children were converted into slaves under this law, for sheltering two fugitive slave children!

3. Debtors sold by their creditors. By a law of the late territory of Florida, approved by Congress (!), when a judgment obtained against a free colored person, shall remain unsatisfied for *five* days, such person shall be sold to raise money to pay the judgment. The sale was nominally for a term of years, but practically for life.

4. Suspected fugitives were sold as slaves. This Roman device for procuring slaves is now in operation in the District of Columbia, under the immediate sanction of Congress, and in almost every slave State. The process is simple: A man who it is deemed *ought* to be a slave, is arrested on suspicion of being a runaway, and thrown into prison; notice is then given in a newspaper to his supposed master, to come and claim him. If claimed, well—if not, the prisoner is sold as a slave for life, to raise money to pay the expense of his imprisonment.

Having obtained some insight into Roman slavery, as it existed in the time of Christ and his Apostles, and with their acquiescence, let us next look at "Slavery as it exists at the present day," and which the Bishop of Texas, with the concurrence of the Bishops of North and South Carolina, assures us "IS AGREEABLE TO THE ORDER OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE."

What is American Slavery? Its advocates are fond of hiding its vileness under false definitions. It is not servitude—it is not com-

pulsory labor—it is not arbitrary authority—it is not cruelty—it is not injustice—it is not oppression. These are, indeed, the usual accidents of slavery; but they do not constitute it, and are daily, one and all, found in total separation from it. Slavery is the conversion of a rational, accountable, immortal being, made in the image of God and a little lower than the Angels, and for whom Christ died, into a CHATTEL, an article of property, a vendible commodity.* It is not the violation of certain rights, but the annihilation of ALL.† It is the degradation of a man to the level of a brute.‡ Slavery involves the denial of all domestic relations, and consequently the refusal to afford them legal protection.§ The infant slave may be sold or given away long before he sees the light, so that, at the instant of his birth, he belongs to one master and his mother to another.|| A slave can possess no property;¶ nor is any

* “Slaves shall be deemed sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners, and possessors, and their executors and administrators, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatever.”—*Law of South Carolina*.

† “A slave is one who is in the power of his master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what belongs to his master.”—*Civil Code of Louisiana*.

‡ “In case the personal property of a ward shall consist of specific articles, such as slaves, working beasts, animals of any kind—the court, if it deem it advantageous for the ward, may at any time pass an order for the sale thereof.”—*Law of Maryland*.

§ “With the consent of their masters, slaves may marry, and their moral power to agree to such a contract or connection as that of marriage, cannot be doubted; but whilst in a state of slavery it cannot produce *any civil effect*, because slaves are *deprived of all civil rights*.”—*Judge Matthews of Louisiana; Martin's Rep. VI., 550*.

“A slave is never prosecuted for bigamy, or petty treason for killing a husband being a slave, any more than admitted to an appeal for murder.”—*D. Dulamy, Attorney General of Maryland: 1 Md. Rep. 561*.

¶ “The testator left his negro wench, Pen, to one daughter, and her future increase to another. The court decided the bequest to be good, and that all the children born of Pen, after the death of the testator, belonged to the sister of her mistress. *Per Cur.* He who is the absolute owner of a TUNING, owns all its faculties for profits or increase, as well as the thing itself. This is every day's practice; and it is held that a man may grant the wool of a flock of sheep for years.”—*Little's Rep. III., 275. Kentucky, 1823*.

¶ A master made a devise to trustees, for the benefit of his slave Betsey and her children. Devise held to be void. *Per Cur.* “The condition of slaves in this country is analogous to that of the ancient Greeks and Romans, and not that of the feudal times. They are generally considered not as persons, but

promise to him, or agreements with him binding in law.* Being under the control of his master, he can have no legal right to attend the worship of his Maker.† Like other chattels, he can obtain no legal redress for any injury, however grievous.‡ The master may indeed recover compensation from any one who damages or kills either his horse or his slave;§ but the law refuses to notice any insult or outrage offered to male or female slaves, which does not lessen their price in the market|| The whole life of a slave is

as THINGS. They can be sold or transferred as *goods* or personal estate; they are held to be *pro nullis, pro mortuis*. By the civil law, slaves could not take property by descent or purchase; and I apprehend this to be the law of this country."—*Dess. Rep. IV.*, 266. *South Carolina*.

* Application to enforce a contract between master and slave "*Per Cur.* In the case of *Sawney vs. Carter*, the court refused, on great consideration, to enforce a promise by a master to emancipate his slave, where the conditions of the promise had been partly complied with by the slave. The court proceeded on the principle, that it is not competent to a Court of Chancery to enforce a contract between master and slave, even although the contract should be fully complied with on the part of the slave."—*Leigh's Rep. I.*, 72. *Vis.* 1829.

† "150 free negroes and *slaves*, belonging to the African Church, were taken up on Sunday afternoon by the city guard, and lodged in the guard-house. The City Council yesterday morning sentenced five of them, consisting of a Bishop and four ministers, to one month's imprisonment, or to give security to leave the State. Eight other ministers were also sentenced separately to receive ten lashes, or pay a fine each of five dollars."—*Charleston Patriot*, 1818.

Those whose punishment is here recorded were *free* negroes; and from their fate, we may judge of the religious privileges of the slaves.

‡ "It would be an idle form and ceremony to make a slave a party to a suit, by the instrumentality of which he could recover nothing; or if a recovery could be had, the instant it was recovered, would belong to the master. The slave can possess nothing, he can hold nothing. He is, therefore, not a competent party to a suit."—*Wheeler's Treatise on the Law of Slavery*, p. 197.

§ "Trespass for killing Plaintiff's slave. It appeared the slave was stealing potatoes from a bank near Defendant's House. The Defendant fired upon him with a gun loaded with *buck-shot*, and killed him. The jury found a verdict for Plaintiff for *One Dollar*. Motion for new trial. The court hold there must be a new trial; that the jury ought to have given the Plaintiff the value of the slave. That if the jury were of opinion the slave was of bad character, some deduction from the usual price ought to be made; but the Plaintiff was certainly entitled to his actual damage for killing his slave. Where *property* is in question, the value of the *article*, as nearly as can be ascertained, furnishes a rule from which they are not at liberty to depart."—*M' Cord's Rep. IV.*, 156. *South Carolina*, 1827.

|| "There must be a loss of service, or at least a diminution of the faculty of the slave for bodily labor, to warrant an action by the master."—*Harris & Johnson's Rep. I.*, 4: *Maryland*.

appropriated by the master, and no portion of it belongs to himself, to be occupied in promoting his own happiness, or that of his offspring.*

* "The Defendant was indicted for an assault and battery upon Lydia, the slave of one Elizabeth Jones. On the trial, it appeared that the Defendant had hired the slave for a year; that during the term, the slave had committed some *small offence*, for which the Defendant undertook to chastise her; that while in the act of so doing, the slave ran off, whereupon the Defendant called upon her to stop, which being refused, he shot at and wounded her. The Defendant was found guilty, and appealed. *Per Cur. Ruffin, J.* The inquiry here is, whether a cruel and unreasonable battery on a slave by the *hirer* is indictable? . . . In criminal proceedings, and indeed in reference to all other persons but the general owner, the hirer and possessor of a slave, in relation to both rights and duties, is, for the time being, the owner. . . . Upon the general question whether the owner is answerable *criminaliter* for a battery upon his own slave, or other exercise of authority or force not forbidden by *statute*, the court entertains but little doubt. That he is so liable *has never been decided*, nor, as far as is known, been hitherto contended. The established habits and uniform practice of the country, in this respect, are the best evidence of the portion of power deemed by the whole community requisite to the preservation of the master's dominion. This has, indeed, been assimilated at the bar to the other domestic relations, and arguments drawn from the well established principles which confer and restrain the authority of the parent over the child, the tutor over the pupil, the master over the apprentice, have been pressed on us. The court does not recognize their application. There is no likeness between the cases. They are in opposition to each other, and there is an impassable gulph between them. The difference is that which exists between freedom and slavery; and a greater cannot be imagined. In the one, the end in view is the happiness of the youth, born to equal rights with the governor on whom devolves the duty of training the young to usefulness, in a station which he is hereafter to assume among freemen. To such an end, and with such a subject, moral and intellectual instruction seem the natural means, and for the most part, they are found to suffice; moderate force is only super-added to make the others effectual? If that fail, it is better to leave the party to his own headstrong passions and the ultimate correction of the law, than to allow it to be immoderately inflicted by a private person. With slavery it is far otherwise. *The end is the profit of the master, his security and the public peace. The subject is one doomed in his own person and in his posterity, to live without knowledge, and without capacity to make anything his own, and to toil that others may reap the fruits.*

"What moral considerations shall be addressed to such a being to convince him, what it is impossible but that the most stupid must feel and know can never be true, that he is thus to labor upon a principle of natural duty, or for the sake of his own personal happiness? Such services can only be expected from one who has no will of his own, who surrenders his will in explicit obedience to that of another. Such obedience is the consequence only of *uncontroled* authority over the body. There is nothing else which can operate

Such is American Slavery, not as abused by the cruel and the lawless, but as established by legislative enactments and maintained by judicial decisions. Such is the Slavery which George W. Freeman, as minister of the Most High God, declares to be "agreeable to the order of Divine Providence."

Such is the Slavery, to the defence of which in God's house, on His holy day, the Right Rev. Father in God, LEVI S. IVES, listened with "most unfeigned pleasure." Such is the Slavery, whose vindication the Churchmen of South Carolina spread on the wings of the wind, for "the advancement of Christianity." And shall there not be a woe now, as in ancient times, "unto them that call evil good, and good evil, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter?" The guilt of such clerical champions of Slavery as Bishops Ives and Freeman, is tremendously aggravated by their personal knowledge of its unutterable abominations. The decision of Judge Ruffin, quoted in the notes, was delivered in Bishop Ives' Diocese, and in which Freeman delivered his notorious sermons. Only *five* days after the latter had declared from the pulpit of Raleigh, that "Slavery as it exists at the present day is agreeable to the order of Divine Providence," the following comment appeared in the Newbern (N. C.) Spectator :

"\$200 REWARD.—Ran away from the subscriber about three years ago, a certain negro man named Ben, commonly known by the name of Ben Fox. He had but one eye. Also, one other negro by the name of Rigdon, who ran away on the 5th of this month. I will give the reward of one hundred dollars for each of the above negroes, to be delivered to me, or confined in the Jail of Lenoir or Jones County, or for THE KILLING OF THEM, SO THAT I CAN SEE THEM.
W. D. COBB."

to produce the effect. The power of the master must be absolute, to render the submission of the slave perfect. I most freely confess my sense of the harshness of this proposition. I feel it as deeply as any man can. And as a principle of *moral right, every person in his retirement must repudiate it.* But in the actual condition of things, it must be so. There is no remedy. THIS DISCIPLINE BELONGS TO SLAVERY."—*The State vs. Mann, Dev. Rep.*; p. 263, North Carolina, 1829.

And so it was decided, that a master or his *locum tenens* may, with legal impunity, SHOOT A WOMAN if she will not stand still to be flogged! It is pleasing to see that this judge, while upholding the essential discipline of slavery, is too honest to wait for a new revelation from Heaven to pronounce it *wrong*; and they who profess to believe it *right*, insult the moral sense of mankind, and lie to their own consciences.

And now does the reader imagine Mr. Cobb some horrible wretch, who thus publicly offers money for the blood of the *innocent*, for even Judge Ruffin admits that no principle of natural duty requires the slave to toil for his master? Mr. Cobb may be a very reputable churchwarden, vestryman, or communicant of the Church in Newbern. He is a law-abiding citizen, and has acted in strict accordance with "Slavery as it exists at the present day," and of course "agreeably with the order of Divine Providence." Before he thus compassed the death of two of his fellow-men, he obtained, and published in the same paper with his advertisement, the following proclamation, viz :

"We do hereby, by virtue of an Act of the Assembly of this State, concerning Servants and Slaves, intimate and declare if the said Slaves (Ben and Rigdon) do not surrender themselves, and return home immediately after the publication of these presents, that any person may KILL and destroy said Slaves, by *such means as he or they may think fit*, without accusation or impeachment of any crime for so doing, or without incurring any penalty or forfeiture thereby.

"Given under our hands and seals, this 12 November, 1836.

B. COLEMAN, J. P.

JAS. JONES, J. P."

It may, indeed, be said that this proclamation of the two Justices of the Peace is an idle mockery, first, because the slaves are by law incapacitated from reading it, and secondly, because it assigns no time for their return, and of course, that they might legally be *flayed alive* an hour after the proclamation was issued. But what is all this to Mr. Cobb? He has strictly pursued the course pointed out by law for murdering slaves in Bishop Ives' Diocese.

Again, the Wilmington (same Diocese) Advertiser of 13th July, 1838, has the following :

"RUN AWAY, my negro man Richard. A reward of \$25 will be paid for his apprehension, DEAD or alive. Satisfactory proof will only be required of his being KILLED.

DURANT H. RHODES."

Mr. Rhodes, it must be admitted, is more confiding in human nature than Mr. Cobb. The latter would only pay his money, after beholding with his own eyes the dead bodies of his slaves; whereas, Mr. Rhodes is contented with satisfactory proof that his man Richard has been slaughtered.

We will give one more instance of the taste, feelings and morality, springing from Slavery in the Bishop's Diocese, extracted

from the North Carolina Standard of July 18, 1838, published at Raleigh, the residence of the Bishop, and very probably honored by his constant perusal.

“TWENTY DOLLARS REWARD.—Ran away from the subscriber, a negro woman and two children. The woman is tall and black, and a few days before she went off, *I burnt her with a hot iron on the left side of her face*, I tried to make the letter M, and she kept a cloth over head and face, and a fly bonnet on her head, so as to cover the burn. Her children, &c.

MICAJAH RICKS.”

It is utterly impossible that the Southern clergy, in pleading for the continuance of Slavery, should not be conscious that they are pleading for the continued ignorance, wretchedness and heathenism of millions of their fellow-men.*

Of the necessary heathenism of Slavery, little need be said. There may indeed be slaves who are Christians, but they are extraordinary exceptions from the system. Can Christianity take root and flourish where every religious privilege depends on the will of an arbitrary and often Godless master; where the conjugal and parental relations are unacknowledged, and in practice unrespected; where the avenues to knowledge are closed, and ignorance enforced, and where the very ministers of Christ are justly regarded by the slaves as in league with their oppressors? It is, moreover, utterly impossible that competent religious instruction can be afforded to the slaves, without at the same time imparting to them sufficient intelligence to endanger the whole system. Give to the slaves the means of becoming Christians, and you render them both useless and formidable to their masters. What! shall a slave be enabled to contemplate the mysteries of redemption, and yet not understand the iniquity of his own bondage? Shall his heart glow with love for his Saviour, and yet shall he be made to believe that that Saviour approves the cruelty and injustice of which he is daily the victim? Shall he be taught, as Bishop Freeman advises, to say the ten commandments, and not perceive that nearly the whole decalogue is violated in his own person? The Bishop says he

* De Tocqueville describes the Slave code as “Legislation stained by unparalleled atrocities; a despotism directed against the human mind. Legislation which forbids the Slaves to be taught to read or write; and which aims to sink them as nearly as possible to the level of the brutes.” But De Tocqueville is a French *Philosophe*. We are not aware that any minister of the Church, in the Slave States, has declared this legislation to be sinful.

must also learn his catechism. If he understands it, with what bitter scorn will he repeat, that it is his duty "not to covet or desire other men's goods, but to learn and labor truly to get his own living," recollecting that he is himself robbed, and with the consent and approbation of his spiritual teacher, of every product of his own labor, and that the only possible means whereby he can get his *own* living, is by escaping from the house of bondage?*

One of the "duties of slaveholders" is to have slave children baptized. It is to be hoped, for the sake of decency, that the address to sponsors will on such occasions be omitted, as it would be trifling with sacred things to tell the chattel parents or friends, that they must call upon the child as he grows up to hear sermons, and take care that he be brought to the Bishop for confirmation; since if either the sponsors or the child attempt to leave the plantation without their master's permission, they may legally be shot, and will certainly be scourged. It is, moreover, scarcely reverent to assure these sponsors, to whom the Word of God is a sealed book, and who have, and can have nothing of their own, that it is their *duty* to provide that the little article of merchandise be taught "all which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."

Bishop Freeman is prudently silent on the subject of slave marriages. Surely a minister of the Church must have a front of bronze to use "the form of matrimony" in connecting two slaves. To make persons who are vendible commodities, and who can never spend an hour together without the permission of one, and often of two masters, vow, in the presence of Almighty God, to cleave to each other in *riches* and in poverty, in sickness and in health, till parted by

* For these or other reasons, Bishop Ives has himself constructed a catechism, whose admirable qualities he thus describes: "The plainness of its directions enables any person to *apply* it. If our planters, therefore, under a sense of their solemn responsibility to God for the Christian instruction of their slaves, would adopt it, and see to its faithful inculcation, the next generation of *blacks* in our State, at a very small expense, would sufficiently understand the truth as it is in Jesus, WITHOUT KNOWING A LETTER OF THE ALPHABET."—*Spirit of Missions*, Nov., 1842.

There are in the Bishop's diocese, as appears by the last census, 209,783 free white persons over 20 years of age. Of these, 56,609, or nearly one-third, cannot read or write. Hence, the next generation of *whites* in North Carolina may be equally indebted with the *blacks*, to this catechism, for their knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. And yet there may be doubts of the efficiency of this labor-saving machine, seeing it is to be applied by slaveholders, so many of whom do not themselves know a letter of the alphabet.

death, is but solemn mockery. The priestly prohibition, "Those whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," is, moreover, not merely in utter contempt of the laws of the land, but at war with the very existence of Slavery. If the husband and wife may not be separated at the will of their owners, and according to the state of the market, what becomes of property in man?

As the House of Bishops, in their selection of Dr. Freeman, gave their implied sanction to American slavery, it might be well for them in their next pastoral letter to determine how far, and under what circumstances, the CHURCH allows a slave a plurality of wives. This is the more necessary, as the "sects" are beginning to legislate upon the subject, since the civil power in this particular gives him unbounded liberty. A Reverend Professor of the Methodist Church has decided that it is perfectly lawful for an owner to separate husband and wife, and that if there be any sin in the case, it rests upon the shoulders of the slaves, who ought not to have taken vows which their condition disqualifies them from keeping. A Baptist association in Virginia have granted permission to a slave member to take a second wife, his first having been sold into another part of the country; and another association in Georgia is reported to have voted, that a separation of man and wife, by sale or *hire*, to such a distance as precludes personal intercourse, is considered by God as equivalent to death.*

One of the blessed objects for which God instituted marriage, was the care and instruction of the young; and hence the injunction, "Parents, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." But slave children, as we have seen, may be sold or given away before their birth, and are the subjects of traffic at an early age. For this and other reasons, the religious education of slaves is, with rare exceptions, wholly out of the question. On the whole, Slavery and Heathenism are, in the general, indissolubly connected; and Jesus Christ, in approving of the one, consented that millions for whom he died should become the victims of the other!

Of the rights of property, none are more obvious and indisputable than that of buying and selling. Hence the advocates of the Afri-

* Professor E. A. Andrews, in his letter on "Slavery and the Domestic Slave-trade," relates that a slave complaining to him that his wife's master was about selling her, remarked, "This is my *third* wife, both the others were sold to the speculators."

can slave-trade in the British Parliament most consistently rested the justification of the commerce on the righteousness of Slavery itself. Not a clerical champion of "Slavery as it exists at present," questions the moral right

"To gauge and span,
"And buy the muscles and the bones of man."

And now we call upon our Bishops, either to disabuse the public mind as to the alleged iniquity of the African slave-trade, or else to show from Scripture, that while it is very wicked to buy a savage in Africa and sell him in Cuba, it is a lawful act to buy a fellow-countryman, and possibly a fellow-christian in North Carolina, and sell him in New Orleans.*

* Bishop Ives' diocese is one of the great breeding districts in which human cattle are raised for the Southern market. As a specimen of the style in which the correspondence of gentlemen engaged in this commerce is conducted, we give a letter from a North Carolina merchant to his consignee, at New Orleans:

"HALIFAX, N. C., Nov. 16, 1839.

Dear Sir—I have shipped in the brig Addison—prices are below—

No. 1.	Caroline Ennis,	- - - - -	\$650.
" 2.	Silvy Holland,	- - - - -	625.
" 3.	Silvy Booth,	- - - - -	487 50.
" 4.	Maria Pollock,	- - - - -	475.
" 5.	Emeline Pollock,	- - - - -	475.
" 6.	Delia Averit,	- - - - -	475.

The two girls that cost \$650 and \$625, were bought before I shipped my first. I have a great many negroes offered to me, but I will not pay the prices they ask, for I know they will come down. I have no opposition in market. I will wait until I hear from you before I buy, and then I can judge what I must pay. Goodwin will send you the bill of lading for my negroes, as he shipped them with his own. Write often, as the times are critical, and it depends on the prices you get, to govern me in buying. Yours, &c.

Mr. Theophilus Freeman, }
New Orleans. } G. W. BARNES."

The above was a small but choice invoice of wives and mothers. Nine days before, viz., 7th Nov., Mr. Barnes advised Mr. Freeman of having shipped a lot of 43 men and women. Mr. Freeman, informing one of his correspondents of the state of the market, writes (*Sunday*, 21st Sept., 1839), "I bought a boy yesterday 16 years old, and likely, weighing 110 pounds, at \$700. I sold a likely girl, 12 years old, at \$500. I bought a man yesterday, 20 years old, six feet high, at \$820; one *to-day*, 24 years old, at \$850, black and sleek as a mole."

And are these brokers in human flesh, these butchers of human hearts, bad men? For aught that appears, they are as sound Churchmen, and as heavenly-minded Christians, except in trading in negroes on *Sunday*, as Bishops Ives and Freeman themselves; they are but reducing to practice the doctrines taught by these Right Rev. Fathers. If Slavery be right, we must indeed wait for a new revelation before we pronounce the slave-trade wrong. No

Again, as God approved of the bondage of *white* men, would it not be a laudable enterprise to enlarge the assortments in our slave-markets, by the importation of Russian serfs? If the reduction of millions of the human race to the condition of mere chattels be consistent with the will of God, then, inasmuch as the greater includes the less, who shall say that every minor form of oppression is not equally agreeable to the common Father of mankind?

"Slavery," says Wilberforce, is "a system of the grossest injustice, of the most heathenish irreligion and immorality, of the most unprecedented degradation and unrelenting cruelty." Yet of this system the Episcopal Church is a mighty buttress, and certain of her Bishops its reckless and unblushing champions. But could the united logic and eloquence of the whole House of Bishops persuade the mother, as she bends with delight over the infant cherub in the cradle, that the compassionate Redeemer, who took little children into his arms and blessed them, has given his consent that the child of her love, the object of her hopes and prayers, should be torn from her embraces, and sold in the market to the highest bidder, to put money in the pocket of another? Let the experiment be made, and if that mother be a Christian, she will thank God that she knows and loves her Saviour too well to believe such a blasphemy.

And by what process do our masters in Israel justify American Slavery? Do they show its accordance with the divine attributes—with the spirit of the Gospel—with the cultivation of holiness—

doubt the trade occasions painful separations, but the rights of property are paramount to the feelings of nature. The Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, some time since, published an address, in which they thus noticed the domestic slave-trade: "The members of a slave family may (by law) be forcibly separated, so that they shall never more meet again till the final judgment. And cupidity often induces the masters to practise what the law allows. Brothers and sisters, parents and children, husbands and wives, are torn asunder, and permitted to see each other no more. *These acts are daily occurring in the midst of us.* There is not a neighborhood where these heart-rending scenes are not displayed. There is not a village or road that does not behold the sad procession of manacled outcasts, where chains and mournful countenances tell that they are exiled by force from all that their hearts hold dear." And the Synod speak of the *iniquity* of the system! But why is it more iniquitous to fetter slaves than any other animals that we send to market? Why more cruel to separate a child than a calf from its mother?

* Benjamin Davis, a slave-trader in Hamburg, S. C., advertised in the Charleston papers, for sale, "SMALL BOYS WITHOUT THEIR MOTHERS."

with the glory of God—with individual happiness and national prosperity? Oh, no—they appeal to Hebrew servitude, and to a few insulated texts in the New Testament.

There is something appalling in the passionate eagerness with which certain ministers of Christ rush forward to lay the blessed Scriptures upon the altar of the southern Moloch. We wish to do these men no injustice, and therefore frankly admit, that some persons may honestly find themselves embarrassed in their endeavors to reconcile certain texts with the obvious cruelty and injustice of human bondage; and we as frankly confess that we shudder at the very idea of one who professes himself called by the Holy Ghost as a preacher of righteousness, teaching his people that American Slavery, Slavery as it exists in North Carolina, is *not* “WRONG.”

The moral sense of every man, when not perverted by pecuniary interest, education, or authority, is itself sufficient to convince him of the iniquity of Slavery. The Christian student, therefore, who commences the Scriptural examination of this subject with an unclouded judgment, will come to his work with a firm conviction, that every attribute of Slavery is opposed to the *spirit* of the Gospel. Hence, he would be restrained from promptly pronouncing Slavery unscriptural only by a painful suspicion that certain passages in the Bible lent it their sanction. He would, however, call to mind that there were some things in Scripture confessedly “hard to be understood,” and he would cherish the hope that he did not rightly understand those which apparently contradicted the character of God and the general precepts of His Word. He would, therefore, search the Scriptures, not to find a warrant for Slavery, but to reconcile certain obscure texts with the love and holiness which beam from every page.

If the Patriarchs did, indeed, as is said, hold slaves, he would recollect that they also indulged in polygamy, and were, in several instances, guilty of falsehood.*

* It is not our purpose to enter at large into the Bible argument, but merely to suggest some reasons why they who think American Slavery “wrong,” are not necessarily impugnors of “Revelation.” It might be inferred from the confidence and evident delight with which the example of Abraham is urged in vindication of our “domestic institution,” that the Father of the faithful was also the Father of all who traffic in human flesh. If he was, indeed, a slaveholder, he was still very far from being the type of a Southern planter. While childless, he designated one of his slaves as his future heir. He was afterwards prevented, only by Divine appointment, from making the son of the

If the Jews were, indeed, allowed to buy slaves of the heathens around them, we must recollect that they were also allowed, nay, even commanded to destroy the inhabitants of Canaan, men, women and children; and Slavery was but a commutation of the punishment of death to which God had sentenced them for their sins. Such examples are not precedents for us under the Gospel dispen-

bondwoman heir *with* the son by promise, and was consoled by the assurance that the *former* should become the father of princes, and the founder of a great nation. He moreover entrusted to one of his slaves, the selection of a wife for his favorite son. The 318 servants "born in his house," the Bishop of Texas asserts were "slaves." Still they were men whom he armed and led to battle. They, with their parents, brothers, sisters, wives and children, must have formed a "gang" of about 2000 in number. Yet we find the master of this multitude of slaves leaving his guests to catch a calf to provide dinner for them, while the mistress of this goodly household occupied herself in kneading and baking cakes for her company! A pro-slavery theory can alone blind us to the evidence afforded by these facts; that Abraham was the chief of a clan or tribe, and that the expression, "born in his own house," only indicates that the 318 were not strangers whom he employed on the occasion, but members of the community acknowledging him as its head.

That there was a species of servitude in the East at an early period, as at present, is true; it is also true that it was of a very different character from that which prevailed in the West. *Our* Slavery belongs to the Western system. In a late work on Egypt by Clot Bey the distinction between the two systems is thus noticed: "There is a prodigious difference between American Slavery, and servitude among the Orientals. With them, the institution is neither cruel or disgraceful. It does not regard the Slave as a *thing*, a material object, as did the Roman law. It does not make him a mere article of import or export, a matter of speculation, a simple machine, in fact, whose efficiency is estimated as horse power. The West Indian regards in the negro only his corporeal value, and forgets in him the intellectual man; he robs him of his nature. The Mussulman, on the contrary, always beholds a *MAN* in his Slave and treats him in such a manner, that we may say of Oriental Slavery, that it is often a real adoption, and always an admission into an extended family circle.

"Oriental servitude honorably contrasts with our Slavery, and above all by its respect for the dignity of human nature. The slave, in Turkey, is not humiliated by his condition: he often proudly boasts that he is of the family of such a Bey, or such a Pasha, and gives his master the title of father. He knows, moreover, that he is not bound for ever to his station by a chain of iron. He has before him examples sufficient to raise his ambition, and to swell his soul with the hope of more brilliant destinies." The author then give various instances of slaves who had risen to high dignities; and mentions two sons-in-law of the present Sultan, who had both been slaves, and adds, "In Egypt, the superior officers are, for the most part, manumitted slaves." See Aperçu general sur L'Égypte, par A. B. Clot Bey, 1840. Tom. i., p. 269.

sation without a special warrant. But is it certain that the "bondmen" (so called by our translators, but not distinguished in the original from servants*) were *Slaves*? If so, they were the *property* of their masters. Now, how was their property acquired? The heathen around, even their very infants, might be slaughtered, but "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Hence the Jewish slaves were to be purchased, but of whom? If the slave-trade constituted a part of the Jewish commerce, strange it is that we hear nothing of the slave market in Israel. We know that the Jews *sold themselves*. "If a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother that dwelleth by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger or sojourner by thee," &c. Hence it is possible that as poor Jews sold themselves to rich strangers, poor strangers might sell themselves to rich Jews. There is no evidence that the heathen in Palestine had *slaves* to sell, but many among them might find it convenient to enter into Jewish families as domestics. The servitude of both Jewish and heathen servants seems to have been limited to the year of Jubilee. That this servitude was not founded on the idea of *property* appears from the prohibition, "Thou shall not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master to thee" (Deut. xxiii. 15). This law, whether the fugitive was a Jew or a heathen, is utterly irreconcilable with common honesty, supposing the servant to have been a mere chattel; and certainly belonged to a very different code of morals from that which enjoins, "If thou meet thy enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shall surely bring it back to him again."

On turning to the New Testament, our inquirer would recollect, that it was written at a time, when, among the Romans, Slavery and the exhibitions of the amphitheatre were systems of extraordinary cruelty and of human butchery, and that although both are alluded to neither is expressly condemned. True it is, that

* The word in the original, sometimes rendered bondman, and sometimes servant, is *Obed*. It is applied to Christ, "Behold my servant whom I uphold," Isaiah xxiv. 1. It is applied to King Rehoboam, 1 Kings xii. 7. Ziba, Saul's *Obed*, had himself twenty *Obeds*, 2 Samuel ix. 10. There is no word in Hebrew for slave, as distinct from servant. We find, 1 Chron. ii. 34, that Sheshan, the head of one of the families of the tribe of Judah, gave his daughter to wife, to his *servant*, an Egyptian; and so far was any disgrace attached in consequence to their children, that the son of this very daughter was enrolled among "the valiant men" of David's army, 1 Chron. ii., 41.

St. Paul induced a servant to return to his master. If the servant was a freeman, the case proves nothing. If he was a slave, the Apostle required his instant manumission, by commanding the master to receive him, "Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved; *receive him as myself.*"*

There are instances in which persons, who perhaps held slaves, are spoken of with commendation, but not on that account. None of the Churches or individuals commended in the Apostolic epistles were faultless, and it would be most monstrous to infer from a general commendation, an Apostolic sanction of every error or sin of which they might be guilty.

Were it possible to imagine a kind of Slavery divested of all sinful attributes, and consistent alike with the glory of God and the good of man, Bishops Freeman and Ives well know that such is not the character of American Slavery. If "Slavery as it exists at present," in the Dioceses of these two Bishops, is indeed acceptable to HIM who proclaims himself, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth," then, indeed, is the Bible a riddle, and its morality a paradox. Be it so; a title to negro slaves must at all hazards be found in the Bible. The very character of the Southern Priesthood for honesty, depends on its production.† What is wanting in proof, must be supplied by bold assertion, and all Christendom beyond the slave region shall be accused of presumption, for not waiting for a *new revelation*, before they dare to pronounce such slavery as exists in North Carolina *wrong!*

And shall we be any longer insulted with the assertion, that the preached Gospel is the divinely appointed means of abolishing Slavery? Most certain it is, *that the spirit of the Gospel*, carried into universal practice, would relieve the human family from every moral evil with which it is afflicted; but it is utterly false that the ministrations of our own, or any other Church, will correct a single vice, independent of the character of its ministers, the examples they set, and the doctrines they preach. Would the teachings of

* St. Paul wrote by Onesimus to the Church at Colosse, and in his Epistle speaks of him as "a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you," Col iv. 9.

† The clergy of the South, of all denomination, are generally slaveholders. A member of the House of Bishops is said, in a late western newspaper, to own 170 slaves.

a thousand Dr. Freemans loosen the fetters of a single slave? No less than forty missionaries are supported by our Board of Missions in the slave regions. Dare we hope they have induced one master to let his bondmen go free? While the Southern clergy vindicate Slavery as a Christian institution, they are in danger of producing a result which they as little expect as desire. "Should the priesthood," says a Southern writer, once himself a slaveholder, "should the priesthood succeed in convincing the world that Slavery is the doctrine of the New Testament, then will INFIDELITY become the true religion of mankind—and not till then." Says another Southern writer, and apparently a pious Christian, "I distinctly avow, that when I can be brought to believe that American Slavery, taken as a system, is sustained by the teachings of Holy Writ, I must cease to be a believer in the Bible."

But, blessed be God! his priesthood has, in all ages of the Church, afforded the most glorious illustrations of fearless devotion to duty, and of self-denying benevolence, that the world has ever witnessed. While some have claimed to hold their slaves as monarchs their crowns, "by the grace of God," many have witnessed a good confession against human bondage. In the Church of England at the present day, there is not probably a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, who would endorse the theology of our Texan Bishop. But then we are told by the slaveholders, and their tools, the Northern demagogues, that England is anti-slavery through envy of our prosperity! Let us, then, hear the English Bishops, when such a motive could have no existence.

BISHOP WARBURTON, in a sermon preached in 1776 against Slavery and the slave-trade, exclaims, "Gracious God! to talk, as in herds of cattle, of property in rational creatures—creatures endowed with all our faculties, possessing all our qualities but that of color—our brethren both by nature and grace, shocks all the feelings of humanity and the dictates of common sense. *Nature created man free, and grace invites him to assert his freedom.*"

BISHOP BURGESS, in a pamphlet against the slave-trade, 1789, says: "Such oppression (W. I. Slavery) and such traffic must be swept away at *one blow*. Such horrid offences against God and nature can admit of no medium. If no British subject is exempt from the duty of doing everything in his place towards preventing the continuance of so great a political as well as moral evil, more especially are not those subjects, whose business it is to teach what

is every man's concern to know, the *interpreters of God's Word*, which is so frequently violated by West India Slavery and its consequences."

BISHOP PORTEUS declared in the House of Lords, 1806, in answering certain *Scriptural* arguments in behalf of Slavery, "There was no such thing as perpetual slavery under the Old or New Testament;" and he showed that all Hebrew servants were set at liberty every seventh year, and all others at the Jubilee.

THE BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH, the same year, asserted in the House of Lords, that "the principle of perpetual slavery is totally inconsistent with the Jewish law. When we come down to Christianity, we find dealers in slaves are held among the worst of the human race. St. Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, tells us what the dealers in slaves are, and who are their companions. The slave-dealers are called 'stealers of men,' and their companions are liars, perjurers, murderers, and parricides."

BISHOP HORSELY, in 1799, with Christian boldness, rebuked the nobles of Britain for their wicked toleration of the slave-trade; and vindicated the Gospel of Christ from the aspersions of those who represented it as a shield for cruelty and injustice. After showing that the "men-stealers" classed in the Bible with murderers of fathers and of mothers, were in fact, according to the true meaning of the Greek word, "slave-traders," he proceeded: "We have reason to conclude, from the mention of 'slave-traders' by St. Paul, that if any of them should ever find their way to Heaven, they must go thither in company with murderers and parricides. My Lords, I do certainly admit that there is no prohibition of Slavery in the Bible in explicit terms, such as these words, 'thou shalt not have a slave,' or 'thou shalt not hold any one in slavery.' There is no explicit reprobation of Slavery by name. My Lords, if I were to say there was no occasion for any such prohibition, because Slavery is condemned by something anterior to either the Christian or the Mosaic dispensation, I could support the assertion by grave authorities. Beware, my Lords, how you are persuaded to bring under the opprobrious name of *fanaticism* the regard you owe to the great duties of justice and mercy, for the neglect of which, if you should neglect them, you will be answerable to that tribunal, where no prevarication of witnesses can misinform the Judge, where no subtilty of an advocate, miscalling the names of

things, and putting evil for good, and good for evil, can mislead the judgment."

"Slavery," said LORD MANSFIELD, "is so odious that nothing but positive law can sustain it." His lordship little suspected that a time was approaching when the CHURCH would afford it more efficient support than even positive law, and would herself look to it for support in return. One of our church periodicals has announced that "the Bishop of Georgia, in his Montpelier Institution, is testing the sufficiency of slave labor to support it." It is not unusual to see in the Southern papers, notices of slaves to be sold on account of ecclesiastical corporations. Bishop Wilberforce, in his History, refers to a proposal by the Editor of the "Spirit of Missions" to establish a Mission School to be supported by slaves, who shall be induced, by the promise of prospective emancipation, to perform so much extra labor in the course of SIXTEEN years as to yield a profit of one hundred per cent. on the capital invested, over and above the ordinary profits extorted by common taskmasters. This revolting scheme, in which it was intended that the slaves should work two hours before sunrise, and two hours after sunset, in all *sixteen* hours out of the four and twenty, and this for sixteen successive years, was pressed upon the Church in an official magazine, published in New York under the supervision of the Missionary Committee, and by an Editor holding his appointment from the Board of Missions, including the Bishops, and other representatives of the Church elected by the General Convention. In about three months after this publication, the Board assembled, and written remonstrances were presented to them, beseeching them, for the honor of the Church, and the cause of religion and humanity, to disavow the conduct of their Editor. These remonstrances excited warm debates, not unmingled with Southern arrogance. It was impossible for the Board to express disapprobation of the plan without indirectly censuring Bishops Ives and Elliott. If slaves be indeed property, what objection can there be to converting their bones and muscles into money for the Church? To condemn the Editor, would offend the pro-slavery Bishops and Clergy; expressly to approve his conduct, would raise a tempest at the North. So, policy was substituted for godly sincerity, and cunning for wisdom. The Board expunged from their minutes the proceedings had on the memorials, and avoiding all intelligible allusion to the scheme which had led to them, ordered the following words to be printed

on the future numbers of their *own magazine*: "It is to be understood by the readers of this periodical, that the Board of Missions are not responsible for the expression of editorial opinions, but simply for the accuracy of facts connected with their operations."

But lest even this extraordinary disclaimer should be supposed to involve a concealed censure on the late "editorial opinions," the resolution recommending it, and which was introduced by a Bishop from a slave State, as chairman of a committee, was preceded by another, declaring, "That, in the opinion of this Board, the Spirit of Missions has been conducted, during the *year past*, with commendable diligence and ability;" and the report of the committee accompanying these resolutions is careful to state that the periodical in question is "gaining reputation and influence, and that if it continues to be conducted with the same ability which it has *of late exhibited*, it will become a powerful auxiliary to the cause."

The subject of Slavery had been brought directly and prominently before the Church, by her own appropriate officers. Money, entrusted to the Board for Missionary purposes, had been employed through the official magazine, to advocate the cause of human bondage, to condemn emancipation as "ruinous, and forbidden by common sense and *Christian* prudence," and to put in motion a machinery by which money was to be extorted for the coffers of the Church, from the cruel and extraordinary toil of miserable slaves. The memorialists had virtually asked the Rev. and Right Rev. Fathers of the Church, in council assembled, do, or do you not, approve of this conduct of your agent? To this interrogatory, the Rev. gentlemen thought it expedient to answer neither yes nor no; but in the notice they ordered to be in future printed on their magazine, they did return a most disingenuous and unworthy reply. No human being ever supposed that the members of the Board, scattered throughout the Union, were responsible for the publication or "expression" in New York, of opinions of which they could have no previous knowledge, and of course no power to prevent. Did the Board intend to enunciate so bald a truism as this? As well might they have given notice that they were not responsible for any heresy or immorality of which their officers might hereafter be guilty. When examined with a critical microscope, the disclaimer has reference to the "expression"—the *printing* of opinions in New York. But in the plain, obvious, popular import of the notice, the disclaimer has reference to the opinions, *after* they are expressed and

printed. In this sense alone, had the disclaimer any reference to the subject which induced it. Nay, the Board intended it to be so understood; for they thought proper to order a resolution to be sent to the memorialists, who had "complained of the tendency of an editorial article in the March number of the Spirit of Missions" (carefully avoiding mentioning in the minutes, the *subject* of the article), declaring that the Board had never "held itself responsible for the opinions expressed by the Editors of the Spirit of Missions," and had directed "this assertion of irresponsibility to be distinctly placed upon the cover of the future numbers of this periodical."

On this assertion of "irresponsibility" we take issue, and affirm that the Board is responsible to the community, to the Church and to God, for the opinions of an Editor appointed by themselves, under their control, paid out of funds entrusted to their care, published in an official magazine, and printed at the expense of Missionary contributions. What! will the Board tell us that *their* Editor may make *their* magazine a vehicle for the dissemination of obscenity and infidelity, and that it is no concern of theirs? That he may disparage the Church, insult her Bishops, and deny her doctrines, and that they are not responsible? But should he misdate a letter, or omit half a dollar in the acknowledgment of a donation, then, then indeed, they will not shrink from responsibility.

Surely the Bishops who concurred in this "assertion of irresponsibility," forget for the moment their consecration vow, "to be ready with all faithful vigilance to drive away from the Church all strange and erroneous doctrines contrary to God's word."

This disclaimer, like most cunning measures, was a sacrifice of duty to present expediency; a sacrifice which, however common with politicians, we had no right to expect from such a body of men. The truth is, the Board were worried by the memorials. To take no notice of them would probably increase "agitation"—to approve the course of the Editor, would disgust many at the North—to condemn it, would offend all at the South. Instead of manfully breaking down this triple hedge, within which they found themselves enclosed, they determined to crawl through it, and for this purpose, disencumbered themselves of a responsibility which God and the Church had commanded them to bear.

Let us now turn to another, but a kindred, subject. Whatever may be the struggles of the slaveholder to wring from the Bible a title to his slaves, no reader of the volume of inspiration, whether

Christian or Infidel, has professed to discover in it a warrant for the establishment of CASTE in the Church of God. However much we may be inclined to appeal to the Scriptures for a license to despise, insult and oppress our fellow-Christians, on account of their race or natural features, we are effectually deterred by the declarations that one God hath created us—that we have all one Father—that in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile, Greek nor Barbarian, Bond nor Free; and by the commands to do good unto all men, and to *honor all men*. Hence the institution of CASTE in the Church, and the obloquy, injustice and cruelty connected with it, are not rested, like slavery, on the alleged consent of Christ and his Apostles; but simply and frankly on pecuniary interest, personal antipathy, and popular prejudice.

So accustomed have we been from childhood to the distinction of caste, arising from color—so universally is this distinction maintained not merely in the Church, but in all the departments of society, that we have, for the most part, become callous to its iniquity; and our understandings can with difficulty be brought to believe that the merciful precepts of Christ's Gospel were intended to govern our intercourse with men of *dark*, as well as of white complexions. But although we may be insensible to the cruelty of caste, it is otherwise with its victims.

The Rev. T. S. Wright, a liberally educated *colored* clergyman, thus briefly enumerates *some* of the consequences of that system, which our Church has been so active and zealous in maintaining.

“No man can really understand this prejudice unless he feels it crushing him to dust, because it is matter of feeling. It has bolts, screws, and bars, wherever the colored man goes. It has bolts in all the schools and colleges. The colored parent, with the same soul as a white parent, sends his child to the seats of learning, and he finds the door bolted, and sits down to weep beside his boy. Prejudice stands at the door and bars him out. Does the child of the colored man show a talent for mechanics? The heart of the parent beats with hope. He sees the children of the white man engaged in employment, and he trusts there is a door open for his boy to get an honest living, and become a useful member of society. But when he comes to the workshop with his child, he finds a bolt there. But even suppose he can get this first bolt removed, he finds other bars. Let him be ever so skilled as a mechanic, up starts prejudice and says, ‘I wont work in the shop, if you do.’

Here he is scourged by prejudice, and has to go back and sink down to some of the employments which white men leave for the most degraded. He hears of the death of a child from home, and he goes in a stage or steamboat. His money is received, but he is scourged by prejudice. If he is sick, he can have no bed; he is driven on deck. Money will not buy for him the comforts it gets for all who have not his complexion. He turns to some white friend, and he says, 'submit, it is an ordinance of God, you must be humble.' I have felt this. As a minister, I have been called to pass often up and down the North River in steamboats. Many a night have I walked the deck, and not been able to lie down in a bed.* Prejudice would, indeed, turn money to dross, where it was offered for these comforts by a colored man. Thus prejudice scourges us from the table, it scourges us from the cabin, from the stage-coach, and from the bed. Wherever we go, it has for us bolts, bars and rods. Even at the communion table, the colored man can only partake of the crumbs after the others have been served. This prejudice drives the colored man from religion. I have often heard my brethren say, they would have nothing to do with such a religion. They are driven away and go to infidelity; for even the Infidels at Tammany Hall make no distinction on account of color."

That this prejudice may drive some of the sufferers into infidelity is probable; since it has been a common mistake in all ages, to judge of Christianity, not by its own inspired records, but by the conduct of a portion of its fallible ministers. And he who is led to believe that American Slavery, and its detestable offspring, American Caste, is approved of by Jesus Christ, may well be excused for questioning the divinity of his mission.

Although caste had long existed among us in practice, the exclusion of Mr. Crummell from the General Theological Seminary was the first instance of its recognition, as a part of the ecclesiastical polity of the American Church. Mr. Degress, the young man whose affecting journal is given by Bishop Wilberforce, was kept out of the Seminary by the personal influence and authority of Bishop Benjamin Onderdonk. But in Mr. Crummell, the Bishop found a more impracticable subject, and a petition for admission was presented to the assembled Trustees. The statutes of the institution rendered it imperative

* The writer has been informed, that the wife of Mr. Wright lost her life in consequence of exposure on the deck of a steamboat, being denied a berth in the cabin, on account of her complexion.

on the Trustees to admit all applicants possessing certain qualifications, and these qualifications the Bishop honestly informed the board, *were possessed* by the present applicant. The Board, under these circumstances, found themselves in a dilemma. To reject the young man *on account of his complexion* would not only be illegal, but would excite remark, invite ridicule, and encourage "agitation;" and on the other hand, to admit him, would irritate a prejudice which Bishop Onderdonk had admitted to Degress was "unrighteous;" and might also hazard the loss of Southern contributions to the Seminary. A committee, with Bishop Henry Onderdonk, of Pennsylvania, as chairman, was appointed to consider the application; and their report was more distinguished for brevity than for wisdom. Without assigning a single reason, and without an allusion to the complexion of the applicant, they merely recommended "that the prayer of the Petitioner be not granted." The report was adopted, whereupon, Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, asked permission, which was *refused*, to enter his objections on the minutes. Hence the minutes merely record the fact, that a Mr. Crummell had applied for admission into the Seminary and was denied. They afforded no intimation that the Trustees had violated the statutes, no hint that the rejected candidate was not colored like themselves. Should any one wonder why the application was rejected, the natural presumption would be, that the young man was deficient in his literary attainments or moral character, and that the Committee who reported against him had benevolently refrained from putting his delinquencies upon record. But Mr. Crummell was a poor obscure colored man; there was no probability that his case would excite inquiry, or ever be known. Certainly the management of the Trustees was exceedingly adroit. Alas! for the wisdom of the wise, and the understanding of the prudent. In a short time the proceedings of the Board were exposed and condemned in the newspapers, not only of New York, but of London, and now form a conspicuous and indelible portion of the "History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America." The Bishop of New York thought it expedient to vindicate himself in a newspaper publication, in which he condescends to propitiate the "unrighteous prejudice" by a gratuitous sneer at *amalgamation* (!).

Mr. Crummell sought and obtained ordination in another Diocese, and then resolved to embrace an opportunity that offered, of organizing a colored Church in Philadelphia. He accordingly repaired

to that city, with the usual letter dismissory from his late Diocese, and in compliance with the Canon, presented it to the Bishop. We can readily believe that this last gentleman was not gratified at finding that the young man, who on his recommendation had been excluded from the Seminary, now claimed a canonical residence in his own Diocese, as a Brother Minister of the Church. The Canons allowed the Bishop no discretion. Mr. Crummell's letter was unexceptionable, and by the laws of the Church, he became entitled, on its delivery, to all the rights and privileges of a Clergyman of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. But the Bishop was as independent of legal restraints in Philadelphia, as he had been in New York. He informed Mr. Crummell that he would receive his letter, only on the condition that he would pledge himself, in his own behalf, and in behalf of his Church, should he succeed in raising one, *never to apply for a seat in Convention*; and immediately proposed to *write* the pledge. He was told it was unnecessary, as the pledge could not be given. He then positively declared he would not receive him, on which the young minister intimated his intention to return to the Diocese he had just left. Here again was an embarrassing dilemma. To disregard a dismissory letter from another Diocese, and to send back the bearer, without the slightest objection being made to his character or conduct, might lead to very inconvenient results, and would unquestionably cause much "agitation;" and, on the other hand, to admit a negro to a canonical residence, was to open the door of the Convention to him, the consequence of which would be that a Minister of Christ, with a dark complexion, might sit in the Council of the Church! The Bishop, to escape from this dilemma, proposed that he should inform the Convention in his address at its next meeting, that he had been admitted with the *understanding* that he was to have no seat in it. Mr. Crummell, with the same high moral courage which had hitherto marked his course, replied that he could have no agency in the matter. Thwarted in his attempts to make Mr. Crummell surrender his rights as a clergyman, the Bishop determined that others should wrest them from him; and consented to receive the dismissory letter, telling him that he would get the Convention to take some order on the subject.

About three weeks after this strange conference, the Convention of the Diocese assembled, and the Bishop's address contained the following passage: "In the Convention of 1795, it was declared

that the African Church of St. Thomas, in this city, was ‘not entitled to send a Clergyman or deputies to the Convention, or to interfere with the general government of the Church.’ This law is still retained in our 8th Revised Regulations. The peculiar circumstances which required this restriction may occur, and probably will, in other cases; and I submit for your consideration whether it will not be proper to enact a similar restriction applicable to all clergymen and congregations in this Diocese under like circumstances.”

It does really seem as if a consciousness of shame and guilt drives our ecclesiastical rulers, when perpetrating oppression and injustice upon *colored* Christians, to hide their meaning in unintelligible and deceptive phraseology.

We here learn that in 1795, the Convention made a certain *declaration*, which to all appearance was *judicial* and not legislative, that a particular Church was *not entitled* to a representation in the Convention. The *reasons* for such a judgment are not given—they may have been good or bad, but the judgment itself was within the jurisdiction of the Convention, since every Legislative body must judge of the qualifications of its members, although it cannot prescribe them. It does not appear that the Convention invaded any right, or did more than refuse to acknowledge an unlawful claim.

And yet from the fact that the Church thus excluded was an *African* one, and from the omission of the *reasons* on which the judgment was founded, we have no question that the pretended declaration was a high-handed unconstitutional enactment, disfranchising a Rector and his congregation, solely on account of the tincture of their skins; and that the Convention were ashamed to place upon their minutes the unchristian motives by which they were tempted to trample under foot the constitutional rights of a minister of Christ, and the people under his charge.

Bishop Onderdonk, we have seen, called on the Convention to enact a similar restriction, “applicable to all clergymen and congregations,” which should hereafter be in “*like circumstances.*” What circumstances? A state of schism, insubordination, or irregular or illegal incorporation? Oh no, he meant having black skins, but was ashamed to say so.

It will be observed that the legislation recommended is to be prospective, not *ex post facto*. No clergyman or congregation, *now* in the Diocese, is to be affected by it. No case *now* calls for this re-

striction, but cases “*may occur, and probably will,*” and it is best to be prepared for contingencies. All this is painful. The Bishop, while uttering the words we have quoted, had in his possession the letter dismissory of the very clergyman against whom the proposed restriction was aimed ; and who, by his advice, had been shut out of the Theological Seminary, and from whom he had vainly endeavoured to obtain a disgraceful surrender of his rights as a Minister of the Church. Again, in his address, he tells the Convention, “*Letters dismissory have been received and accepted by me as follows,*” and then gives a list of clergymen received from other Dioceses ; but Mr. Crummell’s name is not among them !

The powers of our Conventions, like those of our State Legislatures, are limited by written constitutions. The Fourth Article of the Constitution of the Pennsylvania Diocese declares that “*every clergyman of the Church, of whatever order, being a settled minister of some parish in this State, shall be entitled to a seat and vote in the Convention,*” provided he has had a canonical residence of a certain time, &c. The Tenth Article prescribes the mode of altering the Constitution, by the joint action of *two* successive Conventions, and thus takes away the power of doing it by a simple resolution.

Ruffian mobs had on several occasions, within the past few years, assailed the unoffending blacks in Philadelphia, sacked their dwellings, and torn down their houses of worship, and all on account of the complexion their Maker had given them. And how was this wicked, cruel prejudice against color, rebuked by the Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania ? Why, the Convention, at the instigation of the Bishop, “*Resolved, That the following clause be added to the 8th revised Regulation adopted in 1829, and hereafter to be taken as part thereof: ‘No Church in this Diocese, in like peculiar circumstances with the African Church of St. Thomas, shall be entitled to send a clergyman or deputies to the Convention, or to interfere with the general government of the Church.’*” Thus were colored clergymen and colored Christians driven, in contempt and utter violation of canonical law, from the enclosure of the Church, as they had been, by abandoned wretches, from the sanctuary of their own homes. The Bishop, Clergy, and Lay Deputies of the Pennsylvania Church, make common cause with the rioters in the streets, in a general crusade against negroes and mulattoes ! This act of the Convention brands for all future time every minister of Christ, and every member of his mystical body, who may trace his

descent from the land of Cyprian and Tertullian, as belonging to a distinct and degraded caste, and debars them from all participation in the government of the Redeemer's Church. This act forcibly thrusts a portion of the Church into schism, and repudiates one of the fundamental conditions on which the Diocese of Pennsylvania consented, in 1784, to acknowledge a general ecclesiastical government in the United States, viz., "That to make canons and laws, there be no other authority than that of a representative body of the clergy and laity conjointly." The great truth, "HE HATH MADE US, AND NOT WE OURSELVES," is set at naught by the Pennsylvania Convention; and in the indulgence of an "unrighteous prejudice," or in a cowardly submission to it, they have sacrificed both the independence and the unity of the Church, the dignity of the ministerial office, and that love which Christ made the badge and test of discipleship. And this lawless and profane excision of their brethren, these men attempted to veil under the strange and indefinite phraseology of "all in like peculiar circumstances with the African Church of St. Thomas!" If anything can possibly add to the shame of this transaction, it is that the vote was taken without discussion: not one single member of that large body, Clergyman or Layman, having the independence to rise in his place and protest against an act, at variance alike with the principles of the Church, and the precepts of its Divine Head. And what is the apology, the only apology which the Churchmen of Pennsylvania can offer for this wanton insult and oppression of their colored brethren? an apology that aggravates, instead of excusing their conduct. Popular prejudice required that colored Clergymen and delegates should be excluded from the Convention! It is disheartening to the patriot, to see our public men, those to whom high and important trusts are confided, so often governing themselves, not by the immutable principles of justice and rectitude, but by the ever varying opinions of the multitude. But, oh! it is sickening to the soul, to witness the Church of Christ sacrificing to popular clamor, her own holy and glorious attribute of being a light and a guide to a benighted and a sinful world.

Bishop Onderdonk of New York, in his charge of 1843, to the Convention, remarked: "Taking the Gospel for our guide, we must see in the Church and the world, essentially antagonistic bodies. The Church was formed *not to co-operate with the world, but to oppose it*—to attack the wicked principles and practices to which it

is in bondage, and to come to no terms with it on any other principles than its entire surrender of its opposition to the pure and holy spirit of the Gospel, and its entire submission to the rule which Christ, through his Church, would establish over it for good Let us ever, by the grace of God, be careful that in our intercourse with it, we adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things; and then go forward in our Master's work, indifferent save for its own sake, *whether the world be pleased or offended*; and, indeed, looking for the ill will and opposition from it, which that Master and his divine Word have prepared us to expect."

Glorious truths! godly counsels! worthy of an age of martyrs and confessors. Alas, that they should have been in the lips of him who uttered them, *Vox et preterea nihil!* Let the diary of the young candidate for orders, given in the "History," tell how this bold spoken Bishop crouched before a prejudice which his own tongue confessed to be "unrighteous;" and sacrificed duty and independence, lest the Seminary should lose the support of "the South!"

Rank and caste are essentially different; and while the former is sanctioned by the Bible, which requires us to render honor to those to whom honor is due, the latter is heathenish in its origin and character. Rank is founded on condition, and is usually connected with personal distinctions and acquirements. It unavoidably springs from the organization of society; and while it may confer privileges, is not necessarily inconsistent with the claims of justice and humanity. Caste, on the contrary, regards *racés*, irrespective of the individuals composing them. In Hindostan, it both elevates and depresses—with us, its only effects are degradation, cruelty and wretchedness. In the former country, the two extremes of caste are the Brahmins and the Soodras,* and the gulf between them is

* "Soodras may be frequently seen carrying water in a cup, and entreating the first Brahmin they meet, to put his toe into it; after which they drink the water, and bow or prostrate themselves before the Brahmin, who bestows his blessing upon them. Others preserve some of this holy water in their houses. Not only is the body of a Soodra laid prostrate before the Brahmin, to lick the dust of his feet, but his soul is also sacrificed to his honor. If a Soodra dare to listen to the Salvation-giving Vedu, he is to be punished for his sacrilege. If a Brahmin happen to be repeating any part of the Vedu aloud, a Soodra, if near, shuts his ears, and runs away. If a Soodra enter the cook-room of a Brahmin, the latter throws away all his earthen vessels as defiled; nay, the very touch of a Soodra makes a Brahmin unclean, and compels him to bathe in order to wash away the stain."—*Ward's View of the Hindoos*, pp. 79, 107.

wider and more impassable than that which in our own separates the whites and the blacks. And yet the American Church may learn an edifying lesson from the temporary cessation of caste in the presence of a Hindoo idol. "I was surprised," says Dr. Claudius Buchanan, in the journal of his tour to the Temple of Juggernaut, in Orissa, in 1806, "to see the Brahmins with their heads uncovered, in the open plain, and falling down in the midst of the Soodras, before the horrid shape, and mingling so complacently with that 'polluted caste;' but this proved what I had before heard, *that so great a God is this, that the dignity of high caste disappears before him.* This great king recognizes no distinction of rank among his subjects. All men are equal *in his presence.*"

We have long gloried in the conviction, not only that we are a true Church, but that, besides ourselves, there is none other. Too many among us are disposed to look down upon Christians of other names, with much the same feeling with which the Pharisee beheld the Publican who came to the Temple to pray. It seems to be not unfrequently forgotten, that the glory of the Church consists, not in her organization, nor in her rites and ceremonies, but in her *holiness*, which, like the Shechinah of the ancient temple, proclaims the presence of the Divine Lord.

The Church is, unquestionably, spiritually diseased, so far as she ceases to be, in the language of Bishop Onderdonk, "antagonistic to the world, and to attack its wicked principles and practices." Tried by this test, what is the comparative health and vitality of the Pennsylvania Episcopal Convention, and the Pennsylvania Presbyterian Synod? The latter body, like the first, is composed of Clerical and Lay Deputies; and although named from the State in which most of its members reside, embraces various churches in Maryland. On the 30th Sept., 1839, the Synod held its session at Elkton, in the latter State; and of course in the midst of slaveholders. Two colored members took their seats, and assisted in organizing the body. Their presence excited the indignation of some of the rabble in Elkton; and a letter was addressed to a member, recommending the retirement of the two delegates. The letter was shown to them, and they immediately left the town. The Synod was uninformed of what had occurred, until after their departure, whereupon the following resolution was adopted: "Whereas, this Synod have learned that two of their number, the Rev. Jacob Rhodes, and Mr. Stephen H. Gloucester, colored Brethren, have withdrawn, and returned to their

homes, in consequence of representations that their presence occasioned some unusual excitement in a portion of the community; therefore, *Resolved*, that the Synod regret the existence of a prejudice so unreasonable; and, especially, regret that their Brethren, whose right to a seat in this body stands on the same basis as that of any of its members, should have felt themselves called upon to relinquish privileges to which they were justly entitled, and in the enjoyment of which they should have been sacredly protected."

The Rev. Mr. Kip, in his recent work,* describing a visit he made to the Propaganda College in Rome, says: "The students, about eighty in number, were ranged on the two sides of the chapel, and presented a strange mixture of all nations and colors. I counted among them five Chinese, and two *Africans*. Yet here they all sat side by side, without any distinction, singing together the praises of their common Lord. Surely it must be acknowledged that, in this respect, Rome carries out her own Catholic principles, and declares not only in words but by her actions, that 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on the face of the earth.' She recognizes no distinctions of climate or country in the house of God. We had just before, as we entered the door of the chapel, witnessed a similar evidence of this Catholic spirit. An old man, *black as possible*, in an ecclesiastical dress, was just getting into a carriage. He was assisted by two priests, who, with many bows and demonstrations of respect, were taking leave of him."

We trust Mr. Kip remembered with pain the exclusion of colored candidates for orders from the "Propaganda" of his own Church, and the obloquy heaped on his colored brethren in the ministry, by the Pennsylvania Convention, and that he will joyfully aid in infusing into the Episcopal Church "the Catholic principles" so honorably manifested by Papists at Rome, and Presbyterians at Elkton.

In the course of these remarks we have expressed ourselves strongly, because we felt deeply; and on reviewing our language we see no cause to modify it. But while we cannot doubt that the acts we have censured were morally wrong, we are too painfully sensible of the frailty of our common nature, to intimate that a Christian profession, to be sincere, must be without offence. Nor are we forgetful of the power of pecuniary interest, parochial dependence, and habitual prejudice, in warping the judgment, beguiling

* Christmas Holidays in Rome. 1846.

the conscience, and hardening the heart, in relation to slavery and caste. Much, also, of what has been wrong in our ecclesiastical proceedings, has unquestionably arisen, not from reflection, but the want of it. Nevertheless, the responsibilities of the Church are of awful magnitude, extending to the life that now is, and to that which is to come; and they are shared by all her members, however humble.

The Church militant will find her strength and safety only in unceasing conflict with the world, however dire may be the strife. The blood of martyrs has ever proved the seed of the Church. But when she grows faint-hearted, and distrusting the "armor of righteousness" provided by the Captain of her salvation, seeks for weapons of earthly mould, and calls to her aid the selfish passions and sinful prejudices of society, she is treacherous to her Lord, and forms a truce with his enemies fatal to herself. Henceforth her energies, no longer directed against the strongholds of sin, are wasted in "doubtful disputations," and on unprofitable rites and ceremonies. The world is satisfied, and applauds her discretion and moderation, because, although she may retain the form of Godliness, she has parted with its power.

Had the American Church from the first fought a good fight against Slavery and Caste, these abominations, which now so much impair her usefulness, and so widely extend the dominion of the great enemy of souls, would have been swept from our land; a new proof would have been given of the divine character of our holy religion, and the Christian priesthood would have acquired new claims to the gratitude and reverence of mankind. Our Church has hitherto erred in no small measure from ignorance and inadvertence. Such a plea can no longer avail her. A voice from abroad—a voice she can neither stifle nor deride—calls her to repentance and reformation. The reproof of Bishop Wilberforce must and will be heard. The sensibilities of Christians in our land are awakening to the momentous questions to which we have referred. The various denominations around us are daily breaking the ties which have hitherto bound them to the cause of the oppressor. Numerous Churchmen among ourselves are complaining of the league which their clergy and representative bodies have formed with human bondage; and the Church of England is marking and lamenting the delinquencies of her daughter. If the Church values the approbation of her Divine Master; if she appreciates the character and objects of

her own holy mission ; if she desires to avoid agitation in her councils, she must be more than the promulgator and advocate of an abstract theology, however pure and truthful in itself. She must *practically* exhibit the blessed Gospel as at once the antagonist and corrective of every form of wickedness that mars the happiness of man in this world, as well as the next ; she must, in short, manifest FAITH WHICH WORKETH BY LOVE, PURIFIETH THE HEART, AND OVERCOMETH THE WORLD.

A REPROOF OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH,

BY THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

EXTRACTED FROM HIS "HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN AMERICA."

IN forming an estimate of the moral influence of the Episcopalian body, we cannot fail to notice its bearing on the treatment of the colored race. This is, in America, the great question of the present generation: socially, politically, morally, religiously, there is none which can compare with it. Never in the history of any people was the righteous retribution of the holy and living God more distinctly marked than in the manifold evils which now trouble America for her treatment of the African race. Like all other sinful courses, it has brought in, day by day, confusion and entanglement into all the relations of those contaminated by it. It is the cause which threatens to disorganize the Union; it is the cause which upholds the power of mobs and "Lynching;" it is the occasion of bloodshed and violated law; it is, throughout the South, the destroyer of family purity, the hindrance to the growth of civilisation and refinement; it is the one weak point of America as a nation, exposing her to the deadliest internal strife, that of an internecine war, whenever a foreign enemy should find it suit his purpose to arm the blacks against their masters. Further, like all other great and established evils, it is most difficult to devise any escape out of the coils which it has already wound around every civil and social institution; whilst every day of its permitted continuance both aggravates the evil and increases the difficulty of its ultimate removal. This, then, is exactly one of those sore evils of which the Church of Christ is the appointed healer. She must, in His name, rebuke this unclean spirit; she who has been at all times the best adjuster of the balance between the rich and poor, between those who have and those who want; she who has redressed the wrongs of those who have no helper; she who, wherever she has settled, has

changed slaves or serfs, by whatever title they are known, into freemen and peasants;—she must do this in the west, or the salt of the earth hath lost its savour, and is given over, with all things around, to the wasting of that utter and extreme corruption which she should have arrested.

Now, to see how far the Church has fulfilled this her vocation, we must have distinctly before us the real posture of this question in America. Of the twenty-six states, thirteen are slave states; admitting, that is, within their own borders, the institution of Slavery as a part of their institutions; and of these, five—Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and, in part, Tennessee—are slave-selling, whilst those south of them are slave-buying states.

It will, therefore, be seen at once, that in the various districts of the Union widely different parts of the system are at work. But its curse is upon all. Chiefly does it rest upon the South. There, to his own, and little less to his master's degradation, the slave is held in direct personal bondage, and accounted merely as a chattel. Hence, at the caprice of his owner, he is treated not unfrequently with fearful cruelty: though these, it may be granted, are not the ordinary cases; since, except under the impulses of passion, no rational owner will misuse his own chattels. It is not, therefore, for these instances of cruelty, fearful as they occasionally are, that the system will be chiefly odious in the Christian's eyes.* Nor

* Not to quote any of those occasional barbarities which may be turned in some measure aside as extreme cases, it is impossible to deny the ordinary cruelty of the system, when every Southern newspaper abounds in such advertisements as these: "Ten dollars reward for my woman Siby, very much scarred about the neck and ears by whipping." *Mobilc Commercial Advertiser*.—"Committed to jail, a negro slave; his back is very badly scarred." *Planter's Intelligencer*, Sept. 26, 1838.—"Run away, negress Caroline; had on a collar with one prong turned down." *Bee*, Oct. 27, 1837.—"Detained at the police-jail the negro wench Myra; has several marks of lashing, and has irons on her feet." *Bee*, June 9, 1838.—"Run away, a negro woman and two childreu; a few days before she went off, I burnt her with a hot iron on the left side of her face: I tried to make the letter M." *Standard*, July 18, 1838.—"Brought to jail, John —, left ear crompt." *Macon Telegraph*, Dec. 25, 1837.—"Run away, a negro named Humbledon; limps on his left foot, where he was shot a few weeks ago while a runaway." *Vicksburg Register*, Sept. 5, 1838.—"Run away, a black woman, has a scar on her back and right arm, caused by a rifle-ball." *Natchez Courier*, June 15, 1832.

will it be from any notions of the abstract and inalienable rights of man. On these, in their common signification of the possession of political power, we do not touch; it is with the want of personal freedom we are concerned, nor is it needful to assert, that slavery is, under all circumstances, directly forbidden by the law of God. It is enough for our purpose, that, as administered in America, it is a violation of the Christian precept, "Honor all men;" that by its denial of all family life, its necessary irreligion, and its enforced ignorance, it deprives the slave of the privileges of redeemed humanity, and is directly opposed to the idea of the Christian revelation. To maintain this ground it is not necessary to assert that no slaves are happy in their servitude. For the happiest slave in American servitude is the greatest proof of the evil of the system. He is most utterly debased by it who can be happy in such a state. What that state is, is plain enough. The common language of the slave states, which has given to all those who labor the title of "mean whites," is abundant proof of their own estimate of Slavery. But, further, as a general rule, the slave is not happy. The advocates of the system confess this in a thousand ways. Their columns of advertisements for runaways, their severe laws against those who aid or harbor fugitives, their occasional gifts of liberty to slaves who have wrought some great act of public good, their fierce jealousy of all speech or action which threatens ever so remotely their property in man, all bespeak the same secret conviction:—they do know the misery of Slavery. The testimony of the Canadian ferryman,* who described the leap of the escaped slave, when the boat reaches the British shore, as unlike any other, is not more directly to the point.

Accordingly, the master-evil of the South is, that the slaves are not treated as having souls; they are often petted, often treated like spoiled children, never as men. On this point there is no dispute. "Generally speaking they are a nation of heathen in the midst of the land. They are without hope

* Retrospect of Western Travel, vol. i., p. 114.

and without God in the world.”* “They have no Bible to read by their own firesides; they have no family altars; and when in affliction, sickness, or death, they have no minister to address to them the consolations of the gospel.”† “They are destitute of the privileges of the gospel, and ever will be, under the present state of things. They may justly be considered the heathen of this country, and will bear a comparison with heathen in any country in the world.”‡ “Throughout the bounds of the Charleston synod there are at least one hundred thousand slaves, speaking the same language as the whites, who have never heard of the plan of salvation by a Redeemer.”§ And this is the fruit of no accident,—it is inherent in the system. The black must be depressed below the level of humanity to be kept down to his condition. On this system his master dare not treat him as a man. To teach slaves to read is forbidden under the severest penalties in almost every slave state. In North Carolina, to teach a slave to read or write, or give him any book (the Bible not excepted), is punished with thirty-nine lashes or imprisonment, if the offender be a free negro; with a fine of 200 dollars if he be a white. In Georgia this fine is 500 dollars; and the father is not suffered to teach his half-caste child to read the Scriptures?||

The moral state of such a population need not be depicted. The habit of despising the true redeemed humanity in those around them grows always upon the licentious and the covetous, as they allow themselves to use their fellows as the mere instruments of their gain or pleasure: and in the slave states this evil habit reigns supreme. The quadroon¶ girls are educated in the South to live in bonds of shame with

* Sermon by Rev. C. C. Jones, preached in Georgia before two associations of planters, 1831.

† Report in Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, 1833.

‡ Report of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, to whom was referred the subject of the religious instruction of the colored population, 1834.

§ Charleston S. C. Observer.

|| Caste and Slavery in the American Church, p. 27; a noble and heart-stirring protest.

¶ The mixed breed of the third generation.

their white masters. With the slave-population itself the licentiousness of the whites is utterly unbridled: and by this, all the ties of nature are dissolved. Family-life amongst the slaves cannot exist; its fountains are always liable to be poisoned by arbitrary power. White fathers view their own slave-born children as chattels. They work, they sell them. By law they cannot teach them, or set them free; for the jealousy of slave-state legislation lays it down as a first principle, that every slave must have a master "to see to him."

Here, then, in brief, is the curse of the southernmost or slave-buying states;—the holding of property in man, keeping men in servile bondage, using persons as things, redeemed men as soul-less chattels;—this is its essence. Here the testimony of the Church must be against this first vicious principle. This has been the example set to God's witnesses in this generation by their fathers in the faith. They protested against such dominant iniquities, and they delivered their own souls, and saved us their children from the eating canker of a blood-stained inheritance. "Let no man from henceforth," said the Christian Council of London, in 1102,* "presume to carry on that wicked traffic, by which men in England have been hitherto sold like brute animals." This must be the Church's rule on the banks of the Mississippi, as it was on those of the Thames. So much for the extreme south.

As we come one degree northward, other features meet us. In the slave-selling states there is added to the evils of the South the execrable trade of breeding slaves for sale. By it "the 'Ancient Dominion' is converted into one grand menagerie, where men are reared for the market like oxen for the shambles."† This is no figure of speech. The number of slaves exported, from Virginia alone, for sale in the South-

* "Concilium Londinense, A.D. 1102, reg. Angliæ Hen. I. 3, statutum est: xxviii. Nequis illud nefarium negotium, quo hactenus homines in Angliâ solebant velut bruta animalia venundari, deinceps ullatenus facere præsumat." —Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. i., p. 383.

† Speech of Thomas Jefferson Randolph in the Legislature of Virginia in 1832.

ern states, in one year, 1835–36, amounted to forty thousand,* whilst those imported from all quarters into the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas, were reckoned in the year 1836 as not less than 25,000.† “Dealing in slaves,” says a Baltimore newspaper‡ of 1829, “has become a large business; establishments are made in several places in Maryland and Virginia, at which they are sold like cattle: these places of deposit are strongly built, and well supplied with iron thumb-screws and gags.”

The abominations of this trade must not pollute these pages. They may be readily conceived. But as a necessary part of such a traffic, an internal slave-trade, with its well-known horrors, recommences. Here are slave-auctions, with all their instant degradation, and all their consequent destruction of family and social life.§ Here are droves of chained

* Virginia Times.

† Natchez Courier.

‡ The Baltimore (Maryland) Register.

§ One incident will tell this whole tale. “A gentleman of Virginia sold a female slave. The party professing to buy not being prepared to make the necessary payment, the slave was to be re-sold. A concealed agent of the trade bought her and her two children, as for his own service; where her husband, also a slave in the town, might visit her and them. Both the husband and wife suspected that she would be privately sent away. The husband, in their common agony, offered to be sold, that he might go with her. This was declined. He resolved on the last effort of assisting her to escape. That he might lay suspicion asleep, he went to take leave of her and his children, and appeared to resign himself to the event. This movement had its desired effect; suspicion was withdrawn both from him and his wife, and he succeeded in emancipating them. Still, what was to be done with his treasure, now he had obtained it? Flight was impossible, and nothing remained but concealment; and concealment seemed hopeless, for no place would be left unsearched, and punishment would fall on the party who should give them shelter. However, they were missing; and they were sought for diligently, but not found. Some months afterwards, it was casually observed that the floor under a slave’s bed (the sister of the man) looked dirty and greasy. A board was taken up, and there lay the mother and her children on the clay, and in an excavation of three feet by five! It is averred that they had been there, in a cold and enclosed space, hardly large enough for their coffin (buried alive there), for six months!

“This is not all. The agent was only provoked by this circumstance! He demanded the woman; and though every one was clamorous to redeem her and return her to her husband, he would not sell! She was taken to his slave-pen, and has disappeared! The man—most miserable man!—still exists in the town.”—Drs. Reed and Matheson, *ut supra*, vol. ii., p. 188.

negroes marched under the whip, two and two, from the breeding district of Virginia to the labor-markets of Georgia and Alabama.

Here, then, as in the farther South, the testimony of the Church must be uncompromising and explicit. No motives of supposed expediency, no possible amount of danger, can justify her silence. She is set to bear a witness; a witness against the evils round her; a witness at all hazards; a witness to be at any time attested, if so it needs must be, by bearing any amount of persecution. She and she only can do this. The exceeding jealousy of the several states makes them resent with peculiar warmth any interference from without. The regulation of its internal concerns, and so the whole continuance and system of Southern Slavery, is solely under the jurisdiction of the several states. Congress cannot mitigate, much less abolish it. It can come before Congress only incidentally,—as, for instance, on the question of admitting a new slave state into the Union. Even moral influence from without is bitterly resented by the South. This is its ground of quarrel with the abolition societies; with which the general government has so far sympathized as to leave unredressed the violation of the Southern post-office, whereby abolition-papers are uniformly excluded from the South. Thus, at this moment, improvement can only arise from a higher standard of internal principle on this great question. This, it is the business of the Church to create. She must assert her Catholic character on behalf of these unhappy cast-aways. In other respects, there is no country upon earth so fitted by predisposing elements for uniting in one visible body all the company of Christ's redeemed. Gathered, as they are, from all countries, Americans are made partakers, even from natural causes, of a common political and social life. The strong lethargic common sense of the Dutch and the gay vivacity of the French, the phlegm of the German and the buoyant thoughtlessness of the Irish, the shrewd money-getting temper of the Yankee and the hospitable elegance of the Southern gentleman,—are

all here fused into one common mass. From this universal brotherhood the African alone is shut altogether out. Him the Church must take by the hand, and owning him as one of Christ's body, must lead him into the family of man. Not that she is bound to preach insurrection and rebellion—Far from it. It is quite easy to enforce upon the slave his duties, under a system, the unrighteousness of which is, at the same time, clearly stated. His bonds are illegal; but it is God's arm, and not his own violence, which must break them. Let the clergy of the South preach submission to the slave, if at the same time they declare to his master that these, for whom Christ died, are now no longer slaves, but brethren beloved;* and that a system which withholds from them their Christian birthright is utterly unlawful; that it is one which the master, not the slave, is bound to set himself honestly to sweep away. Above all should they, at any cost and by any sacrifice, protest in life and by act against this grievous wrong. The greater the cost, and the more painful the sacrifice, the clearer will be their testimony, and the more it will avail: to them it is given not only to believe in Christ, but also to suffer for His sake.

What witness, then, has as yet been borne by the Church in these slave states against this almost universal sin? How has she fulfilled her vocation? She raises no voice against the predominant evil; she palliates it in theory; and in practice she shares in it. The mildest and most conscientious of the Bishops of the South are slaveholders themselves. Bishop Moore of Virginia writes to Bishop Ravenscroft:† “The good and excellent girl presented to my daughter by Mrs. Ravenscroft paid the debt of nature on the 4th.” She was treated, it is true, with all the indulgence which she could receive, but still, favorite as she was, she was a slave; and, after her death, was laid “in the colored burial-ground, which is not enclosed, and therefore much exposed, and where the grave

* “Not now as a servant (lit. a slave, δούλος), but above a servant, a brother beloved.”—Philemon 16.

† Life of Bishop Moore, p. 282.

was liable to be disturbed." This is no rare instance. The Bishop of Georgia has openly proposed to maintain "The Montpelier Institute" by the produce of slave-labor; and "The Spirit of Missions," edited with the sanction of the Church, and under the eye of the Bishop (Onderdonk) of New York, proposes to endow a mission-school in Louisiana, with a plantation to be worked by slaves, who should be encouraged to redeem themselves by extra hours of labor, before day in the morning and after night in the evening; and should, when thus redeemed, be transported to Liberia, and the price received for them laid out in "purchasing in Virginia or Carolina a gang of people who may be nearly double the number of those sent away."*

Nor are these merely evil practices into which, unawares and against their principles, these men have fallen. In a sermon preached before the Bishop of North Carolina in 1834, and published with his special commendation, it is openly asserted, that "no man or set of men are entitled to pronounce Slavery wrong; and we may add, that as it exists in the present day it is agreeable to the order of Divine Providence;" whilst the Bishop of South Carolina,† in an address to the Convention of his diocese, denounced "the malignant philanthropy of abolition."

Such are the fearful features of the life of Churchmen in the South. Nor is it any real lessening of this guilt to say that it is shared by all the Christian sects. The charge is, indeed, far too nearly true. There is no doubt that the evils of the system may be found still ranker and more gross amidst the prevailing sects of Baptists, Independents, Methodists, and Presbyterians.‡ But this is no excuse. It is the first duty of the Church to reprove the sins of others, not to adopt them into her own practice; to set, and not to take the tone. The cruelty of their tender mercies should lead her to speak out more plainly; it should force her zealously to cleanse

* Caste and Slavery, p. 34.

† Bishop Bowen.

‡ Vide Slavery and the Internal Slave-trade in America, pp. 133-145, for horrors with which these pages shall not be polluted.

herself from their stain, and then fearlessly leave the issue to her God. But she is silent here; and to her greater shame it must be added, that there are sects* which do maintain the witness she has feared to bear.

But further, as has been already said, this clinging curse reaches even to the free states of the North, though it assumes in them another form. In them it leads to the treatment of the colored race with deep and continual indignity. They cannot be held in personal bondage, but they are of the servile class; they may be claimed as runaways, and thus dragged, if not kidnapped, to Southern slavery.

A mingled scorn and hatred of the colored man pervades every usage of society. In the courts of law his testimony is not equally received with the white man's evidence; republican jealousy forgets its usual vigilance, in order to deny him his equal vote; he may be expelled with insult from the public vehicle; he must sit apart in the public assembly; and though no tinge of remaining shade may darken his cheek, yet a traditional descent from colored blood will make it impossible for him to wed with any of the European race. Even in the fierce heat of the "revivals" this supreme law of separation is never for a moment overlooked. There are different "pens" for the white and colored subjects of this common enthusiasm. On all these points feeling runs higher in the free North than in the slave states of the South. There the dominion of the master is supreme, and he can venture when it pleases him to treat his slave with any degree of intimacy; for the beast of the field might, with as high a probability as he, claim equal rights with man. But in the North, where the colored race are free and often rich, the galling insults of

* The Quakers, and four small sects, the Reformed Presbyterians, United Brethren, Primitive Methodists, and Emancipation Baptists.—*Slavery and the Internal Slave-trade in America*, p. 132.

The annual conference of the United Brethren of Maryland and Virginia passed, in 1839, the following resolution. "It appeared in evidence that Moses Michael was the owner of a female slave, which is contrary to the discipline of our Church. Conference therefore resolved, that unless brother Michael manumit or set free such slave in six months, he no longer be considered a member of our Church."—*American Churches the Bulwark of Slavery*, p. 3.

caste are needful to keep up the separation between blood and blood ; and here therefore, more than anywhere, its conventional injustice is supreme ; here, too, by an enforced silence as to the crimes of Southern slavery, a guilty fellowship in its enormities is too commonly established.

Against these evils, then, the Church must here testify ; she must proclaim that God hath made of one blood all nations of the earth ; she must protest against this unchristian system of caste ; her lips must be unsealed to denounce God's wrath against the guilty customs of the South. And what has been her conduct ? If we seek to test her real power over men's hearts by asking what her influence has been, we shall rate it low indeed. No voice has come forth from her. The Bishops of the North sit in open convention with their slaveholding brethren, and no canon proclaims it contrary to the discipline of their Church to hold property in man and treat him as a chattel. Nay, further, the worst evils of the world have found their way into the Church. The colored race must worship apart ; they must not enter the white man's church ; or if they do, they must be fenced off into a separate corner. In some cases their dust may not moulder in the same cemetery. Whilst "all classes of white children voluntarily attend the Sunday-schools on terms of perfect equality,"* any mixture of African blood will exclude the children of the wealthiest citizen. Recent events have shown that all this is not the evil fruit of an old custom slowly wearing itself out ; but that it springs from a living principle which is daily finding for itself fresh and wider developments.

The General Theological Seminary, founded, as we have seen, at New York under the superintendence of the whole Church, was designed to secure a general training for all its presbyters. "Every person producing to the faculty," so ran its statutes, "satisfactory evidence of his having been admitted a candidate for holy orders, with full qualifications, according to the canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in

* Caswall, p. 297.

the United States, shall be received as a student of the seminary."* Curiosity once prompted the question to Bishop Hobart, the founder of the seminary, "whether this wide rule embraced colored candidates?" "They would be admitted," was his answer, "as a matter of course and without doubt." Such, alas! is not the rule of his successor in the Bishop's seat. In June, 1839, Alexander Crummell applied for admission; he came from three years' study at the Oneida Institute, from sharing equal rights with one hundred white students; he brought with him a character which, it was conceded, would warrant his admission if it could be right to admit a colored man at all: he was rejected for this single fault; one Bishop (Doane) alone being found to protest against the step. Three years before, a similar injustice had been wrought.† Both remain to this day unredressed. The

* Statutes of the General Theological Seminary, chap. vii., sec. 1. See Act of Incorporation, 1836, p. 16.

† The diary of the young man then rejected tells so simply all the tale, that it is printed here from "Caste and Slavery," pp. 14, 15:—

"Oct. 10.—On Wednesday last I passed my examination before the faculty of the seminary, and was thereupon admitted a member of the school of the prophets.

"Oct 11.—I called upon the Bishop, and he was dissatisfied with the step I had taken in entering the seminary. Seems to apprehend difficulty from my joining the commons; and thinks that the South, from which they receive much support, will object to my entering.

"Thus far I have met with no difficulty from the students, but have been kindly treated. I have thought it judicious, however, to leave the commons for the present.

"As far as in me lies I will, in my trouble, let all my actions be consistent with my Christian profession; and instead of giving loose to mortified feelings, will acquiesce in all things; but this acquiescence shall not in the least degree partake of dogged submissiveness, which is the characteristic of an inferior.

"My course shall be independent, and then, if a cruel prejudice will drive (me) from the holy threshold of the school of piety, I, the weaker, must submit and yield to the superior power. Into thy hands ever, O God, I commit my cause.

"Oct. 12.—At 9 A. M. I called on our spiritual father again, and sought advice in relation to my present embarrassing circumstances. He gave me plainly to understand that it would be advisable, in his opinion, for me not to apply for a regular admission into the seminary, and, although I had taken a room, and even become settled, yet to vacate the room, and silently withdraw

Church fears to lose the contributions of the South ; she fears to raise the mobs of Philadelphia ; she dare not stand between the dead and living : she cannot therefore stay the plague. Even when admitted to the sacred functions of the priesthood, the colored man is not the equal of his brethren. The Rev. Peter Williams, for years a New York presbyter, of blameless reputation, was, for this one cause, allowed no seat in the Convention of his Church. Thus, again, a special

myself from the seminary. He further said that I might recite with the classes, and avail myself of the privileges of the institution, but not consider myself in the light of a regular member. Never, never will I do so!

“ The reasons of the Bishop for this course are as follows :

“ That the seminary receives much support and many students from the South, and consequently if they admit colored men to equal privileges with the whites in the institution, the South will refuse to aid (it), and (will) use their influence to keep all from the seminary south of the Potomac. As head of the seminary, and knowing the feelings and prejudices of the South, he could not hazard my fuller admission at such an expense.

“ From the extreme excitability of public feeling on this delicate subject, and from my known and intimate connection with the people of color, there would be a high probability not only of bringing the institution into disrepute, but of exciting opposing sentiment among the students, and thus causing many to abandon the school of the prophets.’

“ I think these two form the reasons of the Bishop against my being admitted. The course, however, he advises, viz. the being a ‘ hanger-on’ in the seminary, is something so utterly repugnant to my feelings as a man, that I cannot consent to adopt it. If I cannot be admitted regularly, I will leave the place ; but in leaving I will ever hold the utmost good feeling towards the faculty and my friends. It is a cruel prejudice which drives me so reluctantly from the door, and makes even those who make high pretensions to piety and purity say to me, ‘ Stand thou there, for I am holier than thou.’

“ In this matter, however, I shall acquiesce as a Christian, but shall preserve the independent feelings of a man. My most devoted thanks are due to my dear friends, the Rev. Drs. Berrian and Lyell, for the earnest solicitude which they manifest for my welfare. They seem heartily to regret that any difficulty has arisen on the present subject.

“ Upon reflection, it is my present opinion that Bishop Onderdonk is wrong in yielding to the ‘ unrighteous prejudice’ (his words) of the community. If the prejudice be wrong, I think he ought to oppose it without regard to consequences. If such men as he countenance it, they become partakers with the transgressors. He says, by and by Providence will open the way ; but will Providence effect the change miraculously ? We cannot expect it. He will, however, effect by appointed means, and these means ought to be resorted to by His instruments—men. And what men more suitable than men high in office, high in public favor, high in talents ? Particularly should men com-

canon of the diocese of Pennsylvania forbids the representation of the African Church at Philadelphia, and excludes the rector from a seat.*

Tried, then, by this test, what can we esteem the present influence of this body? It plainly has not been conscious of possessing power to stand up in God's name and to rebuke the evil one; it has not healed this sore wound, which is wasting the true social life of America. It is a time for martyrdom; and the mother of the saints has scarcely brought forth even one confessor.

It is not enough that the distinctive features which mark this communion should be kept clear and plain. There must also be a high tone on those great moral and social questions which are rising daily, and on which mere politicians have no utterance of principle. There must be no timid silence as to great enormities. In those mighty issues which indeed try the spirits of men, her voice must be clear. Thus, for example, the treatment of the negro population must be her care: the equal worth of the colored race must be unequivocally held and asserted by her. It must no

missioned to preach the Gospel, which teaches mercy, righteousness, and truth, enter upon the work. What makes my case more aggravating and dreadful is, that the Bishop says, that even admitting I have no African blood in me, yet my identity with the people of color will bar the door of the seminary against me. Horrid inconsistency!

Oct. 13.—Called on the Bishop yesterday, and had a final interview with him on this mortifying subject. His determination was settled and fixed, that, from a sober consideration of all things, the interest of the seminary, the comfort of myself, and the ultimate good of my people, I had better silently withdraw, and, agreeably to my plan, study privately with a clergyman. He again, at this interview, suggested the plan of my embracing the privileges of the seminary without being regularly admitted; to which I would not consent, as it would be both a sacrifice of the feelings of a man, which I felt not disposed to offer, and, further, a sacrifice of principle, to which, I am confident, the noble-minded among my people would not allow me to submit.

"I cannot but conceive my case to be a very peculiar one, involving much difficulty, and one which will ultimately cause the guardians and controllers of this sacred institution to hang their heads for shame. This day I am driven, in the presence of all the students of the seminary, and the sight of high Heaven, from the school of the prophets."

* Caste and Slavery, p. 17.

longer be the reproach of the Protestant Episcopal Church that it is only in the Romish cathedral at New Orleans that whites and blacks are seen to kneel together,* as those who were made of one blood by one Father, and redeemed from common death through the cross of one only Saviour. Timid, compromising conduct on these great subjects, safe as it may seem at present, will, more than anything besides, weaken through the whole nation the moral weight of any religious body. By an universal law of God's providence, it is in doing battle for His truth that men exercise and train their own spirits, and subdue the herd of weaker minds to their rule and government. By its courage or unfaithfulness on this one question, the Church, as far as we can see, is fixing now for good or ill its true weight and standing in the coming generation.

* Retrospect of Western Travel, vol. i., p. 128.





WERT
BOOKBINDING
Granthville, Pa
Jan Feb 1988
We're Quilts Bound

