

AN
APPEAL TO THE RECORDS:
A VINDICATION
OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
IN
ITS POLICY AND PROCEEDINGS
TOWARD THE SOUTH.
BY
ERASMUS Q. FULLER, D. D.

CINCINNATI:
HITCHCOCK AND WALDEN
NEW YORK: NELSON & PHILLIPS.
1876.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1876, by

HITCHCOCK & WALDEN,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

P R E F A C E .

THE Church is to be judged by the record of its deeds and the results of its labors. The Methodist Episcopal Church is always ready to be examined by these tests. The M. E. Church South now challenges investigation as to the causes and continuance of separation between these branches. Responsive to this call, these pages are submitted to the public, hoping that they will aid in forming a suitable reply, and also assist in setting the matters in question more clearly before the general reader. Appeal is made by the South to the people. Before them both Churches come to plead their cause.

With a view to provide a document upon the matters in dispute which shall command the respect and confidence of the Church, special care has been taken to give, in these pages, quotations from official records and admitted authorities upon the questions discussed, sufficiently full to express the meaning intended by the writers, with references to the volumes from which the extracts are taken. These, in nearly every instance, have been copied by the writer

directly from the works indicated, or they have been compared with the text there found, and it is believed, that, in every instance, the views of the author quoted are properly presented. The writer will be disappointed to find the most rigid criticism detecting errors of this kind. The quotations may be relied upon as correct. In all cases where the official records of the Church would be of service, they have been consulted.

The work is intended to be, as the title indicates, an "Appeal to the Records," in support of the views maintained. The writer has endeavored to give a statement of facts, and he flatters himself that in no point has such an error been overlooked, certainly not admitted otherwise, as would materially change the aspect of any question discussed. Expecting that the matters involved will invite rigid scrutiny, he has endeavored to forestall unfavorable criticism by pursuing this course. If there has been a failure in this respect, the mistakes will, no doubt, soon be pointed out. In order to set aside or break the force of the conclusions reached, the facts must themselves be met. It is important that the truth in this controversy, whatever its bearing, whether for or against the denomination herein defended, or the other named, should be known to the public, and must be known before general fellowship can be profitably cultivated, unless the Southern party, like the Methodist Epis-

copal Church, becomes willing to allow the past, in relation to these affairs, to slumber in silence and be forgotten. The hope of this, for the present, is dispelled by the unfortunate appearance of the extraordinary production of Dr. Myers. If strife or schism follow the discussion, and in consequence of it, the blame, if there be blame, must attach to those who have refused to respond in favor of peace to repeated messages of Christian love, the words of the General Conference of 1872, and the eloquent utterances of the fraternal visitors to Louisville in 1874.

While speaking of the M. E. Church South, and giving the positions of that Church as an organized body, as taken by its General Conference, or expressed by individuals authorized to speak in its behalf, it is never forgotten that there are many within its pale who do not favor, and some who have never indorsed, its course in separating from the parent body, in becoming the ecclesiastical champion of the institution of slavery, in its opposition to the Methodist Episcopal Church, or its espousal of the cause of the Southern Confederacy. If, in any statement, it has been necessary to say aught which is calculated to awaken painful or unhappy thoughts or feelings among these or others, the fact is regretted. These pages are not written to wound, but to heal.

Nor is this Appeal made in a desire for, or inspired by, a love of controversy. The writer is not

conscious of being moved by any purpose or prompting but a hope of presenting the truth in behalf of the Church for the promotion of Christian ends.

These facts, gathered mainly from the records of the Church, speak for themselves. They are submitted to the godly judgment of a Christian people, with a consciousness that there is but one other bar higher than that of public opinion to which appeal can be taken.

“With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right,” this investigation has been made; and the results are laid before the public, in the belief that the Methodist Episcopal Church is fully vindicated in its treatment of the Southern conferences before the division, and of the M. E. Church South since that event, and in its reorganization on Southern territory.

E. Q. F.

ATLANTA, GA., Jan., 1876.

CONTENTS.

PROLEGOMENA,	PAGE. 17
------------------------	-------------

CHAPTER I.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE ORIGINAL METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, AND OF THE M. E. CHURCH SOUTH, TOWARD SLAVERY.

Action of the Conference in 1780, 1783, and 1784—The Christmas Conference and the Antislavery Platform of the Original Church—Changes in the Discipline—The Southern Church on Slavery—Dr. Rivers's Philosophy, Page 20

CHAPTER II.

BISHOP ANDREW AND THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

Position of Dr. Myers and the Southern Church—Was Bishop Andrew deposed?—Office of Bishop—Bishop Asbury's Decision in 1806—Address of the Bishops in 1844—Dr. Hamline's Speech—Proceedings in Case of Bishop Andrew Regular—Reply to Protest, 81

CHAPTER III.

THE "PLAN OF SEPARATION."

History of the "Plan"—Various Resolutions offered—The Committee of Nine—The Protest—Opinion of Members of the Committee—Of Southern Delegates—The "Plan" not a Contract between North and South—An Amicable Arrangement, 141

CHAPTER IV.

FOUR YEARS OF SAD EXPERIENCE.

Matters in the South—The Border Line of 1844 described—The Methodist Episcopal Church Faithful to its Promises—Violation of the "Plan" by the South—The North invaded—Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Ohio Conferences—Report of the Bishops upon Infractions of the "Plan," 186

CHAPTER V.

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF 1848.

The "Direful Repudiation"—Dr. Pierce as Fraternal Delegate—Why not received—Vote on the Sixth Restriction—Memorials from the South—The Declarations of 1848—The "Plan" analyzed and examined with the Declarations—Final Report—Course of the Southern Delegates, Page 224

CHAPTER VI.

CANADA AND THE SUPREME COURT.

Searching for a "Plan"—The General Conference of 1828 did not divide the Church—Separation of Canada by the Action of the Canada Conference—Legal Aspect of the "Plan"—Decision of the Supreme Court—Six Points stated, 256

CHAPTER VII.

SUNDRY MOVEMENTS IN BOTH CHURCHES FROM 1858 TO 1866.

General Conference of 1858—Southern Discipline on Origin of the M. E. Church South—No Southern General Conference in 1862, and why—Addresses of the Bishops—Efforts at Fraternity—The Ditzler Movement—Baltimore Conference—Nullification of the Line of 1844 by the Church South—Five Points stated, 270

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RETURN SOUTHWARD.

The Methodist Episcopal Church always occupying Slave Territory—Reorganization in the Seceded Section—Holston Conference—Other Conferences—Reports—Statistics of Membership—Church Property and Interests, 321

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRESENT RELATIONS OF THE TWO METHODISMS.

Fraternal Delegation to the Church South—Reception of Delegates—Addresses—Majority and Minority Reports of Committee on Fraternity—A Plan suggested for Co-operation, 374

INTRODUCTION.

BY D. D. WHEDON, D. D.

THE author of the book reviewed in this volume, Dr. Myers, was long a leading Church editor, and is now an appointee of the Southern bishops as one of the commission to our next General Conference. The book, we are informed in Dr. Summers's Introduction, has the approval of some, and probably of all, of the bishops, and every effort seems to be made to give it the prestige of an authoritative manifesto, announcing to our Church the present views and demands of the Church South, but more specially assigning to the ministry and membership of the Church South the programme they are to accept in relation to the present and past. The proposal made from our delegates to the Church South, and generally approved by our side, to "let by-gones be by-gones," and to shake hands without a dubious debate over the past, is unceremoniously pronounced by Dr. Summers to be "a farce." The old debate must be rehearsed. The present book, therefore, comes forth as a commencement of the contest, giving a one-sided, South-sided history of some of the past, an argumentative indictment of our whole course, and a presentation of the repeal of our annulment of the so-called "Plan of Separation" (by which repeal we would be bound to surrender all Southern territory, and withdraw our jurisdiction to Mason and Dixon's line), as condition to fraternization. When Dr. Summers pronounces this volume "*irenic*," he is surely *ironical*. It is accusatory from end to end, and can be fully met only by an answer from our side equally accusatory. Dr. Summers discards a peaceful "farce" in order to secure a quarrel. *We* did not propose to forget the past because we were not thankful and religiously proud over *our* past.

Our antislavery history, in all its relations to the South, is a glorious history. And so far as our rectitude and Christian brotherhood in dealing with the Church South are concerned, we should rejoice with exceeding joy to have the case stated before, and decided by, the high court of ecumenical, catholic Methodism. This perpetual quarreling and requarreling, and re-requarreling the case over and over, with no umpire, and no arbitrativ result, is to us a bitterness and a disgust. But let Christendom, let universal Methodism, sit to hear our case, and our soul would be in the work. But as to the "irenic" character of the book, it is sufficient to say that it demands, as condition to fraternity, action on our part which our General Conference declared, in its first movement for sending a fraternal delegation, that it would never perform, namely, *withdrawal of our jurisdiction from the Southern States*.

Dr. Summers, we are glad to say, agrees, however inconsistently, that neither side need be required to renounce its own views and adopt those of the other. And that was ample reason for not opening a sectional debate. Let each side silently hold its own views in regard to the past; let equitable arrangements be made in regard to present affairs, and a permanent brotherly feeling be established for the future. We shall therefore briefly go over the main points of Dr. Myers's history and argument, repudiating his views and frankly stating our own, but not requiring that any Southerner should adopt ours.

ORIGINAL AGGRESSIONS OF THE SLAVE POWER.

And, at start, Dr. Myers must, and does, make a primary assumption which would fatally vitiate his case before the high court we invoke. Primordially, if slavery was right, Dr. Myers's side was right; if wrong, wrong. He assumes that slavery, with its oligarchy, had a right to exist, and push its persistent aggressions upon freedom and right, and that its opponents who resisted its aggressions were "Northern agitators," in a bad sense "Abolitionists," guilty of all wickedness. We maintain that slavery had no right to exist; that, whether legalized or not, it was a sin and a crime; that the laws that established it were criminal laws; that the "politics" under which it was sheltered were criminal and sinful "politics;" that those in the North

who yielded to or aided its aggressions were partakers in the sin; and the "Northern agitators" and "Abolitionists" were, "in the general," heroic maintainers of truth, freedom, and eternal justice. And now, before said high court, we arraign both Dr. Myers and his clients, and say that their whole history is a history of aggression; of aggression by slavery, and wrong upon freedom and right, pushing back the antislavery legislation of our common Church step by step; sadly yielded to by us for a while, and when, at last, we took our stand at the episcopacy, and decided that slavery shall not capture it, his clients made a revolutionary disruption of the Church, and established a new one. We, finding the disruption irresistible, adopted a plan by which, after they had made the disruption, peace might be sectionally maintained. That plan his clients first claimed, most untruly, to be an authorization of their disruption, and then themselves ruthlessly broke, violated, and trampled upon that very plan. We carefully observed the plan while it lasted, and then legally repealed it. We are now most absurdly called upon to rescind that repeal. Never!

The original platform of our American Methodism was pure and absolute abolitionism. John Wesley, in that immortal manifesto which has been a pillar of fire to our Northern anti-slaveryism in its last forty years' fight, proclaimed the true doctrine of ultra-abolitionism. It was adopted by our founder bishops, Coke and Asbury; it was adopted by our Conference. But the despotic slave-holding oligarchy, by mobs, menaces, and pressures, silenced our bishops, and drove our Churchly legislation back until scarce a shred remained. We sorrowfully concede to Dr. Myers that our "fathers erred;" erred in servilely yielding to the aggressions of the slave power; but their error is palliated by the wonderful versatility of alternate violence, persuasion, and treachery on the part of that black aggressive power. The bottom of Northern servility was touched when, in the General Conference of 1840, that humble apology for slavery was issued, in reply to the antislavery address from the British Conference, quoted with such self-complacency by Dr. Myers as a Northern ratification of his own pro-slavery positions. We assure Dr. Myers that we have no more respect for pro-slaveryism in the North than in the South.

Like any other iniquity—intemperance, for instance—it has little reference to latitude or locality. South and North, in different degrees, had share in the guilt; and South and North, in different degrees, have suffered the chastisement of the Almighty.

DEALING WITH BISHOP ANDREW IN 1844.

In the General Conference of 1844, after every other concession had been made to slavery, the final question came up to be tried and settled, *Shall the triumph of the slave power be completed by its possessing our episcopate?* The opposite forces of freedom and despotism in the two national sections were increasing in power, and it was an inevitable issue sooner or later. With freedom and the North, it was a settled determination that no slave-holder's ordaining hands could be laid upon the heads of our young ministry. In the South, under the intensifying absolutism of the slave power, a discontent was growing at the hitherto agreed exclusion of slave-holders from the episcopate. The case of Bishop Andrew, who had become a slave-holder by marriage, brought the issue to a point. After a brief period of humility and willingness to resign on his part, it was boldly announced that *he would not be allowed by his brethren to resign;* and it is clear that the unanimous purpose was by the Southern delegates adopted that there should be an episcopal slave-holder or a secession. If the Northern delegates yielded, slavery was supreme in the Church; if they firmly resisted, then, on some pretext or other, which their desperate wits could invent according to the exigency, the Southern section would secede. If the course of the Northern delegates, in their refusal, should be violent or illegal, the pretext would be easy. The course of the Northern majority was, however, marked by a defeating wisdom and moderation. They might have justly tried and condemned Andrew for "improper conduct," and direful then would have been the Southern howl. But human ingenuity can devise no measure more mild yet efficient to preserve the purity of the episcopacy than the action adopted. His case was brought forward in routine by the Committee on the Episcopacy. The Conference then asked the Bishop to furnish his statement of the facts, and that statement it accepted as the whole unquestioned case. It brought against him no charge,

passed upon him no penalty, or even censure, but informed him by resolution that it was the "sense" of the General Conference that he withhold the further exercise of his episcopal functions until he had disembarrassed himself of all entanglement with slavery which would render him unacceptable in some sections of the Church. It was further directed that his name should be retained on the usual documents, and his full episcopal salary be continued. It is painful to note that Dr. Summers once, and Dr. Myers repeatedly, utter the unjustifiable statement, to spread it through the South, that Bishop Andrew was "deposed." It was no deposition, but was simply an enactment directing his episcopal conduct. This mildness reduced the seceders to the sad strait of grounding their action on its very want of judicial action, and on that ground they seceded. The real fact was, that sooner or later the "irrepressible conflict" between the opposing principles of slave-holding despotism and freedom would come to an outbreak; and the glory of our fathers was, that in their share of the necessary disruption such was their moderate firmness that they allowed the Southrons to secede only in a mode worthy of their bad cause, namely, with desperate sophistry and unequivocal fracture. And it is the moral misfortune of Dr. Myers that his position requires him, as he interprets it, to defend their course in the same spirit.

THE (FALSELY) SO-CALLED PLAN OF SEPARATION.

As soon as the case of Bishop Andrew was decided, the Southern members announced, formally, their purpose of seceding. Thereupon, a Committee of Nine was formed to arrange for sectional peace in case they executed their illegal purpose. Southerners have fastened upon their report the title of the "Plan of Separation," for the purpose of conveying the false impression that it was a plan *authorizing or legalizing the Southern withdrawal and establishment of a new Church by authority or sanction of our General Conference*. It was NOTHING OF THE KIND. It was only an enactment that, in case we were by them deserted, still, illegal and unconstitutional as that desertion would be, we would stay on our side of a certain sectional line, provided they would stay on their side. Of this there is plenty of conclusive proof. During the debate on this Plan,

Dr. Bangs, who was one of that committee, did, in open Conference, in the presence of the other committee-men and of the Southerners generally, give the following uncontradicted narrative of the formation and purport of that Plan :

“The speakers who have opposed that report have taken entirely erroneous views of it. It *did not speak of division*—the word had been *carefully avoided through the whole document*—it only said, ‘IN THE EVENT of a separation taking place,’ *throwing the responsibility from off the shoulders of the General Conference* and UPON THOSE WHO SHOULD SAY THAT SUCH A SEPARATION WAS NECESSARY.”

It was, therefore, the deliberate purpose of the committee in making that report that the General Conference should not be held as preparing a plan for separation, and, in accordance with that purpose, as explained by Dr. Bangs, the report was adopted by the General Conference. Leaving the responsibility of the separation to those who withdrew or seceded, it undertook to make such arrangements as, AFTER *the separation* by the unauthorized act of the seceders, should preserve peace between the sections.

Entirely unhistorical and untrue, then, was the statement made by the Southern bishops at St. Louis: “We separated from you in no sense that you did not separate from us. The separation was by compact, and mutual.” They did separate from us; and we neither separated from them, nor authorized their separation from us. We formed no “compact” for them to separate; we only enacted that, *if THEY did separate*, we would not go over into their section if they did not come over into ours. This enactment, not to overpass, took no effect until after the unauthorized sectionalizing took place. When, therefore, the Louisville Convention based their inauguration of a new Church, as they did, upon an authorization from our General Conference, they based it upon a non-existence. There never was any such authorization. Their secession and new Church were both illegal and revolutionary.

RESCISSION OF THE PLAN AN INSULTING PROPOSAL.

And now Dr. Myers and his co-thinkers ask us to rescind our repeal of that action, as the so-called Plan of Separation is

the only security of their Church property at the time of the secession. We reply that while we do not require our Southern brethren to think as we do over our past history, yet we must say with General Grant, in his late speech, "We do not propose to apologize for the part we have taken," and we scout the proposal of rescission, as not to be considered. Contrary to Dr. Summers's liberal maxim, the proposal requires us to think as they think, and do as they say. We are willing to shake hands in silent oblivion of the past; we are willing with them to kneel down before God, while each prays for forgiveness for his share in the common sin; but the proposition that the maintainers of freedom and government must apologize to the assailants of both, for such maintenance, is a reverse of the tables altogether ludicrous. It is too much like the culprit expecting the judge to beg pardon for hanging him. We are surprised, however, that such keen-sighted men do not see that the rescission of said plan would have *no effect on the property question*. If the decision of the Supreme Court has settled that question forever, they need no such rescission. If it has not, then there is no act of our Church that divides the property. The General Conference of 1844 did not pretend to possess the power to divide the property; the Plan of Separation does not; and our annual conferences, to whom the division was in 1844 referred, positively refused. The property then remains undivided to this day.

So far, however, as the legitimate inauguration of their Church is concerned, our General Conference was guilty of the "farce" of proposing to dismiss that question among the departed "by-gones," and none of us desired to raise the discussion until Dr. Myers's book reopened the quarrel. And whatever legal action is necessary on our part to pass a statute of amnesty and limitation, placing the question of property beyond revival, we should hope our General Conference would be ready to adopt. But, certainly, Dr. Myers's bitter and accusatory book is not persuasive in this direction. Dr. Bledsoe was allowed for years to indoctrinate the Church South, under its "auspices," with secessionism. This book essays to complete that work by fixing a deep, hostile sectionalism into its entire soul and body. But the plantation days are past, and there is a large and

increasing body of noble men in that Church who may not take prescription from Nashville, and who really mean fraternity of heart. The ultra sectionalists may not find it easy to silence men who have understood the kindly heart of our North, and who cordially, yet with entirely independent spirit, reciprocate its feeling. Such men are Bishop Kavanaugh, Dr. M'Ferrin, Dr. Abbey, Dr. J. O. A. Clarke, Dr. Leonidas Rosser, and Dr. Josephus Anderson. Between such men and ourselves a true and honoring fraternity will, we trust, exist, whatever the ecclesiastical politicians may do or say.

POINTS OF LAW TOUCHING OUR EPISCOPACY.

1. There have been lately, even in the editorials of our New York *Christian Advocate*, much play and puzzle upon the terms "co-ordinate" and "subordinate" departments of government. The whole puzzle may, we think, be solved by the single thought that *two governmental departments may be co-ordinate in the constitution, and yet be in their action, each by turn, subordinate to the other*. Our national Supreme Court is constitutionally co-ordinate with the President and Senate, yet it is subordinate, nay, is "the creature" of the President and Senate, in that its incumbents are by them elected, and it must be governed by all constitutional laws by Congress enacted and by the President signed. The President and Congress are subordinate to the Supreme Court, in that their laws are liable to be adjudicated upon by it and declared null and void. So our episcopacy is, we agree with Dr. Myers, constitutionally co-ordinate with our General Conference; and the former is subordinate to the latter, as its constitutional president and executive; and the latter is subordinate to the former, in that it is subject to all the rules and regulations of the former. Co-ordination does not exclude subordination.

2. Let it be remembered that there is an episcopacy as a co-ordinate institution, an episcopate, or particular bishop's office, and the bishop, or officer. Now, while it is true that the *episcopacy* is a co-ordinate *institution*, which can not be modified or abolished but by constitutional process, it is not the less true that the *officer, the bishop*, is subject in the exercise of his office to the "rules and regulations" of the General Conference.

The General Conference is, indeed, in duty bound to legislate, not in order to impede or lower, but to aid and secure, the purity and efficiency of the bishops in the legitimate exercise of their duties. So legislating, it may not only try the bishops for "improper conduct," but may inform them what its "sense" is that they should do or not do; it may lay down rules for their action, and assign them residential districts. This plenary power is right and necessary in order to secure a responsible body of bishops. Dr. Myers has an awful horror of a mad and lawless General Conference, and but little dread of an irresponsible episcopacy. Now, certainly, a General Conference, fresh from the people's vote, existing but a single session, and obliged individually, forthwith, to return and face its constituents, is the safest of all depositaries of power. But a body of life-tenured irresponsible bishops, which might hereafter amount to fifty or a hundred, with full power in successive conclaves to concoct plans of usurpation, would be a very unsafe permanent oligarchy. A bishop has been for centuries the most absolute despot in Christendom. Entire subordination to the *bona-fide* "rules and regulations" of the General Conference, fresh from the people, was the unquestioned doctrine of the Church until the Southern delegations, to meet their case, set up their novel hierarchical claims. Responsibility to the General Conference is the check upon the bishops; immediate connection with its constitutency is the check upon the Conference.

3. If, now, our General Conference in dealing with Bishop Andrew *aimed* to impair the co-ordinate episcopal department, we surrender it absolutely to all the maledictions with which Dr. Myers's "irenic" pages are made horrid. It was a "double-headed monster," a "star-chamber," or any thing else his "paroxysmal" rhetoric pleases. But it did nothing of the kind. It found him involved in an impediment to his episcopal acceptability; an impediment which every previous General Conference had agreed that a bishop must not incur. It simply in the exercise of its power to pass "regulations," expressed its judgment to Bishop Andrew that he should pause, unload himself, and then go on in the exercise of his office. Its intention was not to impair the episcopacy, but to maintain it in its full purity and power. For both the purity of its purpose and the

eminent wisdom and delicacy with which it acted, it is worthy of all honor. It was the historic glory of that General Conference to make the first bold and successful stand against the aggressions of slave-holding despotism in our Church, and to aid in awakening that reaction in behalf of freedom which rose into a revolution, and culminated in sweeping American slavery out of existence. Ever honored be the memory of our General Conference of 1844!

Finally, we are glad to say that for the members of our General Conference, and for all others, Dr. Fuller has here given Dr. Myers's book a very thorough and annihilating analysis. This able and conclusive refutation will, we trust, be thoroughly distributed, especially in the South, where falsehood on the subject reigns.

* * * The foregoing Introduction was originally printed as a Review of Dr. Myers's "Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church" in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for January, 1876.

PROLEGOMENA.

THE OCCASION STATED.

PEACE in the Church is a blessing to be prized, and fraternity among Christians is always to be expected. The first injunction of the apostles to their followers was, to “love one another;” and the second commandment of all, as given by our Savior is, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” He has added also this: “I say unto you, love your enemies.” Disregard of these precepts among Christians can not be excused, and apparent or alleged violations of them call for inquiry.

There is acknowledged dissension between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South. These were once of the same communion. Now, though still holding mainly the same doctrines, and governed by a similar discipline, they are antagonistic. The former offers fraternal fellowship to the latter, but this is accepted only on certain conditions. If these prerequisites are just, they should be complied with; if they are rejected, reasons should be assigned for the refusal. The Methodist Episcopal

Church believes itself entitled to the fellowship of the Christian world. The withholding of that communion by the M. E. Church South, which is tendered to that body by the Methodist Episcopal Church, and causes given for so doing, occasion this writing.

THE PLATFORM GIVEN.

“If the offer of fraternal relations is ever made upon the *basis of the Plan of Separation* of 1844, the Church South will cordially entertain the proposition.” These are the words of Rev. L. Pierce, D. D., representative of the M. E. Church South to the General Conference of the Methodist Church in 1848. This is the “platform on which Southern Methodism stands—propounded by Dr. Pierce in 1848; confirmed by the General Conference of 1850; reasserted by the bishops in 1869; and again confirmed unanimously in 1870, by a full General Conference of lay and clerical delegates—namely, the foundation, as a separate ecclesiastical organization, was, by authority, laid in the Plan of Separation, and this fact must be recognized as the basis of a permanent peace and cordial fraternization.”

THE POSITION TAKEN.

This platform, given by Dr. Myers, and more fully stated in the “Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church,” on pages 190–192, and presented, without

abridgment, in the eighth chapter of this Appeal manifestly implies that there has been an agreement between these two branches of Methodism, here called the "Plan of Separation," which has been disregarded by the Methodist Episcopal Church; and, that the non-observance of this "Plan" has been so detrimental to the Southern Church, and so wrong in principle, that the M. E. Church South can not consistently, or, at least, will not, unite with the ministers and members of this body in fraternal fellowship till the evil be removed and the wrong corrected. Further, Dr. Myers represents that the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the General Conference of 1844, violated agreements with the South, in opposing the institution of slavery, and, also, in the action taken in relation to Bishop Andrew, of the State of Georgia, who, after his election to the Episcopacy, had become the owner of slaves; and that the General Conference of 1848 unjustly annulled this supposed contract; and that, since then, it has pursued a course of wrong toward the M. E. Church South.

In making these very grave charges, and thus arraigning the Church before the bar of public opinion, Dr. Myers claims to express the sentiment of the Southern Church, and, also, lays these matters before the South a few months previous to the meeting of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to be held in Baltimore, in May next. Is

this done, at this time, to impress that body, or to prepare the mind of the Southern people for continued opposition to this Church, and to the Northern States of the Republic, or for some other purpose?

The question demands investigation. If the Methodist Episcopal Church has been guilty of such flagrant wrong as is here charged, and it will not correct itself, nor change its course of action, it deserves the condemnation of the good. But if it has not done so, but, on the contrary, has pursued a Christian and liberal policy toward the South and the Southern Church, condemnation must rest elsewhere.

The following pages are written in reply to these charges, and in vindication of the Methodist Episcopal Church in its treatment of the South since 1844, and the General Conferences held in that year and in 1848. They show: 1. That on the question of slavery the Methodist Episcopal Church has simply returned to its original position, as it had a right, and was in duty bound, to do; 2. That the treatment of Bishop Andrew was just and lawful; 3. That the so-called "Plan of Separation," was provisional; 4. That its provisions either failed for want of approval by the annual conferences, or were violated, and thus annulled, by the action of the Southern Church; 5. That the Methodist Episcopal Church faithfully observed all of the provisions of the "Plan" for years

after they were practically abrogated by the Southern delegates and by the Church South; 6. That the action of the General Conference in 1848 was justified by the facts; and other cognate subjects, all going to prove that in the things charged the Methodist Episcopal Church is not guilty; but that its policy and proceedings in the South have been consistent with Christian obligations, and in the interest of the people at large.

Before entering upon the discussion of the main points to be considered, a few observations in reference to the preliminary pages of Dr. Myers, including the Introduction by Dr. Summers, may not be amiss, but, rather, aid in forming a correct opinion of the import and animus of the work which is about to be reviewed.

THE TITLE-PAGE NOTICED.

The Title which Dr. Myers gives to his book is, "The Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1844-1846, comprising a Thirty Years' History of the Relations of the Two Methodisms." This Title contains erroneous assumptions, and thus indicates the character of the book. The first is in the words, "Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church," as it is claimed in the work, by a full, distinct, purposed, and binding "contract," into two parts of the one Methodist Episcopal Church, equally the

legitimate and legal representatives of the original body. This position of the author is not true; therefore this portion of the Title of his book, as explained by himself, contains a false assumption. The second is in the words, "The Two Methodisms." This term is used by Dr. Myers to show that the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the M. E. Church South, are equally the representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church which once was, but which does not now exist, it having been "disrupted" into these two branches—which is not true, as the Methodist Episcopal Church, the original body from which the Southern Church separated, now exists in name, and in fact, in entirety, having never been "disrupted" in such manner. This portion of the Title, then, also embodies a false premise. Besides, there are other Methodist Churches than those referred to; and the terms, a "Thirty Years' History of the Relations of the Two Methodisms," following the first clause, namely, "The Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church," implies that only one body has seceded from, or grown out of, the Mother Church, while there are several now existing, with all of the legitimacy, authority, and parental character of the M. E. Church South, thus again showing the false position taken in the Title. These points are worthy of remark, as proving that the Title of the book

forms a proper and suggestive sign-board upon the structure erected, indicating what may be found within.

THE DEDICATION CONSIDERED.

The Dedication of the work is as arrogant and offensive as its title is misleading. It is in these words; namely, "To all the members of the two Episcopal Methodisms of the United States of America who wish to know and follow the truth, this appeal to the future against the past—to 1876 *against* 1848—is respectfully dedicated by the Author."

This is arrogant, because it assumes to dictate the course of our General Conference in May next, demanding that the action of 1848 be rescinded by a recognition of the so-called "Plan of Separation" in 1876, as is apparent from the pages which follow this Dedication. This arrogance is the more manifest in the fact that this dictum comes from one in another communion, and in the fact that his Church is interested in forcing such a result; and, further, in the fact that the writer, assuming thus to make these demands of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is set forth by his brethren as the principal or head of the commissioners appointed by his communion to adjust matters of disagreement between the two denominations. Without hearing the case, he has prejudged it, and made in advance imperative

démands upon our General Conference, as the readers of his volume will see.

The language of this Dedication is offensive to good taste, Christian courtesy, and to all candid readers, because, in calling for this action of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it addresses such as “wish to know and follow the truth,” as if it were at least a matter of doubt whether the members and ministers of that Church (or a portion of them) desire to “know or follow the truth.” That such is the intention of the author is evident from the manner in which he repeatedly speaks of some of the most eminent ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of that body as a whole.

THE PREFACE EXAMINED.

The Preface is as unfortunate as are the Title and Dedication. The author says: “In the interest of peace—to do what he can to secure permanent fraternity between these kindred communions—the writer sends forth this volume,” and, on the next page, adds: “This discussion comes opportunely to the *members of the Church South, lest they be hurried away, by an ardent temperament that responds impulsively to the proffer of fraternity*, from a consideration of those principles by which alone they can vindicate their past history and their permanent separate organization.” Thus, it appears that, instead of

writing in the interest of fraternity, as he claims on one page, Dr. Myers has produced this volume, as he tells us here, to retard fraternity, by preventing the members of the Southern Church from being "hurried away" into it; and to vindicate the "past history and the permanent separate organization" of that body! This is, undoubtedly, an honest confession, for it justly, though mildly, characterizes the volume. It is an effort to justify the course pursued by the Southern delegates in 1844, in their entire course of conduct, and the Southern Church, from the time of its organization till the present day; and is most happily calculated, whether so intended or not, to cultivate and deepen the prejudice of the South against the North, and especially against the Methodist Episcopal Church; to make the impression that this denomination has acted in bad faith, while the South has been the perfection of consistency and honor; that all the blame for schism and confusion in the Church is to be laid upon the North, and that the South has suffered great wrong from Northern brethren. He further says: "The writer is persuaded that if those who, having grown up since the division, had no part in the original controversy and its immediate results, will use this opportunity of reviewing the opinions adopted from *ex-parte* representations in the light of what Southern Methodism offers to vindicate its historical position,

they will give their voice for such a settlement as shall be satisfactory to Southern Methodism, however much their verdict may disappoint the original movers of discord and fomenters of strife. From these, only resistance and obloquy can be expected. . . . Hence this appeal to 1876 against 1848—the year of that *direful repudiation that lies at the bottom of all present difficulties.*”

These words form a suitable Preface to the chapters which they introduce. In them the mass of the Methodist Episcopal Church, not accepting Dr. Myers's views, are charged with having “adopted opinions from *ex-parte* representations.” We inform him that they are able to read, and capable of thinking for themselves, and have access to all of the records, and knowledge of the facts involved, as well as the learned Doctor. The vindication of the “historical position” of Southern Methodism is kept in view, and a “settlement, satisfactory to Southern Methodism” hoped for. This, as repeatedly stated in this volume and elsewhere, would be upon the basis of the so-called “Plan of Separation.” Here, also, as is apparent in the book, Northern brethren are spoken of as “movers of discord and fomenters of strife,” from whom “only resistance and obloquy can be expected;” “hence this appeal from the direful repudiation” of 1848, “which lies at the bottom of all present difficulties,” to 1876. That is,

all of these difficulties, and the blame for them, according to this writer, lie at the door of the General Conference of 1848, and of the Methodist Episcopal Church since that time, and are to be corrected in 1876 by returning to the position of 1844.

THE INTRODUCTION REVIEWED.

The Introduction, by Dr. Summers, editor of the *Nashville Advocate*, the leading and only official paper of the Southern Church, is in harmony with the preceding. He begins by saying, "Perhaps no man living is better acquainted with the matters discussed in this volume than its author;" and ends as follows, namely: "We are authorized to say that some of the bishops of the M. E. Church South—we doubt not all of them will concur with their colleagues—agree with us in our estimate of this work, and the expediency of its publication." With this indorsement, we are led to look upon the work as embodying the voice of the Southern Church, and to treat it accordingly. He further says: "No fraternization, that is not a farce, can be effected by simply saying, 'Let by-gones be by-gones; pay no attention to what was done in 1844 or 1848; to the Plan of Separation as ratified by the Southern Church and the Supreme Court of the United States, and nullified by the Northern Church; let us shake hands over the chasm, and have done with it.' . . .

The South can not recede from its platform, . . . with regard to slavery, the terms of membership, the powers of quarterly and district conferences, lay representation in the annual as well as the General Conference, and other matters;" all of which shows not an effort to draw the Churches together, but to keep them apart as widely as possible.

Then follows a reference to the all-absorbing idea with many in the Southern Church; namely, that, to establish "formal" fraternity on a "permanent basis," the Methodist Episcopal Church should divide itself into several parts, on the "plan" of Dr. Summers,—rather, of Dr. Capers, in 1844; that is, to give the South again to Southern Methodism, form a New England, Northern, Western, and Pacific General Conference, and turn our colored people over to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America.

Should all of these local Methodisms prove to be as contentious as the first-born of ecclesiastical sectionalism in American Methodism, twenty or thirty years might develop such strife as would again endanger the American Union. If this is not anticipated by some, why their persistence in maintaining old issues of this nature? The experience of the past has ample warning for the future in this particular. The Methodist Episcopal Church will be slow to divide on geographical lines.

CHAPTER I.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE ORIGINAL METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, AND OF THE M. E. CHURCH SOUTH, TOWARD SLAVERY

THE first chapter of Dr. Myers's "Disruption of Methodism" is under the title in part chosen for this; namely, the "Attitude of the Original Methodist Episcopal Church toward Slavery," and naturally leads one to look for the treatment of the subject indicated; but the reader will be disappointed in this expectation. The author does no such thing, but merely presents a partial view of the position of the Church in 1840, and of the General Conference of that year, which was the most conservative in regard to the subject of slavery of any that has ever been held. To show that the antislavery movements of the Church, of which the South has complained, were only efforts to return to the position of original Methodism upon this question, that attitude is here given from the accredited records of the Church.

The Methodist Episcopal Church originated in New York, in 1766. Five members of Mr. Wesley's societies, who had emigrated to this country, met for worship, and Philip Embury, a local preacher, officiated on the occasion. Frequent services followed, revival influence was kindled, which spread rapidly and widely, and this small beginning, with the co-opera-

tion of those in other colonies, led to the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church. These early Methodists were all followers of Mr. Wesley, they accepted his views and remained for years under his superintendence. Mr. Wesley was positive and outspoken in his opposition to slavery in general, and as it existed in this country in particular. He characterized it as the "sum of all villainies," and American slavery as the blackest that ever saw the sun. His followers adopted his opinions on this subject as well as on others, and from their circumstances became as a people, if possible, more intense in their opposition to slavery than he was himself.

Those who came to this country sought here freedom from the oppressions of the Old World; and, under the antislavery movements of England and the teachings of Mr. Wesley, they, like their brethren who remained on the other side of the water, were also intensely opposed to the institution in feeling and principle. The records of the Church afford incontestable proof of the correctness of this position. As early as 1780, only fourteen years after the first sermon was preached in New York, and before the movement had so far developed as to assume the form and dignity of an independent Christian Church, the Conference took very high ground against slavery. That year, 1780, the following was adopted by the Conference, namely:

Question 16. Ought not this Conference to require those traveling preachers who hold slaves to give promises to set them free?

Answer. Yes.

“*Ques.* 17. Does this Conference acknowledge that slavery is contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, and hurtful to society; contrary to the dictates of conscience and pure religion, and doing that which we would not others should do to us and ours? Do we pass our disapprobation on all our friends who keep slaves, and advise their freedom?”

“*Ans.* Yes.”

In 1783 the Conference added this question and answer:

“*Ques.* 10. What shall be done with our local preachers who hold slaves contrary to the laws which authorize their freedom in any of the United States?”

“*Ans.* We will try them another year. In the mean time, let every assistant deal faithfully and plainly with every one, and report to the next Conference. It may be then necessary to suspend them.”

At the first Conference in 1784, held in May, the following action was taken:

“*Ques.* 12. What shall we do with our friends that will buy and sell slaves?”

“*Ans.* If they buy with no other design than to hold them as slaves, and have been previously warned, they shall be expelled, and permitted to sell on no consideration.

“*Ques.* 13. What shall we do with our local preachers who will not emancipate their slaves in the States where the laws admit it?”

“*Ans.* Try those in Virginia another year, and suspend the preachers in Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

“*Ques.* 22. What shall be done with our traveling preachers that now are, or hereafter shall be, possessed of slaves, and refuse to manumit them when the law permits?”

“*Ans.* Employ them no more.” (Sherman’s Hist. Disc. pp. 115, 116.)

The Revolutionary war resulted in the separation of the American Colonies from the British Govern-

ment. Very soon thereafter the Wesleyan societies in this country were organized into the Methodist Episcopal Church. This was done in Baltimore, the Conference meeting on Christmas-day, 1784, and is for this reason often called the Christmas Conference. Here the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, and its action under the circumstances must be considered as peculiarly suggestive, as expressing the sentiments of the Church at that time. The Christmas Conference adopted the following as the platform of American Methodism upon the subject of slavery:

“Ques. 42. What methods can we take to extirpate slavery?

“Ans. We are deeply conscious of the impropriety of making new terms of communion for a religious society already established, excepting on the most pressing occasion, and such we esteem the practice of holding our fellow-creatures in slavery. We view it as contrary to the golden law of God, on which hang all the law and the prophets, and the inalienable rights of mankind, as well as every principle of the Revolution, to hold in the deepest debasement, in a more abject slavery than is perhaps to be found in any part of the world except America, so many souls that are all capable of the image of God.

“We therefore think it our most bounden duty to take immediately some effectual method to extirpate this abomination from among us; and for that purpose we add the following to the rules of our society:

“1. Every member of our society who has slaves in his possession shall, within twelve months after notice given to him by the assistant (which notice the assistants are required immediately, and without any delay, to give in their respective circuits), legally execute and record an instrument, whereby he emancipates and sets free every slave in his possession who is between the ages of forty and forty-five immediately, or, at furthest, when they arrive at the age of forty-five.

“And every slave who is between the ages of twenty-five

and forty immediately, or, at furthest, at the expiration of five years from the date of the said instrument.

“And every slave who is between the ages of twenty and twenty-five immediately, or, at furthest, when they arrive at the age of thirty.

“And every slave under the age of twenty, as soon as they arrive at the age of twenty-five, at furthest.

“And every infant born in slavery after the above-mentioned rules are complied with, immediately on its birth.

“Every assistant shall keep a journal, in which he shall regularly minute down the names and ages of all the slaves belonging to all the masters in his respective circuit; and also the date of every instrument executed and recorded for the manumission of slaves, with the names of the court, book, and folio, in which the said instruments, respectively, shall have been recorded; which journal shall be handed down in each circuit to the succeeding assistants.

“3. In consideration that these rules form a new term of communion, every person concerned who will not comply with them shall have liberty to quietly withdraw himself from the society within the twelve months succeeding the notice given as aforesaid, otherwise the assistant shall exclude him from the society.

“4. No person so voluntarily withdrawn, or so excluded, shall ever partake of the Supper of the Lord with the Methodists till he complies with the above requisitions.

“5. No person holding slaves shall in future be admitted into society or to the Lord's-supper till he previously complies with these rules concerning slavery.

“N. B.—These rules are to affect the members of our society no further than, as they are consistent with the laws of the State in which they reside.

“And respecting our brethren in Virginia that are concerned, and, after due consideration of their peculiar circumstances, we allow them two years from the notice given, to consider the expedience of compliance or non-compliance with these rules.

“*Ques.* 43. What shall be done with those who buy or sell slaves, or give them away?

“*Ans.* They are immediately to be expelled, unless they buy them on purpose to set them free.” (Sherman's History of the Discipline, pp. 116, 117.)

This is the "attitude of the original Methodist Episcopal Church toward slavery," though Dr. Myers seems not to have learned the fact. But such was the opposition of the slave-holders and their apologists to these stringent rules, that they were not enforced, but were soon suspended from operation, and, after remaining in the Discipline, or at least unrepealed, for twelve years, the whole chapter was substituted by the following, in 1796 :

Ques. What regulations shall be made for the extirpation of the evil of African slavery ?

Ans. 1. We declare that we are more than ever convinced of the great evil of slavery, and do most earnestly recommend to the yearly conferences, quarterly-meetings, and to those who have the oversight of districts and circuits, to be exceedingly cautious what persons they admit to official stations in our Church; and in the case of future admission to official stations, to require such security of those who hold slaves, for the emancipation of them, immediately or gradually, as the laws of the States respectively and the circumstances of the case will admit; and we do fully authorize all the yearly conferences to make whatever regulations they judge proper in the present case, respecting the admission of persons to official stations in our Church; therefore no slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slaves to enjoy freedom.

"2. No slave-holder shall be received into society till the preacher who has the oversight of the circuit has spoken to him freely and faithfully on the subject of slavery.

"3. Every member of the society who sells a slave shall, immediately, except at the request of the slave, in cases of mercy and humanity, agreeably to the judgment of a committee of the male members of the society appointed by the preacher who has the charge of the circuit, after full proof, be excluded the society. And if any member of our society purchase a slave, the ensuing quarterly-meeting shall deter-

mine on the number of years in which the slave so purchased would work out the price of his purchase. And the person so purchasing shall, immediately after such determination, execute a legal instrument for the manumission of such slave at the expiration of the term determined by the quarterly-meeting. And, in default of his executing such instrument of manumission, or on his refusal to submit his case to the judgment of the quarterly-meeting, such member shall be excluded the society. Provided, also, that in the case of a female slave, it shall be inserted in the aforesaid instrument of manumission that all her children, who shall be born during the years of her servitude, shall be free at the following times, namely: Every female child at the age of twenty-one, and every male child at the age of twenty-five; provided, also, that if a member of our society shall buy a slave with a certificate of future emancipation, the terms of emancipation shall, notwithstanding, be subject to the decision of the quarterly-meeting conference." (Sherman's Hist. Disc., p. 118.)

In 1800, the following paragraphs were added to the above:

"2. When any traveling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives.

"6. The annual conferences are directed to draw up addresses, for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, to the Legislatures of those States in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose. These addresses shall urge, in the most respectful but pointed manner, the necessity of a law for the gradual emancipation of the slaves. Proper committees shall be appointed by the annual conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business; and the presiding elders, elders, deacons, and traveling preachers, shall procure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses, and give all the assistance in their power, in every respect, to aid the committees, and to further this blessed undertaking. Let this be continued from year to year, till the desired end be accomplished." (Sherman's Hist. Disc., p. 119.)

The General Conference of 1800 published a Pastoral Address to all of "their brethren and friends in the United States," as follows, namely:

"DEAR BRETHREN,—We, the members of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, beg leave to address you with earnestness on a subject of the first importance.

"We have long lamented the great national evil of negro slavery, which has existed for so many years, and does still exist in many of these United States. We have considered it as repugnant to the inalienable rights of mankind, and to the very essence of civil liberty, but more especially to the spirit of the Christian religion.

"For, inconsistent as is the conduct of this otherwise free, this independent nation, in respect to the slavery of the negroes, when considered in a civil and political view, it is still more so when examined in the light of the Gospel. For the whole spirit of the New Testament militates in the strongest manner against the practice of slavery; and the influence of the Gospel, wherever it has long prevailed, except in many of these United States, has utterly abolished that most criminal part of slavery—the possessing and using the bodies of men by arbitrary will, and with almost uncontrollable power.

"The small number of adventurers from Europe, who visit the West Indies for the sole purpose of amassing fortunes, are hardly worth our notice, any further than their influence reaches for the enslaving and destroying of the human race. But that so large a portion of the inhabitants of this country, who so truly boast of the liberty they enjoy, and are so justly jealous of that inestimable blessing, should continue to deprive of every trace of liberty so many of their fellow-creatures, equally capable with themselves of every social blessing and of eternal happiness, is an inconsistency which is scarcely to be paralleled in the history of our race.

"Influenced by these views and feelings, we have for many years restricted ourselves by the strongest regulations from partaking of the 'accursed thing,' and have also laid some very mild and tender restrictions on our society at large. But at this General Conference we wished, if possible, to give a blow at the root of this enormous evil. For this purpose we maturely weighed every regulation which could be adopted within our

society. All seemed to be insufficient. We therefore determined at last to rouse up all our influence, in order to hasten, to the utmost in our power, the universal extirpation of this crying sin. To this end we passed the following resolutions :

“That the annual conferences be directed to draw up addresses, for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, to the Legislatures of those States in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose.

“That these addresses urge, in the most respectful but pointed manner, the necessity of a law for the gradual emancipation of the slaves.

“That proper committees be appointed, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business; and

“That the presiding elders, deacons, and traveling preachers, do procure as many signatures as possible to the addresses, and give all the assistance in their power, in every respect, to aid said committees, and to further this blessed undertaking. And that this be continued from year to year, ‘till the desired end be fully accomplished.’

“What now remains, dear brethren, but that you coincide with us in this great undertaking, for the sake of God, his Church, and his holy cause? For the sake of your country, and for the sake of the miserable and the oppressed, give your signatures to the addresses; hand them for signatures to all your acquaintances and all the friends of liberty; urge the justice, the utility, the necessity, of the measure; persevere in this blessed work, and the Lord, we are persuaded, will finally crown your endeavors with the wished-for success. O, what a glorious country would be ours, if equal liberty were everywhere established, and equal liberty every-where enjoyed!

“We are not ignorant that several of the Legislatures of these States have most generously stepped forth in the cause of liberty, and passed laws for the emancipation of the slaves. But many of the members of our society, even in those States, may be highly serviceable to this great cause by using their influence, by writing or otherwise, with their friends in other States, whether those friends be Methodists or not.

“Come, then, brethren, let us join hand and heart together in this important enterprise. God is with us, and will, we doubt not, accompany with his blessing all our labors of love.

“We could write to you a volume on the present subject;

but we know that in general you have already weighed it; and we have great confidence that your utmost assistance will not be wanting, and we promise to aid you with zeal and diligence.

“That our gracious God may bless you with all the riches of his grace, and that we may all meet where perfect liberty and perfect love will eternally reign, is the ardent prayer of

“Your affectionate brethren,

THOMAS COKE,	}	<i>Bishops.</i>
FRANCIS ASBURY,		
RICHARD WHATCOAT,		
EZEKIEL COOPER,	}	<i>Committee.</i>
WM. M'KENDREE,		
JESSE LEE,		

[“Signed in behalf and by order of General Conference.”]
(Hist. of the Great Secession, pp. 843-845.)

Some unimportant changes were made in the above resolutions in 1804; and in 1808 all relating to slave-holding by private members of the Church was stricken out. In 1812, the matter of buying and selling of slaves was referred to the annual conferences. In 1816 the first paragraph of 1796 was substituted by this, namely:

“We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery; therefore no slave-holder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom.”

In 1820 the reference to annual conferences was stricken out, and in 1824 slave-holding members of the Church were required to teach their slaves to read the Bible, and some prudential arrangements in reference to the colored people were added to the paragraphs (two of 1800, and the one above, 1816) prohibiting traveling preachers and official members from holding slaves in States where emancipation

was allowed; and thus the matter stood in 1844, the Church presenting a strong protest against the institution, no change having been made in the Discipline upon the subject at the General Conferences in 1828, 1832, 1836, or 1840. Dr. Myers gives merely a partial view of the position of the Church in 1840.

In 1844 the Discipline contained the constitutional prohibition of all trading in slaves, except to buy for the purpose of emancipating, found in the General Rules, to wit:

“The buying and selling of men, women, and children with an intention to enslave them.”

And the statutory law of the chapter “On Slavery,” as follows:

“1. We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery; therefore no slave-holders shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom.

“2. When any traveling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives.

“3. All our preachers shall prudently enforce upon our members the necessity of teaching their slaves to read the Word of God, and to allow them time to attend upon the public worship of God on our regular days of divine service.”

Omitting some minor details, the foregoing embraces the legislation of the Church upon this truly “vexed question,” till the time of the division. It will be observed that the influence of slave-holders over the communion, as well as over the country, so increased as to cause a general retrograde movement,

step by step, from 1784 till 1840, pushing the Conference into one measure after another more and more distant from the original attitude of Methodism. Dr. Smith, of Virginia, one of the ablest defenders of Bishop Andrew, and one of the bitterest opposers of the North, took essentially this view of the case in 1844. He said:

“The first rule passed on the subject was in these words: ‘Ought not this Conference to require those traveling preachers who hold slaves to give promise to set them free? *Answer.* Yes;’ and then follows a fearful denunciation of slavery and slave-holders. Here the ground is taken that the preachers, from the superintendent, or bishop, as he is now called, down to the licensed preacher, shall unconditionally, without regard to consequence, manumit his slaves. The Christmas Conference of 1784, at which the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, made the unconditional manumission of slaves a condition of membership in the Church. The slave-holders residing in Virginia, and in connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, were allowed two years to consider whether they would comply with this condition. Slave-holders in all other sections were allowed but one year. In six months after the passage of this new condition of membership, they passed a rule which, while it left it a little modified in the Discipline, suspended its operations for the present, declaring that it ‘would do harm, instead of good.’ In 1796, twelve years after this new term of membership was adopted, they found that even to keep it, though in a suspended form, in the book of Discipline, was productive of great evil. They therefore passed a resolution requesting both preachers and people deeply to consider the subject of negro slavery, and to communicate their views to the ensuing General Conference which was to convene in 1800. At this period the Conference, adopted the rule which now stands in the Discipline, page 195, in regard to preachers holding slaves. The offensive condition of membership still remained in the Discipline as a testimony of disapprobation until 1808, though its operation was suspended. In 1816 the eligibility of members of the Church to any office, so far as slavery

is concerned, was established on the terms stated in the rule, as it now stands in the book of Discipline.

“Here, sir, let it be briefly noticed, that, according to this showing, in 1800 the Conference receded from the strong ground taken in 1780, and required of preachers only a conditional manumission, thus leaving the rule of the Discipline to be controlled in its application by the legislation of the different State Legislatures. In 1796 they receded from the strong ground taken in 1784 against members holding slaves; and in 1808 all which related to private members was expunged from the Discipline, and in 1816 the basis of compromise was completed. These facts, in connection with the history of the times, will show our present rules to be a compromise; on the part of the slave-holding membership a sacrifice of local interests, and, on the part of the non-slave-holding members, a yielding of original abolition principles. The first ground taken in regard to ministers holding slaves, in 1780, was the purely Abolition action of unconditional manumission; this ground is clearly yielded in the conditional rule adopted in 1800, and which still stands in the Discipline. The ground first taken against the private membership was equally abolition in its character. This was yielded in 1808, by expunging all enactments on the subject from the book of Discipline. Here, then, sir, was an entire abandonment of the abolition ground first taken by the Church.” (Debates Gen. Con. 1844, pp. 139, 140.)

Dr. Smith observes in the above, “*they*” said the stringent action of 1784 “would do harm instead of good.” Who said so? Who were “*they*”—the Conference or the slave-holders? It must have been the latter and their apologists. The Conference, in the action of 1785, to which Dr. Smith evidently refers, said:

“It is recommended to all our brethren to suspend the execution of the minute on slavery (of the Christmas Conference) till the deliberations of a future conference; and that an equal space of time be allowed to all our members for consideration, when the minute shall be put in force. N. B.—We do hold in the deepest abhorrence the practice of slavery; and shall

not cease to seek its destruction by all wise and prudent means." (Sherman's History of the Discipline, p. 118.)

This is what "they," the Conference, thought and said, though the slave power proved too much for them, and prevented the execution of this most wise and just legislation. Dr. Smith speaks of a "compromise," as if at some time the Conference had entered into an agreement not to resist the advancing pro-slavery efforts of the South. In the discussion of 1844, the Southern delegates claimed that such was the fact. It is enough to say, here, that there has never been any such "compromise;" though, in a general and not complimentary use of the term, the Conference may perhaps be justly charged with having compromised, to some extent, with the "peculiar institution." If any wish to verify the correctness of these quotations in relation to the action of the General Conference upon this subject, they can consult the "History of the Discipline," by Sherman or Emory, or "Slavery and the Episcopacy," by Dr. Peck.

Such was the "attitude of the Original Methodist Episcopal Church toward Slavery," and its legislation in reference to it, till the year 1824. From that date, until the division, the Discipline remained unchanged, but up to 1840 the Church, in a general way, continued to yield more and more to the demands of the slaveholders, though comparatively little was said, and, as already seen, nothing by way of legislation done, by the General Conference in reference to the matter. The General Conference in Cincinnati, 1836, sought to allay excitement by rebuking two of its members,

by resolution, for participation in "abolition" meetings, but this action made more Abolitionists than it cured. In May, 1840, the General Conference met in Baltimore, upon slave territory, and unwisely took occasion to rebuke the Abolitionists of New England and New York. The bishops in their address advised against the agitation upon the subject, which they could no more stay than they could repress Niagara with one of their broad-brimmed hats. The address of the British Conference to this body was strongly antislavery, and in reply the General Conference sought to defend the time-serving policy enforced by the slaveholding element, and the pastoral address to the membership did the same. Such, however, at this time, was the antislavery sentiment of the Church in Maryland and Virginia, that for years the Baltimore Conference, including these States, had refused to ordain local preachers who held slaves, thus keeping till this date the ministry in this conference, traveling and local, free from the taint of slave-holding. This General Conference (1840) decided that the action of the Baltimore Conference, in refusing to ordain slaveholding preachers, was not justifiable, and that slaveholders might be ordained as local preachers, thus surrendering another point to the oligarchy. This General Conference, as already remarked, was the most timid and conservative upon this subject of any that has ever been held. And yet Dr. Myers, in a book claiming to be written in the interest of fraternity, and in a chapter of that book entitled, "The Attitude of the Original Methodist Episcopal Church toward Slavery," does not even refer to the original position

of the Church, or so much as intimate that it had ever been more antislavery than in 1840! He simply ignores all of this antislavery action, and the antislavery element in the Church, or sneers at it as made up of "Abolitionists" and "fanatics;" and represents this conservative and pro-slavery action of this one General Conference, of 1840, as proof of the "attitude of the original Methodist Episcopal Church" upon this subject. If this is not a perversion of the truth of history, for the purpose of misleading the reader, and of misrepresenting the North and deepening the prejudice of the South, what is it?

In 1832, James O. Andrew, of Georgia, was elected to the episcopacy. He was not then a slaveholder, nor was it practicable for any one who held slaves to have been elected to that office in the Methodist Episcopal Church then, before, or afterward. The claims of the Southern delegates upon this point are found to be not only unreliable but erroneous. The assertion may be made without qualification that there has never been a time when a slaveholder could have been elected to the episcopacy in the Methodist Episcopal Church. After the General Conference of 1840, it was ascertained that Bishop Andrew had become the owner of one slave by bequest, and of another by inheritance; and in January, 1844, he married a lady who was the owner of several slaves. The laws of the State of Georgia made these also the property of Mr. Andrew, so that, by all of these methods, he became a slaveholder, knowing that the Discipline of the Church did not allow the traveling preachers to hold slaves in those

States where emancipation was practicable, and that he thus rendered himself unacceptable as a bishop to a large majority of the ministers and members of the Church. The General Conference of 1844 met in May, after the marriage of Bishop Andrew, in January; and the Southern delegates, emboldened by the course of the former General Conference, took their seats in that body, purposing to retain Bishop Andrew in his office, though contrary alike to a fair interpretation of the law, the uninterrupted usage of the Church, and the will of the majority. They had predetermined, at all hazards, to do their utmost to foist a slave-holding bishop upon an unwilling and antislavery Church. They failed in this purpose only because they lacked the power to accomplish their designs. With these facts before us, we now ask a careful reading of the following extracts from Dr. Myers:

“The truth of history reveals the fact that, even should it be allowed that slavery was a *cause* rather than an occasion of the disruption of the Church, it was so, not because the South sought any change in the principles, rules, or practice of the Church on this subject, but that the other party made it what it was—cause or occasion, as one pleases—by taking a new attitude in reference to it, contradictory to the rules, precedents, and principles, which had, to that time, controlled the Church, and which the Southern delegates endeavored to maintain in all their purity and vigor. The South stood upon the accepted platform of the Church on the slavery question—the North took “a new departure;” and if, therefore, slavery was the cause of the division, not the South, but the North, made it so; and to criminate the South is not warranted by fact or justice. The South sought for no change in relations of the Church to slavery, nor did its delegates propose or desire any action contradictory of the established policy of the Church.” (Page 18.)

“To charge that the South made slavery the cause of division is but a repetition of the old accusation of the wolf in the

fable, that the lamb muddied the stream while drinking below him." (Pp. 19, 20.)

"The South advocated nothing in 1844 that had not been, with remarkable unanimity, fully confirmed prior to that date, in the ecumenical councils of the Church. These all go to prove that if slavery was either cause or occasion of the division of the Church—to recur to our illustration—it was the wolf, and not the lamb, which had stirred up the filthy waters." (Page 27.)

"The South asked nothing but to be permitted quietly to do her work, proposed no change, advocated no pro-slavery measures beyond the settled rule of the Church—if that can be thus designated—while the other section was clamoring for deliverances, at the ensuing General Conference, at total variance with those of previous conferences. If slavery was the instrument of the division of the Church, it was not severed by the sword reposing in the scabbard of the Southern slaveholder, but by the battle-ax wielded by the hand of the Northern Abolitionist." (Pp. 30, 31.)

"In 1844 the Southern delegates asked for, wished for no change, either in law, declaration, or practice. New England Methodists, taking advanced ground against slavery, *did* ask for changes from the General Conference of 1844." (Page 39.)

These assumptions are contrary to the most palpable facts of history, and the arguments brought forward to support them are unfounded in truth, and easy to answer in detail if one is disposed to give them such attention. The whole matter, in short, is this, namely: From the time of the Christmas Conference in 1784 to 1840, the Church gradually weakened on the slavery question; and the pro-slavery element, having controlled the General Conference of that year, and gained important advantages, predetermined to sustain and perpetuate slavery in the episcopacy in 1844, and, having failed to do so, seceded from the Church. Will Dr. Myers claim that there has ever been a slave-holder in the episcopal

office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, except Bishop Andrew, or that he was a slave-holder when elected to that office? He admits that he was not, and that the only objection to him as bishop was the fact that he was a slave-holder. According to his own showing, he was opposed by the majority on this ground, and the Southern delegates unanimously insisted that he should be retained as bishop while a slave-holder, contrary to the voice of the Church. Nor can he nor dares he say, that this was not a thing before unknown in the history of Methodism. To maintain a slave-holder in the episcopal office was a departure from the former administration of the Church—it was an innovation, an aggression of the pro-slavery power in the communion. How, then, can a man of truth, desiring to set forth matters of fact, make such statements as are found in the preceding quotations? We leave our readers to judge for themselves.

Meanwhile, the antislavery sentiment in the country was rapidly increasing. The conservative course of the General Conference of 1840 had driven many from the Church, and the members and ministers in the North were very generally alarmed and aroused by it to new activity, and prepared to resist further encroachments by the slave power, and, though willing to concede much—too much—they were not ready to accept a slave-holder as bishop under any circumstances, but were rather hoping to restore the Methodist Episcopal Church to its original purity, touching this matter.

God was in the antislavery movement, awakening

the people in all of the Churches, and out of them, to an apprehension of the magnitude of the enormous iniquity, and to the responsibility of the American nation for its perpetuity, and preparing to sweep the deceptive, corrupting, and accursed institution from the continent. This is why the abolition controversy would not subside at the command of bishops or conferences. Methodism was struggling to get back to its "original attitude." The North stood by the Bible, John Wesley, and the former antislavery position of Methodism, while the South was willing to subject every thing to the dicta of slave-holders.

The anathemas heaped upon the North, in times past, for its "abolitionism," would, fifty years ago, have been nearly as applicable to the South. If abolitionism had been wrong—which it was not—the South, in the early days of our national history, would have been, perhaps, as deeply involved in that evil as the North. Our proofs from the records show this to be true, at least so far as the Methodists were concerned. It looks not a little singular that he should have done so; but Dr. Bascom, pre-eminently the champion of Bishop Andrew, by some leading of the Spirit, or outcropping of "abolitionism" in himself, has made the following record. From his defense of the minority, in 1844, in "Methodism and Slavery," page 7, we take these words, namely:

"After traveling nearly four years in the Ohio Conference, I was, in the Autumn of 1816, transferred to the Tennessee Conference, of which I was a member until 1821. During this whole period, a fierce controversy was raging in that Conference

on the subject of slavery and abolition, the Abolitionists having a decided majority. The course and practice of the majority went to settle the principle, that no slave-holder, whatever might be the law of the State in the case, or his claims in other respects, should be received into the traveling connection, and no preacher, traveling or local, admitted to ordination, until he had first, *in fact*, emancipated his slaves." (Bascom's Review, p. 7.)

We are devoutly thankful that the same spirit is yet in Tennessee. The majority of the General Conference in 1844, and from that time till the present, and the Methodist Episcopal Church in these days, have been, and are now, trying to aid these noble Tennesseans to work out the problem of civil and religious liberty in their beautiful valleys and among their magnificent mountains. God, in his providence in the past fifteen years, has vindicated them. We need say no more.

It must be manifest to the most casual observer that the Methodist Episcopal Church through all the years of its history, till 1844, was struggling against the influence and aggression of the slaveholding power in the South, and, from that date to the emancipation, it was trying to get back to the "original" position which it now occupies.

But the Southern Church from the day of its organization, proudly, and with much boasting, stood on the opposite side. It was essentially and avowedly pro-slavery in principle and practice. It defended and encouraged the perpetuity of the iniquity, as a civil institution which was in harmony with the Word of God, by precept and example among its bishops, ministers, and members. The separation of 1844

was based by the protesting delegates, in their speeches in behalf of Bishop Andrew, and in the discussions which followed the action in this case, and in both their "Declaration" and "Protest," expressly upon the "agitation" of this subject. This, in itself, and as connected with Bishop Andrew, was the only reason alleged why a separation was desired. The circular to the South is emphatic upon this point, and the utterances of the Louisville Convention in 1845 equally so, as will appear in the perusal of these pages. The third General Conference of the Southern Church, held in 1854, expunged from the Discipline the chapter on slavery, found there when they seceded in 1844. This was followed by a proposition, originating with Dr. Summers (July Quarterly, 1858, p. 451), to strike out the General Rule forbidding the "Buying and selling of men, women, and children with an intention to enslave them," adopted in 1789, and standing in the Discipline, with some changes, till the present day. On this question the Southern General Conference of 1858 took the following action, to wit:

"The resolution of the Alabama Conference, memorializing the General Conference to expunge the rule in the General Rules forbidding the buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them, received considerable attention, an amount perhaps disproportionate to its merits. It was found that more than the 'three-fourths majority' of the members of the several annual conferences, present and voting on the resolution, were in favor of it, the vote being 1,160 to 311. But as three of the conferences—to wit: Kansas Mission, Indian Mission, and Pacific—had failed to take action in the premises, constitutional difficulties were started, and as hasty legislation on such a subject was deprecated, the question

was settled on the adoption of the following report, by a vote of 143 to 8.

“The committee appointed to report a preamble and resolutions in regard to the expunction of the rule, in the General Rules, forbidding “the buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them,” beg leave to report the following as the result of their deliberations:

“*Whereas*, the rule, in the General Rules of the M. E. Church South, forbidding “the buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them,” is ambiguous in its phraseology, and liable to be construed as antagonistic to the institution of slavery, in regard to which the Church has no right to meddle, except in enforcing the duties of masters and servants, as set forth in the Holy Scriptures; and, whereas, a strong desire for the expunction of said rule has been expressed in nearly all parts of our ecclesiastical connection; therefore,

“*Resolved*, 1. By the delegates of the annual conferences of the M. E. Church South, in General Conference assembled, that the rule forbidding “the buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them,” be expunged from the General Rules of the M. E. Church South.

“2. That in adopting the foregoing resolution, this General Conference expresses no opinion in regard to the African slave-trade, to which the rule in question has been “understood” to refer.

“3. That the bishops, or others presiding in the annual conferences, be, and are hereby, instructed to lay the foregoing resolutions before each of the annual conferences at their next ensuing session, for their concurrent action.

“4. That the president of each annual conference shall be required, as soon as possible after the adjournment of the conference, to report to the book editor the vote on the resolution to expunge the rule in question; and when the book editor shall have received returns from all of the annual conferences voting on the said resolution, he shall lay the information before one of the bishops; and if it shall be found that there is a concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the annual conferences present and voting on the resolution in favor of the expunging of the rule, the bishop shall direct the book editor to expunge it accordingly.

“5. That if any annual conference or conferences refuse or neglect to vote on the aforesaid resolution, the members of such conference or conferences shall not be counted for or against the expunging of the rule.

“6. That the publication of the foregoing preamble and resolutions in the Church papers shall be considered a sufficient notification of the action of this Conference in the premises.

“7. That the bishops are respectfully requested to set forth in the Pastoral Address the platform occupied by the M. E. Church South, on the relation of masters and servants, agreeably to the principles contained in the foregoing preamble and resolutions.’

“Those who voted in the minority did so from the fear of being charged with favoring the African slave-trade—a charge to which none who voted in the affirmative seemed to think themselves obnoxious. No doubt is entertained that the rule in question will be duly expunged within a year from the present date.” (Quarterly Review, M. E. Church South, July, 1858, pp. 384-6.)

The rule was expunged. The eagerness to get it out of the book was ominous. But as it was “understood” to refer to the African slave-trade, and the Conference did not express any “opinion in regard” to that calling in behalf of the evangelization of the Africans, they must have been fearful of the efforts of some to “construe” the rule as “antagonistic to slavery.” Probably, it was capable of such “construction” when interpreted in the light of the position of the Church at the time it was adopted. The bishops responded favorably to the request in the last resolution, and, in their Pastoral Address to the Church, said:

“The almost unanimous vote of this body recommends the annual conferences to concur with us in expunging from our General Rules the rule concerning ‘the buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them.’

The question of slavery has long agitated the Church and the country. The Southern Church, while yet in connection with the North, avowed her conviction that the subject belonged to Cæsar, and that ecclesiastical legislation upon it is contrary to the teachings of Christ and the example of the apostles. Her counsels were unheeded, her remonstrances disregarded, and the unfortunate policy, which at first obtruded into the legislation of the Church, maintained it there, notwithstanding history accumulated evidence amounting to demonstration that its continuance was the occasion of strife and trouble, alienation and discord. Its simple presence in our book of laws, while the Methodist Episcopal Church in this great country was a unit, was the pretext which fanaticism employed during long years to insult our feelings, and, in the memorable Conference of 1844, to *outrage our rights*. When the M. E. Church South, under the authority of the General Conference, and with the consent and approval of our people, organized a separate and independent jurisdiction, we found the Discipline still encumbered with the rule and the section on slavery. The testimony against slavery was decided, although gratuitous, but the legislation in reference to it contradictory and absurd. The section was anomalous. While denouncing slavery as an evil, and pledging the Church to its extirpation, it provided by statute for its allowance and perpetuation. Four years ago we annihilated the chapter, and rid the book of its self-condemning enactments upon the subject. The General Rule still remained under the protection of the restrictive article of the Constitution which forbids a change without a three-fourths majority of all the members of the several annual conferences, and a two-thirds majority of the General Conference. A resolution from the Alabama Conference, recommending the expunction of the rule, passed around; but the failure of three conferences to vote made it somewhat doubtful whether the requisite majority had been obtained. This body, determined to protect the constitution, waived the right of immediate action, and, originating the question of expunging by an almost unanimous vote, now appeals to the annual conferences to concur. Of the issue there is no doubt. The rule will be stricken out by legitimate authority from the book of Discipline. This movement, we feel, is demanded by loyalty as citizens under the Constitution of the country; by consistency as to our position and oft-repeated

declaration; by fidelity to the people whom we serve, and the institutions among which we live. The rule itself was eplative, having no application to an existing state of things, or to one likely to exist. And if, contrary to expectation, the African slave-trade should ever be revived, in the face of the law which declares it to be piracy, we have rule and authority enough by which to hold our membership to a rigid responsibility. Nor would we fail in this, sustained as we would be by our own convictions of duty, the law of the land, and what we know to be the moral sentiment of the people among whom we dwell. We rejoice, ourselves, and confidently expect your sympathy and approbation, that Southern Methodism at last stands disentangled from this vexed and vexing question, erect upon a Scriptural basis—at liberty to circulate every-where in our bounds her book of laws, without note or comment; and that a rule of doubtful interpretation no longer exists to embarrass our ministers and friends, or to justify the suspicion and assaults of our enemies. We have surrendered to Cæsar the things which are his, and, holding ourselves to be debtors to the ‘wise and unwise, the bond and free,’ we can now, unchallenged by the jealous and distrustful, preach Christ alike to the master and servant, secure in the confidence and affection of the one and the other.

“The relation of master and servant is recognized in the New Testament, and the duties of each prescribed. The observance of these moral rules we regard as integral to the morality and piety of our members. The benign spirit of our holy religion not only demands that masters should render to their servants that which is just and equal in wages, as to food, raiment, and shelter, but that religious instruction should be provided alike for servants as for children. The Gospel is God’s gift to the black man as well as to the white, and Christian masters should see to it that all their dependents are regularly supplied with the preaching of the Word and all the privileges of the Church of God.

“The salvation of the colored race in our midst, as far as human instrumentality can secure it, is the primary duty of the Southern Church. Let us earnestly seek to meet our responsibilities, and then, whatever ‘evil thing’ ignorance and prejudice may say of us, we shall have the testimony of a good conscience, and the blessing of Him who is judge of all.” (Quarterly Review, M. E. Church South, 1858, pp. 422-4.)

The above is the "platform of the M. E. Church South on the relation of masters and servants," as stated by the bishops by request of the General Conference. It abuses the Methodists of the States in the North, perverts the facts of history, appeals to the ministers to aid in ridding the Discipline of a rule which they represent as against the African slave-trade, approves of the institution of slavery, as "recognized in the New Testament," and asks Christian privileges for the colored people as slaves. The address was signed by Bishops Soule, Andrew, Paine, Pierce, Early, and Kavanaugh, and officially by Thos. O. Summers, Secretary of the General Conference. In their Address to the General Conference the bishops say: "The missions to the slaves of the Southern plantations, we regard as the crowning glory of our Church." One is at a loss to reconcile this intense interest for the moral welfare of this people with the course pursued by this Church since the war. As soon as emancipated they were banished from the places where they had been accustomed to worship and finally excluded from Church relations by being enrolled in the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America. What has been done for them since by the Southern Church? Who will put this and that together?

The doctrine of the M. E. Church South upon the subject of slavery is more fully stated and defended in a work on "Moral Philosophy," which was published by the "Southern Methodist Publishing House," at Nashville, Tennessee, in 1859; prepared by Rev. R. H. Rivers, D. D., a Southern

Methodist preacher, and President of Wesleyan University, at Florence, Alabama, and edited by Rev. Thos. O. Summers, D. D., present editor of the Nashville *Christian Advocate*. The reason why the author prepared this work may be gathered from the Preface: "For many years the institutions of learning in the South have been without a suitable text-book on Moral Philosophy. Most of the philosophical writings of American authors are exhibitions of fanaticism, rather than of sound logic or Scriptural truth, when they discuss the subject of slavery."

The author "claims for this work what is demanded by the schools in the South, and indeed in every portion of the country: it is the only work on Moral Philosophy that gives a full and correct view of the slavery question. It shows to the youth of our land that slavery is not a sin; that it was established originally by the Divine Being, for wise, just, and benevolent purposes; that it was directly sanctioned by Christ and his apostles, and is not, therefore, 'the sum of all villainies.'"

The late Dr. Cobleigh said, in the *Methodist Advocate*, when editor of that paper: "The proof that the M. E. Church South, 'as an organization,' held these opinions is entirely conclusive. The book was written by an able, honored and popular minister of the M. E. Church South, whom the Church had placed at the head of one of her most influential institutions of learning. It was edited and received the official sanction of that Church, 'as an organization,' by its recognized official Book Editor, appointed by, and working for, their General Confer-

ence, Rev T O. Summers, D. D. It was published by the 'Publishing House of the M. E. Church South,' located at Nashville, Tennessee. Every copy bore on its title-page the official imprint of that Church. It was adopted and used as a text-book in the schools and colleges of the South under the supervision and sanction of their annual conferences. It was recommended by their bishops, if not by their General Conference, and used as a text-book in the course of study prescribed for the ministers joining the conferences and receiving ordination in the annual conferences. Men duly appointed for the purpose carefully examined each year the candidates on this chapter in Moral Science. It had therefore the fullest sanction and highest indorsement of the highest general officers, and of all the organized bodies of that Church. Individual members of the conferences and of the Church, in their individual characters and responsibilities, may not have accepted it, but the Church, 'as an organization,' did accept it, did believe it, and did use it." A later edition has been issued from which this chapter has been eliminated, but the last General Conference said that the opinion of the Church had undergone no change upon this subject. Dr. Rivers says:

"The writer feels that he has a most delicate task to perform. He has sincerely, and with much solicitude, sought to know the truth in regard to the institution of slavery. He has read the arguments and appeals of those philanthropists who contend that slavery is always and every-where a sin. He has seen his beloved country fearfully shaken by the agitation of the slavery question. He has seen the workings of slavery from his infancy, having been born and brought up in a slave-

holding State, and having lived in the midst of slavery during his whole life. He has seen the Church of which he is a humble member torn asunder by what he believes to be mistaken views of this question. He feels that he must not mislead the young. He acknowledges duty to be above every other consideration. From a sense of duty the subject has been examined, and the honest convictions of the mind of the author are here presented.

“Upon the morality of slavery, President Mahan remarks: ‘If human legislation can render it morally right for an individual to sustain this one relation to another, there is no conceivable form of wrong and outrage which said legislation can not render morally right. What is theft, highway robbery, or piracy upon the high seas, compared with the outrage upon the rights and interests of humanity involved, and necessarily so, in this question?’ (Mahan’s *Moral Philosophy*, p. 315.)

“Here, in a grave work on *Moral Philosophy*, by a minister of Christ, and intended for the young, slavery is denounced as worse than piracy, theft, or highway robbery. ‘No human legislation can make it right.’ Granted; but suppose that slavery was established by Divine legislation; if that does not make it right, does it not prove that it is right? We maintain that God’s law is always right; and that whatever God established is right, not because he established it, but we maintain that God established it because he saw that it is right. We think Mr. Mahan in error when he supposes that slavery was established by human legislation. We think that slavery was established by Divine legislation, and that it has the authority of Christ and his apostles. In proof of this proposition we offer the following arguments:

“‘Cursed be Canaan: a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant.’ (Gen. ix, 25-27.)

“This passage is not merely prophetic; it is also judicial. The children of Ham are doomed to serve the children of Shem and of Japheth, by the decree of Him whose ways are not as man’s ways. We think that if Mr. Mahan will read his Bible he will be able to trace the origin of slavery to a higher source than ‘human legislation.’

“If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him forever.’ (Exodus xxi, 2-6.)

“An analysis of this passage will show:

“1. That God authorized the purchase of a Hebrew as a slave for the space of six years.

“2. If this slave, during his bondage, should marry a slave, such marriage was not to liberate either the wife or children. God thus made the bonds which held the slave to her master stronger than those which bound her to her husband. ‘The wife and the children shall be her master's, and *he shall go out by himself.*’

“If the slave loved his master, his wife and children, more than he loved liberty, he was to become a *slave forever*. We admit that this was voluntary slavery on the part of the Israelite. After six years, he was to be liberated, unless he preferred to continue in slavery.

“The privilege of choosing to be free, while it was allowed to the Hebrew slave, was denied to the children of Ham, as will appear from the following passage: ‘If thy brother be waxen poor and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him; yea, though he be a stranger or a sojourner; that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him, or increase; but fear thy God, that thy brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase. I am the Lord your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, and to be your God. And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant; but as an hired servant, and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee; and then shall he depart from thee, both he

and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return. For they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: they shall not be sold as bondmen. Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor; but shalt fear thy God. Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever.' (Lev. xxv.)

“Upon this passage we remark:

“1. That the Divine Legislator makes a clear distinction between a hired servant and a slave, between temporary bondage and perpetual; and between the rigor which might be required in the case of perpetual bondage, and which was not allowed toward the Israelite, whose bondage was but temporary, unless he chose to make it perpetual.

“2. God commanded the Hebrews that all their perpetual slaves should be of the heathen that were round about them. These heathen were the descendants of Ham, the very people upon whom slavery was inflicted.

“3. These people were to be owned; they were to be bought as property; they were to become ‘chattels personal, to all intents, purposes, and constructions whatsoever.’

“4. These slaves were to be inherited by the posterity of their masters. ‘Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession.’ Can language be stronger? Is there a State in the Union whose laws make the bonds of slavery more binding, and whose statutes express more clearly the right of ownership and of inheritance, than is expressed in this law of the Most High?

“‘Where then,’ says Bishop Hopkins, ‘was the sin of holding them in slavery? When the Almighty commanded his people to buy and own the posterity of the heathen, was it a sin to obey him? And how could that which he commanded be a crime against morality? Where is the law which is higher than the code laid down by the Deity? Where is the rule of morals which shall claim supremacy over the Word of God?’

“And we may add, if slavery is a sin, God established it. Divine and not human legislation is responsible for its existence and for its perpetuity. But we hold that God can do nothing wrong; that he would establish no relation which inflicted a great moral wrong upon one of the parties to that relation.

“It appears to me that if Mr. Mahan, and others on his side of this question, would calmly look this institution in the face, and carefully investigate the reason which influenced the Divine Legislator, they would be able to express themselves with less bitterness and more truth.

“The relation involves special duties, to which a separate section of this book will be devoted. For the present, it may be sufficient to say that the slave is under obligation to give his service to his master, and that the master is under obligation to direct his labor, to give him an abundance of good food, a good house, good clothes, to attend to him when sick, and give him a decent burial when dead. Now, this, in brief, is the institution; and will Dr. Wayland or President Mahan enlighten us so far as to show that the relation is essentially a sinful one? We can not see its turpitude. It looks innocent to us, and it appears that He who never errs regards it as right.

“But what were the probable reasons which caused the Divine Mind to enact the law of slavery? The ‘strangers’ were heathen, they were an inferior race; and those whom they were required to serve were enlightened, having a correct knowledge of the true God; and the very doom of slavery, though a physical curse, was to be a moral benefit.

“II. ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor’s.’ (Exodus xx, 17.)

“This commandment is found in the Decalogue, which is admitted to be of universal obligation. It was not designed for the Jews alone, but for the whole race. And here, in this great immutable moral law, slavery is recognized, and the subjects of the law are forbidden to covet a slave belonging to their neighbor.

“III. The highest commendation is bestowed upon slave-holders in the Word of God. Abraham, the father of the faithful, was a slave-holder. He had a large number of slaves, and yet he is commended as a friend of God. Job, a perfect and

an upright man, one that feared God and eschewed evil, is represented as owning slaves. Philemon, the owner of the runaway slave Onesimus, was honored with an apostolic letter, written with Paul's own hand, and was called by Paul his dearly beloved and fellow-laborer. Now, the argument is, that if slavery is, and always has been, a sin of such monstrous growth, a sin equal to piracy, theft, and robbery, such compliments as these, to persons whose hands were stained with the great sin, are altogether out of place in the Word of God.

“IV. The Bible recognizes and approves the institution in those places in which fugitive slaves are sent back to their owners by Divine authority. ‘And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way to Shur. And he said, Hagar, Sarai's maid, whence camest thou? and whither wilt thou go? And she said, I flee from the face of my mistress Sarai. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands.’ (Gen. xvi, 7-9.)

“Two very strong points in this passage bear directly upon the institution, and show that it is sanctioned by Divine authority:

“1. The angel of the Lord required Hagar to return to her mistress. The slave had been treated with some rigor by her mistress; she seemed to be an object of compassion; and had she been met by such a philosopher as President Mahan, she would have been told to flee as far as possible from the rigors of slavery. But she was met by an angel; and, lest we might be tempted to believe it was a fallen angel, it is added, ‘an angel of the Lord.’ The angel recognizes Hagar as Sarai's maid, and he requires her to go back to her bondage.

“2. The angel requires the fugitive not only to return, but to be submissive. She was to submit to her mistress, although her treatment had been rigorous.

“I. We now ask the student to read the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, in which slavery is clearly recognized.

“1. Paul meets a fugitive slave, and is the instrument of his conversion to the Christian religion. He then causes him to return to his master Philemon, whom he calls by the most endearing epithets. He sends him back, not as a guest to receive hospitality, but as a slave who, now that he had become a Christian, would be ‘no longer unprofitable, but profitable.’

“2. Paul, being aged, and needing a servant, would have kept Onesimus, could he have done so in justice to his master. But so scrupulous was that aged apostle of the rights of a slaveholder, that he would do nothing without the consent of the master. ‘Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the Gospel; but without thy mind would I do nothing.’ (Philemon, 12, 13.) How scrupulous of the rights of a man-stealer was the aged Paul!

“3. The inspired apostle begs for Onesimus: ‘I beseech thee for my son Onesimus;’ ‘Yet for love’s sake I rather beseech thee!’ In this he recognizes the right of the master to punish him. If to send a slave back to his master, with an earnest entreaty in the slave’s behalf, be not a recognition of slavery, we can not conceive what would be a recognition of that institution.

“4. To give to this Epistle the authority of an apostle, he writes it with his own hand. Thus, among the last acts of his life, the great apostle of the Gentiles recognizes the right of a master over a slave, even to the punishment of that slave; and sends him back to his master to be his ‘forever.’

“5. The facts in the case prove that Onesimus could not have been a hired servant, as contended by some. If a hired servant, why return him to his master? why refuse to keep him without his master’s mind?

“6. The facts still more strongly prove that Paul neither claimed the right to emancipate the slave, nor did he attempt to exercise such right. He would not even keep him for a while to wait upon himself, although he needed his services; much less would he think of his emancipation. ‘It is preposterous to say that the apostle would emancipate a slave that did not belong to him.

“II. We argue, in the next place, that slavery is no sin, from its effect upon the slave population.

“We do not say that slavery would be a blessing to the enlightened Anglo-Saxon; nor can the argument, with any propriety, be retorted upon us. But we do say that slavery has been, and still is, a blessing to the negro. It is a blessing in whatever light it be considered—whether as affecting his physical comfort, his intellectual advancement, or his moral progress. This we are prepared to prove by facts as impregnable

as any that were ever presented in any controversy on any subject.

“ 1. The condition of the negro slave is very far superior to that of his brethren in Africa. There they are in a state of complete barbarism, living in miserable huts, and in promiscuous concubinage, destitute of the first element of civilization. They are wild, naked, filthy, ignorant savages, with scarcely a redeeming trait of character, brutal in their appetites, fierce almost as their own beasts of prey, and exceedingly vindictive. Now, that this is a true picture, none will deny. Any one can satisfy himself of the truth of this statement by referring to any intelligent African traveler. We would especially refer to the recent explorations by Livingstone and Barth. How very far above this condition has the slave been elevated! He has learned to labor, he has become acquainted with the art of husbandry, and makes a good farmer. He lives in a comfortable house. He has abundance of the most wholesome food. He is well clothed, and learns to dress with neatness, and sometimes with elegance. He has wife and children whom he has learned to love. He has forsaken the brutal ways of his forefathers. He has become a Christian, loves the Gospel, delights in the precious songs of the Church, and is often found at the house of prayer. What a contrast is this! and yet the picture is not overdrawn. It is the contrast brought about by the domestic institution established by God.

“ 2. The condition of the negro slave is far superior to that of the free negro in this country. The negro without a master is notoriously idle and improvident, and soon becomes incapable of self-support. He begins to relax into his old vices, and is notoriously in a worse condition than his enslaved brother. He has the name of freedom without the reality; and yet he has more than he is capable of enjoying or improving. He loses caste among those of his own color, and, separated as he is from the white race, he becomes solitary, dejected, and unhappy. He wishes himself back in slavery, and often returns voluntarily to it. Such is the condition of the free negro at the South, with a few exceptions; and the candid observer of the effects of this nominal freedom upon the negro at the North will confess that his condition is still worse. Now, we believe that in every respect his brother in bondage is in a better condition. All his necessities are met by his master. He is well

provided against the inclemencies of the weather, and is well cared for in sickness and in old age.

“3. The direct tendency of slavery is to make the condition of the slave more happy and prosperous than that of the free white operative at the North or in Europe. Slavery identifies the interest of capitalist and laborer, of master and servant. If it is to the interest of the slave to be well fed, well clothed, well housed, and well tended in sickness, it is equally the interest of the master. And this identity of interest has produced the happiest results. The master wishes him to thrive, to have physical strength and activity, to be free from disease, and to live long. His treatment is directed to that end. The slave must not be overworked, he must not be exposed to the inclement season half clothed and half fed, and he must have the best medical attendance and careful nursing when sick. This accounts for the fine health, joyous spirits, and great prosperity of the negro slave. While the poor white operative is unattended in sickness, and has no one to care whether he lives or dies, while he pines in want and his children become beggars, the negro slave flourishes in plenty, and has to spare. No stronger proof need be demanded of the truth of this proposition than the vast increase of population among the slaves. A community starved and famished, and cruelly treated, do not increase in numbers with so much rapidity. The political philosopher determines the prosperity of a people by the number of healthy children. Granting this to be a correct principle, we are sure that the slaves of the South can not be surpassed in prosperity.

“4. That slavery is not a sin may be proved from the fact that it has done more to Christianize the African race than all else combined. It has brought them to a Christian land, and has made thousands and tens of thousands intelligent, consistent, and deeply pious Christians. They often kneel at the same table with their masters, and take from the same hands the emblems of the body and blood of Christ. They easily learn the simple and beautiful plan of salvation. They delight in catechetical instruction, and are often zealous members of the Church, regarding with solemn reverence her sacred ordinances. Hundreds of missionaries are laboring for the salvation of the negro slave—self-denying and zealous men, who are denounced as worse than pirates, thieves, and robbers!

“5. A comparison of the condition of the negro slave with his

brethren in the West Indies, that have been liberated by France and England, will not lessen the force of this argument. Servile wars, insurrections, constant changes in the government, the destruction of magnificent plantations, relapses into barbarism, idleness, and crime—these are the results of French infidelity and British pseudo philanthropy.

“We have now shown that the condition of the slave is better than that of any other operative in the world—that it is better than that of his brethren in their native wilds in Africa, that it is better than that of the free negro wherever found; and we draw our conclusion, with a certainty approaching demonstration, that slavery is not a sin.

“III. We argue that it exerts no evil effects upon the master, and therefore is not necessarily sinful.

“We believe that the character of Southern slave-holders will compare favorably with that of any other people on the globe. In sympathy with the distressed, in pity for the unfortunate, in generosity to a foe, in a sacred regard for truth, in a high and chivalrous sense of honor, in an utter loathing of what is mean and scorn for what is low, the character of the people of the South can not be excelled. In warm friendship, involving perfect and unselfish devotion to another’s weal, the slave-holders of the South have no equals. Can pirates, thieves, and robbers be possessed of such holy virtues? Now, that this argument may have more force, I wish to present separately the virtues which distinguish many Christian slave-holders:

“1. Humility. Examples of humility as bright as can be found on earth are found among slave-holders.

“2. Charity—that heavenly grace which ‘beareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and thinketh no evil!’

“3. Justice—a sacred regard to the rights of all men, and a firm resolve never to infract the rights of any.

“4. Benevolence. Active benevolence, displaying itself in works of charity, in rendering assistance to the poor, visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, relieving the sick, erecting churches, building up colleges, and sending abroad the Bible, is exemplified nowhere more than among the slave-holders, who are so violently slandered.

“5. Deep piety. This includes love to God and man. It is manifested in veneration for the Almighty, in godly fear, in holy love, in a sacred regard for the Sabbath, and in constant

prayer. This piety, deep, consistent, and self-denying, is exemplified in the lives and deaths of owners of slaves.

“6. Missionary zeal. I have known the slave-holder to surrender the pleasures and ease and luxuries of home, and give himself to the laborious and self-denying work of a Christian missionary.

“Now, we hold that the possession of these virtues is utterly incompatible with the heartless selfishness which our opponents charge as the very source of the *great evil*. We argue that ‘no man can serve God and mammon;’ and as we have shown by their fruits that many masters are servants of God, the argument is conclusive that slavery is not a sin.

“IV. We argue that slavery is not a sin, because it does not increase crime.

“The tendency of crime is to beget crime: this is a universal law and universally admitted. Murder, robbery, piracy, and licentiousness, are all accompanied by a train of evils. So it is with every sin. The one sin of drunkenness has brought countless evils upon our race. This principle forms one of the most fearful elements in the nature of sin. It has been shown by statistics that crime has been more rife at the North than at the South. It has been shown, too, that a very large portion of the convicts at the South are from the North. These facts have been shown, and still we are denounced by such men as Channing and Mahan as worse than pirates!

“V We argue that slavery is not a sin, because it does not diminish the lofty virtue of patriotism.

“No great sin can be committed, generally, by citizens of any nation, without lessening their patriotism. Sin is found in sordid selfishness, and sordid selfishness is incompatible with an exalted patriotism. ‘Sin or vice,’ says a distinguished anti-slavery philosopher, ‘is the moral element or attribute of selfishness.’ The admitted tendency of crime is to react upon the heart and affections, and by degrees annihilate every element of virtue.

“If, then, sin is selfishness, and slavery is the highest type of sin, and, of course, the worst form of selfishness, it must ever be incompatible with that noble and unselfish virtue, patriotism. But it is found that patriotism exists in as exalted a form among a community of slave-holders as among an anti-slavery community. Indeed, the finest specimens of patriotism

that our own country has produced, have been among the owners of slaves. Who dares disparage the patriotism of Washington? What American heart does not thrill at the mention of his name? Who ever equaled him in any country, or during any period of the world's history? And yet Washington was the owner of many slaves. He, the friend of liberty, and the savior of his country, was, according to the theory of antislavery philosophers, worse than 'a pirate upon the high seas.'

"Then, we have the names of the hero of the Hermitage, and of the sage of Ashland, before whose stern and all-absorbing patriotism the virtues of their traducers grow dim. But we need not call attention to particular names. Whenever the country has needed the services of gallant men to lead her armies, fight her battles, repel her enemies, she has found them among slave-holders. It has been through the patriotism of slave-holders that our Republic has spread from ocean to ocean, has become so great and powerful at home and so distinguished abroad. The facts are indisputable, and the argument is conclusive, that slavery is not always and everywhere a sin.

"VI. Finally, we argue that slavery is not a sin, from the fact that to abolish it would be attended with the worst consequences.

"1. The abolition of slavery would turn out of employment thousands of operatives at the North. The great cotton mills would cease to move, for there would be no raw material to supply them. The country would be almost stunned by the wails of anguish that would arise from famishing women and starving children. Age would sink exhausted under its infirmities, and youth would grow sick and die.

"2. England would be ruined. She would totter from her high position, and cease to be the 'queen of the seas.' Her vast and populous manufacturing districts would become a barren Sahara. Every loom and spindle would be stopped. Insubordination would be rife among her subjects, among whom comparative contentment reigns. Men and women and children would be found in the market-places idle, because no man could hire them. Miners and colliers and machinists and mechanics would all be seeking labor and finding none; and worse than Egyptian famine would starve the land. Her grand

missionary and Bible enterprises would languish, and her glory would depart.

“3. Commerce would languish. For years commerce has been the handmaid of religion. It has been the leader of enterprise, and the ‘forerunner’ of the Gospel. It has advanced science, discovered new lands, and penciled their boundaries upon the map of the world. It has broken barriers which had grown strong by the accretions of centuries; it has opened the gates of China and Japan to the civilized world. It has united together a beautiful sisterhood of nations, and lessened the chances of war. Commerce owes its glory to cotton. Cotton sways the commerce of the world. It whitens the ocean with sails, and fills the harbors with vessels. It is the grand motive-power that moves the commerce of the world. But cotton is the production of slave labor. Destroy slavery, and the supply of cotton would cease.

“4. The abolition of slavery would make the South a field of blood. It would lead to war, and prove the utter extinction of the negro race. The South is rich, and is increasing in wealth. In arts and science her progress is onward. Her enterprising citizens are building railroads, erecting manufactories, establishing schools, printing books, and advancing in all the elements of the highest civilization. And, if left alone, she will work out a sublime destiny. But let slavery be abolished, let three or four millions of an inferior race, unused to liberty and equality, be at once elevated to the character and position of freemen, and the consequences would be the ruin of the interests of one race, and the annihilation of the other.

“We have now closed this argument. In the light of nature, and in the still more effulgent light of revelation, we have endeavored calmly to survey the whole ground, and to come to just conclusions. We believe the argument is unanswerable. We think our conclusion is infallible. Here we take our stand, and in the fear of God, and sustained by his unerring word, we dare maintain it.

“We propose to answer the arguments of President Mahan in his ‘Moral Philosophy.’

“‘1. As property, the slave is denied all right to acquire or possess property in any form himself, or to any remuneration whatever for his labor.’ (Moral Philosophy, p. 313.)

“President Mahan is mistaken in this statement. Throughout the South the slaves are encouraged to industry; they are allowed time to make crops of their own, to make any little article of merchandise, and to sell both, and appropriate the proceeds to their own use. They are remunerated, and the laws of the State require that they shall be remunerated. They are the best fed laborers in the world. Is that ‘*no remuneration whatever?*’ They are furnished with good clothes, and good houses, and are therewith content.

“‘2. The system of slavery requires the master to make no more provisions for the comfort of his slave than for that of his horse or ox.’ (Page 313.)

“This is also a mistake. The slave is recognized by the law as a human being, and the master is bound to treat him as such, or be subject to severe penalties. In a few instances masters have been tried, found guilty, and condemned, for not giving their slaves a sufficiency of food.

“‘3. Whatever cruelties the masters may choose to inflict upon the slave, the slave himself can obtain in law no redress whatever. Others, if they choose, may interpose in his behalf, just as they may in behalf of the owner’s ox. But the slave himself can not be known in law as a complainant for any injuries, actual or conceivable, perpetrated upon him.’ (Page 313.)

“This is by no means a correct statement of the law of slavery. It is the *sworn* duty of the Grand Jury to present any man who may be guilty of cruelty to slaves. Besides, the argument proves too much. A parent may cruelly treat his child, or a husband may abuse his wife, and neither the one nor the other ‘can obtain in law any redress,’ except as a slave obtains it. Indeed, the relation of the slave is far better protected in law than any of the other domestic relations. If, then, the argument is sufficient to dissolve the bonds of slavery, it must be equally potent to dissolve those of husband and wife, or parent and child.

“‘4. The system secures to the slave none of the comforts of the domestic relations. It gives the master unlimited power to sunder at will all these ties.’ (Page 313.)

“The domestic relations do exist, and are enjoyed in their full force among the slaves. Laws have been enacted prevent-

ing the separation of children from their parents, under a certain age. The slaves are often married by clergymen, and the marriage bond is held sacred by both master and slave. The law of public opinion is powerful against the sundering of these relations; and no man who would willingly sunder these ties would be tolerated.

“‘5. It annihilates the law of chastity, and with it all forms of virtue.’

“This proposition can not be sustained. The same law of chastity prevails among slave-holders as elsewhere. The negroes themselves are more virtuous in bondage than in a state of freedom. No man, by any law, human or divine, has the right to indulge in licentiousness. And this crime is as much execrated in a country where slavery is allowed as it is where it is not allowed. We do not deny that with some low and vulgar persons a state of slavery might be taken advantage of for the gratification of the passions of fallen human nature. But we do deny that it annihilates the law of chastity, and with it all forms of virtue. Does President Mahan mean to say that there is no virtue in the South? Yes, he does say that we are in the daily practice ‘of the sum of all villainies, a form of wrong which comprehends all others, and in comparison with which every particular form of outrage upon humanity that can be named or conceived of dwindles into absolute insignificance.’ President Mahan is a philosopher; he writes books on logic and metaphysics and Christian perfection. They are good books; he reasons well in them; but when he attempts the discussion of slavery, he runs wild—he rants, he denounces, but he does not reason. Hear what he says about the Bible argument:

“‘6. In reply to all that has been urged upon the subject, it is affirmed that slavery can not be intrinsically wrong, nor in all cases inexpedient, because it has the express sanction of the Bible. We are constrained, then, to admit either that slavery is right, or the Bible not of God. If I felt myself forced to take one or the other of these positions, I freely confess that, for one, I should take the latter.’ (Page 316.)

“I have no comments to make. When a Christian philosopher and minister can so far forget himself as to write that in any case he would give up his Bible, I feel more sorrow than anger, and must obey the apostolic injunction, ‘from such withdraw thyself.’

REPLY TO DR. WAYLAND.

“‘1. Suppose that A has a right to use the body of B according to his, that is, A’s, will. Now, if this be true, it is true universally; hence A has the control over the body of B, and B has control over the body of C, C of that of D, and Z again over the body of A.’

“‘If there were no more difference between men,’ says Professor Bledsoe, ‘than there is between the letters of the alphabet, we would admit the force of this reasoning.’ But as long as there is not only difference in men, but in races of men, the alphabetic argument will not do. It goes upon the false supposition that all men are equally capable of self-government, which Dr. Wayland himself knows to be false. All men must be governed; this is a universally admitted proposition. If they are not capable of self-government, they must be governed by others; this is also universally admitted to be true. If, then, an inferior race is found in the midst of a superior race, it is the right and the duty of the superior race to govern. The African race, altogether inferior and incapable of self-government, is found in the midst of a superior race, and connected with the superior race by peculiar domestic ties, which have been handed down from generation to generation for a long series of years. In these circumstances, it becomes, according to every principle of morality and justice, the duty of the superior race to govern, for the good of both races. This government we have already proved to obtain in the system of domestic slavery. But Dr. Wayland’s conclusion appears to me to be a *non sequitur*. It does not follow that because one man who is capable of self-government has the right to govern one who is not, therefore somebody else has the right to govern him. Because I have the right to control my child, it does not follow that some other person has the right to control me.

“‘2. Dr. Wayland maintains that slavery violates the precept, ‘Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.’

“‘At first glance, this precept might seem to be violated in slavery. But what is the true meaning of the passage? It can mean nothing else than ‘Do unto others as you would have others do unto you, were your conditions reversed.’ Any other interpretation would make the precept impracticable. With this, which is the only reasonable interpretation, the

precept is perfectly compatible in its requirements with the institution. It simply requires masters to treat their slaves as they would wish to be treated were they in bondage.

“3. Dr. Wayland says, ‘The effects of slavery must be disastrous to the morals of both parties.’

“We have shown at length that this is not true. And we again assert that in all virtues of our holy religion, in all the charities of life, in all that makes life pleasant, innocent, and influential for good, the slave-holders of the South will compare favorably with any other Christian people.

“4. ‘Would the master be willing that another should subject him to slavery?’

“No; nor would he be willing to subject others, his equals, to slavery. The slaves are here, already subjected; and the question has no bearing upon the points at issue. This question is often asked, and we are called upon to try slavery, if it is so good. The question is propounded either in ignorance, or with a manifest design to change the issue. When reason has been appealed to, we have always justified slavery on the ground that the race enslaved is an inferior one, and incapable of self-government. Because we who are capable of self-government are not willing to be subjected to slavery, that does not prove that an inferior race, already subjected, must at once be liberated, or we shall be guilty of the sum of all villainies.

“5. ‘The principles of the Gospel are opposed to slavery.’

“What principles? We verily believe that no principle of the Gospel, no principle of morality, no principle of justice, no principle of benevolence, is violated by the system of slavery. If the principles of the Gospel be opposed to slavery, why does it prescribe the duties of those sustaining the relation? When it comes to the duties of masters, why does it not say, ‘Masters, manumit your slaves?’ This would have cut the matter short. It could have been easily done. It would have required but four words.

“We have now very calmly answered the arguments on the opposite side of this question, and we willingly submit the entire subject to our countrymen.

“The position of the master is a very responsible one. Providence has placed under his control human beings whose destiny is, to a great extent, determined by his influence. This race, though inferior, is still a race of human beings, destined to

an immortal existence. He who owns slaves should be deeply impressed with the responsibility of his position. He should feel under most solemn obligations to meet the responsibilities of his position with a clear conscience. The position of the Southern slave-holder is a most singular one. The English language has been exhausted to find epithets sufficiently harsh to apply to him. Poetry and romance, fact and fancy, have been employed with no little skill against him. Emissaries and incendiary missiles have been sent among his people to embitter them against him, and produce a servile war. But for all this, he must go forward and do his duty as a man and as a Christian. He is not to be harsh to the slave because pseudo-philanthropists have endeavored to corrupt him and alienate him from his master. He has duties to perform which may not be omitted.

“1. It is the duty of masters to attend to the physical comfort of their slaves.

“1. It is the duty of masters to see that their slaves are well fed. Slaves should have an abundance of good food. It should be well cooked, and sufficient time allowed the negro to masticate it properly. There should be sufficient variety. He should have meat in abundance; his constitution requires this. Vegetables of different kinds, potatoes, peas, beans, cabbage, etc., should be allowed him, together with soup, milk, and good bread. In regard to the preparation of food, there are two plans in the South. One is, to give a sufficient quantity of food to each family, and let them prepare it separately. The other plan is to have a cook, who shall prepare the food, and let them all eat at the public table. We believe this latter plan the best. It insures the food to be better cooked; and the supply of vegetables is usually much greater on the latter plan. Negroes are fond of eating; they eat slowly, and should generally be allowed from one to two hours for that purpose.

“2. It is the duty of masters to see that their slaves are well clothed. They should be allowed not less than two pairs each of good shoes, and more if necessary. Their feet should be kept from the cold, damp ground. The best masters I have ever known made it a principle to see that their negroes, even if careless and improvident, should be kept supplied with thick, heavy brogans, especially during the Autumn, Winter, and Spring months. Good cotton fabrics should be allowed them

as clothing during the warmer portions of the year, and, during cold weather, woolen goods. Those who are necessarily exposed to inclement weather should have thick, heavy coats, protecting their whole persons; and it would not be amiss to supply them with India-rubber suits in cases of exposure to rain. A good covering for the head, in the shape of a woolen hat, should also be furnished them. Both morality and self-interest should prompt the owner of slaves to conform to the principles here taught.

“3. It is the duty of masters to have comfortable habitations for their servants. The houses should be large, sufficient in number, with good roofs, floors, and chimneys of brick or stone. They should be supplied with beds and bedding. Dr. Smith recommends a mattress made of cotton and shucks, as forming a cheap and comfortable bed. These beds should be supplied with comforts and blankets, so as to insure *comfort* to the negro in his slumbers. When the house is built of logs, the openings between the logs should be carefully closed; when it is a frame, it should be either ceiled or plastered. It is always a gain to the master to afford these comforts to his slaves, and the duty is obligatory upon him, whether it promotes his interest or not. In connection with every house should be a supply of fuel. Good fires are an absolute necessity to the negro.

“4. Proper attention should be paid to the sick. On large plantations a hospital should always be erected. So soon as a negro is attacked with disease he should be taken to the hospital. The family physician should be called in, and an attentive, intelligent nurse required to be at his side. All this should be under the supervision of the master, if possible. He should be often at the bedside of his sick negro, and should see that he has every attention demanded by his condition, and claimed by the feelings of humanity.

“II. The spiritual welfare of the negro should not be neglected.

“The negro is possessed of strong religious sympathies. He is deeply moved at the recital of the Savior’s love. He has great fondness for sacred music. Some of the most touching and plaintive melodies have been sung by pious negroes. They should be required to attend religious meetings. A missionary can always be had to preach to them. He will give them sound religious instruction, improve their morals, excite

them to virtue, repeat to them the teachings of Paul, pray for them, and point them to the Christian's hope and the heavenly inheritance. The children may be placed under catechetical instruction, and early taught the solemn obligations of religion.

"They should be taught the doctrines of the Bible, to remember the Sabbath, to love and fear God, to speak the truth, and to adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things.

"III. Discipline.

"It is the duty of the master to have proper discipline upon the plantation. He is the governor, made so, we verily believe, by the providence of God. Let him see that every thing is kept in order upon the premises. Negroes should be required to perform reasonable labor. This can always be effected without cruelty, and generally without punishment. Idleness is not to be allowed. An idle, thriftless family of negroes will annoy an entire neighborhood.

"In administering punishment, which is sometimes necessary, no cruelty should be allowed. It should be administered in justice, for the sake of reforming the guilty. It should never be administered in anger, but always from a sense of duty, as a means of reformation, and as a terror to evil-doers.

"In the employment of superintendents, a great responsibility rests upon the masters. They should be careful to obtain men of good moral character, conscientious men, who will not overwork their slaves. A virtuous, humane overseer is a great blessing; while a rushing, cruel, unfeeling wretch, is a curse in every point of view. In employing the superintendent, the master should look not only to the size of the crop, but to the welfare of his slaves; to their proper discipline, to the improvement and preservation of their morals, to their physical comfort and their future well-being.

"Mildness and firmness, justice tempered with mercy, should be the great characteristics of the discipline of the slave. In regulating the discipline, suitable rewards, with great propriety, may be given to the industrious and trustworthy. Holidays should be allowed them in which they may enjoy repose, or give themselves to innocent amusements. Some of the best masters and most thrifty planters are in the habit, once or twice a year, of giving their negroes a great feast. Barbecued lambs and pigs and beef are furnished in rich

abundance, and they are fed upon the fat of the land. Such occasions afford suitable opportunities for making a lasting impression upon the heart of the negro, who is by no means inclined to be ungrateful; and they greatly increase the facility of carrying out a proper discipline.

“When a negro commits a crime against the laws of the land, he should be tried by due legal process, and punished accordingly. He should not be smuggled away, and imposed upon another community.

“IV. Social life.

“The social condition of the negro should be attended to. He should be taught that he is a member of society, and, though his condition is humble, that he has duties to perform.

“The marriage relation should be carefully guarded. Negroes should be taught to regard that relation as sacred. They should be encouraged to marry. And in order to secure the sanctity of the marriage vow, every proper effort should be made to effect the permanency of that relation. Masters should not hesitate to buy or sell or exchange, so as to prevent the separation of husband and wife.

“The duties of the parents and children should be taught to them, and young children should not be separated from their parents.

“The duties of masters are violated in the following instances:

“1. When masters fail to give to their servants an abundance of good, wholesome food. To require men to work when they are but half-fed is a cruelty, a burning shame; and no good man will make such a requisition. This is certain to recoil upon the unworthy owner. He does not deserve the respect of his neighbors, nor does he receive it. He ought to be dealt with as the law directs.

“2. These duties are violated when the negroes are suffered to go in rags, with bare feet and head uncovered. It is related of the celebrated John Randolph, that while visiting a benevolent lady, and finding her busily engaged sewing and preparing clothing for the Greeks, he saw a ragged negro slave pass the house. ‘Madam,’ said the eccentric statesman, ‘the Greeks are at your door.’ This was a severe rebuke, but well deserved.

“3. They are violated by those masters who furnish their slaves with miserable hovels, without any comfort whatever;

the rain pours through the roof, the wind whistles through the crevices, the floor is of dirt, and the chimney of wood, and unsupplied with fuel. Such cases are believed to be very rare, but they are as disgraceful as they are rare.

"4. They are violated by those who take no care of the slave while sick; who suffer the sick to pine and die without the attention of either physician or nurse. The man that does this is false to his own interests, false to his responsible position, and false to his God.

"5. These duties are violated by masters who overwork their slaves. To exact labor from slaves which they are not capable of performing is an oppression of no ordinary turpitude. To let them know no rest by day, and but little by night, to require them to go in all weather, during all seasons, is a violation of Christian duty that involves the master in fearful guilt.

"6. These duties are violated by those who pay no attention to their slaves, but give them up entirely to the manager. The master has responsibilities, which he can not transfer to another. He must maintain a general oversight, and see that the manager is doing his duty.

"7. These duties are violated when negroes are forbidden to attend Church; when all spiritual privileges are denied them; when the missionary is not allowed to preach on the plantation; and the young are brought up in heathenish ignorance.

"8. These duties are violated when husbands and wives are separated. When masters, to advance their own interests, sever these sacred ties, they become culpable in the sight of God, and lose the respect of their fellow-men.

"Thus have we endeavored faithfully to obey the apostolic injunction, and earnestly to enforce the duties of masters to their slaves. It is the duty of the slave to be obedient, docile, humble, and faithful. This relation has developed some of the most beautiful virtues of humanity. The old family servant, venerable for his age and long devotion to the interests of his master and his master's family, is beloved by the children, and honored by all. A most tender and lasting affection is often developed between the mistress and the servant who has watched over her in sickness, who has nursed her little ones, and of whose fidelity she can not doubt.

"Let me urge masters, and those who expect to sustain this

relation, to go forward in the discharge of duty, to meet faithfully all their obligations; and a reward, such as the righteous God will give, will afford them boundless fruition in the home of the redeemed.

“Finally, all our remarks apply with equal force to the mistress. Let her be found attending to the duties belonging to her sphere, and she will be rewarded with the gratitude of faithful slaves, with the affection and confidence of the husband to whom she is a helpmeet, with the approbation of her own conscience, and with the smiles of God.” (Rivers’s *Moral Philosophy*, edition of 1859. Article on Slavery.)

Such is the teaching that Southern Methodists were under for a quarter of a century, with nothing upon the opposite side. It would be pleasant to know that such erroneous and corrupting views had passed away with the institution they are intended to defend; but the General Conference at Louisville would not have us so understand. On the 23d of May, 1874, in the Report on Fraternity, that body said: “The position of Southern Methodism on that subject was Scriptural. Our opinions have undergone no change.” The Report of the General Conference of 1858, with the Pastoral Address, and the *Philosophy of Dr. Rivers*, then, express the sentiments of that Church now. These points are presented here because the resolutions of the two Churches can not be apprehended, nor the Southern problem generally understood, without taking them into account. Which has left the original standard of Methodism, the Methodist Episcopal Church or the Southern branch, needs not to be discussed. He that runneth may read.

Nor is it purposed here to answer Dr. Rivers. In the light of the divine denunciations against the sin

of oppression; the fugitive slave law of Exodus xxi, 16: "He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death;" the emancipation proclamation of Leviticus xxv, 10: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof;" the Golden Rule, the whole tenor of Scripture, and the history of the past fifteen years—the Report, the Address, and the Philosophy look like such perversions of the Word of God, as are akin to blasphemy, and one turns from them in abhorrence. But neither fraternity among the Churches, nor reconstruction of the States, will be complete till the lessons of freedom and the value of liberty are learned in the South. When Wesley said that "American slavery is the vilest that ever saw the sun," he uttered a truth which his sons in the South have yet to apprehend. Here is the greatest barrier to fraternal fellowship between the "two Methodisms." On this point the Bible and history are on the side of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

CHAPTER II.

BISHOP ANDREW AND THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

THE questions involved in the case of Bishop Andrew are: The source and prerogatives of our episcopacy; whether a bishop had a right to hold slaves under the Discipline; and whether the action in this case was warranted by the law of the Church. The South affirmed, in defense of the Bishop, that the episcopacy is a co-ordinate branch of the Church, possessing certain ecclesiastical prerogatives, and receiving its authority from Mr. Wesley by ordination. This the North denied; and, on the contrary, maintained that the episcopacy is not prelatial, but the creature of the Church, deriving its powers from the body of ministers by election; the ordination of bishops being an induction into office which could be conferred by elders, and not an elevation to a third and superior order in the ministry. The South affirmed that a bishop was authorized to hold slaves under the Discipline. This the North denied. The South affirmed that the action in this case was extra-judicial and contrary to law. This the North denied. Dr. Myers devotes four chapters to the discussion of this subject. We merely refer to them severally, give his position in ample quotations, and pass to the main points at issue.

The second chapter of the "Disruption" is "Upon the General Conference of 1844," and contains but little at most, and nothing important. The author takes occasion, however, to name some of the "agitators" and "movers of discord" in the North, admits the reception of numerous antislavery petitions by the Conference, and says: "The storm might, perhaps, have been allayed, but for what may be called a conspiracy on the part of the New England delegates." (Page 44.) According to him, the Southern members were meek as lambs and gentle as doves, while those from the North were, in his estimation, "wolves," polluting the streams of ecclesiastical peace, purity, and prosperity.

Chapter three treats of "The Constitutional Powers of the General Conference," in which an ineffectual effort is made to answer the speech of Dr. Hamline, in 1844. If the General Conference has the power which Dr. Hamline claimed for it, that is, to suspend a bishop for "improper conduct," then, says Dr. Myers, "what protection has the individual [a bishop], what appeal, what recourse, against the prejudice, passion, tyranny of this powerful and irresponsible oligarchy? Under the impulse of a temporary madness, it is capable of becoming a monster, fit Protestant counterpart of the hideous Spanish Inquisition." (Page 54.) Again: "Was ever such a monstrous doctrine of judicial supremacy propounded? It reduces the Star Chamber to a mere bagatelle. Here [the General Conference] is a double-headed monster." (Page 57) Who can believe that Dr. Myers thought he was acting in

the interest of fraternity when he penned or published these sentences, or many others equally objectionable?

His fourth chapter has this significant heading, namely, "The Perversion of Law by the General Conference of 1844." To say the least, this assumption of the chairman of the commissioners of the Southern Church is not over modest. Who made him judge of law in the Methodist Episcopal Church? In this chapter the following efforts at argument may be found, namely: "Who was the culprit now, the bishop [Andrew] or the General Conference, which, by deposing him from the superintendency, and yet leaving him a superintendent, did make a regulation that, as to him at least, destroyed the itinerant general superintendency?" "That General Conference further infringed the constitutional provision by raising to the episcopacy Dr. Hamline, who had done so much toward deposing Bishop Andrew." (Page 65 and note.) Dr. Summers says: "Perhaps no man living is better acquainted with the matters discussed in this volume than its author." Perhaps not; but what of his logic, of which the above are specimens? On page 66 he says: "The conclusion we reach is, that Dr. Hamline does not show any warrant of law for deposing Bishop Andrew by regular trial; neither does he show any constitutional authority for deposing him, as was done, without trial, merely at the will of the majority."

The fifth chapter considers "The Relation of the Bishops to the General Conference." Here we have the positions which the author was supposed to be

discussing all along, more carefully formulated, as follows :

“The Southern delegates insisted that the ‘episcopacy is a co-ordinate branch of the government,’ and that, ‘in a sense by no means unimportant, the General Conference is as much a *creature* of the episcopacy as the bishops are the creatures of the General Conference.’” (Page 68.)

“I come now to discuss the question, Are the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as the office-theory of the General Conference supposes, mutable functionaries of the Conference—changeable at will? I hope to show that our episcopacy is not that subject and servile thing which this theory would make it.” (Page 69.)

“The historical development of our episcopacy and its functions and prerogatives will prove that the bishops are not ‘creatures’ of the General Conference, and consequently mutable functionaries of that body, removable at will for less than moral apostasy or official delinquency—removable *without charge or trial*.

“It can be established that the Methodist Episcopal Church—much less its General Conference—never created its episcopacy. On the contrary, the episcopacy organized, and gave ecclesiastical vitality to, a number of ‘societies,’ and constituted them into the Methodist Episcopal Church.” (Page 73.)

“Mr. Asbury did not derive his *episcopal* powers—whereby he could set apart men to administer the ordinances—from the Conference of 1784, but from Mr. Wesley, by ordination.” (Page 81.)

“The Methodist Episcopal Church was born out of the societies, and brought into being as a Church, by bishops, who found Methodism a society and, by the prerogatives they *brought with them*, converted it into a Church, and continued to rule over it with defined powers, fixed by *mutual* consent. Our episcopacy had its ‘fountain of authority’ in Mr. Wesley, our Church its fountain of authority in our bishops, and the General Conference of 1844 its fountain of authority in the Conferences representing the Church.

“Thus I establish a co-ordination of functions in *creating* the Church, and out of the Church the General Conference, between the bishops on the one hand, and the body of the

ministry on the other hand; and I show that the Church—and, of course, the Conference, its representative—is more a ‘creature’ of the bishops than they are ‘creatures’ of the Conference. How, then, can our episcopacy be a merely mutable office, conferred and recalled at the will of that body of elders?” (Page 82.)

“These General Conferences believed the bishops to occupy a relation that made them eligible to co-ordinate legislative powers, and they were so little ‘subject’ to that body that it could not add to their powers—much less take them away without the assent of the annual conferences.” (Page 83.)

“The facts above offered prove that the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church did not consider themselves, and were not considered by the Church, mere lay figures to adorn the platform of a General Conference, to maintain order, put motions, and decide law questions subject to correction by that body, and, unless decapitated, in conformity to its ‘sense’ about some disability incurred by them, to go forth animated statues—vitalized by the breath of gracious *approval*—to execute its behests for another four years, and come back again to this august body, hopeful that no perfectly legitimate act, performed all unwittingly of its terrible consequences, had so ‘embarrassed the exercise of their office as itinerant general superintendents’ as to make it ‘the sense of the Conference that they desist from its exercise.’

“Such a theory of our episcopacy the fathers never held. It was born amid the chaos of 1844—the offspring of power in wedlock with abolitionism.” (Page 85.)

We will not take up these quotations *seriatim*. It is not necessary to do so. They all bear upon one point—Bishop Andrew and the General Conference—and the whole force of these four chapters, unitedly, goes to show that Bishop Andrew was unlawfully and unjustly deposed from the office of bishop, for holding slaves. This was the only charge against him. If we prove, as will be done, that the General Conference acted wisely and with full authority in the case, such proof will leave the assertions, and the

deductions from them which make up these chapters, lying, in the mass, in the condition of Goliath after David had taken off his head. All of these theories and suppositions as to what the General Conference can and can not do, would then appear as a mere waste of words. This is the task now proposed, nor is it very difficult of accomplishment.

But there is another question in this connection which should be settled first; that is, Was Bishop Andrew deposed from the episcopal office by the General Conference of 1844? He either was, or was not, so deposed. If he was not, then all of the accusations against the Methodist Episcopal Church for injustice, oppression, and tyranny, with which the very air of the South has been fouled, were false and unfounded—only assumptions with which to excite and prejudice the people against that Church. If he was deposed from office, then he was no more a bishop. To depose is to divest of office. Instead of doing that, the General Conference simply expressed an opinion—that it was its “sense,” or judgment, that Bishop Andrew should “desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment [slavery] remained.” The writer of the resolution which was adopted said: “We do not depose him as a bishop.” Many of the leading members expressed themselves emphatically as entertaining the same view. This was the judgment of the General Conference, as is certain from the fact that, by a vote of one hundred and fifty-five to seventeen, his name was left on the official documents of the Church with those of the other bishops; and, by a vote of one hun-

dred and fifty-two to fourteen, his support was provided for as a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Thus the General Conference of 1844 left him a bishop, ready to be assigned to episcopal work whenever he should free himself from slavery. It is certain from this action that the Conference did not, nor did it intend to, depose Bishop Andrew.

On the day after the General Conference adjourned, the fifty-one Southern delegates held a meeting, and unanimously adopted the following resolution, to wit:

“Resolved, That, in the event the bishops do not assign Bishop Andrew work, he be, and hereby is, requested, as far as is in his power, to attend and preside in our conferences.”

Does that look as if they thought Bishop Andrew was deposed from the episcopacy?

Within a year from this time—namely, May 1, 1845—the Southern Convention met at Louisville, and, on the first day of the Convention, before the Southern Church was organized, while the bishop and all of the delegates were yet in the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Convention invited, by resolution, the “bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church now in attendance to preside over the meeting.” These bishops were Soule and Andrew, both of whom accepted the invitation and presided, as requested. This action of the Convention is proof that the members of this body also knew, whatever may have been said, that Bishop Andrew was not deposed in or by the Methodist Episcopal Church. On Saturday, the 17th of the same month, this Convention, which had been sitting from day to day under the presidency

of Bishops Soule and Andrew, resolved itself into the M. E. Church South, by the adoption of a report to that effect. At the next session, which was on Monday following, Bishop Andrew was invited by the Convention, or Church, to "unite with, and become a regular and constitutional bishop of the M. E. Church South, upon the basis of the Plan of Separation." The invitation was formally accepted on the same day. Certainly these men knew that Bishop Andrew was not deposed. From that day forward, for more than twenty-five years—till the time of his death—the M. E. Church South has accepted and honored Bishop Andrew as a regular and constitutional bishop of that Church. And now, in 1875, Dr. Myers writes a book, in the interest of fraternity, to show that the Methodist Episcopal Church did a great wrong to the South by unlawfully and unjustly deposing Bishop Andrew!

If he was really deposed in 1844, the Louisville Convention of 1845, which organized the M. E. Church South, must have been guilty of stupendous fraud and falsehood in foisting upon that denomination one whom the delegates must have known was deposed from the episcopal office—if such was the fact—as a "regular and constitutional bishop." Further, if Bishop Andrew was deposed in 1844, he, not having been restored to office after that date, and so not authorized anew to ordain ministers, could not lawfully do so. What, then, is the character of the ordination parchments which he has distributed over the South since that time? Are they all invalid? They must be worthless—a sham and a mockery—if

Bishop Andrew was deposed. Dr. Myers, who, according to Dr. Summers, knows more than any other man living about the matter, says he was deposed by a "double-headed monster," an "irresponsible oligarchy," "fit Protestant counterpart of the hideous Spanish Inquisition," in comparison with which the supremacy of the "Star Chamber" is "a mere bagatelle!" Dr. Myers knows and must be correct, though all of the world think to the contrary; and the Louisville Convention must, then, according to this authority, have picked up and palmed off upon the Southern Church a deposed bishop, and hundreds of the ministers are carrying about invalid parchments bearing the signature of a deposed bishop.

Were it not for the fact that "perhaps no man living is better acquainted with" these matters than the author of these four laborious chapters, written to show that Bishop Andrew was "unlawfully" and "unconstitutionally" deposed by a "double-headed monster," we should conclude that there must be some mistake about this unfortunate and complicated case. But how can there be? He must have been deposed, and that "double-headed monster" did it; and numbers of preachers have been administering the sacraments and marrying people all over the South, white as well as colored, on the authority of a deposed bishop! What wretched work that "double-headed monster" has done! We can see no way out of this dilemma but through the "organic union" of the Southern Church with the Methodist Episcopal Church—but for our Southern brethren to take refuge under that same "double-headed mon-

ster," the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and that, we fear, would be harder for some of them to bear now than would have been the "deposition" of the Bishop, had that been done.

Seriously, Bishop Andrew was not deposed; and neither Dr. Myers, nor any one else with ordinary good judgment, acquainted with the facts, believes that he was. They have known to the contrary all of the time. The abuse heaped so lavishly upon the Methodist Episcopal Church in this case has been not only unjust, but absolutely causeless, except to cultivate prejudice against the North by the Southern Church. But, as it was expected that Bishop Andrew would regard the judgment of the General Conference and desist from the exercise of the functions of his office, this action practically amounted to a temporary suspension in, though not a deposition from, the episcopacy. Dr. Myers assumes that the General Conference was not authorized to do even this. We claim that it was. Dr. Myers holds that the bishops are a co-ordinate power in the Church, and not the creatures of the General Conference. This we deny. The bishops are created by the General Conference, and derive their ecclesiastical authority from that body; are subject to it, are made, and can be deposed, suspended, or reprovved by it; the episcopacy being an office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and not a third and higher order in its ministry, with prerogatives not conferred by the General Conference.

Dr. Myers, in the extracts given, assumes the

opposite ground, which is, no doubt, that of the Southern Church—at least of many of the leading minds in it—and was indorsed by the General Conference at Louisville, 1874, in the Report on Fraternity; but it is not the position of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and never has been. It is a sort of High-churchism, which sprung up in 1844, in the defense of Bishop Andrew. The Methodist Episcopal Church has always held that the bishops were the creatures of, and subject to, the General Conference; and hence that body had a right, not only to ask Bishop Andrew to desist from performing episcopal functions, but, if it found it necessary to do so, to compel him to desist, or to suspend or depose, as, in the judgment of that body, circumstances should require. In support of this ground, and in defense of the action of 1844, against the theories of Dr. Myers, we present two lines of argument to show that the episcopacy is not co-ordinate with, but subordinate to, the General Conference.

Webster defines co-ordinate thus: “Being of the same order, or of the same rank or degree; not subordinate.” Dr. Peck observes: “In this sense I understood the word to be used in the Protest” of the Southern delegates against the action in the case of Bishop Andrew. That Dr. Myers so uses the term is evident from the quotations given from him. (Pages 68, 82, 83.) The first of these, especially, indicates that Dr. Peck was correct in his understanding of the Protest. Dr. Bascom, however, in his “Review of the Reply to the Protest,” puts a somewhat, but not essentially different, construction upon

the sense of the word as used by him in the Protest. He says:

“The Protest, in assuming episcopacy to be a co-ordinate branch of the government, intended to convey the idea usually conveyed by such phrase—that it is an *independent department*, a separate sphere of executive power and action, standing in the same relation to the constitution that the General Conference does; that is to say, as the episcopacy can not constitutionally invade in any way the rights and powers of the General Conference, so the General Conference has no constitutional right to touch, in any form, the vested rights of the episcopacy.” (Review, page 154.)

If Dr. Bascom intends to say—as he does say—that the episcopacy is an “independent department” of the government, he must agree essentially with Webster. If this is not his idea, he is talking at random and without point, as at other times is the case in his “Review.” Dr. Peck replies to the above thus:

“The explanatory part of this passage comes short of ‘the idea usually conveyed by the phrase.’ It may be conceded, that, as the episcopacy can not constitutionally invade, in any way, the rights and powers of the General Conference, so the General Conference has no constitutional right to touch, in any form, the *vested* rights of the episcopacy. ‘If by “vested” he mean fixed, not in a state of contingency or suspension,’ no one will dispute him. And if he only mean, by a ‘co-ordinate branch of the government,’ a branch that the ‘General Conference has no right to touch,’ so far as it is covered by the restrictive rules, the proposition of the Protest, that ‘the episcopacy is a co-ordinate branch of the government,’ is a mere truism. This, however, is not his meaning; for this sense would nullify the whole argument of the Protest, and convict its signers of gross folly. But if he mean, by a ‘co-ordinate branch,’ ‘an independent department,’ ‘not subordinate,’ then we must dissent from him. And that this is the true doctrine of the Protest and the ‘Review’ is as clear as the sun in the heavens.” (Slavery and the Episcopacy, pp. 65, 66.)

We may add that this is clearly the doctrine of Dr. Myers, as our quotations prove, and that of the Church South, and now proceed to show that it is *not* that of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Our first argument is based upon the nature of things—upon the mutual relations of the episcopacy and the General Conference. Wesley claimed that he was, and he is admitted by Methodists to have been, a Scriptural bishop, though only an elder or presbyter in the Church of England. In the order of Providence, he was especially called to exercise, over the people raised up under his ministry, all of the superintendence or authority of a bishop in an organized Church. He was bishop of the early Methodists by divine appointment; but he has had no successor in that relation to the Methodist people in Europe or America—did not expect any. Those after him claimed to be appointed, not of God, but by the Church. He did not expect the Wesleyan Church of England to appoint a bishop in his stead, but made other provisions for the perpetuity of the work in that country. Mr. Wesley said, and recorded in the Minutes of the Conference: “To me the preachers have engaged themselves to submit—to serve me as sons in the Gospel—but they are not thus engaged to any man, or number of men, besides. To me the people in general will submit; but they will not submit to any other.”

Much less did he claim to be the head and bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church after that was severed from the work in England by the results of the war of independence, and it had become a

distinct organization. Neither could he nor did he attempt to appoint a successor for America; but he, being an elder of the Church of England, with the aid of other elders, ordained Dr. Coke to the *office* of bishop, holding that relation to be, not a superior order in the ministry, but an office, only, in the Church. Nor was he appointed to this office so much to exercise episcopal authority over the American Methodists as to convey to them the sacraments. They already had a superintendent—Mr. Asbury—but as most of the ordained ministers (of the English Church), of whom there had been but few, had returned to England during the war, the people were left almost, though not wholly, without baptism or the communion; and it was believed that the time had come when Methodist preachers in America should be ordained.

To supply this lack, Dr. Coke was authorized, by the laying on of hands in a Scriptural manner by Mr. Wesley and others, to ordain ministers in America, with the advice and consent of the Conference. But Dr. Coke was appointed by Mr. Wesley as an American bishop, Dr. Myers asserts. Not so; neither his ordination nor appointment made him superintendent, and Dr. Coke so understood; for, as soon as he reached New York, he was solicited to enter upon the exercise of episcopal functions, but declined to do so until the Conference had acted. If his ordination made him a bishop, it did not give him a Church, but left him as a shepherd without sheep, a general without an army, an officer qualified to enter upon the duties of office when that should be given

him by the action of those over whom he was to preside. He was elected by the Conference, and thus his induction into the episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church became complete. The case of Bishop Asbury was still more clear. He was elected both to the office and to ordination by the Conference, his orders being "confirmed," merely, by Bishop Coke, as the bishops so clearly state in their address to the General Conference of 1844.

The appointment of Bishops Coke and Asbury to the superintendence of the Church in this country, by Mr. Wesley, amounted to, and was recognized by the Conference as, only a nomination or recommendation to that office. Dr. Myers says that Mr. Asbury, without the consent of the preachers, the Conference, "might have proceeded to exercise, by prerogative, all of the power to which Mr. Wesley appointed him." (Page 76.) But the Conference would not and did not allow of such a proceeding, and without the Conference he would have been a bishop without a Church, if a bishop at all. Dr. Myers's statement is contrary to the facts. In 1786 Mr. Wesley recommended the appointment of Richard Whatcoat to the episcopacy, and Bishop Coke assumed that this amounted to an appointment as superintendent, and that he ought to be accepted as such, as the other bishops had been; but the Conference did not so regard it, and declined, at that time, to elect Mr. Whatcoat. The appointment of Mr. Wesley did not constitute Mr. Whatcoat a bishop. He did not claim a right to, nor power to exercise, the functions of the office till elected by ballot, with

no little formality, by the Conference in 1800. (Journal General Conference, Vol. I, pp. 35, 36.)

This was the position maintained by Bishop Asbury from the first in reference to the episcopacy. For years he had acted as assistant to Mr. Wesley, as a missionary superintendent of the work in America, by Mr. Wesley's appointment *and the consent of the Conference*; but when the Church adopted an independent organization, this relation to Mr. Wesley and this authority from him ceased, and the appointment came wholly from the Conference. Mr. Asbury declined to accept the office of bishop unless he should be elected thereto by the Conference, and said, "If the preachers unanimously choose me, I shall not act in the capacity I have hitherto done by Mr. Wesley's appointment;" that is, he would act by appointment of the Conference, and not from Mr. Wesley. In direct opposition to the assumption of Dr. Myers, this Conference of 1784, which elected both Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury, said in the Minutes, and so ingrafted the provision into the Discipline, to wit: "No person shall be ordained a superintendent, elder, or deacon, without the consent of a majority of the Conference." No bishop has ever been appointed to, or over, or in any way constituted a bishop of, the Methodist Episcopal Church, without election by the Conference. The Conference, at the organization of the Church, adopted this rule, and there has never been a time when a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church could be constituted otherwise.

This Conference voluntarily acknowledged itself

ready, in matters of Church government, to obey *Mr. Wesley during his life-time*, but did not agree to obey any one whom he might designate, to exercise such authority before or after his death; and, 1787, this action was rescinded, and Mr. Wesley's name left off the Minutes, and, as already seen, his appointment of Mr. Whatcoat, bishop, was rejected. (See Emory's "Defense," p. 123.)

The idea of electing the superintendent by the Conference was not altogether new at the organization of the Church in 1784. Before this date, namely, in 1778, only twelve years after the first sermon was preached in New York, and six years before the Christmas Conference, the Minutes contain this question and answer, namely:

"Ought not brother Asbury to act as general assistant in America?"

"*Answer.* He ought: first, on account of his age; second, because originally appointed by Mr. Wesley; third, by being joined with Messrs. Rankin and Shadford by express order of Mr. Wesley." (Minutes of Conferences, Vol. I, p. 10.)

The first reason given above is not the appointment of Mr. Wesley, as Dr. Myers would have answered, but because he was the one desired by the Conference. That said modestly, "on account of his age," when he was but thirty-three years old, and had been but seven years in America. In 1780 the Conference asked this question, namely: "What shall the Conference do in case of brother Asbury's death or absence?" The reply was not, Send to Mr. Wesley for a superintendent, but "Meet once a year, and act according to the Minutes." In 1782, two

years before the Christmas Conference and the election or appointment of Coke and Asbury as bishops, the 19th Question of the Minutes read thus, namely:

“Do the brethren in Conference unanimously choose brother Asbury to act according to Mr. Wesley's original appointment, and preside over the American conferences and the whole work?”

“*Answer.* Yes.”

The Conference next preceding the organization of the Church ordered that the ministers be “subject to Francis Asbury as general assistant while he stands approved by Mr. Wesley and the Conference.” (Minutes of Conferences, Vol. I, pp. 12, 17, 21.)

Thus, it appears that, even before the separation from Mr. Wesley, the Conference had a voice in the appointment of assistant. It had full power in the case afterward, and asserted the right to do so at the organization of the Church in 1784 by three distinct and separate acts, namely: first, by electing Coke and Asbury to the episcopacy, instead of accepting them as bishops by appointment of Mr. Wesley; second, by providing that none could be elevated to, or received in, that office, except by election by the Conference; and, third, by unequivocally assuming that the Conference now, having received deacon's and elder's orders, could create bishops independent of Mr. Wesley and all others, by election and ordination by the Conference.

The fathers of the Methodist Episcopal Church did not look to Mr. Wesley as the source of ecclesiastical authority, but to the Church. If, at any time after its organization, the Church had been

without bishops, it would not have returned to Mr. Wesley or to the British Conference or elsewhere for authority to create one or more, but simply to its own power and resources. What Mr. Wesley sent to America by Dr. Coke was ministerial orders for the proper administration of the sacraments, rather than episcopal authority. Power to confer the latter was inherent in the Church, and exercised by the Conference, jointly with Mr. Wesley from the first till the meeting of the Christmas Conference; independently of him afterward. The Southern delegates in 1844 made, in their famous "Protest," the same mistake that Dr. Myers does, and said that the General Conference can not create a bishop, because it has not the power to ordain, when the Discipline said directly to the contrary, namely, that in case of the death of all of the bishops, the General Conference should elect and the elders ordain one.

To be more specific, the Christmas Conference provided not only that "no person shall be ordained a superintendent (or bishop) without the consent of a majority of the Conference," but, also, that, "if by death or otherwise there be no superintendent remaining in our Church, the Conference shall elect a superintendent, and the elders, or three of them, shall ordain him." (See Emory or Sherman.) These provisions have never been abrogated, but still remain in the Discipline. This Conference further said: "We formed ourselves into an independent Church, making the episcopal office elective, and the elected superintendent, or bishop, amenable to the body of ministers or preachers." (Minutes of

Conferences, Vol. I, p. 22.) This view of the case is confirmed by the Conference of 1800, which said: "In case of the death, dismissal, or resignation of the superintendent, in the recess of the General Conference, the Philadelphia Conference shall have power to appoint another superintendent until the next General Conference." (General Conference Journal, Vol. I, p. 46.) There is no reference here to Mr. Wesley, or any authority whatever outside of the Conference. From the foregoing it is certain that the Conference, after receiving ministerial orders of deacon and elder from Mr. Wesley, through Bishop Coke, claimed full power to perpetuate these orders; and that they saw fit to do this through the episcopacy, an office of their creation, and to which they had power to ordain a person elected thereto by themselves. The Conference had power both to elect and to ordain—that is, to create the episcopacy.

In 1808 a delegated General Conference was provided for, and to this delegated body this authority was explicitly transferred. The Discipline upon this subject then read as follows: "How is a bishop to be constituted? *Answer.* By the election of the General Conference, and the laying on of hands," etc.; and if there were no bishop, the General Conference could then both elect and ordain. These provisions, being in the Discipline of 1808, were transferred from the entire body of ministers, the annual conferences, to the delegated body, with full powers to make rules and regulations for the maintenance of the episcopacy, or to create this agency in the Church, if it became extinct. The office was to be perpetual, and

to the delegated General Conference was given authority to fill it in any case. Dr. Myers holds that the bishops created the Church, and not the Church the bishops. In this he is mistaken. When Bishop Coke came to America, he found a Church, with eighteen thousand members, regularly organized into classes and societies, with all of the essentials of a Christian Church, including the sacraments. He simply brought authority from Mr. Wesley to ordain others to administer these rights to the people in an orderly manner, and more frequently than had been done before.

The episcopacy is not only a creature of the General Conference, but, being created by it, is necessarily subordinate to that body. This was the original design, as the Christmas Conference declared in these words, already quoted:

“We formed ourselves into an independent Church, making the episcopal office elective, and the elected superintendent, or bishop, amenable to the body of the ministers or preachers.” (Minutes Conferences, Vol I, p. 22.)

This Conference further asked, “To whom is the superintendent amenable for his conduct?” *Answer.* “To the Conference,” and, in 1792, “To the General Conference.” The authority of the body of ministers in this particular was conferred upon the delegated General Conference in 1808, so that this body, as now constituted, has full power in the case by specific action.

The conferences, both in England and America, acted agreeably to this fact. When Bishop Coke returned to England, some objected to his course in

signing the address to President Washington with Bishop Asbury; and for thus acting "improperly as a British subject," he was censured and nominally suspended for a year, by having his name left off the Minutes by action of the Conference. The British Conference held him as much subject to its authority after his ordination to the episcopacy as before. The American Conference did the same thing, requiring him to sign an agreement not to exercise episcopal authority while out of this country, thus actually suspending him in office on certain conditions; and in 1787 the authority of Mr. Wesley over the American Church was denied.

That the action of the Conference in reference to the episcopacy was in harmony with the views of our first bishop, Dr. Coke, a man of culture and extensive learning, is apparent from his sermon preached at the organization of the Church, at the Christmas Conference, of 1784, at which Dr. Coke was received by the Conference as a bishop by election, and Francis Asbury was elected and ordained to the office, and on the occasion of the ordination of Mr. Asbury, from which we take the following:

"God has given us sufficient resources in ourselves, and, after mature deliberation, we believe that we are called to draw them forth.

"'But what right have you to ordain?' The same right as most of the reformed Churches in Christendom; our ordination, in its lowest view, being equal to any of the Presbyterian, as originating with three presbyters of the Church of England.

"'But what right have you to exercise the episcopal office?' To me the most manifest and clear. God has been pleased, by Mr. Wesley, to raise up in America and Europe a numerous society, well known by the name of Methodists. The whole

body have invariably esteemed this man as their chief pastor, under Christ. He has constantly appointed all their religious officers, from the highest to the lowest, by himself or his delegate. And we are fully persuaded there is no Church office which he judges expedient for the welfare of the people intrusted to his charge, but, as essential to his station, he has a power to ordain. After long deliberation, he saw it his duty to form his society in America into an independent Church; but he loved the most excellent liturgy of the Church of England, he loved its rites and ceremonies, and therefore adopted them in most instances for the present case.

“Besides, in addition to this, we have every qualification for an episcopal Church which that of Alexandria (a Church of no small note in the primitive times) possessed for two hundred years; our bishops, or superintendents (as we rather call them), having been elected or received by the suffrages of the whole body of our ministers through the continent, assembled in General Conference.

“‘But do n’t you break the succession?’ The uninterrupted succession of bishops is a point that has been long given up by the ablest Protestant defenders of episcopacy. Bishop Hoadly, in his controversy with Dr. Calamy, allows it to be unnecessary. His words are: ‘To the thirteenth question I answer, that I think not an *uninterrupted line of succession* of regularly ordained bishops necessary.’ He also grants the authenticity of the anecdote given us by St. Jerome, which informs us that the Church of Alexandria, mentioned above, had no regular succession from the time of St. Mark the evangelist, the first bishop of that Church, to the time of Dionysius, a space of two hundred years; but the college of presbyters, on the death of a bishop, elected another in his stead. We are also informed from the epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians, written soon after the death of St. Paul, that the Church of Corinth was then governed by a college of presbyters. And from the epistle of St. Polycarp to the Church of Philippi, written in the year of our Lord 116, we also find that the Christian Philippians were then governed only by a college of presbyters. So that the primitive Christians were so far from esteeming the *regular succession* as essential to the constitution of a Christian Church, that, in some instances, *episcopacy itself* was wholly omitted.” (Quarterly Review, 1840, pp. 242, 243.)

Dr. Coke held the truly devout, beautiful and evangelical letter of Clement in higher esteem than has the Church generally, but his views of the episcopacy were indorsed by the Conference of 1784, and have been maintained by the Methodist Episcopal Church till the present time. The bishop makes two points of vital interest; namely, 1. The Conference established a true and Scriptural episcopacy; and 2. It did this by authority inherent in the Church, Conference, or body of elders. The first of these points is illustrated and impressed by his reference to Clement and Polycarp; the second is apparent from the quotation from Jerome.

Clement was a disciple of the apostle Peter, and afterward bishop, or overseer, of the Church at Rome, and as such stands as an illustration of the sort of episcopacy instituted by this Conference. In a letter to the Corinthians, referred to by Dr. Coke, he says :

“Christ, therefore, was sent by God, the apostles by Christ, so both were orderly sent, according to the will of God. For, having received their command, they went abroad, publishing that the kingdom of God was at hand; and thus, preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first-fruits of their conversions to be bishops and ministers over such as should afterward believe, having first proved them by the Spirit.”

“Nor was this any thing new,” as he argues from the incident of the rod of Aaron which budded, and then adds:

“So likewise our apostles knew, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there should contention arise upon the account of the ministry. And therefore, having a perfect foreknowledge of this, they appointed persons, as we have before said, and then gave direction [left a list, says Archbishop Wake, from whose translation we quote], when they should die, other chosen and

appointed men should succeed in their ministry. Wherefore we can not think that those may justly be thrown out of their ministry who were either appointed by them [the apostles], or afterward chosen by other eminent men with the consent of the whole Church, and who have, with all lowliness and innocency, ministered to the flock of Christ, in peace and without self-interest, and were for a long time commended by all."

From the above it would appear that, after the decease of those appointed by the apostles, ministers—that is, presbyters and deacons, including bishops, or overseers—were "chosen by eminent men, with the consent of the whole Church." This bishop, in the primitive Church, while indorsing episcopal authority or government by his example, says in his letter to the Church in Corinth, then under the administration of the presbytery, or elders, "Let the flock of Christ be in peace, with the elders that are set over it." We conclude that Bishop Coke was correct in supposing that Clement held to the idea that an episcopacy, or superintendency, created by the presbytery, or body of ministers, after the decease of the apostles, was valid, and agreeable to the authority and teachings of the New Testament.

The reference to the epistle of Polycarp is perhaps equally suggestive, especially if taken in connection with those of Ignatius to him, and to the Church over which he presided. Polycarp served the Church at Smyrna for more than eighty years as pastor, and bishop, or overseer, having been recommended thereto—or appointed, as suggested by Clement in the quotation above—by the apostle John, and was burned at the stake in Smyrna, A. D. 166. He was the friend and disciple of Ignatius, who was

the senior of Polycarp, and for forty years bishop, or overseer, at Antioch. Ignatius was educated under the apostle John, and personally acquainted with Peter and Paul. He was arrested at Antioch, and sent in chains to Rome, where he was thrown to lions. On his way to Rome he stopped at Smyrna, and from there wrote letters to the Churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, Trallia, Rome, and Philadelphia, and, while on the journey from Smyrna to Rome, wrote back to Polycarp, and also to the Church under his care.

In his letter to the Church at Smyrna, Ignatius says:

“Follow your bishop as Jesus Christ the Father, and the presbytery as the apostles. Let no man do any thing of what belongs to the Church separately from the bishop. Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people also be; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic Church.”

Through all of his epistles he enjoins affectionate obedience to the bishop, using the *singular* number, as the head, or, as he says to the Magnesians, the “well-wrought spiritual crown of your presbytery.” The letter to this father opens thus: “Ignatius to Polycarp, Bishop of the Church which is at Smyrna, their overseer, but rather himself overlooked by God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Here is certainly the recognition of an episcopacy or superintendency. Such an episcopacy Dr. Coke claims, and we think justly, to have assisted in establishing in the Methodist Episcopal Church. His reference to Clement and Polycarp leaves us no room to doubt his purpose at this point. Polycarp, as clearly as

Clement, further recognizes this episcopacy; for while he exhorts the Church at Philippi, then governed by presbyters, to be "subject to the priests [or elders] and deacons, as unto God and Christ," in the same letter he speaks of "the blessed Ignatius," and of his "epistles which he wrote unto us"—including these commendations of episcopal administration—"by which ye may be greatly profited; for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that pertain to edification in the Lord Jesus." We may add that there is nothing more explicitly mentioned in these letters of Ignatius, which are thus commended by Polycarp, than the bishop, or overseer of the Church, often using the singular number, and thus referring to an individual filling the office of superintendent over the Church, and not to the body of elders or presbyters as "bishops."

Dr. Stevens, in "Church Polity," Chapter V, makes it appear plainly that bishops and presbyters were of the same order in the ministry; and that this order, in the early Church, was the same as that of elder in the Jewish synagogue; and that these terms, in the times of the apostles and afterward, were used interchangeably; and that presbyters ordained to that order and also to the office of president, or overseer. He also quotes from Watson, page 39—excellent authority among Methodists—showing that "each synagogue had its rulers, elders or presbyters, of whom one was the angel of the Church, or minister of the synagogue, who superintended the public service," but was not "elevated in order above the rest." As the order of elders was

transferred to the new Church, so this office evidently accompanied it, and John in the Revelation uses the term "Angel of the Church" repeatedly in this sense; and, further, Polycarp was, without doubt, this "Angel of the Church of Smyrna," spoken of by John, and is called by Ignatius the "overseer" of that Church. Clement, at Rome, and Ignatius, at Antioch, filled the same office in the Church. This is primitive episcopacy, though not distinctively designated as such by this title till later years. It is an office among elders or presbyters, and was introduced into the Methodist Episcopal Church by Mr. Wesley through Dr. Coke, and his reference to these primitive bishops, at the organization of the Church and at the first ordination in America, seems to have been peculiarly opportune, not to say providential.

We know very well that some of the epistles of Ignatius have been called spurious, and that they are said to have been interpolated. But, on the other hand, others of them, and enough to prove all that is here claimed, are unquestionably genuine. It should also be remembered that some writers have, at least, seemed to question the authority of these epistles because they give such unequivocal support to the fact of an episcopal government in the early Church, and that others have disputed their testimony because that episcopacy was manifestly not prelatical.

The method by which such an episcopacy could be, and at least in some instances unquestionably was, constituted after the death of the apostles, in the judgment of Dr. Coke, is explicitly stated on the

authority of Jerome, one of the most learned writers of the fourth century, to be by election and ordination by the presbytery, or body of ministers. The notes on the Discipline of 1792, by Coke and Asbury, as given by Dr. Peck, say :

“The authority given to, or rather declared to exist in, the General Conference, that, in case there shall be no bishop remaining in the Church, they shall elect a bishop, and authorize the elders to consecrate him, will not admit of an objection, except on the supposition that the fable of an uninterrupted apostolic succession be allowed to be true. St. Jerome, who was as strong an advocate for episcopacy as perhaps any in the primitive Church, informs us that, in the Church of Alexandria (which was, in ancient times, one of the most respectable of the Churches), the college of presbyters not only elected a bishop, on the decease of the former, but *consecrated him by the imposition of their hands solely*, from the time of St. Mark, their first bishop, to the time of Dionysius, which was a space of about two hundred years; and the college of presbyters, in ancient times, answered to our General Conference.” (Slavery and the Episcopacy, p. 80.)

We do not see how any thing can well be more clear than these conclusions, namely:

1. That Bishop Coke believed and taught that if the Church or presbytery at Corinth or Philippi had elected and ordained one of their number as bishop or superintendent of the Church, such a one would have been as truly a bishop or overseer under Christ and the New Testament as was Mark at Alexandria, Clement at Rome, or Polycarp at Smyrna, though these may have been appointed directly by one or more of the apostles.

2. That he assisted in establishing in the Methodist Episcopal Church an episcopacy essentially like that of the primitive Church.

3. That the body of the eldership has all the needed authority to constitute such an episcopacy by election and ordination.

The words of Dr. Coke are the more suggestive for the reason that, having come directly from Mr. Wesley in England, he undoubtedly gave expression to his sentiments.

Dr. Stevens also quotes Good's translation of the account given by Eutychius of the affairs at Alexandria, fully corroborating the position of Dr. Coke in relation to the ordination of bishops by elders.

“His words are these: After mentioning that Mark the evangelist went and preached at Alexandria, and appointed Hananias the first patriarch there, he adds: ‘Moreover, he appointed twelve presbyters with Hananias, who were to remain with the patriarch, so that, when the patriarchate was vacant, they might elect one of the twelve presbyters, upon whose head the other eleven might place their hands and bless him [or invoke a blessing upon him], and create him patriarch, and then choose some excellent man, and appoint him presbyter with themselves in the place of him who was thus made patriarch, that thus there might always be twelve. Nor did this custom respecting the presbyters, namely, that they should create their patriarchs from the twelve presbyters, cease at Alexandria until the times of Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was of the number of the three hundred and eighteen [bishops at Nice]. But he forbade the presbyters to create the patriarch for the future, and decreed that, when the patriarch was dead, the bishops should meet together and ordain the patriarch. Moreover, he decreed that, on a vacancy of the patriarchate they should elect, either from any part of the country, or from those twelve presbyters, or others, as circumstances might prescribe, some excellent man, and create him patriarch. And thus that ancient custom, by which the patriarch used to be created by the presbyters, disappeared, and in its place succeeded the ordinance for the creation of the patriarch by the bishops.’” (Church Polity, pp. 58, 59.) •

The itinerant, joint, and general character of our episcopacy has for its support the example of the college of apostles, and combines unity of administration with diversity of gifts, multiplicity of labors and influence and a remarkable unified aggregate of skill and judgment in directing the affairs of the Church.

If any should inquire, What might have been done in case Mr. Wesley had not yielded to the solicitations of the American Methodists for ministerial orders? we reply, in the words of Dr. Peck (*Slavery and the Episcopacy*): "Had Mr. Wesley utterly refused to send over ordained men to assist them in their organization, they would have been justified in seeking orders from some other source. Ordination by the Rev. Mr. Otterbine (Mr. Asbury's friend, who, with Dr. Coke and others, laid hands on him) would have been as good as that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a thousand times better than that of the Pope of Rome;" or, with Dr. Stevens, "This just claim of American Methodism could not be effectually refused."

That Mr. Asbury entertained similar opinions upon this subject is clear, as we have already said, and as also the notes on the Discipline by the two bishops jointly prove. In these they say, in addition to the above taken from Dr. Peck, that they are "entirely dependent on the General Conference," "as responsible as any of the preachers," "perfectly subject to the General Conference," perfectly dependent; that "their power, usefulness, themselves, are entirely at the mercy of the General Conference." Dr.

Myers tries to explain away the force of this language, but fails, as any one must who undertakes to do so.

Bishop Asbury officially decided upon the question of episcopal authority under circumstances which leave no room for even a shadow of a doubt touching his opinions. In 1806, Bishop Coke proposed a division of conferences between himself and Bishop Asbury. The reply to this suggestion, by the Western Conference, written by M'Kendree, afterward bishop, contained the following, namely: "We would much sooner depose you both." Jacob Young objected to these words. M'Kendree defended them. Bishop Asbury was in the chair, and decided it as a law question, "that the General Conference had the power to depose a bishop when they thought the good of the Church required it, though there might be no charge of improper conduct." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 330, 428, 1,013.) Such has been the position of the Church from the first till now. Other quotations might be added, but that is needless.

At this point one more extract, however, will not be out of place. It is from the address of the bishops to the General Conference of 1844, and is very suggestive because made at the same Conference and preceding the controversy respecting Bishop Andrew, and because indorsed by him. It was signed by Bishops Soule, Hedding, Andrew, Waugh, and Morris, and contains this passage on the episcopal office:

"So far from being irresponsible in their office, they are amenable to the General Conference, not only for their moral

conduct and for the doctrines they teach, but also for the faithful administration of the government of the Church, according to the provisions of the Discipline, and for all decisions which they make on questions of ecclesiastical law. In all these cases this body has original jurisdiction, and may prosecute to final issue in expulsion, from which decision there is no appeal.

“With these safeguards thrown around them, we trust the Church has nothing to fear from the exercise of that authority which has been committed to them in trust, to be used for the conservation of the whole body, and for the extension of the Redeemer’s kingdom, and not to oppress or afflict any.”

Ordination by the bishops they call “confirming orders,” as follows:

“Confirming orders, by ordaining deacons and elders. We say *confirming*, because the orders are *conferred* by another body, which is independent of the episcopal office, both in its organization and action. This confirmation of orders, or ordination, is not by virtue of a distinct and higher *order*. For, with our great founder, we are convinced that bishops and presbyters are the same order in the Christian ministry. And this has been the sentiment of the Wesleyan Methodists from the beginning. But it is by virtue of an *office* constituted by the body of presbyters for the better order of discipline, for the preservation of the unity of the Church, and for carrying on the work of God in the most effectual manner. The execution of this office is subject to two important restrictions, which would be very irrelevant to prelacy, or diocesan episcopacy, constituted on the basis of a distinct and superior order. The latter involves *independent action* in *conferring orders*, by virtue of authority inherent in, and exclusively appertaining to, the episcopacy. But the former is a delegated authority to *confirm orders*, the exercise of which is dependent on another body. The bishop can ordain neither a deacon nor an elder without the election of the candidate by an annual conference; and in case of such election he has no discretionary authority; but is under *obligation* to ordain the person elected, whatever may be his own judgment of his qualifications.” (Journal General Conference, 1844, pp. 154, 155.)

In the debate on the Andrew case, the delegates from the North ably and successfully defended this ground. We conclude that the General Conference had a right to advise, suspend, or depose Bishop Andrew, or any other one of the number, for cause, if there had been no Disciplinary provision touching the question. We shall next show that the Conference acted under law.

The second line of argument which we present on this question is based upon the provisions of the Discipline. There were three points in the book, as it stood in 1844, bearing upon the case. The first is used in defining the powers of the General Conference as follows:

“The General Conference shall have full powers to make rules and regulations for our Church, under the following limitations and restrictions, namely: They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away with episcopacy, or destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency.” (Discipline.)

The second is in the provision made for the trial of a bishop, namely:

“To whom is a bishop amenable for his conduct? *Answer.* To the General Conference, who have power to expel him for improper conduct if they see it necessary.” (Sherman’s History of the Discipline, p. 187.)

The third is in the chapter on slavery, which says:

“1. No slave-holder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter [from 1816], where the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of emancipation and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom. 2. When any traveling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless

he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives." (Sherman's History of the Discipline, p. 118.)

We will speak of the last or third item first. If no official member of the Church or traveling preacher should hold slaves, how much less a bishop! But Bishop Andrew lived in a State that would not allow emancipation. So much the worse for the State, as well as for the bishop. But this point was anticipated. Dr. Elliott says:

"Nor was there any necessity that Bishop Andrew should continue a slave-holder, because many individuals in the North offered formally to bind themselves to purchase all his slaves and their connections, and set them free; but he and his Southern friends refused this, and clung with tenacity to the evil of slavery.

"Were bishops to become slave-holders, then ministers might as truly, under the same circumstances, own and hold slaves. The preachers of the Philadelphia, Baltimore, Ohio, and Pittsburg Conferences, partly in free and partly in slave territory, were free from slavery; so, also, were the Kentucky and Missouri Conferences, though in slave States. The admission of slavery into the episcopacy would lead to its introduction into the ministry in these conferences. In all these conferences the moral feelings of the community revolt against a slave-holding ministry.

"A Methodist bishop is not a bishop of the North or South, but of the whole Church. And as slavery is not tolerated in preachers in the free States, a bishop owning slaves could not be tolerated in the free States, though he resides in the South. For, in reason, it is right that freedom should control bondage; therefore the usage suitable to the free States alone can only be tolerated in a bishop who is as much a bishop in the North as in the South.

"Add to all this, the example of a slave-holding bishop is the same in the North as in the South; and this example *sanc-tions, approves, or even justifies* the very system of slavery. And as this system is a moral evil, and a great moral evil,

slave-holding in the episcopacy would sanction moral wrong and sin, which could not be entertained in the Methodist Episcopal Church, much less be tolerated or sanctioned." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 318, 319.)

Dr. Hamline in his speech in that memorable debate, which was indorsed by the General Conference by his election to the episcopacy, spoke of the Finley resolution and of the general question thus:

"The resolution proposes to suspend the exercise of a bishop's functions on a certain condition to be performed by him. Its passage will absolutely suspend the exercise of the superintendent's *functions*, until he complies with the prescribed condition. The measure of power required to do this is the same which would be requisite to suspend or depose a bishop for such reasons as the resolution mentions, or, in other words, for '*improper conduct*.' Have we, then, such an authority? I shall assume that we have.

"I argue this authority in the General Conference *from the genius of our polity on points which the most nearly resemble this*. Strict amenability in Church officers, subordinate and superior, is provided for in our Discipline. From the class-leader upward, this amenability regards not only major but minor morals—not only the *vices*, but also the *improprieties* of behavior. The class-leader, by mere eccentricity, becomes unpopular in his class. The pastor, at discretion, removes him from his office. The exhorter or unordained local preacher proves unacceptable, and a quarterly conference refuses to renew his license. The itinerant pastor is not useful in charge, and the bishop or presiding elder deposes him from his charge, or from the pastoral office, and makes him an assistant. The presiding elder impairs his usefulness on a district, not by gross *malfeasance*, but by a slight *misfeasance*; or, oftener still, because 'he is not popular;' and the bishop removes him to a station or a circuit, and perhaps makes him an assistant. I speak not now of annual appointments, when the term of the itinerant expires by limitation, but of removals by the bishop or presiding elder in the intervals of conference, which always imply a deposing from office, as well as a stationing act. In all these instances the manner of removing from office is peculiar:

First, it is *summary*, without accusation, trial, or formal sentence. It is a ministerial rather than a judicial act. Second, it is for no crime, and, generally, for no misdemeanor, but for being "unacceptable." Third, most of these removals from office are by a sole agent, namely, by a bishop or a preacher, whose will is omnipotent in the premises. Fourth, the removing officer is not legally obliged to assign any cause for deposing. If he do so, it is through courtesy, and not as of right. Fifth, the deposed officer has no appeal. If indiscreetly or unnecessarily removed, he must submit; for there is no tribunal authorized to cure the error, or to rectify the wrong. But we believe that there are good and sufficient reasons for granting this high power of removal to those who exercise it. It promotes religion. It binds the Church in a strong and almost indissoluble unity. It quickens the communication of healing influences to the infected and the enfeebled parts of the body ecclesiastical. In a word, it is a system of surpassing energy. By it executive power is sent, in its most efficient form and without loss of time, from its highest sources or remotest fountains, through the preachers and class-leaders, to the humblest member of the Church. The system is worthy of all eulogy.

"We will now inquire as to the bishop. In his case is this strong feature of Methodism lost sight of? Is he, who can, at discretion, by himself or by his agents, remove from office so many, among whom are thousands of his co-ordinates or peers, subject in turn to no such summary control? We have seen that, to lodge this power of removal in superior, and impose submission to it on inferior, officers, is the fashion of Methodism. She loves the system. She carries it up through many grades of office until we reach the bishop. Does it suddenly stop there? If so, on what ground? I can conceive none. If any can, let the reasons be arrayed before us. I can conceive none, Mr. President, *in being*; but I can conceive them possible under given circumstances. In Church and in State there must always be an ultimate or supreme authority, and the exercise of it must be independent, so far as systematic responsibility is concerned. But is the episcopacy, regarding this question, supreme? Certainly not. The General Conference, adjunct in certain exigencies with the annual conferences, is the ultimate depository of power in our Church. And I beg to dwell here. For, in the second place, I shall argue our authority to depose a

bishop summarily for improprieties morally innocent, which embarrass the exercise of his functions, *from the relations of the General Conference to the Church and to the episcopacy.*

“This Conference, adjunct (but rarely) with the annual conferences, is supreme. Its supremacy is universal. It has legislative, judicial, and executive supremacy. Its legislative supremacy consists of “*full powers to make rules,*” as the Discipline words it. This is full power for *quasi legislation.* Under self-assumed restrictions, which are now of constitutional force and virtue (especially as they originated in a General Conference, composed not of delegates, but of traveling preachers), it can make *rules of every sort* for the government of the Church. The restrictions are few and simple. They embrace our articles of religion, the ratio of representation, the perpetuity of episcopacy, and the general superintendency, the General Rules, trial by committee and appeal, and the avails of the Book Concern. Beyond these slender restrictions, its legislation is legitimate and conclusive; and within them it is so, if the members of the annual conferences are consenting.

“Now, Mr. President, in legislation the bishop has not only peers, but more than peers. In clerical orders every man on this floor is his equal, but, in legislative functions, his superior. Can you contribute the uplifting of a hand for or against a conference act? You may not do it. The Discipline, which we shape at pleasure, defies your touch. You may not, in this regard, breathe upon it. You may not spread the plaster upon a patch which we, *ad libitum,* apply to its weak parts. If the Conference, by a tie, fail to do what is desirable to be done, and (like the philosopher’s starving brute, caught centrally between two heaps of hay) can not escape from the dilemma, I believe it is doubted by the college of bishops whether the president can come to our rescue by a casting vote.

“It has been urged privately, by very many, that we have no authority to displace a bishop, except for crime, and by a formal trial. And they who advocate it tell us to look into section fourth, page 28, and we shall be convinced. Well, what now is section fourth to us in a question of this sort? That whole section is statutory. Were it a part of our Church constitution it might be invoked as authoritative. Mere rules as they are, and alterable by us in ten minutes, by two conference votes, they expressly recognize our authority to “expel a bishop

for improper conduct.' Why, then, urge any thing in the fourth section against this pending resolution? If there were no express rule for deposing a bishop, we should still be competent to depose. And for this plain reason: whatever this Conference can constitutionally do, it can do without first resolving that it has power to do it—without passing a rule into the Discipline declaring its authority. The power of this Conference is derived, not from its own enactment, but from the constitution. Is there any thing in the restrictive articles which prohibits the removal or suspension of a bishop? This will not be pretended, and, of course, nothing in our own statutes can deprive us of powers conferred on us by the higher authority of the constitution.

“There is a rule which many of us believe applies to this case, in the answer to Question 4th, page 28: ‘To the General Conference, who have power to expel him for improper conduct, if they see it necessary.’ Let it be noticed that, in harmony with what I have said concerning our constitutional power, this rule does not *convey* authority, else the auxiliary ‘shall’ would be used. It does not say the General Conference *shall* have authority, which is the style used in creating constitutional prerogatives. The language of the rule is simply declaratory, recognizing a power already existing. Let us notice certain phrases in this declaratory rule: ‘Have power to expel,’ sets forth the extent to which we may proceed in our efforts to guard against the consequences of a bishop’s improprieties. The expulsion contemplated is doubtless from office. For though *depose* is the word generally used in such connections, expel is not less significant of the thing. To put out of office is expulsion. If any dispute, and say the expulsion must be from orders, or from the Church, we answer: A power to expel from Church is certainly equal to the power of removing from office. The child who has license to play *all* day, need not dread the rod for playing *half* a day; and the boy who is told he may ride ten can not disobey by riding five miles. That argument is hard-pushed which resorts to the phrase, ‘have power to expel,’ to prove that the Conference has not power to *depose*. ‘*Improper* conduct’ means less than *imprudent* conduct. Imprudence carries our thoughts to the neighborhood of crime. It means a want of wisdom to a degree which involves exposure and harm. Improper means, simply,

not suitable, or unfitting. The *usus loquendi* in the Discipline forbids us to assume that in some generic sense it embraces crime. Whatever is unfitting a bishop's office, and would impair his usefulness in the exercise of his functions, is embraced, I conceive, in the phrase 'improper conduct.' In the Discipline it is used in contradistinction from crime. And it is never treated as crime in the administration, except when a private member, after frequent admonitions, obstinately refuses to reform. In such a case, obstinacy itself becomes a criminal state of mind, and may procure expulsion. Finally, the phrase, 'if they see it necessary,' sheds light on the whole paragraph. It proves that improper does not mean criminal; for then it would be necessary, and the condition would be useless. The phrase accords to the Conference discretionary power, and invites them to proceed on the ground of 'expediency,' of which some have loudly complained. They may expel him, if they see it to be proper or expedient—that is, if his improprieties injure his usefulness in the high office where our suffrages placed him.

"A bishop's influence is not like a preacher's or class-leader's. It is diffused like the atmosphere, every-where. So high a Church officer should be willing to endure not slight sacrifices for this vast connection. What could tempt you, sir, to trouble and wound the Church all through from center to circumference? The preacher and class-leader, whose influence is guarded against so strongly, can do little harm—a bishop infinite. Their improper acts are motes in the air—yours are a pestilence abroad in the earth. Is it more important to guard against those than against these? Heaven forbid! Like the concealed attractions of the heavens, we expect a bishop's influence to be all-binding every-where—in the heights and in the depths, in the center and on the verge of this great system ecclesiastical. If, instead of concentric and harmonizing movements, such as are wholesome and conservative and beautifying, we observe in him irregularities, which, however harmless in others, will be disastrous or fatal in him, the energy of this body, constitutionally supreme, must instantly reduce him to order, or, if that may not be, plant him in another and a distant sphere. When the Church is about to suffer a detriment which we, by constitutional power, can avert, it is as much *treason in us not to exercise the power we have, as to usurp, in other circumstances, that which we have not.* (Debates, Gen. Conf., 1844.)

Dr. Myers, following the course of the Southern delegates in 1844, holds that paragraphs first and second, taken from the Discipline, and embodying the law in relation to this matter, do not warrant the General Conference in proceeding directly against a bishop, but that they merely authorized that body to enact laws under which a prosecution can be brought. That is absurd, because: 1. The power to make such laws implies, in this instance at least, power to act directly upon the case. 2. The second one provides expressly for proceeding against a bishop *during the interim* of the General Conference, thus indicating that any General Conference was supposed to be wise enough, as it had the power, to conduct such an inquiry with propriety; hence, no method of proceeding was laid down for the government of the General Conference in this particular. 3. These provisions had stood in the Discipline for sixty years, and, if Dr. Myers is correct, the Church was too stupid to make them available in any case by proper legislation—that is, they were blanks for the want of sense to apply them! And 4. The General Conference had uniformly done exactly contrary to this theory, as will appear from what follows.

Our author evidently thinks that he makes a strong point on what he calls the irregularity of the proceedings against Bishop Andrew; but he fails, for the reason that there is no point there. All the proceedings were regular, according to the usage of the Church and the established methods of the General Conference, as the records prove. In 1812, both Bishops Asbury and M'Kendree had matters in rela-

tion to the episcopacy which they desired to submit to the Conference. This was done through a Committee on Episcopacy; and at every General Conference, after that date, such a committee was appointed, to which all matters relating to the episcopacy were submitted. (Journal General Conference, Vol. I, pp. 114, 115.) At the Conference of 1828, charges of heterodoxy in doctrine were brought against Bishop Soule by resolution in the General Conference, in the same manner that the case of Bishop Andrew was introduced to that body. The charge and specifications were referred to the Committee on Episcopacy. That committee reported, after having been "required to investigate," that, "having had the matter under careful examination," the opinions expressed by the Bishop, on the occasion referred to, were sound. (Journal General Conference, Vol. I, p. 348, 349, 350.) Slanderous reports in relation to an address before the Pittsburg Conference had been circulated against Bishop Hedding; and at the same Conference the matter was referred to the Committee on Episcopacy. The committee made a careful investigation, calling the writer of the reports in question before them, with the Bishop, and examining the delegates of the Pittsburg Conference severally, one by one, as witnesses in the case. The Bishop was fully vindicated. (Journal General Conference, Vol. I, pp. 317, 331, 333, 334.)

For eight consecutive General Conferences, embracing a period of thirty-two years, all matters of complaint or inquiry in relation to the bishops had been referred to the Committee on Episcopacy

for investigation, and that committee had reported the facts to the Conference for such action as might be required. During this time there were at least these two cases which were followed as precedents in the matter of Bishop Andrew. Dr. Elliott says :

“The trial of Bishop Andrew was strictly formal, and in the usual way of trying or examining into the character of bishops.

“The Committee on the Episcopacy, having heard there was a difficulty growing out of his connection with slavery, sent a deputation to him, respectfully to inquire into the facts. He proposed to wait on the committee, and make his statements in person. He did so, and his statements were taken down by the secretary, read to him, and admitted to be substantially correct. Afterward he sent a written communication to the committee, which he desired might be substituted for the minutes taken by the secretary. This was consented to, and the committee reported this communication to the Conference without note or comment. On this document, the subsequent action of the Conference was based.

“On this representation, he was charged before the Conference; and the charge was, that he was ‘connected with slavery, by marriage and otherwise.’ Dr. Paine acknowledges the charge. He says, in his review, ‘It should be borne in mind that proceedings had been taken against Bishop Andrew as a slave-holder, in the Committee on the Episcopacy, at the first session of the committee after its organization; and at this very time the prosecution of the Bishop was still pending.’ No charge could be more specific. The Bishop pleaded guilty to the charge, placed it in the hands of the Episcopal Committee, who laid it before the proper court. The Conference proceeded as in the cases of Bishops Soule and Hedding, in 1828. The General Conference may originate their own proceedings in any case of the kind, and one session could not establish a course that would bind a succeeding Conference, possessing, as it does, equal authority with themselves.” (History of the Great Secession, p. 323.)

The facts in the case being thus brought officially and regularly before the Conference, that body proceeded

to make up a verdict or decide the matter according to law and usage. Alfred Griffith and John Davis offered the following resolution, namely:

"Whereas, the Rev. James O. Andrew, one of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has become a slave-holder; and whereas, it has been, from the origin of said Church, a settled policy and the invariable usage to elect no person to the office of bishop who was embarrassed with this 'great evil,' as, under such circumstances, it would be impossible for a bishop to exercise the functions and perform the duties assigned to a general superintendent with acceptance in that large portion of his charge in which slavery does not exist; and whereas, Bishop Andrew was himself nominated by our brethren of the slave-holding States, and elected by the General Conference of 1832, as a candidate who, though living in the midst of a slave-holding population, was free from all personal connection with slavery; and whereas, this is, of all the periods in our history as a Church, the one least favorable to such an innovation upon the practice and usage of Methodism, as confiding a part of the itinerant general superintendency to a slave-holder; therefore,

"Resolved, That the Rev. James O. Andrew be, and he is hereby, affectionately requested to resign his office as one of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church." (Debates in General Conference, 1844, p. 82.)

The matter was discussed during the entire session. Next day, J. B. Finley and J. M. Trimble offered the following as a substitute for the above, namely:

"Whereas, the Discipline of our Church forbids the doing any thing calculated to destroy our itinerant general superintendency; and whereas, Bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery by marriage and otherwise, and this act having drawn after it circumstances which, in the estimation of the General Conference, will greatly embarrass the exercise of his office as an itinerant general superintendent, if not, in some places, entirely prevent it; therefore,

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this General Conference

that he desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment remains." (Debates in General Conference, 1844, p. 100.)

The discussions were continued for a week, and finally the substitute of Mr. Finley was adopted, by a vote of one hundred and eleven to sixty-nine. Such was the case of Bishop Andrew. It was based upon just grounds, instituted in a disciplinary manner, conducted in a regular way, and decided according to the law, in the mildest form that the facts would justify. It then necessarily follows that for more than thirty years the Methodist Episcopal Church has been grossly misrepresented and vilified in the South in relation to this matter.

The Protest against the decision in the case of Bishop Andrew, from the Southern delegates, was read in the General Conference, by Dr. Bascom, and placed on file, on the 6th of June. The Reply to the Protest was written by Dr. Durbin, Chairman of the Committee, and signed by Drs. G. Peck and C. Elliott. It was read before the General Conference on the 10th of June, and adopted by the Conference, and is therefore the official statement of that body—the same that adopted a few days before (June 8th) the so-called "Plan of Separation." In reference to Bishop Andrew, it is the testimony of the Church. We give it entire:

"The committee appointed to prepare a statement of the facts in the case of Bishop Andrew, and to examine the Protest of the minority, regret that the circumstances under which they have been compelled to act have prevented their preparing so complete a report as the importance of the subject demands. The Protest was not placed under their command until Friday

afternoon, and, immediately afterward, two of the original committee had to withdraw, one of them being ill, and the other having been elected bishop—nor were their places supplied until Saturday evening. It is under these disadvantages, and amid the pressure of important conference business, that they have been required to prepare a document in relation to some of the most important questions that have ever engaged the attention of the Church. It is believed, however, that the following statement of *law* and *facts* will be a sufficient notice of the Protest which has been referred to them.

“As the proceedings of the General Conference in the case of Bishop Andrew were not judicial, its decision has gone forth to the public unaccompanied by the reasons and facts upon which this action was founded. This deficiency is but partially supplied by the published reports of the debate on the subject. The speakers who advocated the resolution were restrained by a praiseworthy delicacy from all avoidable allusions which might give pain to the respected individual concerned, or awaken unpleasant emotions in any quarter. It is but natural that, under these circumstances, some misunderstanding should prevail as to the merits of the case. The following statement, it is believed, contains nothing, at least so far as facts are concerned, which will not be cheerfully confirmed by all parties, and will throw light upon the true position of the authors of the Protest.

“From the first institution of the episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, no slave-holder has been elected to that dignity, though, in several instances, candidates otherwise eminently fitted for the station have failed of success solely on account of this impediment. Since the period referred to, nine bishops have been elected who were natives of the United States. Of these, only three have been Northern men, while six were natives of slave-holding States. Not one, however, was a slave-holder—a remarkable fact, which shows very clearly that, while much more than their just claim has been conceded to the slave-holding portions of the Church, a decided and uniform repugnance has, from the first, been felt and manifested to the occupancy of that high office by a slave-holder.

“It is known and acknowledged by all Southern brethren that Bishop Andrew was nominated by the delegates from the South Carolina and Georgia Conferences, as a Southern candidate for whom Northern men might vote without doing violence

to their principles, as he was no slave-holder; Bishop Andrew himself perfectly understood the ground of his election. Since the year 1832 the antislavery sentiment in the Church, as well as in the whole civilized world, has constantly and rapidly gained ground, and, within the last year or two, it has been roused to a special and most earnest opposition to the introduction of a slave-holder into the episcopal office—an event which many were led to fear by certain intimations, published in the *Southern Christian Advocate*, the *Richmond Christian Advocate*, and perhaps some other Methodist periodicals. This opposition produced the profoundest anxiety through most of the non-slave-holding conferences. The subject was discussed every-where, and the dreaded event universally deprecated as the most fearful calamity that ever threatened the Church. Many conferences instructed their delegates to use all possible means to avert such an evil. Other conferences and many thousand laymen sent up petitions and memorials to the same effect to the present General Conference. Such was the state of sentiment and of apprehension in the Northern portion of the Church, when the delegates to the General Conference learned, on reaching this city, that Bishop Andrew had become a slave-holder. The profound grief, the utter dismay, which was produced by this astounding intelligence, can be fully appreciated only by those who have participated in the distressing scenes which have since been enacted in the General Conference.

“When the first emotions of surprise and sorrow had so far subsided as to allow of sober thought and inquiry, it was ascertained that Bishop Andrew had been a slave-holder for several years. Soon after his election to the episcopacy, a lady of Augusta bequeathed him a female slave, on condition that she should be sent to Liberia at nineteen years of age, if her consent to emigrate could be obtained, otherwise she was to be made as free as the laws of Georgia would permit. She refused to emigrate, has since married, and is now enjoying all the privileges provided for in the will of her former mistress. She is, and must be, a slave—she and her children—and liable to all that may befall slaves. Another slave Bishop Andrew has inherited from the mother of his former wife; and by his recent marriage he has become the owner of (it was said on the floor of the General Conference) fourteen or fifteen more. These

belonged to Mrs. Andrew in her own right before her marriage. That act, according to the laws of Georgia, made them the property of Bishop Andrew, to keep or dispose of as he pleased. He conveyed them to a trustee, for the joint use of himself and wife, of whom the survivor is to be the sole owner. This conveyance was made for the security of Mrs. Andrew, and with no view either to satisfy or to mislead the opinions of the Northern Church. So much, at least, Bishop Andrew was understood to say to the Conference. His known integrity forbids the suspicion that he would attempt to disguise the real character of the transaction; and the fact that the earnings of the slaves, as well as the reversionary title to them, are his, demonstrates that this arrangement was not made with any view to satisfy the well-known sentiments of the Church against a slave-holding bishop. It is manifest from this statement, which is believed to be strictly correct, that Bishop Andrew's connection with slavery is not, as the Protest intimates, merely an 'assumption,' but that he is the owner of slaves, in the full and proper sense of that term. His title was acquired by bequest, by inheritance, and by marriage, which are by far the most common grounds of ownership in slaves. All the usual and necessary conditions of slavery have their fulfillment in the relation of these persons to Bishop Andrew. Their labor and their earnings are subject to his control, and inure to his benefit and that of his family. They are now liable, or they may be hereafter, to be sold; they and their offspring are doomed, as the case now stands, to a bondage that is perpetual, and they are liable and likely to descend to his heirs. Beyond all reasonable doubt, the condition of Bishop Andrew's slaves will be attended, while he lives, with all the alleviations—and these are many and great—which a very benevolent and Christian master can provide. Still, it must be slavery. In view of the law of the land, and of the law of the Discipline, in all its more weighty and permanent consequences to the bondman, it is, and must be, slavery. It was said repeatedly on the floor of the Conference that the deed of trust had put it quite beyond Bishop Andrew's power to free his slaves, even if there were no other obstacle. So, then, should the stringent laws of Georgia against emancipation be relaxed or repealed by her next Legislature, the rule of the Discipline, which would then become imperative on Bishop Andrew, could not, and would not, be satisfied; and the Church

must still have a slave-holding bishop, in spite, not only of its known will, but of its standing laws.

“It was the almost unanimous opinion of the delegates from the non-slave-holding conferences, that Bishop Andrew could not continue to exercise his episcopal functions, under existing circumstances, without producing results extensively disastrous to the Church in the North; and from this opinion the brethren of the South did not dissent. For a while the hope was entertained that the difficulty would be quietly removed by his resigning his office, which it was known he had previously desired to do. But this hope was dissipated by the intelligence that the delegates from the conferences in the slave-holding States had been convened, and that they had unanimously advised him not to resign. Various efforts were then made in private to devise some method to relieve the case, but they all proved abortive, and nothing remained but that it must come before the General Conference. The bishops themselves, in their united Address to the Conference, had urged it to ascertain whether there had been any departure from the essential principles ‘of the general itinerant superintendency;’ and had declared of that superintendency, that ‘the plan of its operation is *general, embracing the whole work in connectional order, and not diocesan, or sectional*; consequently, any division of the work into districts, or otherwise, so as to create a particular charge, with any other view, or in any order, than as a prudential measure to secure to all the conferences the annual visits of the superintendents, would be an innovation on the system;’ that ‘*our superintendency must be itinerant, and not local,*’ that ‘it was wisely provided in the system of Methodism, from its very foundation, that it should be the duty of the superintendents *to travel through the connection at large.*’ The question then presented itself, how the case of Bishop Andrew could be so disposed of as to preserve this itinerant general superintendency? If the General Conference had even been disposed to evade it, the consideration of it was forced upon them by the episcopal Address itself.

“A diversity of sentiment existed as to the proper method of treating the case.

“Some, at least, believed—perhaps few doubted—that sufficient ground existed for impeachment, on a charge of ‘improper conduct,’ under the express provisions of the Discipline. The

opinion was certainly entertained in several quarters that it was 'improper' for the shepherd and bishop of eleven hundred thousand souls, either deliberately or heedlessly, to place himself in direct and irreconcilable conflict with the known and cherished moral sentiments of a large majority of his vast flock. Such, however, was the prevalence of moderate counsels, that no proposal was made either to impeach or punish, and such the controlling influence of forbearance and kindness, that it is believed not one word was uttered, during the entire debate of nearly a fortnight, derogatory to the character, or justly offensive to the feelings, of Bishop Andrew. The transaction which had brought such distress upon the Church, and threatened such extensive ruin, was dealt with merely as a fact—as a practical difficulty—for the removal or palliation of which it was the duty of the General Conference to provide. It was in this spirit, and for such ends, that the preamble and resolution of Messrs. Finley and Trimble were passed.

“The action of the General Conference was neither judicial nor punitive. It neither achieves nor intends a deposition, nor so much as a legal suspension. Bishop Andrew is still a bishop; and should he, against the expressed sense of the General Conference, proceed in the discharge of his functions, his official acts would be valid.

“Such are the facts in the case of Bishop Andrew. We now proceed to notice the law. Nearly all the objections raised in the Protest against the action of the General Conference may be reduced to two, namely, that that body has violated the *constitutional* and the *statutory* law of the Church. That it has violated the constitutional law, the Protest attempts to prove by representing its late action as a breach of what it calls 'the compromise law of the Church on the subject of slavery; meaning, as is supposed, the section on slavery, particularly that paragraph which relates to traveling preachers. The entire language on this subject is evidently formed so as to make the impression on any reader not intimately acquainted with the history and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that there has been some period (whether 1804 or 1816 does not clearly appear from the Protest) when the question of slavery was settled in the Methodist Episcopal Church, as it was in the general Government at the adoption of the Federal Constitution; that 'the confederating annual conferences,' after a vexed

and protracted negotiation,' met in convention, and the section on slavery 'was finally agreed to by the parties after a long and fearful struggle,' as 'a compact,' 'a treaty,' which can not be altered by the General Conference until certain constitutional restrictions are removed. So that now any interference on the part of that body with the question of slavery in the Southern Conferences is as unconstitutional as it is admitted would be the interference of the general Government with the question in the Southern States.

"After the boldness with which this doctrine is advanced, and the confidence with which it is relied upon as 'the first and principal ground occupied by the minority in this Protest,' it will be difficult for the uninitiated to believe that it is as unfounded in fact as it is ingenious in its 'legal casuistry.' It is indeed true that the question of slavery had been long and anxiously agitated in the Church, and the various General Conferences had endeavored to adjust the matter so as to promote the greatest good of all parties; but this very fact goes to disprove the position assumed in the Protest: for as the attention of the Church had been thus strongly called to the subject, if it had been the intention to guard the question of slavery by constitutional provisions, it would have been done when the Church actually did meet to frame a constitution. But nothing of the kind appears. For when, in 1808, it was resolved that the General Conference, instead of consisting, as before, of all the traveling elders, should be a delegated body; and when it was determined that that body (unlike the general Government, which has no powers but such as are expressly conferred) should have all powers but such as are expressly taken away—when this vast authority was about to be given to the General Conference, among 'the limitations and restrictions' imposed, *there is not one word on the subject of slavery, nor was any attempt made to introduce any such restriction.* The only provision anywhere established by that General Conference, of constitutional force, was the general rule forbidding the buying and selling of human beings with an intention enslave them. So that, in direct opposition to the assertion of the Protest, we maintain that the section on slavery is 'a mere legislative enactment, a simple decree of a General Conference,' as much under its control as any other portion of the Discipline not covered by the restrictive rules. If additional proof of the truth of this position

were needed, it might be adduced in the fact that that section which the Protest represents to have been settled in 1804, was not only altered at the General Conference, or convention, of 1808, but also at the delegated General Conferences of 1812, 1816, 1820, and 1824. And although the Protest speaks of it as '*usually known*' by the name of the 'Compromise Act,' the greater part of this General Conference have never heard either that appellation or that character ascribed to it until the present occasion.

"But although this General Conference can not admit that any portion of the section on slavery is constitutional in its character, and therefore could not under any circumstances allow the imputation of the Protest, that they have violated the constitution of the Church, yet they do admit that it is *law*—law too which the General Conference (though possessing full powers in the premises) has never altered except at the above periods, and then, in each instance, for the further indulgence of the South. The question then comes up, whether this General Conference, as the Protest maintains, has, in effect, suddenly reversed the legislation of the Church, not, indeed, by altering the law, but by practically disregarding it. The portion of the law particularly in question is the following paragraph:

"'When any traveling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives.'

"This, it is alleged, fully covers the case of Bishop Andrew, and therefore he ought to have been left in the quiet and unquestioned enjoyment of his rights. Were it even true, that proceedings, either judicial or 'extra-judicial,' have been had in his case, we should not hesitate to join issue here, and maintain that this law does not protect him. The Protest asks, 'Is there any thing in the law or its reasons creating an exception in the instance of bishops?' We answer, there is in both. So far as judicial proceedings are concerned, the Discipline divides the Church into four classes—private members, local preachers, traveling preachers, and bishops—and establishes distinct tribunals and different degrees of responsibility for each. The section on slavery applies only to officers of the Church, and therefore private members are not named at all, but special provision is made in the case of local and traveling preachers. How

happens it that bishops are not named at all? Are they necessarily included in the title 'traveling preachers?' In common parlance they may sometimes be thus designated; but in the Discipline it is not so understood, even in regard to matters much less important than this, in evidence of which we need only advert to the fact, that the General Conference of 1836 did not consider that the allowance of bishops was provided for under the general title of 'traveling preachers,' and they therefore inserted them accordingly. To explain why no mention is made of 'bishops,' it is not necessary, as the Protest supposes, 'to slander the virtuous dead of the North,' as if they excluded them intentionally 'by a resort to deceptive and dishonorable means.' It is a much more natural and reasonable explanation, that at that day, when the Church could hardly tolerate slavery in any class of the ministry, 'the virtuous dead,' both of the North and of the South, did not dream that it would ever find its way into the episcopacy.

"But though the *language* of the law does not include bishops, yet, if the 'reason' and spirit of it did, we might be disposed to allow them the benefit of it. But this is not the case. The whole tenor of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church is adverse to slavery. Even the Protest has admitted (irreconcilable as the admission is with another portion of the same instrument), that, at the time of the alleged 'compact,' 'the whole Church, by common consent, united for the *mitigation and final removal* of the evil of slavery.' But let the Discipline speak for itself. The mildest form in which the question at the head of the section on slavery has ever been expressed, is the present, namely, 'What shall be done for the *extirpation* of the evil of slavery?' And the very Conference of 1804, which enacted the so-called 'compromise law,' as well as that of 1800, when the paragraph relating to traveling preachers was really adopted, were each convened under a request from the preceding General Conference that the whole Church would aid that body in obtaining 'full light in order to take further steps toward the *eradicating this enormous evil* from that part of the Church of God to which they are united. It is obvious, therefore, that connection with slavery is tolerated no further than seems necessary. In the case of ordinary traveling preachers there appeared to be a necessity for some indulgence. They might become owners of slaves in the providence of God;

the laws of the States might not allow of emancipation; and they had no power to choose their own place of residence. But no such 'reason' could apply to a bishop, for he has always been allowed to live where he pleases. Again: traveling preachers encumbered with slaves labor among people similarly situated, and who would not, therefore, be likely to object to them on that account. But a bishop, by the *constitution* of the Church, is required to labor in every part of the connection; and in by far the larger portion of it the services of a slave-holding bishop would not be acceptable. So here again the 'reason' of the case does not apply to a bishop. There is not, therefore, as the Protest so roundly asserts, any 'express' or 'specific law' in the case; and therefore, as the Protest itself admits, 'in the absence of law it might be competent for the General Conference to act on other grounds.' With the failure to prove any 'specific law' authorizing a bishop to hold slave property, the third and fourth arguments of the Protest, which are founded on this assumption, fail also.

"But perhaps it is not so much the law of the Discipline which the Protest claims to cover Bishop Andrew as the law of the land; for it declares: 'The rights of the legal owners of slaves in all the slave-holding States are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and by the local Constitutions of the States respectively, as the supreme law of the land, to which every minister and member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, within the limits of the United States Government, professes subjection, and pledges himself to submit, as an article of the Christian faith, in the common creed of the Church.' If by this is meant that the law of the land *allows* citizens to hold slaves, it is admitted. But so also it allows them to keep theaters and grog-shops, so that this is no ground of argument. But if it mean that the law of the land *requires* citizens to keep slaves (the only interpretation which can make the argument available), it is denied. And until it can be shown that the Methodist Episcopal Church by its action—legislative, judicial, or executive—requires any citizen to do what the law of the land requires him not to do, it is unjust to attempt to get up popular clamor against it, as if it came in conflict with the civil authority.

"This course of reasoning had been pursued thus far, not so much because it was deemed necessary for the vindication

of the Conference, as to avoid sanctioning, by silence, the erroneous exposition which the Protest presents of the Constitution and the law of the Church. For it has been already seen that Bishop Andrew has been subjected to no trial, and no penalty has been inflicted. At present, it is plain that the Conference has done nothing to depose or even suspend Bishop Andrew. His name will appear in official publications with those of the other bishops, and with them he will derive his support from the funds of the Church. In order to make out that the General Conference had no right to take such action as they have in Bishop Andrew's case, the authors of the Protest have been driven to the necessity of claiming for the Methodist episcopacy powers and prerogatives never advanced before, except by those who wished to make it odious, and which have always been repudiated by its chosen champions. The Protest maintains 'that the episcopacy is a co-ordinate branch of the government;' for which no argument is adduced save this—that it is, in general, the province of bishops to ordain bishops; a sufficient answer to which may be found in the principle of Methodist polity stated in the Address of the bishops to the present General Conference—that orders (the principle applies to bishops, though not expressly named, as well as to elders and deacons) are 'conferred' by the election, and only 'confirmed' by the ordination; and that when the election has been made, the bishop 'has no discretionary authority; but is under *obligation* to ordain the person elected, whatever may be his own judgment of his qualifications.' And if all the bishops should refuse to ordain the person elected by the General Conference, that body would unquestionably have the right to appoint any three elders to ordain him, as is provided 'in case there be no bishop remaining in our Church.' The Protest declares that 'the bishops are beyond doubt an integral, constituent part of the General Conference, made such by law and the constitution.' If the words 'General Conference' be not a mere clerical error, the assertion is sufficiently refuted by the answer in the Discipline to the question, 'Who shall compose the General Conference?' and by the practice of the bishops themselves, who disclaim a right to give even a casting vote, or even to speak in General Conference except by permission. The Protest maintains, that 'in a sense by no means unimportant, the General Conference is as much the *creature* of the episco-

pany as the bishops are the creatures of the General Conference.' The proof adduced for which is, that 'constitutionally the bishops alone have the right to fix the time of holding the annual conferences; and should they refuse, or neglect to do so, no annual conference could meet according to law; and, by consequence, no delegates could be chosen, and no General Conference could be chosen or even exist.' That is to say, because, for the convenience of the bishops in performing their tour, they are allowed to say *at what time in the year* an annual conference shall meet, therefore they have the power to prevent such body from meeting at all—though from its very name, it must meet once a year!—that, by preventing the meeting of annual conferences, they might prevent the organization of any General Conference; and thus, escaping all accountability for their delinquencies, might continue to lord it over God's heritage, until themselves and the Church should die a natural death. We can easily perceive, were this reasoning legitimate, that the bishops might *destroy*, not only the General Conference, but the Church; but are at a loss to discover how it proves that they can *create* either. We must protest against having any argument of ours adduced as analogous to this.

"The Protest maintains that 'the General Conference has no right, power, or authority, ministerial, judicial, or administrative,' in any way to subject a bishop 'to any official disability whatever, without the formal presentation of a charge, or charges, alleging that the bishop to be dealt with has been guilty of the violation of some law, or at least some disciplinary obligation, of the Church, and also upon conviction of such charge, after due form of trial.' To those who are not familiar with the Methodist economy, this might seem plausible. But it is, in reality, an attempt to except from the action of a general system those who least of all ought to be excepted. The cardinal feature of our polity is the itinerancy.

"To sustain this system, it is essential that the classes should receive the leaders that are appointed by the preacher, that the societies should receive the preachers that are stationed over them by the bishops, that the annual conferences should receive the bishops that are sent to them by the General Conference. Unless, therefore, the utmost care be taken, by those who have authority in the premises, that these parties shall severally be acceptable to those among whom they labor, there is

great danger that those who are injured by such neglect may seek redress by revolutionary measures. For this reason the officers of the Methodist Church are subjected regularly to an examination unknown, it is believed, among other denominations. Not only is provision made for formal trials, in cases of crimes and misdemeanors, but there is a special arrangement for the correction of other obstructions to official usefulness. At every annual conference, the character of every traveling preacher is examined; at every General Conference, that of every bishop. And the object is to ascertain not merely whether there is ground for the formal presentation of charges, with a view to a regular trial; but whether there is any 'objection'—any thing that might interfere with the acceptance of the officer in question among his charge. And it is doctrine novel and dangerous in the Methodist Church, that such difficulties can not be corrected unless the person objected to be formally arraigned under some specific law, to be found in the concise code of the Discipline—doctrine not the less dangerous because it is applied where 'objections,' unimportant in others, might be productive of the most disastrous consequences. Will the Methodist Church sanction the doctrine, that, while all its other officers, of whatever name or degree, are subjected to a sleepless supervision; are counseled, admonished, or changed, 'as necessity may require, and as the Discipline directs,' a bishop, who decides all questions of law in annual conferences; who, of his mere motion and will, controls the work and the destiny of four thousand ministers; who appoints and changes at pleasure the spiritual guides of four millions of souls—that the depositary of these vast powers, whose slightest indiscretions or omissions are likely to disturb the harmony, and even impair the efficiency, of our mighty system of operations, enjoys a virtual impunity for all delinquencies or misdoings not strictly criminal?

"It is believed that an attempt to establish such an episcopal supremacy would fill not only a part, but the whole, of the Church, 'with alarm and dismay.' But this doctrine is not more at variance with the genius of Methodism than it is with the express language of the Discipline, and the exposition of it by all our standard writers. The constitution of the Church provides that 'the General Conference shall have full powers to make rules and regulations for our Church,' under six 'limitations and restrictions,' among which the only one relating to

the episcopacy is this: 'They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away episcopacy, or destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency.' As there is nothing in the restrictive rules to limit the full powers of the General Conference in the premises, so is there nothing in the special provision respecting the responsibility of a bishop. In reply to the question, 'To whom is a bishop amenable for his conduct?' the Discipline declares, 'To the General Conference, who have power to expel him for improper conduct, if they see it necessary.' And this, be it remembered, is all that is said respecting the jurisdiction over a bishop, with the exception of a rule for his trial, in the interval of a General Conference, if he be guilty of immorality. In full accordance with the plain meaning of these provisions is the language of all the standard writers on Methodist polity.

"Bishop Emory—a man of whom it is no injustice to the living or the dead to say, that he was a chief ornament and light of our episcopacy; that he brought to the investigation of all ecclesiastical subjects a cool, sagacious, powerful, practical intellect—fully sustains the positions we have assumed in behalf of the powers of the General Conference over the bishops of our Church. He gives an unqualified assent to the following passages from the notes to the Discipline, prepared by Bishops Asbury and Coke, at the request of the General Conference: 'They (our bishops) are entirely dependent on the General Conference;' 'their power, their usefulness, themselves, are entirely at the mercy of the General Conference.'

"Dr. Emory also quotes some passages from a pamphlet, by the Rev. John Dickins, which, he says, was published by the unanimous request of the Philadelphia Conference, and may be considered as expressing the views both of that Conference and of Bishop Asbury, his intimate friend. Mr. Dickins affirms that the bishops derive their power from the election of the General Conference, and not from their ordination; and that the Conference has, on that ground, power to remove Bishop Asbury, and appoint another, 'if they see it necessary.' He affirms that Bishop Asbury 'derived his official power from the Conference, and therefore his office is at their disposal'—Mr. Asbury was 'responsible to the General Conference, who had power to remove him, if they saw it necessary;' 'he is liable every year to be removed.'

“The above quotations show very clearly the sentiments of Asbury and Coke and Dickins, on this question—men chiefly instrumental in laying the foundations of our polity.

“Equally clear and satisfactory is the testimony of another venerable bishop, who still lives, in the full exercise of his mental powers and benignant influence, to guide and bless the Church: ‘The superintendents now have no power in the Church above that of elders, except what is connected with presiding in the Conference, fixing the appointments of the preachers, and ordaining.’ ‘They are the servants of the elders, and go out and execute their commands.’ ‘The General Conference may expel a bishop not only for immoral, but for “*improper* conduct,” which means a small offense below a crime; for which not even a child or a slave can be expelled but after repeated admonitions.’ ‘The traveling preachers gave the bishop his power, they continue it in his hands, and they can reduce, limit, or transfer it to other hands, whenever they see cause.’ Such is the language of Bishop Hedding, who only concurs in the moderate, truly Methodistic views of Bishops Asbury, Coke, and Emory.

“It is believed that this statement of the facts and the law in the case will afford a satisfactory answer to all the positions and reasonings of the Protest; and, after having thus presented it, the majority are perfectly willing to ‘abide the decision of our contemporaries and of posterity.’ They can not, however, close these remarks, without expressing their regret that the minority, not content with protesting against the action of the General Conference, as ‘lawless,’ as ‘without law and contrary to law,’ as ‘such a violation of the compromise law,’ that ‘the public faith of this body can no longer be relied upon as the guaranty for the redemption of the pledge,’ ‘that there shall be no further curtailment of right as regards *the Southern ministry*’—that, not content with thus harshly assailing the proceedings of the General Conference, they have even refused to the bishops, whom they have invested with such exalted prerogatives, the quiet possession of their thoughts and feelings; and have thrown out the significant intimation, ‘that any bishop of the Church, either violating or submitting to the violation of the compromise charter of union between the North and South, without proper and public remonstrance, can not be acceptable in the South, and *need not appear there.*’ We shall be slow to

believe that even their constituents will justify them in thus virtually deposing, not one bishop only, but several, by a process which is even worse than 'extra-judicial.'

"When all the law and the facts in the case shall have been spread before an impartial community, the majority have no doubt that they *will* fix '*the responsibility of division,*' should such an unhappy event take place, '*where in justice it belongs.*' They will ask, Who first introduced slavery into the episcopacy? And the answer will be, *Not the General Conference.* Who opposed the attempt to withdraw it from the episcopacy? *Not the General Conference.* Who resisted the measure of peace that was proposed—the mildest that the case allowed? *Not the majority.* Who first sounded the knell of division, and declared that it would be impossible longer to remain under the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal Church? *Not the majority.*

"The proposition for a peaceful separation (if any must take place), with which the Protest closes, though strangely at variance with much that precedes, has already been met by the General Conference. And the readiness with which that body (by a vote which would doubtless have been unanimous but for the belief that some entertained of the unconstitutionality of the measure) granted all that the Southern brethren themselves could ask, in such an event, must stand as a practical refutation of any assertion that the minority have been subjected to the tyranny of a majority.

"Finally, we can not but hope that the minority, after reviewing the entire action of the Conference, will find that, both in their Declaration and their Protest, they have taken too strong a view of the case; and that by presenting it in its true light before their people, they may be able to check any feelings of discord that may have arisen, so that the Methodist Episcopal Church may still continue as one body, engaged in its proper work of 'spreading Scriptural holiness over these lands.'" (Journal General Conference, 1844, pp. 199-210.)

CHAPTER III.

THE "PLAN OF SEPARATION."

THE sixth chapter of Dr. Myers's "Disruption," etc., is under this surprising heading, namely: "A Division of the Church Declared Inevitable before the Finley Resolution was Passed; and the Result was Intended," and contains astonishing assertions, affirming that the majority intended to force the South to depart. It is true that Northern delegates assumed that if a bishop were allowed to hold slaves, the Church in the North would be convulsed—many would leave or be driven from our communion; but they gave no ground for such an assumption as this. Their words are tortured by Dr. Myers to serve his purpose.

Chapter seven is on "The Plan of Separation Proposed and Adopted," in which he says that it was an "agreement," "contract," "covenant," by which the Church was divided into two like bodies.

The eighth chapter treats of "The Conditions of the Plan of Separation," and contains, perhaps, the most vital portion of the volume. Our investigation of the "Plan" covers the ground occupied by these three chapters. If the "Plan" falls, all of the theories and arguments in them perish like the worm-smitten vine of Jonah. Some of our Southern

brethren write about an imaginary "Plan" as if they thought it was the hope of their Church, their sheet-anchor, their all—as if some "Plan of Separation," which is supposed to exist, formed the basis upon which the Southern Church is established, or, as Dr. Myers says, the "foundation of their separate organization," while, in fact, there is nothing of the kind, except a certain "broken reed," which may yet pierce the hands of those who cling to it so tenaciously. The questions involved in this idea of the "Plan" are, perhaps, the most weighty of any in this discussion; and it is here proposed to investigate the matter, not only with care and the utmost candor, but more fully than has been heretofore done. We shall show that there is not, and never has been, any such "Plan" as many in the Southern Church suppose. But, in doing so, we do not pretend, as they sometimes represent, to take away, or in the least disturb, the "foundation" of their Church. That must rest on Christ, the "chief corner-stone," and not on the resolutions of a General Conference. Just what that "Plan" is, will appear from the following pages. We first permit Dr. Myers to state his position touching it in his chosen words. He says:

"The majority intended the resulting sequence—the breaking up of the one ecumenical jurisdiction into two jurisdictions—as an alternative to another sequence more disastrous to themselves. They intended to save Northern Methodism from dissolution that impended, no matter what might be the result to Southern Methodism." (Myers's "Disruption," p. 87.)

"They saw the result, and intended to force the South to depart." (Page 92.)

“Truly may this be called a ‘Plan of Separation,’ an agreement, contract, compact, covenant—whatever one will—that no good man, as described by the Psalmist, ‘who sweareth’ even ‘to his own hurt and changeth not,’ should think of repudiating.” (Page 102.)

“At a quarter past twelve o’clock on the night of June 10, 1844, the ninth and last *ecumenical* delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States adjourned *sine die*, and neither that body nor its direct successor has ever since met. It was legitimately succeeded, as by agreement, by two like bodies independent of each other; each vested with all *its* powers over the same membership it had heretofore legislated for, but in a divided territory; one body, with its constituency, inheriting its name, the other, to avoid confusion, affixing to that name the convenient geographical designation ‘South;’ both inheriting its Discipline, its purpose, its work, its obligations, its prerogatives, its rights, and its duties, each within its respective territory.” (Page 103.)

“The method of procedure for effecting a separation was devised and proposed by the leading ‘constitutional lawyer’ of the Northern party; the Southern delegates conformed to his advice; his Plan was proposed by a committee of which he was a member, was advocated by himself and every other member of the committee, and was enacted by a large majority of the Northern votes—all these facts establishing the hypothesis that separation was looked upon as inevitable on the passage of the Finley Resolution, and that, under all the circumstances, *this result was intended.*” (Page 127.)

Dr. Myers, in these extracts and elsewhere, affirms that, by the adoption of the report of the Committee of Nine, the General Conference intentionally divided the Church into two like bodies by a positive contract or covenant. He is very certain of the purpose to do this, using the word “intention” or its equivalent at least twelve times in five pages; that is, “intended” five, “intention” four, “intend” two times, and “intending” once, in stating or illustrating this point.

He says, with great precision, that, “at a quarter past twelve o'clock on the night of June 10, 1844, the ninth and last ecumenical delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States adjourned *sine die*, and neither that body nor its direct successor has ever since met.” He that proves too much, proves nothing, is an old maxim which it would have been well for Dr. Myers to have considered before making this statement; for,

1. He claims that this ecumenical delegated General Conference had, before this, divided this same Church *twice* in a similar way—in the settlements with Canada—and devotes his eleventh chapter to these “two divisions of the Methodist Episcopal Church prior to 1844.” Now, according to him, it does the same thing again.
2. He contradicts his position by adding, one body “*inheriting* its name,” thus proving it to be the direct and legitimate successor of the General Conference of 1844.
3. If one body inherited the name, why does Dr. Myers falsify history and stultify himself by calling that body the Methodist Episcopal Church *North*?
4. How could the General Conference thus divide and destroy itself and the Church twice, and at the same time remain entire for the third operation of the kind, and still,
5. Inherit the original name? The fact we shall find to be that it did not divide at all, neither did it intend to do so.

The circumstances attending the adoption of the Report of the Committee of Nine, which is called the “Plan of Separation,” throw light upon its meaning, and aid in its interpretation. That its import may be fully understood, the following statement

of facts is given, together with the report, in full, as it was adopted by the General Conference.

On Saturday, June 1, 1844, the General Conference adopted the Finley Resolution, expressing the judgment of the Conference that Bishop Andrew should desist from episcopal work until he should be free from the impediment of slavery, as amply set forth in the last chapter. On the Monday following, June 3d, Dr. Capers, in behalf of the South, which had unitedly resisted this proceeding, and determined to sustain the Bishop in holding slaves, offered a series of resolutions in favor of dividing the Church, and providing for such a division, as follows, namely:

“Be it resolved by the delegates of all the annual conferences in General Conference assembled:

“That we recommend to the annual conferences to suspend the constitutional restrictions which limit the powers of the General Conference so far, and so far only, as to allow of the following alterations in the government of the Church, namely:

“1. That the Methodist Episcopal Church in these United States and Territories, and the Republic of Texas, shall constitute two General Conferences, to meet quadrennially, the one at some place *south*, and the other *north*, of the line which now divides between the States commonly designated as free States and those in which slavery exists.

“2. That each one of the two General Conferences thus constituted shall have full powers, under the limitations and restrictions which are now of force and binding on the General Conference, to make rules and regulations for the Church, within their territorial limits respectively, and to elect bishops for the same.

“3. That the two General Conferences aforesaid shall have jurisdiction as follows: The Southern General Conference shall comprehend the States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, and the States and Territories lying southerly thereto, and also the Republic of Texas, to be known and designated by the title of the Southern General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal

Church of the United States. And the Northern General Conference to comprehend all those States and Territories lying north of the States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, as above, to be known and designated by the title of the Northern General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States.

“4. And be it further resolved, That, as soon as three-fourths of all the members of all the annual conferences voting on these resolutions shall approve the same, the said Southern and Northern General Conferences shall be deemed as having been constituted by such approval; and it shall be competent for the Southern annual conferences to elect delegates to said Southern General Conference, to meet in the city of Nashville, Tennessee, on the 1st of May, 1848, or sooner, if a majority of two-thirds of the members of the annual conferences composing that General Conference shall desire the same.

“5. And be it further resolved, as aforesaid, That the Book Concerns at New York and Cincinnati shall be held and conducted as the property and for the benefit of all the annual conferences, as heretofore—the editors and agents to be elected once in four years, at the time of the session of the Northern General Conference, and the votes of the Southern General Conference to be cast by the delegates of that Conference attending the Northern for that purpose.

“6. And be it further resolved, That our Church organization for foreign missions shall be maintained and conducted jointly between the two General Conferences as one Church, in such manner as shall be agreed upon from time to time between the two great branches of the Church, as represented in the said two Conferences.” (Journal General Conference, 1844, pp. 86, 87.)

These resolutions were referred to a committee, but the proposition to divide was considered so manifestly unconstitutional that the committee would not report in favor of it, whereupon the Southern delegates laid before them another but similar paper, which was also rejected by the committee. This second paper was a declaration, says Dr. Elliott,

“drawn up by Drs. Paine and Smith, to which the Southern delegates were believed to be agreed, intended to supersede the Declaration, but not presented to the General Conference, because it was believed it would not pass, as it was somewhat identical with the Plan offered by Dr. Capers and rejected.” The following is the paper in question, namely:

“The delegates of the Southern and South-western conferences, having been appealed to by the committee appointed by the General Conference on the subject of the proposed division of the Church for their views in the premises, concur in the following declaration of sentiment:

“1. That they have always deprecated division of any kind, and still regard it as a *dernier ressort*, to which nothing short of imperative and uncontrollable necessity could reconcile them even for a moment to entertain.

“2. Such necessity they have been constrained to feel is now imposed upon them by the extra-judicial action of a majority of the General Conference in the case of Bishop Andrew, taken, as it has been, in defiance of our united remonstrance, made in view of averting this precise calamity, as well as our repeated assurances given the Conference that such action would render it inevitable.

“3. Thus compelled against our will to entertain the idea of division, we can not even now consent to a division of the Church, but only a division of our great field of ministerial labor, by the organization of the two General Conferences, each retaining the patronymic name Methodist Episcopal Church, the Articles of Religion, General Rules, and Restrictive Articles.

“Such division of the work would not necessarily involve either schism or secession, to both which we are irreconcilably opposed.

“4. This kind of division in the General Conference we regard as necessary, and even desirable, unless the future agitation of the subject of slavery in the General Conference can be wholly interdicted by express statute, excluding it from the counsels of the Church, as exclusively belonging to the civil, and not to ecclesiastical, government.

"5. It is only under the stress of these circumstances, that, yielding to the necessity which the present emergency has occasioned, we concur in soliciting the committee to report a plan for the amicable division, not of the Church, but only our field of ministerial labor, including an equitable partition of the property and funds heretofore held in common by all the annual conferences.

R. PAINE,

"WILLIAM A. SMITH."

(History of the Great Secession, pp. 1116-17.)

These resolutions, together with those of Dr. Capers, show who were seeking to divide the Church, and were preparations for the results seen in the General Conference of 1858, and for accepting the doctrines taught in Rivers's Philosophy.

On the 5th, the Southern delegates, still determined to push the matter through, laid before the General Conference their "Declaration," as follows:

"The delegates of the conferences in the slave-holding States take leave to declare to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that the continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church, the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference, and especially the extra-judicial proceedings against Bishop Andrew—which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent—must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of this General Conference over these conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slave-holding States." (Journal General Conference, 1844, p. 109.)

This was signed by the fifty-one delegates from the thirteen conferences in the slave-holding States. It caused some debate, Mr. Sandford claiming that the words "extra judicial" were an insult to the Conference. The Declaration, immediately after this brief discussion, was referred to a committee, consist-

ing of nine persons, and from that fact has generally been known as "The Committee of Nine." This Declaration is manifestly and must always be considered as an announcement of the intention of the Southern delegates to withdraw from the Church unless the Conference should recede from its anti-slavery position.

During the same day, June 5th, Dr. M'Ferrin offered a resolution, which was referred, instructing the Committee of Nine to report, if possible, a plan for the division of the Church, providing a settlement could not be effected, as follows, namely:

"Resolved, That the committee appointed to take into consideration the communication of the delegates from the Southern conferences be instructed, provided they can not, in their judgment, devise a plan for an amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing in the Church on the subject of slavery, to devise, if possible, a constitutional plan for a natural and friendly division of the Church." (Journal General Conference 1844, p. 111.)

The names of this committee were here announced, embracing nearly all the members of committee on Dr. Capers's resolutions of division, so that this "Committee of Nine" now had the whole matter in hand. The names of the members of this committee are, Robert Paine, of Tennessee, Chairman; Glezen Fillmore, of Genesee; Peter Akers, of Illinois; Nathan Bangs, of New York; Thomas Crowder, of Virginia; T. B. Sargent, of Baltimore; William Winans, of Mississippi; L. L. Hamline, of Ohio; and James Porter, of New England.

The day following, June 6th, the Southern delegates presented a long and labored Protest against

the action taken in the case of Bishop Andrew, in the closing paragraph of which these words occur, namely :

“ If the minority have not entirely misunderstood the majority, the abolition and antislavery principles of the North will no longer allow them to submit to the law of the Discipline on the general subject of slavery and abolition; and if this be so, if the compromise law be either repealed or allowed to remain a dead letter, the South can not submit, and the absolute necessity of division is already dated. And should the exigent circumstances in which the minority find themselves placed, by the facts and developments alluded to in this remonstrance, render it finally necessary that the Southern conferences should have a *separate, independent* existence, it is hoped that it will be found practicable to devise and adopt such measures and arrangements, present and prospective, as will secure an amicable division of the Church upon the broad principles of right and equity, and destined to result in the common good of the great body of ministers and members found on either side *the line of separation.*” (Journal of the General Conference, 1844, pp. 113, 186-199.)

This was replied to during the session of the Conference, and the answer, given in our last chapter, forms one of the most important documents in these pages. The Protest states more explicitly than the Declaration had done the intention of the South to withdraw, unless the General Conference should retract.

The “Committee of Nine” now had before it: 1. The resolutions of Dr. Capers, containing a plan for the division of the Church; 2. The paper of the Southern delegates, covering essentially the same ground; and 3. The resolution of Dr. M’Ferrin. All of these asked for a division—a proposition which the majority held to be unconstitutional; therefore they did

not, and could not, approve it, or report favorably to such action. Also, this committee had before it the Declaration and the Protest, which demonstrated the purpose of the South to withdraw, as heretofore stated.

Two days after the reading of the Protest, namely, June 8th, the Committee of Nine brought in their report, which, manifestly, was not a plan for a division of the Church, but merely a pledge that, if the South withdrew, the seceded body should be granted certain privileges. Here is the report of the committee, which is called the "Plan of Separation." We give it entire, and ask for it a careful reading. For some reason, Dr. Myers omits this report from his book, giving only such extracts as can be tortured to serve his purpose:

"The select Committee of Nine, to consider and report on the Declaration of the delegates from the conferences of the slave-holding States, beg leave to submit the following report:

"*Whereas*, a declaration has been presented to this General Conference, with the signatures of fifty-one delegates of the body, from thirteen annual conferences in the slave-holding States, representing that, for various reasons enumerated, the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry and Church organization can not be successfully accomplished by them under the jurisdiction of this General Conference, as now constituted; and,

"*Whereas*, in the event of a separation, a contingency to which the Declaration asks attention as not improbable, we esteem it the duty of this General Conference to meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity; therefore,

"*Resolved*, by the delegates of the several annual conferences in General Conference assembled:

"1. That should the annual conferences in the slave-holding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical

connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the Northern boundary of such connection: All the societies, stations, and conferences, adhering to the Church in the South by a vote of the majority of the members of said societies, stations, and conferences, shall remain under the unmolested pastoral care of the Southern Church; and the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church shall in no wise attempt to organize Churches or societies within the limits of the Church South, nor shall they attempt to exercise any pastoral oversight therein; it being understood that the ministry of the South reciprocally observe the same rule in relation to stations, societies, and conferences, adhering, by a vote of a majority, to the Methodist Episcopal Church; provided, also, that this rule shall apply only to societies, stations, and conferences, bordering on the line of division, and not to interior charges, which shall, in all cases, be left to the care of that Church within whose territory they are situated.

“2. That ministers, local and traveling, of every grade and office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, may, as they prefer, remain in that Church, or, without blame, attach themselves to the Church South.

“3. That we recommend to all the annual conferences, at their first approaching sessions to authorize a change of the sixth Restrictive Article, so that the first clause shall read thus: ‘They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Chartered Fund, to any other purpose than for the benefit of the traveling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children, and to such other purposes as may be determined upon by the votes of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference.’

“4. That whenever the annual conferences, by a vote of three-fourths of all their members voting on the third resolution, shall have concurred in the recommendation to alter the sixth Restrictive Article, the Agents at New York and Cincinnati shall, and they are hereby authorized and directed to, deliver over to any authorized agent or appointee of the Church South, should one be organized, all notes and book accounts against the ministers, Church members, or citizens within its boundaries, with authority to collect the same for the sole use of the Southern Church; and that said Agents also convey to the aforesaid agent or appointee of the South, all the real estate,

and assign to him all the property, including presses, stock, and all right and interest connected with the printing establishments at Charleston, Richmond, and Nashville, which now belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“5. That when the annual conferences shall have approved the aforesaid change in the sixth Restrictive Article, there shall be transferred to the above agent of the Southern Church so much of the capital and produce of the Methodist Book Concern as will, with the notes, book accounts, presses, etc., mentioned in the last resolution, bear the same proportion to the whole property of said Concern that the traveling preachers in the Southern Church shall bear to all the traveling ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the division to be made on the basis of the number of traveling preachers in the forthcoming Minutes.

“6. That the above transfer shall be in the form of annual payments of twenty-five thousand dollars per annum, and specifically in stock of the Book Concern, and in Southern notes and accounts due the establishment, and accruing after the first transfer mentioned above; and, till the payments are made, the Southern Church shall share in all the net profits of the Book Concern, in the proportion that the amount due them, or in arrears, bears to all the property of the Concern.

“7. That Nathan Bangs, George Peck, and James B. Finley be, and they are hereby, appointed commissioners, to act in concert with the same number of commissioners appointed by the Southern organization—should one be formed—to estimate the amount which will fall due to the South by the preceding rule, and to have full powers to carry into effect the whole arrangements proposed with regard to the division of property, should the separation take place; and if, by any means, a vacancy occur in this Board of Commissioners, the Book Committee at New York shall fill said vacancy.

“8. That whenever any agents of the Southern Church are clothed with legal authority or corporate power to act in the premises, the agents at New York are hereby authorized and directed to act in concert with said Southern agents, so as to give the provisions of these resolutions a legally binding force.

“9. That all the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church in meeting-houses, parsonages, colleges, schools, conference funds, cemeteries, and of every kind within the limits of the

Southern organization, shall be forever free from any claim set up on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, so far as this resolution can be of force in the premises.

“10. That the Church so formed in the South shall have a common right to use all the copyrights in possession of the Book Concerns at New York and Cincinnati at the time of the settlement by the commissioners.

“11. That the Book Agents at New York be directed to make such compensation to the conferences South, for their dividend from the Chartered Fund, as the commissioners above appointed shall agree upon.

“12. That the bishops be respectfully requested to lay that part of this report requiring the action of the annual conferences before them as soon as possible, beginning with the New York Conference.” (Journal General Conference, 1844, pp. 135-37.)

Such is the celebrated so-called “Plan of Separation.” Dr. Myers affirms that, by the adoption of this report, the General Conference intentionally divided the Methodist Episcopal Church into two like bodies by a positive contract or agreement, neither body being the successor of the General Conference of 1844, but each vested with all of the powers, rights, duties, and prerogatives of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Let the reader examine the report for himself, and judge of the position taken by the author of the “Disruption.”

We deny the soundness of this proposition, and do so, first, because:

1. *It is not warranted by the language of the report.*

The report does not claim to divide the Church, does not say any thing about dividing the Church, only refers to a separation as a “contingency” “not improbable.” Nowhere does it provide for such a division. The resolutions of Dr. Capers did that by

specifying the two General Conferences to be formed (one in the North, the other in the South), and the territory to be occupied by each, and for episcopal supervision of both branches. But these provisions were all rejected by the committee as unconstitutional. The report, instead of providing for two Churches, or two parts of one Church, simply says: "Should the annual conferences in the slave-holding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the northern boundary of such connection." Does that speak of a part of the same Church into which the original body had been divided, or of a distinct connection or Church? The report provided that, if the South saw fit to form such a "distinct" organization, or "independent" Church, as the Protest demanded, certain privileges should be granted those who should leave the Methodist Episcopal Church to form that "separate, independent existence." Dr. Elliott observes:

"We have already noticed that Mr. M'Ferrin, June 5th, presented a resolution instructing the Committee on the Declaration 'to devise, if possible, a constitutional plan for a mutual and friendly division of the Church.' This had already been attempted, but without success, by the resolutions of Dr. Capers; and it was agreed on all hands that it could not be done.

"The division of the Church was a work which was not entertained by the committee, and it was so avowed when Mr. M'Ferrin's resolution was before Conference. Indeed, Mr. Hamline remarked that, if the Conference sent him to do that work, he could not serve, and he served only on the condition that division could not be entertained.

"The only thing the committee attempted was on the other part of Mr. M'Ferrin's resolution; namely, 'to devise a plan

for an amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing in the Church on the subject of slavery.'

"The word division is foisted in, in some way, by the reporter, but it has no proper or correct application. The title, too, which afterward obtained, the '*Plan of Separation*,' is equally exceptionable; for the Conference did not strike out a plan for the procedure of the South in their course of secession; but it means that this is the plan, or course of treatment, they would meet with, provided they took on themselves the responsibility of separating or seceding from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and could furnish a certain reason for doing so." (History of the Great Secession, p. 333.)

"Mr. Hamline said that the committee had carefully avoided presenting any resolution which would embrace the idea of a separation or division. He further said, that 'when the first committee met they had before them a paper which proposed a new form of division of the Church. The committee thought there were difficulties in the way of such a proposition.'" (History of the Great Secession, p. 339.)

And yet Dr. Myers says that the plan was "devised and proposed by the leading constitutional lawyer of the Northern party;" that is, Dr. Hamline. Who knows best what this gentleman thought, said, and did—Dr. Myers, or Mr. Hamline? How could he have been a leader on both sides at the same time? No one was more pronounced in his views against the unconstitutionality of any division of the Church, or of any provision to divide, than Dr. Hamline. Dr. Myers goes so far as to say that his election to the episcopacy was a violation of the plan of the general superintendency, because of the offense he had given to the South by his extreme course in this General Conference ("Disruption," p. 65); and then, on page 179, he represents that a plan for the division of the Church was proposed and originated by him! On page 110 he claims that Dr.

Hamline's objection to Dr. Capers's resolutions on constitutional grounds was, not that they provided for the division of the Church, but that they proposed a reference of the matter to the annual conferences, for which the constitution made no provision! It is difficult to conceive of more palpable perversion of facts.

The following extracts show the opinions of leading members of the General Conference upon this point as expressed at the time in the debate upon the question :

"Mr. Finley could see in the report no proposition to divide the Church." (History of the Great Secession, p. 339.)

"Dr. [now Bishop] Paine, Chairman of the Committee of Nine, said he did not know for certainty that separation would take place, that it would become positively and imperiously necessary. He ardently hoped it would not. *The separation would not be effected by the passage of these resolutions through the General Conference.* They must pass the annual conferences." (Debates in General Conference, 1844, p. 221.)

"Dr. Bangs, a member of the committee, said: 'The report did not speak of division; the word had been carefully avoided through the whole document; it only said, 'in the event of a separation taking place,' throwing the responsibility from off the shoulders of the General Conference, and upon those who would say that such a separation was necessary.'"

"Mr. Cartwright contended that they had no authority conferred upon them, either directly or indirectly, to divide the Church.'

"Dr. Porter, also a member of the committee, said, respecting the whole report: 'If there were defects in the document, they could arrest it in their annual conferences. The South could take no action upon it till the annual conferences had decided respecting the sixth rule; and if, when they got home, and calmly and deliberately examined it, they found any thing radically wrong, let them stop it in their annual conferences.'"

(History of the Great Secession, p. 340.)

“In reply to the assertion of the South, ‘that the old Church is destroyed, and two new ones are created in its place,’ Hon. Rufus Choate, in the New York Book Concern case, replies that there are conclusive answers to this.

“First. The General Conference has no power, ecclesiastically, to destroy the Church. It does not speak of a division, leaving the old identity untouched.

“Secondly. The General Conference did not, in this transaction, assume to destroy the Church; but, on the contrary, the Plan of Separation, from beginning to end, shows that what they intended to do was to authorize a departure, leaving the old identity untouched; because, 1. The General Conference never assumed, in terms, to destroy the Church. 2. That they never assumed, in terms, to divide the Church; for while they speak of a division of property, they never speak of a division of the Church, but simply of a separation of parties from the Church; it deals throughout with a contemplated act of other persons, and calls that act a separation by them, and all it contemplates is a separation by others, leaving itself to exist. It calls itself by the old name of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“Thirdly. Not only does the General Conference not assume to destroy the Church, but it goes further, and takes care to ordain that the seceding party shall have nothing at all on the ground of natural right or natural equity; but that it shall have nothing except according to the existing law of the Church—unless the annual conferences would give it. Instead of dissolution, there was a withdrawal of a party; and it was ordained that every body not withdrawing should be subject to the still existing law of the society. It is unquestionable that the General Conference intended, and so determined, that no one should take a dollar by secession or natural right, unless the annual conferences gave it.” (History of the Great Secession, pp. 747, 748.)

Observe the language used in the report. The terms employed in the preamble and in every resolution indicate that it was not a contract by which the Church was divided into two like bodies, but simply a proposition to meet a possible “emergency

with Christian kindness and the strictest equity." The preamble refers to the declaration that the South can not remain "under the jurisdiction of this General Conference," and says: "Whereas, in the event of a separation, a contingency not improbable," etc. The first resolution begins thus: "Should the annual conferences in the slave-holding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the *northern boundary* of such connection." The second resolution provides that ministers "*may remain*" in the Methodist Episcopal Church, or "attach themselves to the Church South," as they prefer. The third resolution says: "We recommend to all the annual conferences to authorize a change." The fourth resolution proceeds: "Whenever the annual conferences shall have concurred;" and the fifth continues: "When the annual conferences shall have approved the aforesaid change." The sixth resolution mentions a "*transfer*." The seventh resolution, speaking of the Southern organization says, "should one be formed," and "should the separation take place." The eighth provides that "whenever any agents *are clothed with authority*." The ninth says: "so far as this resolution can be of force in the premises;" and the tenth stipulates that the "*Church so formed in the South shall have*," etc. The eleventh resolution directed the agents to do as the "commissioners *shall agree*;" and the twelfth and last requested the bishops to *lay the report "before the annual conferences."* Do these terms indicate that the adoption of this report divided the Church, or that it was in-

tended to provide for some future contingency? This report was not known at the time of its adoption as a plan for a division or separation of the Church, but simply as the report of the Committee of Nine, as Dr. Elliott shows in a quotation already given. In a very friendly and otherwise excellent article upon the Louisville General Conference in the *Quarterly Review* for July, 1875, page 167, Dr. Whedon says: "The title 'Plan of Separation,' was invented for this document, not by the General Conference, nor by any other competent authority, but by the reporter, Rev. R. A. West, a local preacher from England, whose sympathies were with the Southern side." This title, therefore, is spurious. The language used in the report does not admit of the interpretation put upon it by Dr. Myers and the Southern Church.

We deny that the adoption of this report divided the Church, in the second place, because:

2. *The circumstances preceding and attending the adoption of the report, and the testimony of six members of the Committee of Nine, and others, forbid such a conclusion.*

The division of the Church was not a new question at that time, but one that had been brought forward repeatedly from before the Christmas Conference. The first controversy that threatened division was about the administration of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's-supper. The early Methodists received the sacraments mostly from the English clergy—the Methodist preachers not being then in orders. But during and after the War of the Revolution, most of these English clergy returned to

England, and others were confessedly immoral. Such was the destitution among the people that the preachers in the South determined to remedy the evil by electing some of their number to ministerial orders, which was done at a Conference in 1779, and they were ordained by a committee appointed for that purpose. This proceeding sorely grieved Mr. Asbury and others, and threatened to divide the Church; but the matter was finally settled satisfactorily to all parties. (See Asbury's Journal, Vol. I, pp. 363, 367; Bangs's History, Vol. I, pp. 128-31, 135-7.)

The second subject which threatened disunion was the episcopacy. In 1805, Bishop Coke proposed to divide the Conferences between himself and Bishop Asbury into two episcopal districts. At the session of the Western Conference, in 1806, a reply, written by Mr. M'Kendree, was made to the proposition, which said, "No, dear Doctor; much as we love you and brother Asbury, and highly as we esteem your services, we would sooner, much sooner, depose you both." Dr. Elliott remarks upon this matter: "It appears that the division of the Church was a thing not to be entertained in those days; and if bishops undertook to do it, it was thought better to depose them than to submit to it." (History of the Great Secession, p. 330.)

Two years after this, the Restrictive Rules were adopted, which plainly forbid such a division of episcopal labor as was contemplated, and, indirectly, any separation of the Church by the General Conference. The question reappeared under the Discipline as it

was in 1844, and now is, in the controversies and legislation in relation to the work in Canada. Soon after the war of 1812, embarrassments to our ministry and people in Canada arose out of the fact that the Methodists of the Provinces were sustaining ecclesiastical relations with a foreign body; namely, the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States. From 1816 to 1836 the matter was more or less prominently brought before the General Conference. The question of division was freely canvassed, and the General Conference held that it had no power to divide the Church, and this opinion was almost universally indorsed by thinking men. This point was settled as a fundamental principle in our economy before 1832. For nearly twenty years it had been canvassed in its various bearings, and decided by General Conference action, as well as by the general opinion of the wisest and best men in the communion.

This conviction was based upon the express terms of the constitutional provisions of the Discipline. That said in the third restriction:

“The General Conference shall have power to make rules and regulations for our Church under the following limitations and restrictions, namely: They shall not change or alter any part or rule of government so as to do away episcopacy, or destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency.”

The fifth Restrictive Rule is in these terms, to wit:

“They shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers, of a trial by a committee, and of an appeal; neither shall they do away the privileges of our members, of trial before the society, or by a committee, and of an appeal.”

Authority is here given to the General Conference to make rules and regulations for the unity, perpetuity, and prosperity of the Church; but not to divide or to distract or to destroy it, indirectly, by division, or otherwise. There are three points in these prohibitions, namely:

1. The General Conference is expressly prohibited from making any change which would destroy the "plan of itinerant general superintendency." The division of the Church into two or more parts would do this effectually. Therefore it is not in the power of the General Conference to divide the Church, because, in doing so, the plan of the general superintendency would be thereby destroyed.

2. The General Conference is here prohibited from taking any action that would exclude ministers or preachers from the Church without the privilege of a trial by a committee, and of an appeal. To divide the Church, without the consent of both the ministers and preachers, would certainly do this in many cases; therefore the General Conference is forbidden to take such action.

3. The General Conference is here further prohibited from pursuing any course which would result in cutting off members of the Church from their rights as such, without the privilege of a trial before the society, or by a committee, and of an appeal. To divide the Church, without the consent of the membership, would necessarily deprive many of these rights; therefore the General Conference has not authority to divide.

Thus the constitution of the Church, as embodied

in the Restrictive Rules, forever debarred the General Conference from making any division.

Governments do not make provision for their own destruction by division or otherwise, hence revolutions originate in rebellions. Neither, in the nature of things, does the Church provide for the perpetration of schism or separation; and all division must be, at least in some measure, schismatic. The Methodist Episcopal Church was not provided for in Mr. Wesley's plans, but there came a time when such an organization was a necessity, and circumstances justified the course pursued by the American Methodists. The Canada Conference was in foreign territory, and the Church there became seriously trammelled in its operations by that fact, and it was thought best to form an independent conference; and that was accordingly done, in the same spirit, and for the same end, that the Methodist Episcopal Church was established in the United States. Both movements were approved because of the demands of the times, and not for the reason that they were provided for by previous legislation. This was not done or attempted. So with divisions of the Church generally; they necessarily come by more or less violence, because they are not—and in the nature of things can not be—anticipated and arranged for in advance. Provisions to do this would dissolve and destroy any Church or government, and fill all lands, even those most enlightened, with anarchy.

The Methodist Episcopal Church furnishes no exception to this rule. The Southern Church claims to be justified in its course to effect a division by cir-

cumstances then existing. If this is so, in the opinion of mankind, well; if not, that body must suffer the consequences of disapproval. Apprehension of this fact suggests the repeated efforts to put itself before the world in the most favorable light possible. Many think, on the best of grounds, that the Southern delegates made a fearful mistake in dividing the Church because it opposed slavery. That this is the cause of their schism or division is avowed by themselves in both the Declaration and the Protest, which were signed by them all. This institution was an unmitigated, all-pervading, and infinite evil, which, in the order of Divine Providence, was washed away in the blood of the nation within a quarter of a century from the time that these delegates stood forth as the defenders of the accursed thing in the Church and in the episcopacy. What results might have followed as earnest efforts for freedom as these ministers made in behalf of slavery!

We come now to 1844. The Southern delegates, foiled in their attempts to sustain a bishop in holding slaves, determined to withdraw or secede from the Church, and set about making the best terms possible in behalf of the South. On Saturday, June 1st, as before stated, the case of Bishop Andrew was decided, and, on Monday following, Dr. Capers presented the set of resolutions (found on another page) asking for a division. This was regarded by general consent as being so manifestly unconstitutional that one or more members of the committee to whom they were referred refused to serve if required to consider the subject of division. On the 5th, a declaration of the

Southern delegates, against the "continuance of the jurisdiction of the General Conference" over the South, followed. The same day the resolution of Dr. M'Ferrin, asking for a plan of division, was sent to the committee; and during the next day the Protest, saying, that the "South can not submit; that the Southern conferences should have a separate, independent existence," was read to the Conference; and two days afterward the Conference adopted the report of the Committee of Nine by an overwhelming majority—more than three-fourths; the majority of the members of the General Conference evidently holding to the already settled principle that the General Conference had no authority to divide the Church. Both the committee and the Conference had distinctly before them two lines of thought; namely, from the resolutions of Drs. Capers and M'Ferrin and the paper of Drs. Paine and Smith, that of a division of the Church; and, from the Declaration and the Protest of the Southern delegates, that of the withdrawal or secession of the minority from the majority—the South from the North. With that idea clearly defined in the mind of the Conference, the report was presented and adopted; and, in view of these facts, what must be the judgment of any unbiased mind in regard to the meaning and intent of the report? Is it, from a careful reading of the document, and in consideration of these circumstances, the opinion that it is a contract—a covenant dividing the Church into two like bodies—or only a pledge of kindness, made in advance, toward a probable secession? The reader may form his own opinion upon the subject. Agree-

ably to the idea that the adoption of the report of the Committee of Nine did not divide the Church, but that this action merely promised favors to an element threatening to secede, the following quotations are pertinent and very important, in further elucidating the sense of the report, and the purpose of the General Conference :

“Dr. Capers’s plan for division, by almost general consent, was abandoned as unconstitutional and impracticable. Drs. Paine, Winans, and Smith declared that the Conference had no such powers. And Messrs. Hamline, Bangs, and Finley uttered similar sentiments.

“‘There is not in any government a provision made to divide itself, and consequently it must be done by violence, or in a peaceful manner by common consent.’—*Dr. Paine.*

“‘The only proposition was, that they might have liberty, if necessary, to organize a separate Conference.’—*Dr. Winans.*

“‘This General Conference, I am aware, has no authority directly to effect this separation.’—*Dr. Smith.*

“The General Conference of 1844 neither designed to divide the Church, nor did they attempt to do so. All the debaters denied that any such power existed in the General Conference. The prospective separation of the South was viewed as a contingency, and this depends on an emergency which might not happen. There was no resolution of the General Conference proposing to divide the Church, to destroy the old Church, or organize new ones. There was a withdrawal from the Methodist Episcopal Church apprehended and provided for. No one in the General Conference pretended to act for the South, and to separate or withdraw them. This, it was conceded by all, if done, must be done by the South themselves. If, indeed, the Methodist Episcopal Church, as it existed in 1844, was divided into two Churches, and the old Church ceased to exist, it was done without the knowledge, concurrence, or consent of the Northern conferences.” (History of the Great Secession, pp. 767, 768.)

In the above the opinions of four members of the Committee of Nine are indicated; that is, of Drs.

Paine and Winans, of the South; and of Drs. Hamline and Bangs, of the North. In the discussion upon the language of the report, the positive declaration of Dr. Paine, of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee, that the "separation would not be effected by the passage of these resolutions," is found, and also these words of Dr. Bangs: "The report did not speak of division." The statement of Dr. Hamline, "that the committee had carefully avoided presenting any resolution which would embrace the idea of separation or division," together with his remark in relation to serving on the committee, is also there to be seen. The ground of Dr. Porter, another member of the committee, that "the South could take no action till the annual conferences had decided respecting the sixth rule," is there also given; and to all of these the attention of the reader is called. Mr. Fillmore, another member of committee, said: "The resolutions do not say the South must go, shall go, will go, or that any body wants them to go; but, simply, make provision for such contingency." In 1848, Mr. Fillmore said, that "the principle set forth in the first Declaration" (that the General Conference could not divide the Church), "was recognized in the action of the last General Conference (1844), and by the Committee of Nine, of which he had been one." These quotations from Mr. Fillmore are taken from "History of the Great Secession," pages 336, 647, and the first of them, with all the others here referred to, may be found in the debates of 1844.

Here we have the words of six members of the Committee of Nine stating positively, in so many

different forms of language, that this report, the so-called "Plan of Separation," did not, and was not intended to, divide the Church. Probably, these unequivocal statements of the six members of the committee, made and recorded at the General Conference, will have more weight than the opinion of Dr. Myers, unless it be with Dr. Summers. Further, another of the Nine, Dr. Akers, was of a similar mind. He wrote an article to the *Advocate*, in February, 1845, in which he showed clearly "that the *necessity* urged by the South did not exist." How could such a committee make such a report as Dr. Myers claims theirs to have been? Either they did not know what they were doing, or he is widely mistaken. Let it not be forgotten that many others took the same view of the case, and, that *not one*, in the committee or in the General Conference, claimed that this action divided the Church. Where, then, are the "facts," arguments, or candor, claimed by Dr. Myers, or by others in his behalf?

The adoption of this report could not have effected the division of the Church, thirdly because:

3. *The report was to be submitted to the annual conferences.*

Why submit the report to the action of the conferences, if the Church was already divided; or if that division depended solely upon the course of the South, without regard to contingencies, as claimed by Dr. Myers? That the validity of the whole "Plan" was understood by the General Conference to be conditioned upon the approval of three-fourths of the annual conferences is apparent from the Ad-

dress of June 11th, to the South. But as this question is discussed at length in the final report of 1848, to be hereafter given, it will not be dwelt upon now. The Southern delegates in this Address say that it was to be submitted to the annual conferences.

The provision for taking a vote of the annual conferences seems to have been devised for the purpose of obtaining the indorsement of the Church to the proposition for a division, as well as to secure for the South a *pro rata* interest in the property of the Book Concern and Chartered Fund. At that time, ever since, and now more than heretofore, the South desired and labored to throw the responsibility of the course pursued by the separating members upon the Church as a whole. The report was calculated to aid them in this respect, especially the clause submitting the division of the Book Concern and the Chartered Fund to a vote of the conferences. At first, the conferences voted in favor of giving up a portion of this property; but those meeting later in the year decided adversely, having more light upon the matter, and observing the advantage being taken of this vote by the South; and when this was refused, for the best of reasons, the Southern brethren were not only indignant, but proceeded, as soon as circumstances would allow, to obtain a division of this property by a suit at law. Had the conferences voted otherwise—that is, to give the South a portion of the Book Concern if secession should take place—who doubts that that vote would have been held as a complete vindication and approval of the separation?

The annual conferences refused to become parties to the division, and, so far as they were concerned, negatived the whole movement by declining to allow a division of the Book Concern. Had they approved of the separation and been willing to encourage it, they would, of course, have cheerfully given up a share of this property; but they refused the latter lest they should seem to favor the former. The fact that the report, or any part of it, was submitted to the annual conferences for action, is a demonstration that it did not divide the Church, as held by Dr. Myers, that it was not a contract and covenant to do so irrespective of the action which they might take; and, further, the vote of the conferences in the North, taken in the latter part of the year, was in demonstration of the opposition of the North to the proposed division. Dr. Myers says:

“That separation *per se* was conditioned by the Plan *solely* upon its being inaugurated and consummated by the votes of the slave-holding conferences. *That done*, then the action of the General Conference had *already* divided Methodism between two independent jurisdictions.” (Page 105.)

That is, it did and it did not; it had “already divided” the Church, if the South should finally secede. This was a “retrospect of the future,” becoming some sort of “double-headed monster.” The two parts of the proposition are contradictory, and, taken together, are about as clear as most of the arguments of the learned author. It is well, however, that he takes the ground laid down in the first sentence, and defends it valiantly, devoting his seventh chapter to its advocacy, because it is true. This part

of it we admit; so does Dr. Elliott—so does every body else with whom we are acquainted. The separation *per se*, and in fact, was conditioned by the Plan, or report of the committee, “solely upon its being inaugurated and consummated by the slave-holding conferences;” that is, this report promised certain things if the South should separate, but the responsibility would be “solely” upon the seceding party. This, taken as it stands, and as it is brought out in this chapter, is the best point made by the Doctor. But if the division was conditioned solely upon the action of the South, how could it have been made by the General Conference? It was so conditioned, therefore it was not consummated by that body. The first sentence is true, but the last false. How could they have divided the Church without dividing the Church? If the separation was conditioned solely upon the action of the slave-holding conferences, how could the Church be “already divided between two independent jurisdictions?” It was not; and Dr. Myers for once is right in one sentence, though wrong in the next.

If, however, Dr. Myers in the above extract intends to say that the slave-holding conferences alone were to vote on the “Plan,” the assertion is palpably false. That the third resolution was to be submitted to all of the conferences is a fact too plain to admit of doubt; and while the vote against it did not prevent secession, that of conferences in the North, after the measure was fully understood, proved that the Church was opposed to the division.

What we claim is: 1. That the separation was

effected wholly by the South—this Dr. Myers now admits and argues; and 2. That this was done without the approval of the Church. The only appeal made to the Church in the matter was by the submission of a part of this report to the annual conferences, and they voted against it, and thus, so far as they could do so, annulled the action that had been taken by their delegates. 3. That the report was only a promise of favors in case the secession should occur.

The submission of the report, or any part of it, to the vote of the conferences, is, therefore, as already stated, proof that the division was not consummated, but contingent—not a division of the Church by covenant, but an agreement to treat the withdrawing party with unusual favor. If the South accepts Dr. Myers's position, and admits that the "separation was conditioned by the Plan solely" upon the action of the South, and so relieves the Church from all responsibility in the case, and pronounces the movement a secession, no one will care to appeal to the vote of the annual conferences. But, if any claim that the Plan was so made as to hold the Church now under obligations, we respond that the Church repudiated all that was laid before it, and so condemned the whole; that the offers of special terms to seceders by delegates of the General Conference was not approved by their constituents, the body of ministers. The submission of the report to the conferences is further discussed in the final report of 1848.

We conclude that the report of the Committee of Nine did not divide the Church, fourthly, because:

4. *The Southern delegates did not so understand it.*

In proof of this fact the entire course of the delegates, from the day that the General Conference adjourned, may be cited. In their Address of June 11th, they say that it is to be submitted to the annual conferences, and, if approved, there will "remain no legal impediment to its peaceful consummation."

"The General Conference, as we have seen, provided, in their report on the revolutionary declaration of the South, that, should the South separate, or secede from the Church, they would treat them with great tenderness, although the secession must be their own will and deed. The Southern members, as we have also seen, had declared that secession would take place, and they seemed to be resolved on commencing it immediately, so as to leave no time for inaction or any further deliberation.

"Accordingly, on the 11th of June, or the next day after the adjournment of the General Conference, the Southern delegates met, passed resolutions, and published an address, manifestly calculated, and we must infer designed, to promote secession. The three following resolutions were passed in reference to the organization of the new Church:

"(1.) There shall be a convention held in Louisville, Kentucky, to commence the 1st of May, 1845, composed of delegates from the several annual conferences within the slaveholding States, appointed in the ratio of one for every eleven members.

"(2.) These delegates shall be appointed at the ensuing session of the several annual conferences enumerated, each conference providing for the expenses of their own delegates.

"(3.) These several annual conferences shall instruct their delegates to the proposed convention on the points on which action is contemplated, conforming their instructions, as far as possible, to the opinions and wishes of the membership within their several conference bounds.'" (History of the Great Secession, pp. 357, 358.)

If the "Plan" divided the Church, what was this convention for? Why that address, these resolutions,

and the call for a convention at Louisville? Did they find these things in the Plan? This convention in New York, June 11th did more, that is, it unanimously adopted the following:

“Resolved, That, in the event the bishops do not assign Bishop Andrew work, he be, and hereby is, requested, as far as in his power, to attend and preside in our conferences.” (History of the Great Secession, p. 358.)

Was this resolution in the “Plan?” Here is a clear case of contumacy, a willful contempt and disobedience of the action of the General Conference, conduct which justly submits one to Church action, according to the Discipline. This was the early Southern fruit of the famous “Plan.” To make the matter still more revolting, the men who adopted this resolution, in defiance of the General Conference, had been vociferating about the Conference for more than three weeks that the passage of the Finley resolution would depose Bishop Andrew from office! And now, when this action was taken, on the day after the General Conference adjourned, they contumaciously insult that body, eat their words, demonstrate to the world that they did not believe what they had been saying, indicate their purpose to secede from the Church, and illustrate the spirit that moved them to action. Well may the question be repeated, Was all of this in the “Plan?” No; but the course pursued shows that these delegates knew that the Church was not divided by the adoption of the report. If this was not the preparation for a secession, what was it?

A year passed, a year of anxiety and discord to

American Methodism. The "Plan" was working. On the first day of May, 1845, the Louisville Convention met, many of its members, all of the leading ones, were of the fifty-one Southern delegates to the General Conference, in New York, the year before. May 5th, Drs. W. A. Smith, of Virginia, and L. Pierce, of Georgia, presented the following resolution, which was discussed in the characteristic style for more than a week, and then gave way to the report on organization to which it referred:

"Resolved by the delegates of the several annual conferences in the Southern and South-western States, in general convention assembled, That we can not sanction the action of the late General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the subject of slavery, by remaining under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of that body, without deep and lasting injury to the interests of the Church and the country. We hereby instruct the Committee on Organization, that if, upon a careful examination of the whole subject, they find that there is no reasonable ground to hope that the Northern majority will recede from their position, and give some safe guarantee for the future security of our civil and ecclesiastical rights, that they report in favor of a separation from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the said General Conference." (History of the Great Secession, p. 475.)

The first resolution on organization said:

"Be it resolved, by the delegates of the several annual conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the slave-holding States, in general convention assembled, That it is right, expedient, and necessary to erect the annual conferences represented in this convention into a distinct ecclesiastical connection, separate from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as at present constituted; and, accordingly, we, the delegates of said annual conferences, acting under the provisional Plan of Separation, adopted by the General Conference of 1844, do solemnly declare the jurisdiction hitherto exercised over said annual conferences, by the

General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, *entirely dissolved*; and that said annual conferences shall be, and they hereby are, *constituted* a separate ecclesiastical connection, under the provisional Plan of Separation aforesaid, and based upon the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, comprehending the doctrines and entire moral, ecclesiastical, and canonical rules and regulations of said Discipline, except only in so far as verbal alterations may be necessary to a distinct organization, and to be known by the style and title of the M. E. Church South." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 476, 477.)

Where was Dr. Myers then? What a pity that he could not have "hushed up" this Convention before the corner-stone or fundamental idea for his book was spoiled, or perhaps better to have made his book conform to the facts. He would have informed these gentlemen, at least he now says, "that the action of the General Conference had already divided Methodism between two independent jurisdictions." Instead of this, however, we find this Convention still resolving on "separation," unless the North will recede from its position on slavery; and declaring the jurisdiction of the General Conference over them dissolved, and now erecting these conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church into an independent or distinct ecclesiastical connection, known by the style and title of the M. E. Church South! In what part of the "Plan" did they find all of this? Provisions for these or similar proceedings should have been there if Dr. Myers is correct; but he is not. The Convention was right, and he wrong. It really acted agreeably to the "Plan." That contemplated a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and here is one without a doubt.

The report of the Committee of Nine anticipated just such doings, though it did not provide for or justify them. The Convention so understood it, and acted accordingly; but Dr. Myers is wrong in his representation of the matter. It is manifest that the Southern delegates acted in the Convention in New York and also at Louisville, and individually in their several conferences, as if they understood that the General Conference had not separated them from the Church, but as if they were determined to separate themselves from it by their voluntary course. When they pleaded the "Plan of Separation," it was in order to make their secession a success. It is clear that they understood that the Church was not separated at the General Conference in New York.

We deny that this report divided the Church, or that it was a contract or covenant to do so, fifthly, because:

5. *If so, the transaction was in violation of the obligations of the delegates, and partook of the nature of fraud.*

Fraud is "deception in contracts, or bargain and sale; deceit, trick, artifice, by which the right or interest of another is injured; a stratagem intended to obtain some undue advantage:" and any pretense to the making of a contract to divide the Church, by the delegates of 1844, must have partaken of this character, because the delegates from the South disavowed such a purpose, claimed to be acting in behalf of the Church, and asked for the report which was adopted as a "peace measure," by which the Church could be held together; and if they secured

the approval of such a "contract," it must have been by "stratagem intended to obtain undue advantage" over the North, and to the injury of a large number of the ministers and members of the Church in the South. This very serious charge is not made against the members of the General Conference of 1844 by the writer—it is a conclusion which must follow if the positions of Dr. Myers are correct. He says that this report is a "Plan of Separation, an agreement, contract, compact, covenant" (page 102), to divide the Church, and labors in various parts of his book to establish this point, and represents the delegates from the two sections of country as the contracting parties in the agreement. He does not, however, allow that the North and South were distinct and opposite parties in the case, but on one side were all of the delegates, with those from the South constituting the other also; that is, they were on both sides, or members of both parties at the same time. His words are:

"The parties to this agreement, contract, compact, were the delegates of *all* the conferences, acting in General Conference capacity, on the one hand, and the delegates of the conferences in the slave-holding States on the other." (Disruption, p. 173.)

That these fifty-one delegates had an adroitness for getting on both sides of a question may be admitted; but when they are represented as belonging to both parties in a solemn "contract" and a sacred "covenant," that is a little too much to be accepted as reasonable, even for the sake of fraternity. The absurdity of this position must be apparent even to

children. Nevertheless, such "contracting parties" may answer for an imaginary "covenant."

Who made these delegates such contracting parties? Were they delegated to do such work as this? Not at all. On the contrary, they were elected as delegates to the General Conference under the Discipline and usage of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with duties and lines of operation clearly defined, and by the highest law of the Church, the constitutional restrictions, they were prohibited from doing any thing of the kind. They were not sent to New York to divide the Church, but to preserve it, and to promote its interest in unity, because it existed in no other form. If, then, they acted as Dr. Myers claims, they did so without authority, and in contravention of the duties assigned them. They were not constituted parties to contract for destroying the unity of the Church, any more than for changing its doctrines or abolishing its government, or for performing any other unauthorized act which would be injurious and destructive to the organization which they were appointed to serve and protect. They could become parties to such a contract only by a palpable breach of trust in the most important and sacred matters committed to their keeping; and any such "compact" or "covenant," if made, must have been, in the nature of things, invalid, null, and void from the first, and, from what we have seen, could have been secured only by deceit and trickery. If they were parties to any "contract" of the kind, it was one like those of Absalom and Adonijah in seizing the kingdom of David, unwarranted, revolu-

tionary, and in violation of solemn obligations. Dr. Myers's arguments make these delegates appear to be guilty of such things. We say they were not. They did not covenant or agree to give away, sell, or otherwise dispose of, any portion of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They simply said to the South, "If you *will* secede, go in peace."

But there is another aspect to this question, and one in which the delegates from the South appear to great disadvantage. We quote from Dr. George Peck, whose knowledge of the facts, and whose candor in stating them, can not be doubted:

"The late General Conference conceded much for the sake of peace. The report of the Committee of Nine, providing for an amicable and equitable adjustment of the claims of the South, as to territory and pecuniary interests in the Book Concern and Chartered Fund, 'should they see it necessary to organize a separate ecclesiastical connection,' was a concession. It was asked 'as a peace-offering,' and as such it was granted. But it was granted with the assurance from our Southern brethren that if, upon their return home, they could quiet the public mind and retain their connection with the North, they would do so. I was personally assured by leading Southern members that if the recommendation for the alteration of the sixth Restrictive Rule was passed promptly in the Northern conferences, it would do much toward restoring confidence and preserving the unity of the Church. Consequently, I advocated that recommendation in the three annual conferences which I attended, in all of which the vote passed by a very large majority. But, while we were laboring to further this peace measure—and actually carried it swimmingly through all the New England conferences, excepting one, and that conference laid it over merely to see what the state of things might be after the lapse of a year; and the same course of things was rolling on West—all at once the tide of sympathy was interrupted by the extravagant measures of the South. It has been said that none favored the proposed alteration of the Restrictive Rule except pro-slavery men

on the one hand, and ultra-abolitionists on the other, both of whom desired division. This representation does the conservatives of the North and East great injustice. They voted the recommendation as a peace measure, hoping that a disposition upon the part of the North to do ample justice to the South would either prevent disunion, or give it a mild and comparatively harmless form. If they have been disappointed, they have the consolation of having done all they could to save the Church from the evils of schism. Had we good reason to believe that the Southern delegates, upon their return, used their best endeavors to restore peace, we should now be much better satisfied. Did it appear that the separation was demanded by the Southern people, and merely submitted to as a matter of necessity by the preachers, we should meet the result with all due submissiveness, and feel no loss of confidence in our old friends of the Southern conferences. But, as it is, we feel injured, and can not suppress the conviction that false issues have been raised, and extravagant and utterly erroneous representations have been made to the Southern people in relation to the action of the General Conference, and the prevailing views and feelings of the North." (Slavery and the Episcopacy, pp. 62, 63.)

This is a sad picture, the reproduction of which we regret that Dr. Myers has challenged. No one can study the doings of this General Conference without being impressed with the candor and Christian spirit of the delegates from the North, and their desire to go to the utmost verge of consistency in conciliating the South. Nor do we charge upon those of the thirteen conferences such duplicity as the author of the "Disruption" would leave us to infer that they practiced on this occasion. The representations of Dr. Peck, given above, are bad enough. Surely, those of Dr. Myers must be without foundation in truth.

The efforts of Dr. Myers to construe and defend

the "Plan of Separation" in the interest of the M. E. Church South are painful to witness. On pages 107, 108, he speaks of the resolutions of Dr. Capers as being considered unconstitutional, not because they provided for a division of the Church, but for the reason that they submitted the question of division to the annual conferences, and claims that while this submission of the case was unconstitutional, the General Conference could constitutionally divide. This is a logical monstrosity which would do credit only to an inmate of an insane asylum. After speaking of the rejection of the resolutions of Dr. Capers, because of their reference to the annual conferences, he says:

"And yet within two days a committee, made up of almost the same persons, reported a plan which not only gave the two General Conferences proposed by Dr. Capers, but went further by providing for a total division of labors and property, which the other did not suggest; the difference in other respects being that, not by a vote of the General Conference, but by that of the South, was the division inaugurated; and the objection of unconstitutionality being avoided by sending down to the conferences, for their concurrence, *only* a measure respecting property, which came *within* the *literal* provisions of the constitution." (Page 108.)

The italics in the above are the same as given by the author. The worst of this, because so shockingly untruthful, is, he represents this as the action of Hamline, Bangs, Porter, Fillmore, and Akers, in the committee, and of the General Conference. On page 115, he says: "Dr. Finley goes so far even as to provide for the *secession* of the South," while nothing is more apparent in the General Conference of 1844 than his opposition to the whole scheme,

except in this—like others, he was willing to grant the South, as a peace measure, all it asked that could be given. On pages 109, 110, 111, 112, he interpolates, in brackets, and perverts, the words of Griffith, Finley, Hamline, Bond, Bangs, Porter, and Paine. Dr. Hamline was utterly opposed to all plans for dividing the Church, and yet he is represented as suggesting and devising one. The Northern delegates generally are repeatedly made to appear as actively aiding to further the schemes of the minority. The misrepresentations of fact and palpable perversions of truth in this connection are appalling.

Such are some of the facts in relation to this report, though the half has not been told. But enough has been said to show that no such contract or covenant, as Dr. Myers speaks of, was ever made between the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the M. E. Church South. The General Conference of 1844 did agree to bestow great and unusual favors upon the South, if secession occurred; and this it has done, though the report, with all of the plans and provisions in it, was long since broken, annulled, and destroyed, by the M. E. Church South.

The so-called "Plan of Separation" utterly failing as a peace measure, the territory of the thirteen seceding conferences was reopened in the natural order of things to the Methodist Episcopal Church. Thousands of members within these conferences were not willing to unite with the new connection when that was formed, but claimed their membership in the old Church; and the Methodist Episcopal Church is in the South, now, by invitation of the people, of such as

desired to adhere North according to the "Plan." The report did not forbid the people to ask for the ministrations of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, they did so in numerous instances.

The ninth resolution of the report relating to the churches, parsonages, etc., is practically a nullity, and always has been, because the General Conference did not, and does not now, hold or control the property of the Church. That is held by local trustees, and owned by the Methodist people. It was for them, in their localities severally, to say whether their churches, parsonages, and school-houses should, or should not, remain in the Methodist Episcopal Church, or be transferred elsewhere. No general or annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church has violated this provision.

As to the people of color in their present relation as freemen, they are a new element in the country, originating since the report was adopted, and not taken into account by it. When the slaves became citizens, they were proper subjects for missionary labor by all the denominations of Christians, and there was nothing in the "Plan" which debarred the Methodist Episcopal Church from entering this field, nor, indeed, the whole South, both among the white and colored population, since the failure of the "Plan," and especially under the new order of things occasioned by the late war. It is here by right, as much so as any Church anywhere within the bounds of Christendom.

CHAPTER IV.

FOUR YEARS OF SAD EXPERIENCE.

A DISTORTED view of the "Action of the South on the Plan of Separation" is given in the ninth chapter of the "Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church," which is as unjust to the North as it is flattering to the South. The author deprecates, with Mr. Crowder, of Virginia (kindred spirits), and with others like them, even the reading of the Reply to the Protest in the General Conference, much more the adoption of it by that body. "The passage of that Reply," said he, "would render division inevitable; they had no choice left." He repeated, with much warmth, and earnestness, his conviction as to the "disastrous consequences to be produced by the publication of that paper."

Indeed, why these fears no one needs ask. The reason of them is apparent to all who have read this Reply. It shows conclusively that the General Conference acted with great consideration and prudence, and in accordance with the law, in the case of Bishop Andrew, and that it left the South without reasonable excuse for the course pursued against the Church, and that it did not intend to yield its antislavery position; hence the "disastrous consequences to be produced by the publication of that paper," that is, disastrous

to the schemes to the protesting delegates. The "Disruption" does not contain this Reply, nor, in fact, scarcely any thing calculated to give a fair view of the questions at issue. Dr. Myers proceeds:

"We have had terrible proof of the jealousy with which the South met any—though anticipated—interference with its institutions [slavery]; and the people would have risen *en masse* against Methodism, in every form, if it were believed to be under the domination of even antislavery, much less abolition, sentiment; and they would have believed this of it unless the action of this Conference were repudiated by the Southern delegates. . . . Methodism had many enemies, who would be quick to promote disruption and schism; and any seeming hesitancy of these delegates to show fealty to their own section, amid its present excitements, would be the signal for breaking up many Churches, and all of their missions among the slaves." (Page 129.)

What about "fealty" to God, to right, to humanity? Was this less important than "fealty to their own section?" The depth of the love of Southern Methodists for the moral welfare of the slaves has been evinced by this Church since the liberation of that people, by first excluding them from their houses of worship (the basement in cities), where they had been accustomed to hold service, and then from Church fellowship, by putting them into a "separate organization," without a school-house or a teacher. According to our author, the "Plan" became a "peace measure" in the South by unifying Methodism here, where it is well known a divided sentiment prevailed with regard to slavery and separation in the Church. With them, it was, and is still, a war measure against the North and a "peace measure" in the South, by serving as a check and gag to all

who differ from the controlling element. It was made to serve the purpose of war or peace, to suit various occasions. He continues:

“It may be granted that, had there been no Plan of Separation devised, and had the Methodist Episcopal Church persisted in maintaining her jurisdiction in the South, there *might* have been found in the many ‘societies’ a nucleus of members remaining true to her, as also here and there some preachers. But this would have involved schism, and the general dissolution of the Church. These were Northern men, and some who sympathized with the North on that question which proved the occasion of this revolution. But the great body of Methodists were not of that sort, especially the leading men in that Church. The wealth and intelligence of her membership would have been arrayed against any preachers or people who attempted to maintain Church fellowship with Northern Methodists on their principles. The war would have been transferred from the border to nine out of ten of all the societies of Southern Methodism; and if these prominent Methodists could not have carried their societies, one by one, out of the Northern organization, they would, by tens of thousands, have withdrawn from Episcopal Methodism. The united front of the delegates and their wise suggestions preserved the unity of the Church, in that it kept the influential classes from disrupting or abandoning it. Had they gone, a remnant might have remained in many societies, out of which it would have been as difficult to re-establish the pristine power of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South as it has proved to be in later years to regain to its fold the white people of this section. But for this wise forecast of these delegates, the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, after 1844, might have been but a prophecy of itself as now existing—*plus* the ‘meeting-houses’ and *minus* the negroes.” (Pages 130, 131.)

The slang in the last sentence of the above is simply contemptible. As to the “pristine power of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South,” it is certainly not found now in the Southern Church. The fling at “Northern men, and some who sympa-

thized" with them, is in keeping with the man, the book, and the Church to which they belong; and then, on the same page, to see him call the Methodist Episcopal Church, before 1844, "the Northern organization," is refreshing. Aside from the truckling to "wealth," "intelligence," "influential members," and public opinion generally, indicated in the above, it is rather a plausible putting of the case, provided the reader is not acquainted with the facts, or skips page 129. There the people are represented as controlling every thing. Here, on page 130, the delegates are made to lead the van and appear as the heroes of the occasion. If the representations on this page, in reference to a friendly feeling toward the North, are true of that day, no doubt many thousands would have adhered to the old Church had they been permitted to do so. These are correct so far as they go, but do not indicate one-half of the tendency in that direction. The "pristine power" of Methodism would have been much more likely of preservation in the unity of the Church than by the new connection. Those whom Dr. Myers calls the enemies of the Church were, many of them, such of its members as entertained antislavery views—Dr. Bascom's Tennessee "Abolitionists," for instance.

The course pursued by the delegates proves them to have been the leaders in the secession movement. Their meeting in New York, on the day after the General Conference adjourned, has been noticed. There they inaugurated the separation by arranging for the Louisville Convention, and made it, most emphatically, a secession, by asking Bishop Andrew to

hold their conferences, in defiance of the General Conference, and by publishing throughout the South the following inflammatory and revolutionary paper:

“ ADDRESS

TO THE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL
CHURCH IN THE SLAVE-HOLDING STATES AND TERRITORIES
BY THE DELEGATES OF THE SOUTHERN CONFER-
ENCES. ISSUED JUNE 11, 1844.

“ The undersigned, delegates in the late General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from thirteen annual conferences in slave-holding States and Territories, would most respectfully represent that the various action of the majority of the General Conference, at its recent session, on the subject of slavery and abolition, has been such as to render it necessary, in the judgment of those addressing you, to call attention to the proscription and disability under which the Southern portion of the Church must of necessity labor, in view of the action alluded to, unless some measures are adopted to free the minority in the South from the oppressive jurisdiction of the majority in the North in this respect.

“ The proceedings of the majority in several cases, involving the question of slavery, have been such as indicate, most conclusively, that the legislative, judicial, and administrative action of the General Conference, as now organized, will always be extremely hurtful, if not finally ruinous, to the interests of the Southern portion of the Church, and must necessarily produce a state of conviction and feeling in the slave-holding States, entirely inconsistent with either the peace or prosperity of the Church.

“ The opinions and purposes of the Church in the North on the subject of slavery are in direct conflict with those of the South, and, unless the South will submit to the dictation and interference of the North greatly beyond what the existing law of the Church on slavery and abolition authorizes, there is no hope of any thing like union or harmony. The debate and action of the General Conference in the case of the Rev. Mr. Harding, of the Baltimore Conference; the debate and action in the case of Bishop Andrew; and the opinions and purposes avowed and indicated in a manifesto of the majority, in reply to a protest

from the minority against the proceeding complained of; together with hundreds of petitions from the East, North, and West, demanding that slavery, in all its possible forms, be separated from the Church—these, and similar demonstrations, have convinced the undersigned that they can not remain silent or inactive without hazard and injustice to the different portions of the Church they represent.

“They have therefore thought proper to invoke the attention of the Church in the South to a state of things they are compelled to regard as worthy the immediate notice and action of the Church throughout all the slave-holding States and Territories. The subject of slavery and abolition, notwithstanding the plain law of the Discipline on the subject, was agitated and debated in the late General Conference for five successive weeks; and even at the very close of the session the aspect of things was less satisfactory and more threatening to the South than at any former period; and under such circumstances of mutual distrust and disagreement the General Conference adjourned.

“Some time before the adjournment, however, upon a declaration made by the Southern delegates, setting forth the impossibility of enduring such a state of things much longer, the General Conference, by a very large and decided majority, agreed to a plan of formal and specific separation, by which the Southern conferences are to have a distinct and independent organization of their own, in no way subject to Northern jurisdiction. It affords us pleasure to state that there were those found among the majority who met this proposition with every manifestation of justice and liberality. And should a similar spirit be exhibited by the annual conferences in the North, when submitted to them, as provided for in the plan itself, there will remain no legal impediment to its peaceful consummation.

“This plan is approved by the undersigned as the best, and, indeed, all that can be done at present, in remedy of the great evil under which we labor. Provision is made for a peaceable and constitutional division of Church property of every kind. The plan does not decide that division shall take place, but simply, and it is thought securely, provides that it may, if it be found necessary. Of this necessity you are to be judges, after a careful survey and comparison of all the reasons for and against it.

“As the undersigned have had opportunity and advantages

which those at a distance could not possess, to form a correct judgment in the premises, and it may be expected of them that they express their views fully on the subject, they do not hesitate to say that they regard a separation at no distant day as inevitable; and, further, that the plan of separation agreed upon is as eligible as the Southern conferences have any right to expect, at any time. We most respectfully, therefore, and with no common solicitude, beseech our brethren of the ministry and membership in the slave-holding States to examine this matter carefully, and, weighing it well in all its bearings, try to reach the conclusion most proper under the circumstances. Shall that, which in all moral likelihood must take place soon, be attempted now, or are there reasons why it should be postponed?

“We deprecate all excitement; we ask you to be calm and collected, and to approach and dispose of the subject with all the candor and forbearance the occasion demands.

“The separation proposed is *not* schism, it is *not* secession. It is a state or family separating into two different states or families by mutual consent. As the ‘Methodist Episcopal Church’ will be found north of the dividing line, so the ‘Methodist Episcopal Church’ will be south of the same line.

“The undersigned have clung to the cherished unity of the Church with a firmness of purpose and force of feeling which nothing but invincible necessity could subdue. If, however, nominal unity must coexist with unceasing strife and alienated feeling, what is likely to be gained by its perpetuation? Every minister and member of the Church in slave-holding States must perceive at once that the constant, not to say interminable, agitation of the slavery and abolition question in the councils of the Church and elsewhere must terminate in incalculable injury to all the Southern conferences. Our access to slave and master is, to a great extent, cut off. The legislation of the Church in conflict with that of the State—Church policy attempting to control public opinion and social order—must generate an amount of hostility to the Church impossible to be overcome, and slowly but certainly diminish both the means and the hope of usefulness and extension on the part of the Church.

“Disposed, however, to defer to the judgment of the Church, we leave this subject with you. Our first and most direct object has been to bring it fully before you, and, giving

you an opportunity to judge and determine for yourselves, await your decision. The minority from the South in the late General Conference were most anxious to adjourn the decision in the case of Bishop Andrew, with all its attendant results, to the annual conferences and to the Church at large, to consider and decide upon during the next four years—as no charge was presented against the Bishop, and especially as this measure was urgently recommended by the whole bench of bishops, although Bishop Hedding subsequently withdrew his name. The proposition, however, to refer the whole subject to the Church was promptly rejected by the majority, and immediate action demanded and had. But as all the facts connected with the equivocal suspension of Bishop Andrew will come before you in other forms, it is unnecessary to detail them in this brief address, the main object of which is to place before you, in a summary way, the principal facts and reasons connected with the proposed separation of the Southern conferences into a distinct organization.

“Adopted at a meeting of the Southern delegations, held in New York, at the close of the General Conference, June 11, 1844, and ordered to be published.

“Signed on behalf of the Kentucky, Missouri, Holston, Tennessee, North Carolina, Memphis, Arkansas, Virginia, Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina Annual Conferences.” (History of the Great Secession, pp. 1045–1047, and also History M. E. Church South, pp. 105–108.)

This was signed by all of the fifty-one delegates.

How do the statements of Dr. Myers look in the light of this work of 1844? No wonder excitement in the South followed such a “manifesto” to the Church in the slave-holding States. This, Dr. Myers says, was “calmly and prayerfully done,” including the invitation to Bishop Andrew to hold their conferences; and then he innocently asks, What could have been done more considerately for the sake of peace?” Ironically, the writer would answer, We do not know, unless it should be for the Chairman

of the Peace Commissioners to write a book, in the "interest of fraternity," on the "Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church!" Contradicting the position of Dr. Myers, Dr. Olin, the friend, and, to some extent, the patron and defender of the South in 1844, with which he was well acquainted, in the *New York Advocate*, September 10, 1845, says:

"The General Conference did not divide the Church or consent to the division. It left the responsibility of that deplorable act upon those who have since deliberately done the deed.' This division was promoted, he says, 'through the party zeal and ungenerous misrepresentations of many of the Southern preachers' and then remarks, 'Let it be known, however, let it be published through the length and breadth of these lands, that the subject of the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church *originating with*, was *perpetuated* and *carried through by*, her ministers in the South, assisted and sanctioned by ultra-abolitionists of the North, in opposition to the wishes and remonstrances of the *Southern membership*.' This is history; and as such it will pass down to posterity." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 524, 525.)

It would be difficult to conceive of more direct or telling testimony against the assumption of Dr. Myers than the above.

Though writing ostensibly about the "action of the South on the Plan," our author is careful not to mention the most vital points at issue. But let us now return to the "Plan," and examine the results of its working from 1844 to 1848, under the influence of such "peace measures" as those adopted by the delegates, and the South following the leadership of these peace-loving brethren. The report of the Committee of Nine was made in response to the declaration of the delegates of the thirteen Southern

conferences, in their behalf and theirs alone, as it is plain for any one to see. The border conferences were Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri. It must be apparent to all that the report left the Northern conferences untouched. They were satisfied with the Church, did not desire to secede. But the report provided that if societies on the border of these Southern conferences should vote to adhere North, they must be permitted to remain in the Methodist Episcopal Church, but there is not a word said about those north of the border adhering South. Mark these words: "The following rule shall be observed with regard to the northern boundary of such connection." What connection? Answer: The connection made of the thirteen conferences about to withdraw; that is, the northern boundary of Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri Conferences, as then constituted. The report does not authorize this new connection to go beyond this northern line, does not provide for the transfer of a person outside of these thirteen conferences to the Southern Church, but it does expressly provide that, if the majority of any society, station or conference on the border within any of these three conferences were dissatisfied with this new pro-slavery arrangement, and did not wish to go with it, they could remain in the Methodist Episcopal Church by voting to do so. Read the first resolution of the report in the preceding chapter, and see if this interpretation is not correct. The Southern Church, then, had no right to go North, but the Methodist Episcopal Church was allowed to come South and take as many societies on the border

as preferred to remain in that Church, which was manifestly just.

The northern boundary of the Southern Church was not Mason and Dixon's line, as some suppose, neither was it any line or distinction between free and slave territory, but the northern geographical border of the protesting conferences. That was very crooked, but it is easy to define and also to trace upon the map.

The Virginia Conference did not include, in 1844, the whole of that State, scarcely one-half of it. The eastern shore belonged to Philadelphia; and three large districts in the north and central portions of the State to Baltimore, namely: the Potomac District, lying between the Potomac and Rappahannock Rivers, and including, with Washington and the District of Columbia, Fairfax, Warrenton, and all of the country between the rivers named except Fredricksburg and Port Royal; the Winchester District, including that portion of the State; and the Rockingham District, extending up the valley of Virginia, and embracing Staunton, Lexington, Fincastle, Covington, Lewisburg, Salem, and Christiansburg. The Pittsburg Conference embraced the northern portion of Virginia, west of the mountains; and the Ohio, the Kanawha country to the Kentucky line; the Rappahannock forming the northern, and the Blue Ridge the western, boundary of the Virginia Conference. To trace this line upon the map, commence on the Chesapeake Bay at the mouth of the Rappahannock, follow up that river to the Blue Ridge, thence along this ridge southward to the railroad from

Lynchburg to Bristol, along this road so as to include Salem and Christiansburg, thence along the New River to the line of West Virginia, and across to the Big Sandy on the Kentucky line, and down that stream to the Ohio River; so as to include the eastern shore, the country between the Rappahannock and the Potomac, the valley of Virginia as far south as the railroad, or beyond, and all of West Virginia in the "Northern" conferences. From the mouth of the Big Sandy, on the Ohio, which forms the line between West Virginia and Kentucky, the Ohio River was the boundary separating Kentucky from Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois Conferences. From the mouth of the Ohio, the Mississippi River formed the line northward to the northern boundary of the Missouri, the State line dividing between that and the Iowa Conference; north of this line the "Plan of Separation" gave the Southern Church no right or recognition whatever, while the Methodist Episcopal Church embraced on slave territory, by the "Plan," all of Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia, half of Virginia, and was permitted to include all societies upon the border of and within these Southern conferences, if a majority of the members so determined.

The course pursued by the two Churches on either side of this boundary was, from the time of separation, about as different as it well could be—as opposite as is that followed by the Methodist Episcopal Church from that of our Southern brethren. It is the same spirit on the part of each in 1844, 1848, 1861, and 1876. The Methodist Episcopal Church carried out in good faith the promises contained in the report

of the Committee of Nine, notwithstanding the South had violently rent the Church, contrary to the promises made by many, and had trampled the provisions of this report under foot from the time of its adoption, when it suited the convenience or interests of that Church to do so, though all the while claiming to be acting under its stipulations. We will state the case thus:

After the Methodists in the South seceded, *the Methodist Episcopal Church kept all of the pledges provisionally made in case secession should occur:*

1. By allowing ministers and members in the thirteen seceding conferences or any others to depart in peace, not endeavoring to restrain them from carrying out their cherished purpose of establishing an independent ecclesiastical organization, and "leaving them under the unmolested pastoral care of the Southern Church;" and it continues to do so till this day.

2. By not attempting to organize Churches or societies within the limits of the Church South, or exercising pastoral oversight therein, till after the Southern Church had repeatedly violated, broken, annulled, and destroyed all of the "Plan" there was.

3. By permitting all ministers of every grade and office—local and traveling—from Bishop Soule down, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, without blame, to attach themselves to the Church South; and it continues to do so till this day.

4. By leaving all of the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844 in meeting-houses, parsonages, schools, etc., within the limits of the Southern organization, free from any claim set up by the

Methodist Episcopal Church; and it continues to do so till this day. If there is any thing of that kind belonging to the General Conference, that body has not taken it from the Southern Church. Nor has the General Conference taken any property whatever belonging to the Southern Church from that body till this day.

In cases of dispute about local Church houses or parsonages, the question has not been between our General Conference on one side and the Southern on the other, but between individuals or societies, and about property to which the General Conference had no title, and over which it exercised no control. The "Plan," in respect to this property, said, "so far as this resolution can be of force in the premises," and that amounted to nothing, because the General Conference neither owned nor held the property in question. This resolution was merely a quit-claim to property which the General Conference did not pretend to possess. It might have passed such a resolution about all of the railroads, canals, iron mines and grave-yards in the country, and not have affected the title to any of them. It was put in the report because the Southern delegates desired something of the kind.

The property of the Book Concern was not divided according to the "Plan," because the provisions of the "Plan" were such that, being defeated by the annual conferences, they prohibited such division. How could the Southern delegates act honorably in demanding a division of this property when, by their own cherished "Plan," it was denied them?

5. The bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in their administration, carefully avoided complications with the Church South, and scrupulously observed the provisions of the report. After the Louisville Convention, which declared the South independent of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they courteously declined to claim jurisdiction over those conferences which had withdrawn, and notified them accordingly. (See History of the Great Secession, pp. 1071, 1072.)

The bishops, finding it desirable to give public expression in regard to their views and administration, at their meeting held in the city of Philadelphia, March 3, 4, 5, 1847, passed the following resolutions, namely:

“Bishop Hedding presented for consideration several subjects connected with our administration relative to border work, under the Plan of Separation adopted by the last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, when it was,

“1. *Resolved*, That the Plan of Separation aforesaid provides for taking the votes by conferences, stations, and societies, and not by circuits, in fixing their Church relations.

“2. *Resolved*, That, in our administration under said Plan of Separation, we consider the period of taking the vote of conferences, stations, and societies, is limited: for conferences, to the time of their next session after the organization of the M. E. Church South; and for stations and societies, to the time of the first session of their respective annual conferences subsequent to said organization.

“3. *Resolved*, That in our administration we will, under the Plan of Separation aforesaid, consider the first vote regularly and fairly taken, after the organization of the M. E. Church South, by any border station or society *south of the line of separation*, as final in fixing its relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church, or to the M. E. Church South.

“4. *Resolved, therefore*, That we can send no preacher to

any station or society, *south of the line of separation*, which, subsequent to the organization of the M. E. Church South, has once received a preacher from said Church without remonstrance from a majority of its members.

“5. *Resolved, also*, That when a border station or society, north of the line of separation, has once received a preacher from the Methodist Episcopal Church—subsequent to the organization of the M. E. Church South—without remonstrance from the majority of said station or society, it fixes finally the Church relation of said station or society to the Methodist Episcopal Church, even if it were to be admitted that the ‘Plan of Separation’ allows stations and societies north of said line to vote on the subject of Church relationship.

“6. *Whereas*, the Discipline says, ‘Virginia Conference shall be bounded on the east by the Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean,’ and ‘Philadelphia Conference shall include the eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia,’ the Chesapeake Bay, an arm of the ocean, being between them; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That in our administration we will regard the ‘eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia’ as not being ‘border’ work in the sense of the ‘Plan of Separation.’

“7. *Resolved*, That, from the information before us, after mature consultation, we agree in the opinion that the Kanawha District, Ohio Conference, under the ‘Plan of Separation,’ belongs to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that we will govern our administration accordingly.

“8. *Resolved*, That our administration within the bounds of King George, Westmoreland, Lancaster, and Warrenton Circuits, Baltimore Conference, be governed by the principle laid down in our first resolution, and that we feel obliged to furnish preachers to said circuits as heretofore, if it be practicable.

“9. *Resolved*, That, as our immediate duties do not require us to speak publicly of other parts of our border work where difficulties exist, we deem it unnecessary to make known our opinions concerning them at present.

“10. *Resolved*, That the extracts selected from the journal for publication be signed by the Secretary, and forwarded to the *Christian Advocate and Journal*.

“As per order, EDMUND S. JANES, *Sec’y.*”
(History of the Great Secession, pp. 578, 579.)

Dr. Myers quotes the first five of these resolutions, but he is careful to omit the others. The sixth, seventh, and eighth speak expressly of territory belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church, both by the "Plan," being in Northern conferences, and by formally adhering to the Methodist Episcopal Church! Read them again; also the third, fourth, and fifth. Southern preachers had "bullied" numerous societies and circuits, north of the boundary line, out of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in various ways; and the first five resolutions, by stating the course pursued by the bishops and their views of the "Plan," gave indirect but pointed rebuke to the general policy of the Southern Church. Nevertheless, out of these resolutions Dr. Myers tortures comfort for the Church South, and, with his accustomed horrible disregard for the truth, represents the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church as favoring and supporting the "Plan of Separation" as held and carried out by the South. This is so utterly false that it appears ridiculous, if not foolish.

The disregard of the "Plan," since the war, charged upon the North, we leave unnoticed for the present, but up to 1848 we challenge any one to find an instance in which the Methodist Episcopal Church, or any of its bishops or conferences, violated the provisions of this "Plan."

On the other hand, *the Southern Church was doing this all the time.* Now for the proof: To repeat, for the sake of perspicuity, the report of the Committee of Nine was intended to provide for contingencies which might arise in the future. The Southern

delegates, without waiting till those contingencies arose, set about creating such a state of things as the report sought to prevent, and, on the day after the General Conference adjourned, June 11, 1844, held the meeting heretofore mentioned, and violated the "Plan," and inaugurated secession, by three distinct acts, to wit: 1. By providing for the Louisville Convention; 2. By sending out an inflammatory circular to the Methodists in the South; and 3. By setting the action of the General Conference at defiance in asking Bishop Andrew to hold the Southern conferences.

The Louisville Convention, held in May, 1845, has been spoken of, and the action in organizing the Southern Church given. This Convention, the first organized body of the Southern Church, acting in behalf of those who composed the new connection, just one year after the General Conference was held, palpably and understandingly violated the "Plan," and invited others to do so, by the adoption of the following resolution, namely:

"Resolved, That, should any portion of an annual conference, not represented in this Convention, adhere to the M. E. Church South, according to the Plan of Separation adopted by the late General Conference, and elect delegates to the General Conference of 1846 upon the basis of representation adopted by this Convention, they shall be accredited as members of the General Conference." (History of the Great Secession, p. 478.)

This is not only an invitation to those north of the line to unite with the new Church, but, as we shall see presently, an indication of preparation for aggressive warfare upon the original body. Was the "Plan" a peace measure between the two Churches?

The first General Conference of the Church South also violated the "Plan," by approving of the most flagrant infractions of it by Bishops Soule and Andrew, and by presiding elders and preachers, and by this shameless perversion of its provisions, to wit:

"The construction put upon the provisions of this rule by the bishops of the M. E. Church South, and by those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for any thing that appears to the contrary to your committee, is, that it gives a plain, permissive grant of occupancy to the Southern Churches along the borders northwardly, until the dividing line is satisfactorily settled and determined by the formal adherence north of a definite line of societies and stations. This ascertained, then the societies and stations lying beyond that line become interior charges, which are to be left undisturbed by the Southern ministry. But the line of division never becomes fixed until such an act of adherence North takes place. This act alone is made, by the aforesaid rule, the condition of protection against the advance of the southern boundary, and *vice versa*. Such a construction of the law alone secures to border societies the rights and privileges allowed by the Plan of Separation, and provides, at the same time, for the peace and security of the border region." (Disruption, p. 152.)

Under such an interpretation of the report, the suggestions of the delegates in New York, the inspiration of the Convention at Louisville, the example of Bishops Soule and Andrew, and with the backing of the General Conference, what might not have been expected of the Southern Church? Turning to the records, we find what it did. The eastern shore of Virginia was in the Philadelphia, a Northern Conference, not on our border, in the sense of the "Plan," because north of the Chesapeake Bay, and certainly not included in the Southern Church. It was soon invaded, however, by the new connection which had

thus quickly forgotten the "peace measure," at least so far as the interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church were concerned. The following shows the "fraternity" of the Southern Church on Northern territory in 1846-7:

"Northampton Circuit is one of those invaded by the South. It is named after a county on the eastern shore of Virginia. Two societies of this circuit, claiming to be border societies, though the Chesapeake Bay, thirty-five miles wide, divides it from the Virginia Conference, voted, by a numerical majority of one or two, to unite with the new Church. Bishop Andrew sent them a preacher from the Virginia Conference. On Saturday and Sabbath, April 17 and 18, 1846, Rev. John Early held his second quarterly-meeting, at Capeville, for this circuit. After the sacrament of the Lord's-supper, as Mr. Brickhouse, who was present, writes, under date of April 24th, Mr. Early lectured the people on the division of the Church. He pointed out the danger to the South of admitting Northern preachers to their pulpits; that they were Abolitionists, and would sow dangerous opinions among the slaves. And this was said in reference to the preachers of the Philadelphia Conference, who were never accused, or even suspected, for a period of over sixty years, of teaching any thing but what tended to peace and harmony. The effect of this speech, on the baser sort, was to prepare and excite them to mob violence, while the sober and peaceable citizens were of a different mind.

"Accordingly, on Sunday, 12th of July, 'the Rev. Mr. Gray, preacher in charge of Northampton Circuit, when about to commence the morning services in the Salem Church, was assailed by a mob, seized in the pulpit, and forcibly taken out of the pulpit and church. On Monday he went to Eastville, the seat of justice for the county, the court being then in session; he was met then and there by the mob, and driven away from the seat of justice, without redress or protection. He left the county, his life being considered in danger if he remained. The alleged cause for this violence was, that he was a Northern preacher.'

"In pursuance of previous notice, a public meeting was held at the court-house of Accomac County, August 31, 1846, 'to take into consideration the serious evils to be apprehended

from the adherents of the Methodists of this county to the Philadelphia Conference, and to urge upon them the necessity of their connecting themselves with the M. E. Church South.' The president of the meeting, the Hon. George P. Scarborough, remonstrating with the Methodists upon their present position, 'impressing upon them the dangers which may result to the safety of the people, and calling upon them, as pious, intelligent men, to sever their connection from the Philadelphia and attach themselves to the Virginia Conference.'

"In the report of the committee, adopted by the meeting, a brief survey of the steps in the Church controversy is given, and the Methodists of Accomac are entreated to unite with the new Church. The committee express their deep regret that all the Methodist societies of Accomac, with a solitary exception, still continue in the Methodist Episcopal Church. This they say is calculated to exert an alarming influence on their slaves. The subject has long since reached their ears; they already look on the Methodist Episcopal Church as their friends, and upon those in favor of the Church South as their enemies. A spirit of dissatisfaction is the result of such a state of things; and the transition from this feeling to that fanatical spirit which excited the Southampton insurrection is too easy not to be justly appreciated. The Methodists of the county are actuated by good motives in the course they are pursuing. They compose a large and highly respectable class of citizens, are as patriotic, and as devoted to the cause of peace and the welfare of society, as any other portion of the people; nevertheless, the inevitable tendency of their present position is of the most dangerous and alarming character. The committee, then, 'respectfully ask the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this county to take it into consideration, and to restore peace and a feeling of security to this community, by severing their connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church North, and uniting with the M. E. Church South.' A committee was then appointed to prepare an address to the people and the Methodist societies in Accomac, in conformity with these views. The address was published and reviewed by Dr. Bond." (History of the Great Se-
cession, pp. 585, 586.)

"Dr. Lee, in publishing the report in his paper, the Richmond *Advocate*, goes all lengths in eulogizing the principles and measures of the report. In his paper, containing this report, he

has an article headed, 'The Workings of Public Opinion,' in which he says: 'The reflecting people of the slave-holding States will ultimately arrive at the same conclusions as to the jurisdiction of an Abolitionist Church over their neighbors and slaves. It is an enormity that enlightened public sentiment can not and will not tolerate. Light is all that is wanted to bring the whole population of every slave-holding State to the conviction that they can not coalesce with abolitionism, either in the ministry or membership of the Church; and they dare not subject themselves to the ecclesiastical oversight and jurisdiction of those who maintain and propagate its principles.' " (History of the Great Secession, p. 587.)

"On November 29, 1846, Rev. Mr. Hargis, of the Philadelphia Conference, was mobbed at Guilford, Accomac County, while preaching on the holy Sabbath, by those who professed to be in the interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, as stated in the New York *Advocate*, by one who was present." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 587, 588.)

"In the month of May, 1847, attempts were made by a mob to drive away the preacher, but without success, as the Church members were firm to their purpose, and, withal, more numerous than their persecutors, so that the assailants failed of success. In the month of June they had a quarterly-meeting on Accomac Circuit, which was held without molestation, and with great profit. Such was the state of things before Dr. William A. Smith made his inflammatory speech in Northampton, in July, 1847. Since that the persecution burned more fiercely, and one of the preachers was advised by the brethren to leave his circuit. Dr. Smith, in his lecture, represented the Methodist Episcopal Church as abolition, or, as the term was used, *incendiaries, revolutionists, and traitors*; while he could not but know that much of the action of the Church was in opposition to all such measures, as well as to the ultra measures of Dr. Smith himself, and those of his school, who headed the Southern secession." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 589, 590.)

That is the way the Church South, in 1846 and 1847, pushed over the line into the Philadelphia Conference, contrary to the letter and spirit of the "Plan."

The Baltimore Conference suffered much more.

Its territory lay along the border of the Virginia Conference from the mouth of the Rappahannock to the Blue Ridge on the north, and along the Blue Ridge nearly across the State on the West. The Southern preachers were not satisfied when societies on the north side of the conference line expressed a determination to remain where they were, in the Methodist Episcopal Church; but used the most unfair and unchristian means to drag them over to the other side. Regardless of the "Plan," now so lovely in the eyes of some Southern Methodists, they sent a preacher to Westmoreland Circuit, in the Baltimore Conference, in 1846, and the next year sent preachers to three other circuits of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the same Conference, and made the most desperate efforts to break up the old Church, and to "disintegrate" and then "absorb" it into the "new connection." Dr. Elliott says: "The Virginia Conference occupied any territory they could obtain, whether of minorities or majorities, border or interior." These encroachments were made upon the Baltimore Conference through the bishops, and approved by the Southern Church. At the session of the Baltimore Conference in 1848, that body adopted a noble, manly, and Christian report upon this subject, in which it said:

"That disorganizing influences have been scattered all along the Southern border of our territory from the region beyond the Rappahannock—influences of authority, such as could not only give countenance, but pledge aid and protection, though the strife engendered should involve the whole work in confusion and disorder. The fraternal regards of Christians have all been forgotten or sacrificed in the repeated aggressions upon

our societies which have lately transpired. It is high time that we announce to our people and the world, that, while we, through our episcopacy, carefully confine ourselves to a strict construction of the Plan, which will not admit of incursion into Southern territory, the Church South, through its episcopacy, has, in more than one instance, thrown down every safeguard, and embroiled, or sought to embroil, almost every society from the Chesapeake to the Blue Ridge and from the Blue Ridge to the Alleghanies." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 590, 591.)

Such is the testimony of this Conference of these times, and of the operations of the Southern Church under the great "peace measure," the "Plan of Separation." They both love and use it now as they did then, where they have the power to do so.

The Ohio Conference fared no better at the hands of the Southern brethren. Its Virginia Territory was overrun and the work distracted and slaughtered by incursions from Kentucky, as it was in the Baltimore Conference from Virginia. The Kanawha District, then in the Ohio Conference, voted almost solidly to adhere North, but that made no difference with the seceders, they "bullied" the people into their measures. When the vote was taken, one preacher put the question thus, namely: "Will you stay with us, or will you go with the Abolitionists?" The question was, of course, intended to decide the vote, and sometimes accomplished this object. The Kanawha Circuit

Resolved, That we are deeply pained and mortified that the name of Methodism has been so stained by the unchristian, and the immoral means used, or sanctioned, by some of the adherents of the M. E. Church South among us, to effect their ambitious project of pulling down the Methodist Episcopal Church to build up a pro-slavery Church; and we can not here-

after have fellowship with those of them known by us to have been engaged in this business, either actively or approvingly, till we have evidence of their contrition and reformation." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 592.)

Cincinnati was also visited by these "missionaries" from the South, who were laboring under a "Plan" which separated Churches and friends, and carried discord wherever they went. In many cases peace was restored only by the death of the movement. The Southern cause came to naught in Cincinnati. But why multiply words upon the subject? We pass on to Kentucky. Maysville was a border charge in the sense of the report; that is, it was on the Northern border of the Southern Church and voted to adhere North under the "Plan," but the vote availed but little, as is seen by the following:

"As the case of Maysville has been one of both importance and notoriety, it may be considered. Before the Louisville Convention, the whole number of members in Maysville on the Church-books was two hundred and fifty-six. Of this number, one hundred and forty-one wished to remain in the Methodist Episcopal Church. With the hue and cry of 'Abolitionists,' the agents of the South, on the 31st of August, 1845, prevailed on one hundred and nine to join the Church South. On the day on which the vote was taken, only ninety-seven made their appearance for the old Church, as they thought they had already done all that was necessary to retain their membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church. With all the mustering of the South, the old Church had a majority of twenty-six members; but the minority who went South, by various stratagems, succeeded in wresting the Church property out of the hands of the majority and using it themselves.

"In Kentucky, in general, the Methodists were thrown from their proper position by the leaders in the secession, though under the plea that it was no secession. Yet there were several places which could not be induced to leave, as Maysville, Augusta, a large minority in Covington. There were

minorities almost every-where who refused to go; and in many places the majorities themselves, who joined the new Church, were far from being cordial in the exercise of their reluctant choice." (History of the Great Secession, pp. 592, 593.)

Missouri and Arkansas were in like manner divided, and perhaps in an equally disturbed condition, though the Methodist Episcopal Church did not try to organize there till after 1848, notwithstanding some societies on the border remained in that Church. Thousands added to thousands would have adhered North, had they been given an opportunity to do so.

The General Conference of 1848 considered this whole question, devoting much of the session to it, and put on record the following painful chapter of the usurpations and wrongs of the pro-slavery Church:

"The attention of the committee has been directed, by sundry memorials submitted to their consideration by the General Conference, to numerous infractions of the provisions of the so-called *Plan of Separation* upon the part of the M. E. Church South; and upon this subject present to the Conference the following statement and facts:

"I. The M. E. Church South has officially and authoritatively taught the infraction of the Plan by her convention, her General Conference, her bishops, her annual conferences, her editors, and her leading ministers.

"1. The Louisville Convention taught the violation of the Plan.

"In the Report on Organization, passed Saturday, the 17th of May, 1845, the new Church is declared to be formed out of the conferences represented in the convention. (See 'History of the M. E. Church South,' p. 186.) But while the Convention, in their formal acts of organization, on Saturday, the 17th of May, make this declaration, we find them on the following Monday passing these resolutions (See *Western Christian Advocate*, Vol. XIII, p. 42, column 7):

"*Resolved*, That should any portion of an annual conference on the line of separation, not represented in this Conven-

tion, adhere to the M. E. Church South, according to the Plan of Separation adopted at the late General Conference, and elect delegates to the General Conference of the Church in 1846 upon the basis of representation adopted by the convention, they shall be accredited as members of the General Conference.

“*Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this Convention, those societies and stations on the border, within the limits of conferences represented in this Convention, be constructively understood as adhering to the South, unless they see proper to take action on the subject; and in all such cases we consider the pastor of the station or society the proper person to preside in the meeting.’

“Thus, although the Convention, in their formal organization, confine themselves to the original limits; yet two days after, when the way was prepared for further inroads, they enlarge the provisions of the Plan, and extend it into the boundaries of the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other conferences. And in all societies within the border where no votes would be taken, these societies must be constructively understood as adhering to the South. Hence their preachers have generally prevented any voting whenever they could by any means hinder it, although the Plan of the General Conference required the societies to vote. The conclusion is, that the Convention taught the infraction of the Plan in two very important respects.

“*First*. They exceed the provisions of the Plan by extending it into the territory of the Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and other conferences. Thus they teach to cross the line.

“*Second*. And in all societies where no vote would be taken, they claim them constructively as belonging to their Church.

“2. The bishops of the M. E. Church South have taught the infraction of the Plan.

“Bishop Soule, in his letter dated Lebanon, Ohio, August 4, 1845, and published in the *Western Christian Advocate*, of August 22, 1845, or Vol. XII, p. 75, col. 2, teaches the breach of the Plan. It is addressed ‘to the preachers and border societies of the Kentucky and Missouri Conferences, and of other conferences bordering upon them.’ The Bishop here calls on the societies on the southern verge of the Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa Conferences, to vote whether they will, or will not, remain in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Bishop Soule, how-

ever, makes these regulations in reference to his own administration. But this same course was sanctioned by Bishop Andrew immediately, and afterward by their General Conference, and by all their bishops. And, indeed, Bishop Soule, in his letter to the Rev. Wesley G. Montgomery, dated Nashville, April 30, 1847, and published in the *Western Christian Advocate* of May 21, 1847, hints broadly enough that minorities had best be accommodated. He says: 'Minorities on either side of the line of division are entitled to a kind and respectful consideration, and should be treated accordingly. And I should think it far better for such minorities, being on the border, to receive preachers from the Church to which they desire to adhere, provided they believe themselves able to support them, than for majorities to be interdicted the exercise of a right plainly secured to them by the provisions of the law, or rule in the case.' Now, with this instruction about minorities, as well as the maintenance that the line is a sliding one, and no limits of time are given in which its sliding operation ceases, Southern preachers will find little difficulty in passing over any limits which may be in the way.

"But Bishop Capers's letter to Rev. Mr. Moorman, and published in the *Christian Advocate* and *Journal* of April 21, 1847, claims all the territory in the slave-holding States, and this, too, according to the Plan, or, as he calls it, the 'Deed of Separation.' Now, as Bishop Capers claims all slave-holding territory, and Bishop Soule as much of the territories of the free States as the accommodation of minorities and the sliding line will transfer, it would be difficult indeed to fix any line at all.

"It were useless to insist, in a matter so clear, that the bishops of the M. E. Church South have taught officially the violation of the Plan.

"3. The General Conference of the M. E. Church South has taught the infraction of the Plan.

"For proof of this we need go no further than the famous Report on the Episcopacy, in which the Conference sanctions the breaches of the Plan as taught by the Convention, and as was taught and practiced by Bishops Soule and Andrew, from the session of the Convention in May, 1845, to the session of the Conference in May, 1846. This document will be found in the *Western Christian Advocate* of June 26, 1846, and in the *Richmond Advocate* of May 21, 1846. The report fully clears

Bishops Soule and Andrew of any blame for occupying Cincinnati, the Kanawha District, etc., and gives such full latitude of interpretation that the limitations of the Plan became a perfect nullity. Our limits will not allow us to quote the report, but it can be perused in the papers, as cited above, as well as in all the Southern papers.

“4. The annual conferences, editors, and leading members of the new Church, maintain the infraction of the Plan in perfect accordance with the acts of their convention, their General Conference, and their bishops.

“It were useless to make quotations on this point. Their press teems with approving acts of annual conferences, and the labored essays and constant admissions of the editors' correspondents, upholding fully their conventional, episcopal, and General Conference decisions and acts. And from all this there is no dissent in any quarter.

“II. The bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, in their official administration, have actually broken the Plan.

“As undoubted and official testimony on this point, we need only quote the report on this subject by our excellent and devoted bishops, which, at the request of the General Conference, they furnished the committee. This official document is as follows:

“*To the Committee on the State of the Church:*

““In compliance with a request of the General Conference, made on the 6th instant, the superintendents present to you such information as they possess in regard to alleged infractions of the “Plan of Separation,” on the part of the constituted authorities of the M. E. Church South, by which the Methodist Episcopal Church has been injuriously deprived of portions of its territory and members. They must be understood as giving the most authentic statements which have come to their ears, without vouching their own personal knowledge for the correctness of every item thus presented. They are, nevertheless, impressed with the conviction of the truth of the statements, generally, as hereinafter made.

““They commence first with Baltimore Conference. Within its bounds there is a portion of the State of Virginia, situated between the Potomac and Rappahannock Rivers, commonly called the “Northern Neck,” embracing the counties of King

George, Westmoreland, Richmond, Northumberland, and Lancaster. These counties contained the following circuits (having a membership of eight hundred to a thousand), namely, King George, Westmoreland, and Lancaster, each having preachers annually appointed to it from the Baltimore Conference. At different times each of those circuits determined to attach themselves to the Methodist Episcopal Church, not as border societies, but as circuits. To all of them preachers have been sent from the Virginia Conference, who are there at present, to the exclusion of the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church. From the Conference of 1847, preachers were sent to this portion of the Baltimore Conference, who found, on their arrival, the circuits under the pastoral care of ministers of the Virginia Conference. The ministers sent from the Baltimore Conference, not being able to have access to the preaching-places or societies, were withdrawn after suitable time, and sent to places where they were needed, except one, who was left in the charge of the whole field of labor. At present this place appears on the Minutes, "to be supplied." No minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church is now in this ancient portion of the Baltimore Conference.

"Warrenton Circuit has been occupied between one and two years with preachers from the Virginia Conference; but as this circuit did not go to the Church South, in whole, a portion thereof continuing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, a preacher from the Baltimore Conference has been continued there. Some of the societies which voted to go to the Church South were strictly border societies, but others also went which were as strictly interior societies. One of the Churches (Wesley Chapel), where a majority adhered to the Methodist Episcopal Church, was forcibly entered, and new locks were attached to its doors; and the Church South has it in possession at the present time, unless the civil court has recently decided a suit which was instituted for the property, in favor of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

"Harrisonburg, in Rockingham County, Virginia, unquestionably an interior society, having, by a majority of votes, determined to connect themselves with the M. E. Church South, a preacher from the Virginia Conference has been appointed to labor there. A minority adhering to the Methodist Episcopal Church are under the pastoral care of one of its ministers. The

Church was in a course of litigation a few months since, and probably the case has not been decided by the court. An attempt was made to get possession of the parsonage in Harrisonburg for the Church South, but with what success there is no information.

““ Leesburg, a station belonging to the Baltimore Conference, clearly an interior society, has been visited by a preacher from the M. E. Church South, much agitation produced in the society and in the community, and a suit at law commenced for the Church edifice. Whether the effort is still persisted in to occupy this place is not certainly known. That which makes this case even a glaring one is the fact that the majority of the society voted to adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church. There are other instances of the violation of the Plan of Separation, in the opinion of some equally apparent with the instances given in this paper, of which more certain information may be obtained from Rev. Messrs. William Hamilton, N. J., B. Morgan, S. A. Roszel, John Bear, and J. A. Collins, members of this General Conference.

““ Kanawha District, in the north-west part of Virginia, is a part of Ohio Conference. In 1845 that work was supplied from the Ohio Conference, as usual. The preachers were received with one exception, as far as we know, namely, Parkersburg Station. A part of the members there refused to receive any preacher from Ohio Conference. They rejected the preacher sent to them, not for any objection to him personally, but because he came from Ohio; and by threats of violence, and preparation to execute those threats on a given day, compelled him to leave the place, and took possession of the chapel. He, however, returned after some weeks, and, in connection with the preacher of the adjoining circuit, to which they were transferred, served the remaining members of the scattered flock in another house. These outcast members have since erected a chapel for themselves, in which they worship undisturbed, while the old chapel is supplied from Kentucky Conference of the M. E. Church South. Parkersburg is not a border station. It is the county-seat of Wood County, situated at the junction of Little Kanawha and Ohio Rivers, and is about seventy-five miles from the nearest point of the Kentucky State line; so that the Kentucky preachers had to travel that distance through our work to reach it, though they now occupy other

places through our work between that and Kentucky. No preachers were appointed from the Kentucky Conference of 1845 to the Kanawha District; but some were sent there, as we learn, during that conference year, by a presiding elder, that made breaches in some of our circuits. In 1846 the Kanawha District was all supplied from the Ohio Conference, as usual, though the societies in some places were divided by Southern influence. A few weeks afterward a second supply was sent from Kentucky Conference, as we learned from the newspapers. Since that time there have been two presiding elders and two sets of preachers there, one from Ohio Conference, and the other from Kentucky Conference. Indeed, it is alleged that, at the last session of Kentucky Conference, they divided the district; so that the old Kanawha District is now occupied by three presiding elders, one from Ohio, and two from Kentucky.

“These are the most material facts which have been reported to us, bearing on the point of inquiry submitted to us, so far as Kanawha District is concerned.

“*Soule Chapel, Cincinnati.*—In 1834, Cincinnati, which had previously been one charge, was divided into two, “Wesley Chapel” and “Fourth-street.” Each had definite bounds, within which the stationed minister had exclusive pastoral functions. Private members were *advised* to observe these limits in fixing and holding their membership, but were not considered *bound* to do so, and did not in all cases practice it. But class-meetings, etc., were held in strict regard to this provision.

“New preaching-places have been opened in these charges under the direction and countenance of the presiding elder and preachers in charge, have matured societies, and have been finally formed into stations by the presiding bishops, and received preachers.

“In 1844 the first city missionary was appointed, and was supported by a city missionary society, whose object was to carry the Gospel to the destitute. The first year, with the approbation of those having authority to direct him, he formed three societies—namely, the Bethel, Ebenezer, and Maley Chapel—and succeeded in erecting two small chapels for “Ebenezer” and “Maley,” in the north-west part of the city and suburbs. By permission, he exercised pastoral authority in some or all of these societies.

“In 1845 the same brother, Rev. G. W. Maley, was

reappointed to the same mission. At the same time, two of the aforesaid societies, "Bethel" and "Ebenezer," were made stations, and Rev. J. W. White and Rev. Joseph Bruner were appointed to serve them. These two stations were marked out by metes and bounds, as had been invariably done when new stations were formed in Cincinnati. This was done in council with the presiding elder of Cincinnati District, two or three days after conference closed, it having been forgotten in the pressure of conference business. Letters were written by the presiding bishop to brothers White and Bruner, defining by streets, etc., the bounds of the new charges; and the city missionary had Maley Chapel, and the region around it, set apart from all the stations as his special field of labor, within which, *and nowhere else*, he was to exercise pastoral functions. As the superintendent, however, was in haste, he did not write to the missionary, but requested the presiding elder, brother Marlay, to give him the information.

"Three objects were sought in this arrangement:

"*First.* As the city mission had lost two principal appointments, it seemed proper to encourage the missionary by assigning him the pastoral charge of this precinct territory, which was fast filling up, and which must, of course, receive most of his labors.

"*Second.* Ebenezer Station bordered on Maley Chapel, and the population and territory were enough to be under the pastoral care of one man, after Maley Chapel and its territory were taken off.

"*Third.* It seemed proper to the presiding bishop that each city preacher should have exclusive pastoral authority within his own charge; and, though no rupture was then dreamed of, it was thought the exercise of pastoral functions by the missionary within the different charges would derange and disorder the work.

"Within three or four weeks after these arrangements were made, the city missionary obtained leave from the City Missionary Board to preach in "Vine-street Church," an old deserted building within the bounds of Morris Chapel charge, from one-half to three-fourths of a mile from "Maley Chapel" charge, and in the heart of the city. If we understand correctly, both the presiding elder and the Board deny that the missionary received any authority to form a society there, or

do any other act which belonged to the pastoral oversight. He received no such authority from the bishop.

“A number of brethren, however, obtained certificates, and presented them to the city missionary, not in his own charge, but at “Vine-street;” and in the very heart of the city he proceeded to take possession of his brother’s territory, and form a society. Having increased it to a company of several scores, it voted to go South, was created “a charge” by the authority of Bishop Andrew; and Revs. E. W. Sehon, G. W. Maley (the missionary), and S. A. Latta were appointed to serve it as ministers of the M. E. Church South. Bishop Andrew named it “Vine-street Charge, a border society,” etc. In a short time this society purchased a church in the heart of “Wesley Chapel charge,” so that between it and the border, or the Ohio River, interposes one whole charge, the Bethel, which makes Soule Chapel as truly an interior station as though it were in Columbus or Cleveland.

“*Andrew Chapel, Cincinnati.*—“Andrew Chapel” was purchased a few months since by the “Soule Chapel” society, and stands within the bounds of Ninth-street charge, having, like “Soule Chapel,” one whole charge—“Morris Chapel”—between it and the border or river. It is understood to have regular preaching; but whether placed on the Minutes of the M. E. Church South as a distinct charge, we know not, but understand that pastoral authority is exercised there in the formation of classes, receiving members, and exercising discipline.

“*Statement of Encroachment on the Territory of the Philadelphia Conference by the M. E. Church South.*—Accomac and Northampton Counties, Virginia, are separated from the Virginia Conference by a broad bay (the Chesapeake), in every place from fifteen to thirty miles wide. The first place that voted to unite with the Church South was Capeville, in Northampton, about seven miles north of Cape Charles. The next place at which the vote was taken was Salem, eight miles north of Capeville, which, by a strong majority, had previously determined to stay with us. The next place was Johnson’s Chapel, about ten miles north of Salem, which, by a small majority, preferred the Church South. The next place reported to have chosen the Church South was Bethel, in Occahannock Neck. Here no vote was taken, but some friends of the Church South went around to the houses of the members, and reported

that they had obtained a majority for the new organization. These were all that had declared for the South before Mr. Moorman was sent over. Some time after his arrival, Franktown, five or six miles north of Johnson's, gave a majority of one vote for the South, by getting together members who had not attended class for years. Pungoteaque, in Accomac County, about ten miles further north, after giving a majority to remain in the old Church several times, at length chose the new Church by a small majority. And, finally, Cradockville, a few miles southeast of Pungoteaque, in a neck, gave a majority for the Church South. There is no appointment between any of the above and the Chesapeake Bay.

““ Signed,

E. HEDDING,
B. WAUGH,
THOMAS A. MORRIS,
L. L. HAMLIN,
EDMUND S. JANES.’

“Although the Plan could have no reference to the Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Ohio Conference, nevertheless, allowing that these conferences could be the theater of the operation of the Plan on their southern verge, the framers of the Plan, in reference to majorities of societies or stations, as well as to internal societies, have been overlooked by the Southern bishops. At first, by the concession of all, the Plan was confined to thirteen conferences in the slave-holding States. Next, it was extended by the South to the other conferences; and even in these the border regulations were disregarded, and Southern encroachment stopped at nothing. While our bishops, individually, in laudable submission to the episcopal board, have, on their part, most scrupulously observed the regulations of the Plan, the bishops of the new Church have trampled under foot the provisions of the Plan, while at the same time they have professed to be governed by it; and although the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church did their utmost to preserve the line unbroken, it was unavailing. The authorities of the M. E. Church South, by precept and example, have broken over the barriers; and the line, by their doing, has no longer any being. They themselves have destroyed the Plan, and have placed it now beyond the reach of the Methodist Episcopal Church to restore the boundaries. Nor is there now any hope

that measures could be taken to restore the line or continue it, did it exist. The General Conference of the M. E. Church South, by the following resolution, in their report on the administration of their bishops, have decided this point. They say:

“*Resolved*, That after a full and patient examination of the particulars of the administration of the Southern bishops, in relation to the Plan of Separation, the General Conference of the M. E. Church South consider the charges so repeatedly made by the editors and correspondents of the *Western Christian Advocate*, and the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, against Bishops Soule and Andrew, as entirely groundless; and that, on the contrary, the administration aforesaid has been strictly conformed to the rule set forth by the authority of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in its legislation on this subject in 1844.’

“Thus the administration of the Southern bishops has been sustained by their General Conference. They have, therefore, in advance of the Methodist Episcopal Church, overthrown the Plan and have left none of it remaining for us to overthrow; and now, in pronouncing it null and void, the South have compelled to this action.

“Respectfully submitted. GEORGE PECK, *Chairman.*”
(Journal General Conference, 1848, pp. 164-171.)

Such is the voice of the General Conference and the testimony of the bishops, over their several signatures, in regard to the unfaithfulness of the Southern Church in reference to the “Plan.” All of these violations of it were before May 1, 1848, and while the Methodist Episcopal Church was scrupulously observing the provisions of the report. And now, after the Methodist Episcopal Church has for more than ten years extended fraternal fellowship to the Church South, that body refuses to return the “formal fraternity,” unless the Methodist Episcopal Church will adopt such a “Plan of Separation” as they have held the report of the Committee of Nine to be, and which under circumstances directly opposite they have al-

ways interpreted in their favor. So far from doing this, the original Church is under obligation to God and to the right to prosecute its work in the South though opposed by the other branch.

Dr. Olin, in the letter already quoted from, observes :

“This stipulation, let it be kept in mind, was made upon the supposition and expectation that both parties should continue to preach the pure Gospel after the order of Methodism. If either shall cease to be Christians or Methodists, then the fundamental condition of the compact will fail, and it will cease to be binding. Should we of the North ever become infidels, or conform to other denominations, no doubt would remain of the clearest right on the part of Southern Methodists to visit us with missionary labors, and recall us, if they could, to the deserted standards of Wesley.” (History of the Great Secession, p. 524.)

This position must approve itself to all unprejudiced minds, and the converse, by the interchange of North for South, would be equally true. We do not say that the Southern Church has become infidel, or ceased to be Christian or Methodistic. It is recognized by the Methodist Episcopal Church officially, and by its ministers and members, as both Christian and Methodist; but it is plain that it has not carried the Gospel to the poor, either white or colored, in the South, as it should have done, or as has been done in the Northern States by the Methodist Episcopal Church. It has also wholly deserted the standards of Wesley and the Church in regard to American slavery and the rights of men, and it refuses to return to those standards; also upon the episcopal office, and, notably, during the war, in regard to submission to the authority of the United

States Government. It has also departed from the standards of Wesleyan Methodism in behalf of universal education, and the vigorous administration of discipline against the crime of intemperance, and also in reference to class-meetings, the probationary relation in the Church, if not upon the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification or perfect love. The welfare of millions of both races in the South is providentially committed to the Methodist Episcopal Church. It can not desert them without such dereliction of Christian duty as would be deserving of the disapprobation of men, or without disobeying the commission of Christ to the Church, and inviting the condemnation of the Great Shepherd.

CHAPTER V

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF 1848.

WE come now to a very important point in this discussion; namely, to the action of the General Conference of 1848 in rejecting the so-called "Plan of Separation," or in refusing to be governed by the provisions of the report of the Committee of Nine, and pronouncing the action of the General Conference of 1844 in this particular to be null and void. There were many considerations which led to this conclusion. 1. One was that, though the report did not authorize the division of the Church, its provisions were unconstitutional, because they practically excluded many from Church membership contrary to the Discipline. 2. The change of the sixth Restrictive Rule, so as to allow of the division of the Book Concern and Chartered Fund, was not authorized by the vote of the annual conferences. 3. The "Plan," in relation to the northern boundary of the Southern Church, had been repeatedly and grossly violated by the preachers, presiding elders, bishops, conferences, and the General Conference of the Southern Church. It is not necessary to repeat anything that has been said bearing upon either of these questions, or to notice in particular the chapter, tenth, of Dr. Myers's "Disruption," devoted to the

General Conference of 1848. The whole matter will be brought under review in considering the action of the General Conference, and in the final report adopted by that body upon the subject.

When the report of the Committee of Nine, which was adopted as a peace measure, proved, in the hands of the South, to be only an apple of discord, occasioning strife and schism in many localities which would otherwise have been comparatively, if not wholly, peaceful, and when it was wrested from its intended purpose, to the serious injury of the Church, the General Conference very properly rejected the whole scheme. This delicate subject was approached with becoming regard to the importance and gravity of the question, and the whole matter was carefully reviewed, and all of the facts involved brought before the body. On the second day of the session a very able committee, consisting of two members from each Conference, was appointed on the state of the Church, to which all of the papers in relation to this matter were referred. The first document which was passed to this committee was the communication of Rev. L. Pierce, D. D., May 3d, almost as soon as the Conference was organized, and before it was possible to investigate this subject and decide on any course of action in relation to it. The singular and hasty proceedings on this point, are given by Dr. Elliott. The letter of Dr. Pierce is as follows:

“To the Bishops and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in General Conference assembled :

“REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,—The General Conference of the M. E. Church South appointed me as their delegate

to bear to you the Christian salutations of the Church South, and to assure you that they sincerely desire that the two great bodies of Wesleyan Methodists, North and South, should maintain at all times a warm, confiding, and brotherly fraternal relation to each other; and that, through me, they make this offer to you, and very ardently desire that you, on your part, will accept the offer in the same spirit of brotherly love and kindness.

“The acceptance or rejection of this proposition made by your Southern brethren is entirely at your disposal; and, as my situation is one of painful solicitude till this question is decided, you will allow me to beg your earliest attention to it.

“And I would further say, that your reply to this communication will most gratify me if it is made *officially, in the form of resolutions.*
L. PIERCE.’

“On the 5th of May, the Committee on the State of the Church reported, in reference to the above, as follows:

“That they have had under consideration the letter from the Rev. Dr. Pierce, and that they recommend to the General Conference the adoption of the following preamble and resolution:

“*Whereas*, a letter from the Rev. L. Pierce, D. D., delegate of the M. E. Church South, proposing fraternal relations between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South, has been presented to this Conference; and whereas, there are serious questions and difficulties existing between the two bodies; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That while we tender to the Rev. Dr. Pierce all personal courtesies, and invite him to attend our sessions, this General Conference does not consider it proper, at present, to enter into any fraternal relations with the M. E. Church South: *provided*, however, that nothing in this resolution shall be so construed as to operate as a bar to any propositions from Dr. Pierce, or any other representative of the M. E. Church South, toward the settlement of existing difficulties between that body and this.’

“Adopted.

“It seemed that neither the Church South nor Dr. Pierce considered or acknowledged that difficulties existed; and therefore a fraternal recognition would, in effect, go to say that the course of the South was as it ought to be, and the fraternization once recognized would preclude all further adjustment; and this

would virtually acknowledge the course of the South, and that the Methodist Episcopal Church was at fault. The proposition of Dr. Pierce was not to settle difficulties; *it was to ask the Methodist Episcopal Church to sanction the entire course of the M. E. Church South.* Indeed, Dr. Pierce did not come to settle or acknowledge difficulties on the part of the Church South. He came, 'in the unity of Wesleyan Methodism,' to be received—and through him the Church South to be received—as a sound branch of Wesleyan Methodism, after all that had passed.

"Dr. Pierce, however, was treated with great courtesy by all." He was invited by subsequent resolution to a seat within the bar, with the explanation that such was the meaning and design of the action of the Conference in his case."

The next morning, May 6th, an explanatory resolution was adopted, stating that the resolution of the day before was an invitation to Dr. Pierce to a seat within the bar of the Conference; and on the 9th, Dr. Pierce presented his credentials to the General Conference and received from the Secretary, by request, a copy of his letter to that body.

"The foregoing would go to say that Dr. Pierce was in no small haste to secure fraternization for his Church, and not to settle difficulties. The Southern Conference decided every thing right that was done by their bishops, their convention, their editors, and by themselves, and they wished an official acknowledgment of all this from the Methodist Episcopal Church. More still; by this act of recognition it would be decided that the Methodist Episcopal Church, her bishops, and all her officials, were wrong, except so far as they believed and acted in conformity with the teachings of the Declaration, the Protest, the Convention, and all the infractions of the Southern bishops.

"The proceedings of the 5th and 6th were communicated to Dr. Pierce by the Secretary, and the following letter from him, on the same day, terminated the negotiations :

"To the Bishops and Members of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church :

"REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,—I have received two extracts from your journal of the 4th and 5th instant. From

these extracts I learn you decline receiving me in my proper character as the accredited delegate of the M. E. Church South, and only invite me to a seat within the bar, as due to me on account of my private and personal merits. These considerations I shall appreciate, and will reciprocate them with you in all the private walks of Christian and social life. But within the bar of the General Conference I can only be known in my official character.

“ ‘ You will therefore regard this communication as final on the part of the M. E. Church South. She can never renew the offer of fraternal relations between the two great bodies of Wesleyan Methodists in the United States. But the proposition can be renewed at any time, either now or hereafter, by the Methodist Episcopal Church. And, if ever made upon the basis of the Plan of Separation, as adopted by the General Conference of 1844, the Church South will cordially entertain the proposition.

“ ‘ With sentiments of deep regard, and with feelings of disappointed hope, I am, yours, in Christian fellowship,

“ ‘ L. PIERCE,

“ ‘ *Delegate from the M. E. Church South.*

“ ‘ PITTSBURG, May 8, 1848.’ ”

(History of the Great Secession, pp. 636-39.)

Such was the sudden and peremptory closing of this visitation on the part of the Southern delegate. The object of obtaining recognition is apparent from the letter of May 3d, six days before the credentials were presented to the Conference, and from the hauteur of the closing epistle and the dictatorial character of both. It will be observed also that the visiting brother shakes the dust from his feet, as a testimony against the Conference, on the same day that he presented his credentials to it. Was he fearful of the result of the investigations then being made? Why this unseemly haste?

This is the action and these are the words of Dr. Pierce which have become historic, and to which the

Southern Church has always tenaciously adhered. The General Conference, the Board of Bishops, and the official editors of that Church, have repeatedly reaffirmed them. They constitute the platform in reference to fraternity upon which Dr. Myers and that Church now stand. While the whole question of the "Plan" and the infractions of it, and the division of the Book Concern, was under the most careful examination by the General Conference, and before its merits could have been determined, the delegate evidently takes offense and closes the avenues of fraternal intercourse, unless the Methodist Episcopal Church yields to his mandatory terms.

On the 8th, the Committee on Itinerancy was instructed to ascertain and report to the Conference the result of the vote on the sixth Restrictive Rule, authorizing the division of the property of the Book Concern. But before the committee reported, namely on the 12th, the Southern commissioners announced themselves present and ready to settle and take possession of the amount claimed by them. The committee made its report upon this point on the 18th, announcing that the measure was lost by a lack of a few less than the required two-thirds. The vote was very close, and stood 2,135 for, to 1,070 against, the change of the rule. It may be remarked that the annual conferences which met soon after the General Conference of 1844 decided in favor of dividing the property, but the course of the Southern delegates was such as to change the tide of public sentiment against them, and consequently against this measure, in those conferences meeting later in the same year.

The thirteen conferences had, at that time, 1,320 traveling preachers, including the superannuated, 275 of whom were probationers, leaving 1,045 voting solidly for the change of the restriction, and the vote in the North about equally divided, notwithstanding the approval first given to the report as a "peace measure." As such the division of the Book Concern was not objected to, but had the report been presented to the Conference as a "Plan of Separation," it would have been almost unanimously rejected in the North. The whole number of traveling preachers at that time, including the superannuated, was 4,621, of whom 933 were probationers, leaving 3,688 voters in the conferences. Of this number, 3,205 voted on the change of the restriction, only 483 being absent or not voting. In the North they were in a quandary. If they voted for a change, it seemed to favor a division of the Church, which they were not willing to authorize; and if they voted against the resolution, that refused a division of the Book Concern, which they were not prepared to deny. Had the vote been taken on the simple question of giving the South, as a "peace measure," a part of the property, a large majority, nearly all, would have favored the proposition; but had the vote been taken on the report as a "Plan" for separating the Church, it would have been almost universally condemned. Bishop Soule was also present at this General Conference, demanding investigations, and adding fuel to the flames of sectionalism and strife.

Another point of vital importance to the whole question manifested itself through petitions from va-

rious parts of the South, especially from Kentucky, Missouri, and Arkansas, signed by 2,735 persons, which were presented to the Conference and referred to this committee, asking for recognition as members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and complaining of the effect of the report of the Committee of Nine in their case. They claimed that as members of the Church they had rights in the communion which the General Conference could not dissolve, that they had been unlawfully and unjustly thrust out of the Church by the adoption of this report, under the instigation and leadership of the fifty-one Southern delegates in 1844. They asked for ministers to be sent to them, and for reorganization of their circuits, districts, and conferences; and some complained that their Church property had been wrested from them by the M. E. Church South, and asked for indemnity by the General Conference. All of these matters were inquired into by the committee and discussed in their various aspects, and on the 24th of May the report of the committee was taken up, and the subject was discussed from time to time till June 1st. The following declarations were adopted, May 24th, 25th, 26th, and the final report on the 1st of June (see *Journal General of the Conference, 1848*, pp. 73-85), to-wit:

“FIRST DECLARATION.—There exists no power in the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church to pass any act which either directly or indirectly effectuates, authorizes, or sanctions a division of said Church.

“Yeas, 146; nays, 3.

“SECOND DECLARATION.—It is the right of every member of the Methodist Episcopal Church to remain in said Church,

unless guilty of the violation of its rules; and there exists no power in the ministry, either individually or collectively, to deprive any member of said right.

“Yeas, 148; nays, 1.

“THIRD DECLARATION.—This right being inviolably secured by the fifth Restrictive Article of the Discipline, which guarantees to the members, ministers, and preachers, the right of trial and appeal, any acts of the Church otherwise separating them from said Church contravene the constitutional rights and privileges of the membership and ministry.

“Yeas, 142; nays, 6.

“FOURTH DECLARATION.—*Section 1.* The report of the select Committee of Nine, on the declaration of the delegates in the slave-holding States, adopted by the General Conference of 1844, of which the memorialists complain, and the operation of which deprived them of their privileges as members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was intended to meet a necessity which, it was alleged, might arise, and was given as a peace-offering, to secure harmony on our Southern border.

“Yeas, 133; nays, 5.

“*Sec. 2.* It was further made dependent, first, upon the concurrence of three-fourths of the members of the several annual conferences in reference to a part of its regulations.

“Yeas, 124; nays, 16.

“*Sec. 3.* And, secondly, upon the observance of certain provisions respecting a boundary by a distinct ecclesiastical connection separating from us, should such a connection be formed.

“Yeas, 129; nays, 10.

“*Sec. 4.* Without waiting, as this Conference believes, for the occurrence of the anticipated necessity, for which the plan was framed, action was taken in the premises by the Southern delegates.

“Yeas, 130; nays, 6.

“*Sec. 5.* The annual conferences by their votes, officially received, have refused to concur with that part of the plan which was submitted to them.

“Yeas, 122; nays, 15.

“*Sec. 6.* And the provisions respecting a boundary have been violated by the highest authorities of said connection, which separated from us, and thereby the peace and harmony

of many of the societies on our Southern border have been destroyed.

“Yeas, 135; nays, 4.

“*Sec. 7.* Therefore, in view of these facts, as well as the principles contained in the preceding declarations, there exists no obligation on the part of this Conference, to observe the provisions of said plan.

“*Sec. 8.* And it is hereby declared NULL AND VOID.

“Yeas, 133; nays, 9.” (History of the Great Secession, p. 645-647.)

This is what Dr. Myers calls “that direful repudiation at the bottom of all present difficulties,” and which he, in the name of the Southern Church and as Chairman of the Commission to adjust these difficulties, demands shall be rescinded by the General Conference of May next.

There is no reasonable doubt that the General Conference of 1848 had power to take this action rescinding, for the reasons assigned, the report of the Committee of Nine in 1844. Each General Conference is an independent body, charged with maintaining and promoting the interests of the Church, and one General Conference can not bind any succeeding one. The legislation of the Church is largely made up of acts which virtually and directly repeal and annul the action of former General Conferences. Had the report of the Committee of Nine been found merely unwise and injurious, and had it been judged constitutional, and, further, had its provisions been sacredly observed by the Southern Church, still the General Conference of 1848, or afterward, would have had power or authority to rescind this action. There was not a word of this so-called “Plan” in the Discipline, not a clause, line, or letter of it was ever

elevated to the dignity of even statutory law, much less was it covered by the constitutional restrictions. If it had been placed in the Discipline as a statute, it would still have remained, as before, subject to the action of General Conference by change or repeal, by modification or nullification, as the judgment of that body should deem wise and proper. How much less were the mere resolutions of one General Conference binding upon another, and yet even less these provisional resolutions anticipating a threatened secession from the Church! Neither did this report confer any rights or privileges upon the Methodists of the South not before enjoyed, the division of the Book Concern being prohibited by the annual conferences. Any minister or member of the Church in good standing is at liberty at any time to withdraw from it if he chooses to do so; and the report simply promised to allow the thirteen conferences to depart in peace if they wished to go. They did so elect, and no one restrained them from going; but such as chose to remain, the Church was bound to protect and provide for. The General Conference not only had the power, but was under obligation, to hear these petitioners.

Dr. Myers makes a feeble effort to reply to these Declarations severally, but utterly fails to show their incorrectness or want of application to the case. As an illustration of his weakness, under the Third Declaration, he quotes Dr. Durbin as saying, "The fifth Restrictive Article referred only to privileges where members are accused of some immorality or violation of Discipline. In such cases they must have a trial and privilege of appeal." But Dr. Durbin

adds, in the same connection, and in the same sentence, in explanation of the above, "The General Conference [of 1844, by adopting this report] did not infract this restriction. *It did not divide or authorize a division of the Church.*" (See "History of the Great Secession," p. 647.) Why does Dr. Myers thus pervert the truth and falsify the position of Dr. Durbin? It is like corrupting the Scriptures, Eph. iv, 28, to show that the Bible justifies theft, thus, "Let him that stole, steal;" while the passage reads, "Let him that stole, steal no more." Dr. Durbin was as pronounced against the positions now taken by Dr. Myers as the Bible is against stealing.

Consider these Declarations in their relation to the several parts of the so-called "Plan," which is here arranged in sections according to the subjects involved, and designated by suitable headings, for the purpose of examination, in connection with the Declarations severally, as follows:

"I. THE PREAMBLE.

"The select Committee of Nine, to consider and report on the Declaration of the delegates from the conferences of the slave-holding States, beg leave to submit the following report:

"*Whereas*, a Declaration has been presented to this General Conference, with the signatures of fifty-one delegates of the body, from thirteen annual conferences in the slave-holding States, representing that, for various reasons enumerated, the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry and Church organization can not be successfully accomplished by them under the jurisdiction of this General Conference as now constituted; and,

"*Whereas*, in the event of a separation, a contingency to which the Declaration asks attention as not improbable,

"We esteem it the duty of this General Conference to

meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity; therefore,

“II. NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE SOUTHERN CHURCH.

“Resolved, by the delegates of the several annual conferences, in General Conference assembled,

“1. That, should the annual conferences in the slave-holding States find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the Northern boundary of such connection: All the societies, stations, and conferences adhering to the Church in the South, by a vote of the majority of the members of said societies, stations, and conferences, shall remain under the unmolested pastoral care of the Southern Church; and the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church shall in no wise attempt to organize Churches or societies within the limits of the Church South, nor shall they attempt to exercise any pastoral oversight therein—it being understood that the ministry of the South, reciprocally, observe the same rule in relation to stations, societies, and conferences, adhering, by vote of a majority, to the Methodist Episcopal Church; provided also, that this rule shall apply only to societies, stations, and conferences, bordering on the line of division, and not to interior charges, which shall, in all cases, be left to the care of that Church within whose territory they are situated.

III. THE PREACHERS.

“2. That ministers, local and traveling, of every grade and office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, may, as they prefer, remain in that Church, or, without blame, attach themselves to the Church South.

“IV. CHURCH PROPERTY IN THE SOUTH.

“9. That all the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church in meeting-houses, parsonages, colleges, schools, conference funds, cemeteries, and of every kind within the limits of the Southern organization, shall be forever free from any claim set up on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, *so far as this resolution can be of force in the premises.*

“V. THE BOOK CONCERN.

“3. That we recommend to all the annual conferences, at their first approaching sessions, to authorize a change of the

sixth Restrictive Article, so that the first clause shall read thus: 'They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Chartered Fund, to any other purpose than for the benefit of the traveling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children, and to such other purposes as may be determined upon by the votes of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference.'

"4. That whenever the annual conferences, by a vote of three-fourths of all their members voting on the third resolution, shall have concurred in the recommendation to alter the sixth Restrictive Article, the agents at New York and Cincinnati shall, and they are hereby authorized and directed to, deliver over to any authorized agent or appointee of the Church South, should one be organized, all notes and book accounts against the ministers, Church members, or citizens within its boundaries, with authority to collect the same for the sole use of the Southern Church; and that said agents also convey to the aforesaid agent or appointee of the South all the real estate, and assign to him all the property, including presses, stock, and all right and interest connected with the printing establishments at Charleston, Richmond, and Nashville, which now belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church.

"5. That when the annual conferences shall have approved the aforesaid change in the sixth Restrictive Article, there shall be transferred to the above agent of the Southern Church so much of the capital and produce of the Methodist Book Concern as will, with the notes, book accounts, presses, etc., mentioned in the last resolution, bear the same proportion to the whole property of said Concern that the traveling preachers in the Southern Church shall bear to all the traveling ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the division to be made on the basis of the number of traveling preachers in the forthcoming Minutes.

"6. That the above transfer shall be in the form of annual payments of \$25,000 per annum, and specifically in stock of the Book Concern, and in Southern notes and accounts due the establishment, and accruing after the first transfer mentioned above; and, till the payments are made, the Southern Church shall share in all the net profits of the Book Concern, in the proportion that all the amount due them, or in arrears, bears to all the property of the Concern.

"7. That Nathan Bangs, George Peck, and James B. Finley be, and they are hereby, appointed commissioners to act in concert with the same number of commissioners appointed by the Southern organization—should one be formed—to estimate the amount which will fall due to the South by the preceding rule, and to have full powers to carry into effect the whole arrangements proposed with regard to the division of property, should the separation take place; and if, by any means, a vacancy occur in this board of commissioners, the Book Committee at New York shall fill said vacancy.

"8. That whenever any agents of the Southern Church are clothed with legal authority or corporate power to act in the premises, the agents at New York are hereby authorized and directed to act in concert with said Southern agents, so as to give the provisions of these resolutions a legally binding force.

"10. That the Church so formed in the South shall have a common right to use all the copyrights in possession of the Book Concerns at New York and Cincinnati at the time of the settlement by the commissioners.

"VI. THE CHARTERED FUND.

"11. That the Book Agents at New York be directed to make such compensation to the conferences South, for their dividend from the Chartered Fund, as the commissioners above provided for *shall agree upon*.

"VII. REQUEST OF THE BISHOPS.

"12. That the bishops be respectfully requested to lay that part of this report requiring the action of the annual conferences before them as soon possible, beginning with New York Conference." (Journal General Conference, 1844, pp. 135-7.)

Observe, first, that there is not a part or paragraph of this "Plan," the language of which does not indicate that it was intended to be provisional to meet a certain contingency, should that arise; second, that the Declarations of 1848 are not retroactive—do not propose to take from the Southern Church any thing that it had acquired by secession

from the Methodist Episcopal Church. All who desired to withdraw were, by the General Conference of 1848, as well as that of 1844, allowed to go in peace, with all of their offices, orders, and honors. These Declarations were made to define and protect the rights of those who had not withdrawn from the Church, and who were not willing to accept membership in the Church South, but who still claimed their former relations in, and adherence to, the original body, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and not to deprive the Southern Church of any right or possession whatever. They said, "There exists no obligation on the part of this Conference to observe the provisions of said 'Plan.'"

To see how these Declarations affected the entire "Plan," we may inquire of its operations upon the several parts. As to the Preamble they do not touch it. That expressed the purpose of the Conference of 1844 to "meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity," if it should arise. This has not been rescinded, but, on the contrary, every General Conference since has endeavored to act in that way toward the Southern Church, and all other bodies and all persons.

If the third part of the "Plan," relating to preachers, was repealed, it effected nothing, because ministers in the thirteen Conferences, and any others in good standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, were, and ever since have been, permitted to attach themselves to the Church South without blame, if they so desired.

Neither is the fourth part of the "Plan," referring

to Churches and parsonages in the South, affected by these Declarations, because the General Conference did not own or control the property in question, nor has it since made any effort to do so.

The fifth part of the "Plan," relating to the Book Concern, was not annulled by the General Conference of 1848, because, by the express terms of the report, that failed of ratification in the annual conferences.

The sixth part, relating to the Chartered Fund, could not have been annulled, because the Fund was divided, and the portion claimed given to the South, regardless of the Discipline in the case.

Neither was it possible that the seventh section of the "Plan" was nullified, because it had already been complied with by the bishops.

Only the first resolution, or second part of the report, was revoked or practically rescinded by the General Conference of 1848; that was in reference to the northern boundary of the new connection involving the rights of members to recognition by the Methodist Episcopal Church; and this boundary had been utterly disregarded by the Louisville Convention, by the Southern General Conference, and the bishops of the Church South. It was repeatedly violated, as we proved in the preceding chapter, and so annulled and destroyed by the purposed and deliberate action of the highest authorities of the M. E. Church South; and the General Conference of 1848, simply stated the facts in the case, as it had a right and was in duty bound to give them, for the protection of the Church, especially of those mem-

bers whose rights had been interfered with by the operations of the report, or rather by the proceedings of those who had taken advantage of the report in dividing the communion.

The General Conference of 1848 did not act upon the report of the Committee of Nine without giving reasons for the course pursued. As has already been said, the matter was before the Conference in all of its aspects through the entire session, from May 3d to June 1st. On that day, the last of the Conference, the "Final Report" was adopted. It was written by Dr. George Peck, with great care, after mature deliberation; and having been adopted by the Conference, it is the official statement of that body upon the questions involved.

The entire document, except that part of it on the Infractions of the "Plan," given in Chapter IV, is here reproduced. We ask for it a careful reading:

"The Committee on the State of the Church, after a full and careful examination of all the sources of information within their reach, including, as they believe, all that are essential to a just understanding of the subjects hereinafter named, do recommend to this body the adoption of the following as their final report:

"1. We claim that the M. E. Church South exists as a distinct and separate ecclesiastical communion solely by the act and deed of the individual ministers and members constituting said Church.

"In support of this position we set forth the following facts: On the fifth day of June, 1844, the fifty-one delegates from the Southern Conferences presented to the General Conference, then in session in the city of New York, the following declaration, to wit: 'That the continued agitation of the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church; the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference; and, especially, the

extra-judicial proceedings against Bishop Andrew, which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of that General Conference over these conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slave-holding States'—from which it is evident that they sought their remedies for alleged grievances, not in any constitutional acts, but in violation of the integrity of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“And, further, on the sixth day of June in the year above written, the above-named gentlemen presented a protest to the above-named General Conference against its action in the case of Bishop Andrew, in which they assert, ‘If the compromise law be either repealed, or allowed to remain a dead letter, the South can not submit, and the absolute necessity of a division is already dated.’ Now, while we wholly deny the existence of any ‘compromise law,’ in the sense here claimed, the indication in this extract, and indeed in the whole document, of a purpose upon the part of those protesting brethren to secure a division of the Church, is too plain to be mistaken.

“And, further, at the close of the General Conference, on the eleventh day of June, and year above mentioned, fifty-one of the above-named brethren assembled in the city of New York, and by formal resolution recommended to the Southern conferences the appointment of delegates to a convention, to commence in Louisville, Kentucky, on the first day of May, 1845; said delegates to be instructed ‘on the points on which action is contemplated, conforming their instructions, as far as possible, to the opinions and wishes of the membership within their several conference bounds.’ And the said brethren issued from this unauthorized meeting an address, in which they call the attention of Southern Methodists ‘to the proscription and disability under which the Southern portion of the Church must, of necessity, labor in view of the action alluded to, unless some measures are adopted to free the minority of the South from the oppressive jurisdiction of the majority in the North in this respect;’ and they declare ‘that they regard a separation at no distant day as inevitable.’ There is, therefore, no room to doubt that the appointed Louisville Convention was one of those leading ‘measures’ adopted by these fifty-one brethren for the express purpose of freeing the minority of the South from what they are

pleased to term 'the oppressive jurisdiction of the majority in the North;' and that the contemplated separation, if it actually occurred, must be the legitimate result of these premature preliminary arrangements.

"And, further, the several annual conferences now included in the Church South did, at their meetings, successively, of their own will and accord, vote to approve the holding of the Louisville Convention, for the purposes proposed by the members of the aforesaid meeting at New York; appointed delegates to said Convention, and, in various forms of expression, directly assumed, as far as they were able, the responsibility of the dismemberment of the Church evidently contemplated in the appointment of said Louisville Convention.

"In the mean time, Bishop Soule wrote to Bishop Andrew, requesting him to resume episcopal functions, and, in the character and office of a bishop, to attend the sessions of annual conferences; which he did, though said act was clearly in contravention of the expressed will of the General Conference, 'that he desist from the exercise of the' episcopal office so long as the impediment of slave-holding 'remained.' By which acts Bishop Soule and Bishop Andrew openly repudiated the authority of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

"And, further, in the Convention assembled at Louisville, in May, 1845, delegates from the following conferences, namely, Kentucky, Missouri, Holston, Tennessee, North Carolina, Memphis, Arkansas, Virginia, Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, and Indian Mission, Bishops Soule and Andrew presiding, did formally resolve, 'That it is right, expedient, and necessary to erect the annual conferences represented in this Convention into a distinct ecclesiastical connection, separate from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as at present constituted.' And they did 'solemnly declare the jurisdiction hitherto exercised over said annual conferences by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church entirely dissolved; and that said annual conferences shall be, and they hereby are, constituted a separate ecclesiastical connection.' Accordingly, a delegated General Conference from the annual conferences above named, held at Petersburg, Virginia, May, 1846, did assume the powers and privileges of authorized representatives of a

separate ecclesiastical connection, under the style and denomination of 'the M. E. Church South;' to which Church many of the former ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, some evidently from choice, and others from the force of circumstances which they felt themselves unable to resist, did, formally or informally, attach themselves, thereby withdrawing themselves from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

"Finally, while a clearly marked line of history, extending from the first-named declaration to the final action of the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, shows the independent action of the ministers and members of said Church in its organization, we affirm it to be impossible to point to any act of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church erecting or authorizing said Church; nor has the said General Conference, or any individual, or any number of individuals, any right, constitutional or otherwise, to extend official sanction to any act tending directly or indirectly to the dismemberment of the Church.

"2. In view of the formal declaration of the brethren herein first named, that certain acts of the General Conference, especially the act in the case of Bishop Andrew, 'must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of that General Conference over these conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slave-holding States;' fearing that ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church would, according to the opinion expressed in the declaration above quoted, deem it necessary to erect themselves into a separate and independent Church in the intervals of General Conference sessions, when no remedies for so great an evil could be provided in time; and desiring, as far as practicable, in accordance with suggestions made by brethren from the South, to adopt measures calculated to pacify our members and ministers in the South—the General Conference, at its session in New York, A. D. 1844, did propose a Plan for the adjustment of relations between the Methodist Episcopal Church and her separating members and ministers, when such separation should, by their own act and deed, if at all, occur. Said Plan, based entirely upon the above first-named declaration of the delegates from thirteen specified and above-written conferences in the slave-holding States, having relation to those conferences and to no others, proposed an amicable division of territory

between them and the Methodist Episcopal Church, as follows : 'The Northern boundary' of the prospective new Church to be fixed at the northern extremities of those societies, stations, and conferences,' a majority of whose members should, of their own free will and accord, vote to adhere to the said Southern Church; and ministers, traveling and local, to be allowed to remain in the Methodist Episcopal Church, or attach themselves to the 'M. E. Church South,' at discretion. And said Plan further proposed to make over and give to the prospective 'Southern Church so much of the capital and produce of the Methodist Book Concern as will, with the notes, book-accounts, presses,' etc., in the South, due and belonging to the Book Concern of the Methodist Episcopal Church (the transfer of which is provided for in the fourth article of said Plan), 'bear the same proportion to the whole property of said Concern that the traveling preachers in the Southern Church shall bear to all the traveling preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church.' And said Plan further proposed, that 'the Book Agents at New York be directed to make such compensation to the conferences South for their dividend from the Chartered Fund as the commissioners to be provided for shall agree upon.'

"But the whole of this Plan was expressly or otherwise conditional as follows, namely :

"(1.) That the asserted 'state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of that General Conference over these conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slave-holding States' should be '*produced*' by the action of the General Conference in the cases referred to.

"(2.) That three-fourths of the members of all the annual conferences should, 'at their first approaching sessions,' concur in the vote of at least two-thirds of the General Conference to so alter 'the sixth Restrictive Article' of the Discipline as to add to it the following words, to wit: 'and to such other purposes as may be determined upon by the votes of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference;' it being certain that should such vote be refused by the annual conferences, the financial part of the Plan could not go into effect, which financial part was deemed by both parties essential to the Plan; and it being probable that those who opposed the Plan as a whole, would vote against the change in the sixth Restrictive Article.

"(3.) It was clearly and necessarily implied, that the friend-

ship and fidelity of the parties should be evinced by voluntarily keeping inviolate the principles and ordinances of the Plan, pending the settlement of the important conditions upon which its validity and binding force depended.

“In support of the above statement of facts, we refer expressly to the aforementioned declaration of the fifty-one Southern brethren, and to the report of the Committee of Nine, presented to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the 7th of June, 1844.

“And, further, it will be observed that the declaring brethren of the South did not claim that a state of things already existed that required any separation of the South from the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal Church; or that required the positive enactment of any unconditional plan of such separation. They only asserted that (in their opinion, of course) certain acts of the General Conference ‘must produce’ this state of things. And hence they do not proceed upon the supposition that they were the official judges of the facts which might require the separation of the Southern ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church from her jurisdiction. It is true that the report of the Committee of Nine, as it was first presented, made these delegates from the thirteen conferences South the judges of that necessity; but it was so changed as to leave the question to the annual conferences from which they came, thus showing that the General Conference would by no means allow this question of necessity to be decided by these men. From all of which it appears that the Plan proposed rested, not on the present or future existence of any state of excitement in the South which might be produced by causes entirely apart from the General Conference, but upon the production of such a state of things as was predicted by the acts of the General Conference alone. Certainly, if, upon returning to their charges, our Southern brethren had found that no such ‘state of things’ as they had supposed existed, and hence no separation had occurred, they would not assert the validity of the proposed Plan; and if it would have been of no binding force in the absence of the predicted necessity produced solely by the action of the General Conference, it follows inevitably that such necessity so produced was an indispensable condition of the Plan. And though this necessity had actually been so produced, and the Southern ministers

and members had actually separated on this ground alone, in this case one of the conditions of the Plan would have been met, [yet] we nevertheless affirm that in failure of this condition the Plan became invalid, though every other condition of it had been literally fulfilled.

“And, further, in proof that the proposed alteration of the sixth Restrictive Article of the Discipline was a fundamental condition of this Plan as a whole, we refer to the third resolution of the report of the Committee of Nine, in which it is expressly asserted. Also to the published speech of Dr. (now Bishop) Paine, from which the following language was reported: ‘This separation would not be effected by the passage of those resolutions through the General Conference. They must pass the annual conferences, beginning at New York, and when they came round to the South, the preachers there would think and deliberate and feel the pulse of public sentiment, and of the members of the Church, and act in the fear of God, and with a single desire for his glory.’ Every word of which, in its connection, would be entirely incompatible with the idea that he referred merely to an extension of the power of the General Conference in relation to the appropriation of funds; but it is perfectly consistent with the doctrine here asserted, that a vote on the change of that Restrictive Article was understood to be a vote on the merits of the Plan as a whole. So, we believe, many of the members of the annual conferences regarded it, and hence so many of them voted against it as to defeat the measure. Indeed, so essential to the Plan did our Southern brethren consider this change of the sixth Restrictive Article, that they never have, in any way, signified their willingness to accept of the Plan without it. With this agrees perfectly the address of the above-named fifty-one brethren, from their meeting in New York, held the eleventh day of June, 1844, in which they hold the following language: ‘It affords us pleasure to state that there were those found among the majority who met this proposition [the Plan, not of formal and specific separations,’ but to provide for the results of separation, should it occur under the necessity above explained] with every manifestation of justice and liberality. And should a similar spirit be exhibited by the annual conferences in the North, when submitted to them, as provided for in the Plan itself, there will remain no legal impediment to its peaceful consummation.’

“But ‘if a similar spirit should’ not ‘be exhibited by the annual conferences in the North, when submitted to them, as provided for in the Plan itself,’ then, of course, by the showing of these fifty-one Southern brethren, ‘there will remain a legal impediment to its peaceful consummation’ as a Plan. It is true that the question of a ratification of the Plan was not directly, and in so many words, submitted to the annual conferences; but it is evident that, in the honest opinion of these Southern brethren, it was in effect so submitted. Nor could it by possibility have been otherwise, from the language of the Plan, which submits an amendment of the Discipline absolutely essential to the Plan as a whole, the preachers being obliged to vote upon said amendment in view of its bearing upon the whole Plan, and the failure of said amendment rendering the Plan as a whole entirely unsatisfactory to the South; therefore, in the event of a failure of three-fourths of the members of all the annual conferences—the Southern conferences included—‘at their first approaching sessions,’ to vote for the change proposed in the sixth Restrictive Article, said Plan would be as a whole, and hence of necessity in its details, rendered null and void.

“And, further, we claim that the position that a sacred though voluntary observance of the requirements of the proposed Plan by the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the brethren South who should separate from her, was a fundamental condition of the Plan, is a clear and undeniable inference from the whole design and scope of said Plan. It was, as its friends openly claimed, a *peace measure*. It was designed to prevent aggressions from either party, and thus to prevent unchristian feelings and angry collisions between those who claimed to be brethren. If, therefore, this great object, lying at the very foundation of the scheme, and in the light of which alone any part of it has the least significancy, were disregarded or trampled under foot by either party, the other, as a whole, and every individual of them, would be entirely absolved from all obligations to it whatsoever. If, therefore, this shall be found to have been done, then, though all other conditions of the Plan were certainly fulfilled, it will be, to all intents and purposes, null and void.

“Finally, it has fully appeared that, to meet in what was then supposed to be the best manner possible the disastrous

results of a violent dismemberment of the Methodist Episcopal Church, should it occur, and provide for an amicable adjustment of all relations between the two parties, this provisional Plan was adopted by the General Conference at its session in the year 1844; that to provide for or sanction a division of said Church was therefore no part of the intentions of said General Conference; and that it rested upon three distinct and fundamental conditions, the failure of either of which must be fatal to its validity and binding force. And though, in the light of four years' history, we are fully convinced that the act implied a degree of faith in men not justified by the facts, and, under all the circumstances of the case, it was not adapted to secure its intended results, we can not for a moment question the Christian liberality in which it had its origin.

"3. It is evident to us that the acts of the General Conference complained of did not produce a state of things in the South which rendered the continuance of the jurisdiction of said Conference 'inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slave-holding States.' Three-fourths of the members of all the annual conferences did not concur in the vote to alter the sixth Restrictive Rule, and thus sanction the Plan, for the accommodation of which said alteration was asked. And the conditions and the requirements of said Plan have been violated, and hence said Plan *is, and*, from the first failure of the conditions of said Plan, or either of them, *has been*, null and void.

"In support of which we offer the following facts:

"After the adoption of the proposition for a peace measure, and providing for its final ratification and use in case the predicted separation should occur, it would, as we humbly conceive, have been in perfect conformity to said peaceful arrangement for the Southern delegates to have used their utmost endeavors, as some of them assured us they would do, to quiet the public mind in the South, and, entering instantly upon their regular work, to have met every act of resentment, and every appearance of insubordination to the authorities of the Church, with a calm, dignified, and determined resistance—to have defended the General Conference, so far as they could conscientiously do so, and themselves to the utmost, for doing which their motions, speeches, votes, declaration, and Protest furnished ample materials. To have adopted this course would, we believe, have been doing no more than to meet the just expectations excited

by their peaceful protestations upon the Conference floor and elsewhere, both before and after the vote upon the proposed pacific Plan, and their avowed attachment to the Church of their choice in its uninterrupted integrity. But if *active* peace measures had been either incompatible with their private opinions or self-respect, or inconvenient under their peculiar circumstances, they, as we verily believe, might have avoided all acts preparatory to the excitement of the public mind, and leading, directly or indirectly, to the division of the Church; by doing which they would have given to the world an example of moderation, under circumstances confessedly difficult and trying, worthy of all commendation, and afforded an opportunity for a free, spontaneous, and, in due time, decisive verdict of Southern Methodists upon the question whether the action of the General Conference had, and 'must necessarily' have, 'produced a state of things in the South which rendered a continuance of the jurisdiction of that General Conference over these conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding States.' This, we claim and assert, the Methodist Episcopal Church had a right to exact of them, in order to a *just estimate* of the circumstances under which the conscientious and legitimate action of her highest judicatory had placed her in relation to her Southern ministers and membership. But, instead of this, these fifty-one brethren, by character and position highest in rank and influence among Southern Methodists, did, at a meeting called and had before leaving the seat of the General Conference, only ten days after the principal action, and five days after the final action in the case of Bishop Andrew, virtually appoint a convention to be held in Louisville, Kentucky, to commence on the first of May, 1845, to take into consideration the question of a division of the Church, and thus superinduce the very excitement which they should have deprecated, and attempted by every laudable means in their power to allay. Indeed, it is evident, as it should have been foreseen, that the appointment of that convention alone was, under the circumstances, decisive of the very question which should have been left to the decision of time under the action of all the conservative elements available in the case.

"Moreover, from the said meeting in New York, which, if it occurred at all, should have given utterance only to counsels peaceful in their nature and tendency, and strictly loyal to the

Methodist Episcopal Church, an address was issued 'To the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Slave-holding States and Territories,' in which these *fifty-one* brethren say, that the 'various action of the *majority* of the General Conference, at its recent session, on the subject of *slavery and abolition*, has been such as to render it necessary, in the judgment of those addressing you, to call attention to the *proscription and disability* under which the Southern portion of the Church must, of necessity, labor in view of the action alluded to, unless some measures are adopted to free the minority of the South from the oppressive jurisdiction of the majority in the North in this respect. The proceedings of the majority in several cases involving the question of slavery have been such as indicate most conclusively that the legislative, judicial, and administrative action of the General Conference, as now organized, will always be extremely hurtful, if not finally ruinous, to the interests of the Southern portion of the Church, and must, necessarily, produce a state of conviction and feeling in the slave-holding States entirely inconsistent with either the peace or prosperity of the Church. The opinions and purposes of the Church in the North on the subject of slavery are in direct conflict with those of the South; and, unless the South will submit to the dictation and interference of the North greatly beyond what the existing law of the Church on slavery and abolition authorizes, there is no hope of any thing like union or harmony.'

"Further, similar quotations might be made from this address, but we deem it unnecessary. We submit it to a candid world whether language less respectful to the Church of which they were members, or more inflammatory to the Southern minds in the midst of slavery, could well be used. Surely, there is no room for surprise that the most excited meetings soon occurred in all parts of the South, and the most indignant resolutions were passed, leading to a degree of public agitation alarming to the peace of the Church and the nation.

"But one more quotation shall be made, to show that these *fifty-one* brethren did not hesitate formally to take the initiative in the work of deciding the question which they had raised, and thus *actually*, as they had already done *virtually*, give the full weight of their influence to counteract the pacific measures which they had asked at our hands, and for which they had just voted: 'As the undersigned have had opportunity and

advantages, which those at a distance could not possess, to form a correct judgment in the premises, and it may be expected of them that they express their views fully on the subject, they do not hesitate to say that they regard a separation at no distant day as inevitable.' After this declaration, of what avail was it to 'beseech their brethren of the ministry and membership in the slave-holding States to examine this matter carefully, and try to reach the conclusion most proper under the circumstances?' or 'disposed, however, to defer to the judgment of the Church, we leave this subject with you?' The result was what must have been expected. The voice of remonstrance, though sincere and beseeching, against the revolutionary measures urged on by such powerful talents and influence, was too feeble to be heard till the confusion was over, and *it was too late*. The act of separation was consummated, as we have already seen, and many thousands hurried out of the Methodist Episcopal Church into the new organization, with scarcely an opportunity to know what it was for.

"We thus see clearly that the way for separation was prepared, not by a state of things in the South *produced*' by the action of the General Conference, but by revolutionary measures adopted by the Southern delegates at the very seat, and nearly at the time, of our General Conference session. The success of the ministry could not have been hindered by our action; for not only was there no instance of the kind alleged, but there was a want of time to produce any such result before these fifty-one brethren, by taking the lead of the Southern mind, anticipated their decision. In view of the whole of which, we claim and affirm that the Southern organization was consummated in direct contravention of the plan proposed to meet the results of separation, thus reducing it to a nullity by the violation of its first great and fundamental condition. And we, moreover, claim and affirm that the very acts of calling the convention and issuing the said address, by which Southern opinion was forestalled, was an abandonment of the Plan proposed by the General Conference; and hence that, for the reason above alleged, the Plan has been of no real force since the date of said call and address; namely, the eleventh day of June, 1844.

"And, further, it appears, from official returns made from all the annual conferences voting thereon, including those now embraced in the Church South, obtained since this session

commenced, that the required three-fourths majority of the members of the said annual conferences has not been given, and hence, that for this reason, as shown above, the plan is null and void.

“And, further, from information officially given by the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in answer to a call upon them by the General Conference for a statement of facts in the premises, that in numerous instances the Plan proposed in the event of a separation has been openly violated by the Southern Church, and hence that the peace upon the border and elsewhere, which it was designed to promote, has not been secured. The bishops of the M. E. Church South have claimed a movable line, thus transferring from one place to another the scenes of strife and confusion as fast as society majorities could be obtained, which we regard and affirm to be in direct contravention of the most obvious principles of the said provisional Plan. And it is in evidence before us, that, in numerous instances, the sense of members on the proposed border has been taken by Southern preachers, privately, and in various other illegal and inconvenient ways, and hence that societies have been reported and claimed for the South which, by suitable tests, would have given large majorities in favor of adhering to the Methodist Episcopal Church. And, in numerous instances, influence has been applied, and often varied, and obstinately persevered in, to secure a decision in favor of the M. E. Church South, and contrary to the wishes of many of our people. And also, in some instances, houses of worship, built at the expense, in whole or in part, by members adhering to the Methodist Episcopal Church, have been taken from them without their consent and without compensation, and they have been discommoded by vexatious lawsuits, costs, and in various other ways, by preachers and members attached to the Church South. All of which we claim and affirm is in direct violation of the most sacred objects and conditions of the said proposed Plan, showing that it has long since, in this way also, been rendered a nullity by our brethren of the South; and this notwithstanding the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, waiving all the conclusions which this General Conference were entitled to draw from the numerous ascertained infractions of the proposed Plan, resolved, ‘as far as their administration was concerned,’ to adhere to it strictly,

which, for the sake of the magnanimous Christian example it exhibits, and in view of the right of the General Conference alone to assert the facts of the infraction and consequent destruction of the Plan, we are happy to find they have scrupulously done.

“Finally, having thus found, upon clear and incontestable evidence, that the three fundamental conditions of said proposed Plan have severally failed, and the failure of either of them separately being sufficient to render it null and void, and having found the practical workings of said Plan incompatible with certain great constitutional principles elsewhere asserted, we have found and declared *the whole and every part of said provisional Plan to be null and void.*”

“4. In view of the above-named principles and facts—as well as the constitutional rights already referred to—we regard those who have, by their own act and deed, become members of the M. E. Church South as having withdrawn from the Methodist Episcopal Church. And whereas those who are members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in good and regular standing, can not be deprived of such membership without due form of trial, all those members who have not attached themselves to the M. E. Church South are, and have been, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and as such they are entitled to its care and privileges, as provided for in another report of the committee.” (Journal General Conference, 1848, pp. 154-164.)

Such is the testimony of the General Conference after a month of prayerful deliberation. Add to this the other portion of the report on the “Infractions of the Plan,” including the statement of the bishops found in the preceding chapter, and what can be more clear than the fact that the Southern Church had destroyed the “Plan” before it was “repudiated” in 1848; and that the Methodist Episcopal Church ought, as it then did, to disregard it and provide, as best it could, for the adherents upon Southern territory? With this light before them, who shall

say that the Methodist Episcopal Church should leave the South, or that it has no right to be here, because the General Conference of 1844 adopted the report of the Committee of Nine? Our members need not fear that the Mother Church will be again beguiled into the abandonment of her children in the South so long as they are true to the Divine Master.

CHAPTER VI.

CANADA AND THE SUPREME COURT.

DR. MYERS still searches diligently to find "Plans of Separation," devoting the eleventh chapter of his book to the controversies about the division of Canada from the parent body, from which he tries to make it appear that the General Conference divided the Church, both in the case of the Lower and Upper Province, which is not true in either instance. Methodism was early planted in both the Canadas, and formed a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church till after the war of 1812-14. That gave rise to prejudices and difficulties between the States and Canada, which eventuated in the withdrawal of the Methodists there from the Methodist Episcopal Church. In Lower Canada the work was practically "disintegrated and absorbed" by the Wesleyan connection; the preachers who were sent over from the States returning to this side of the line if they so preferred, and the people being supplied by such ministers as were subjects of the British Government, from the British Conference, as they very naturally and properly desired. Much feeling attended this change of Church relations, but the authorities both of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the British Conference were thoughtful and forbearing, and maintained

fraternal intercourse during the whole time of the controversy. Dr. Myers here pays some deserved compliments to the liberality of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which, we trust, ministered to his spiritual comfort. In 1844, 1848, and all of the time since, this same Methodist Episcopal Church has cultivated a like fraternal charity. The only reason why it has not succeeded as well in maintaining friendly relations with the Southern Church is because it had another and widely different element to deal with from that found on our northern border.

Upper Canada remained in the Church some years longer than the Lower Province, but finally withdrew, in 1828, and formed an independent Church, and afterward also united with the Wesleyan connection. In the proceedings of the General Conference of May 21, 1828, Dr. Myers finds a "Plan of Separation," in these words, to wit:

"Resolved, by the delegates of the annual conferences in General Conference assembled, That, whereas the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America has heretofore been extended over the ministers and members in connection with said Church in the province of Upper Canada, by mutual agreement, and by the consent and desire of our brethren in the province; and whereas this General Conference is satisfactorily assured that our brethren in the said province, under peculiar and pressing circumstances, do now desire to organize themselves into a distinct Methodist Episcopal Church, in friendly relations with the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States; therefore, be it resolved, and it is hereby resolved, by the delegates of the annual conferences in General Conference assembled:

"1. If the annual conference in Upper Canada at its ensuing session, or any succeeding session previously to the next General Conference, shall definitely determine on this course,

and elect a general superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in that province, this General Conference do hereby authorize any one or more of the general superintendents of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, with the assistance of any two or more elders, to ordain such general superintendent for the said Church in Upper Canada." (Journal of the General Conference, Vol. I, p. 406.)

Look sharply; read again. There must be a "Plan" here. Dr. Myers says there is, and he knows more about it than any other man living. But, alas! no searching will find it, for the reason that it exists only in the lively imagination of the brother, who often draws upon that ample reservoir for his facts. All that we can discover in the above is provision for the ordination of a bishop, if the Conference should, acting upon its sole responsibility, organize independently. That this is a correct understanding of the action is evident from the fact that, on the 17th of May, the General Conference (1828) adopted the following, namely:

"Whereas, the Canada Annual Conference, situated in the province of Upper Canada, under a foreign government, have, in their memorial, presented to this Conference the difficulties under which they labor in consequence of their union with a foreign ecclesiastical government, and setting forth their desire to be set off as a separate Church establishment; and whereas, this General Conference disclaims all right to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction under such circumstances except by mutual agreement; therefore,

"Resolved, by the delegates of the annual conferences in General Conference assembled: 1. That the compact existing between the Canada Annual Conference and the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States be, and hereby is, dissolved by mutual consent, and that they are at liberty to form themselves into a separate Church establishment." (Journal of the General Conference, Vol. I, p. 338.)

But because this resolution, adopted on the 17th of May, had the appearance of authorizing a separation, it was reconsidered and rescinded by the same Conference, and the resolution, quoted by Dr. Myers, and given above, was adopted in its stead, on the 21st of the same month, so that if there is a "Plan of Separation" in it, the Conference was too stupid to make the discovery; neither has it been learned since, except by a few of our Southern friends.

Dr. Bangs speaks of this matter thus:

"When the subject first came up for consideration, it was contended, and the committee to whom it was first referred so reported, which report was approved of by a vote of the General Conference, that we had no constitutional right to set off the brethren in Upper Canada as an independent body, because the terms of the compact by which we existed as a General Conference made it obligatory on us, as a delegated body, to preserve the union entire, and not to break up the Church into separate fragments. Hence, to grant the prayer of the memorialists, by a solemn act of legislation, would be giving sanction to a principle, and setting a precedent for future General Conferences, of a dangerous character—of such a character as might tend ultimately to the dissolution of the ecclesiastical body; which would be, in fact and form, contravening the very object for which we were constituted a delegated conference, this object being a preservation, and not a destruction or dissolution, of the union. These arguments appeared so forcible to the first committee, and to the Conference, that the idea of granting them a separate organization, on the principle of abstract and independent legislation, was abandoned as altogether indefensible, being contrary to the constitutional compact.

"But still feeling a desire to grant, in some way, that which the Canada brethren so earnestly requested, and for which they pleaded with much zeal, and even with most pathetic appeals to our sympathies, it was suggested by a very intelligent member of the General Conference, the late Bishop Emory, that the preachers who went to Canada from the United States went in the first instance as missionaries; and that ever afterward,

whenever additional help was needed, Bishop Asbury and his successors asked for volunteers, not claiming the right to send them in the same authoritative manner in which they were sent to the different parts of the United States and Territories; hence it followed that the compact between us and our brethren in Canada was altogether of a voluntary character—we had offered them our services, and they had accepted them—and therefore, as the time had arrived when they were no longer willing to receive or accept of our labors and superintendence, they had a perfect right to request us to withdraw our services, and we the same right to withhold them.

“This presented the subject in a new and very clear light; and it seemed perfectly compatible with our powers as a delegated conference, and their privileges as a part of the same body, thus connected by a voluntary and conditional compact, either expressed or implied, to dissolve the connection subsisting between us, without any dereliction of duty or forfeiture of privilege on either part. *It was on this principle alone that the above agreement was based.*” (History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Vol. III, pp. 390–392.)

Let it be remembered that the resolution expressing a “mutual agreement” to separate was rescinded, and that which Dr. Myers imagines to be a “Plan of Separation” was adopted in its place. Like other of his “Plans,” this does not prove to be one when put to the test, as it was in 1836. The interest in the Book Concern was not settled till that time. The General Conference of that year said expressly that the Canada Conference separated by its own act, in these words, namely :

“*Whereas*, the union which by mutual consent then subsisted, was dissolved at the earnest and repeated solicitations of the ministers and members of the Church in Canada, which was definitely determined upon by an act of the Canada Conference, etc.” (Journal of the General Conference, 1836, p. 461.)

The *union* was by “mutual consent” of the parties; the *separation*, “by an *act of the Canada Conference.*”

Dr. Myers quotes from the "Life of Bishop Hedding," page. 365, as follows:

"After the usual conference business had all been transacted, resolutions were introduced and adopted by the body, declaring their ecclesiastical connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, etc., dissolved, and organizing themselves into a separate and independent Church. Bishop Hedding then, after congratulating them on their prosperity, and upon the amicable attainment of this result, vacated the chair, and the Canada Conference became the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada."

A few years later, this Church, as has been observed, was absorbed in the Wesleyan connection.

The quick perception of our author discovers here another "Plan of Separation," or the consummation of division by the General Conference, and he exclaims:

"In view of these facts, how could the General Conference of 1848 declare that there existed no power in the Conference of 1844 to pass an act which either directly or indirectly authorizes or sanctions a division of the Church?" (Page 163.)

Why not so declare? It is manifest from this extract that the Canada Conference separated by its voluntary act.

It was greatly to the credit of Bishop Hedding and to the Conference that this division occurred in such a friendly spirit, especially in view of the excitement which had preceded. The Conference asked for this action in 1824, but, instead of granting it; the work in the province was set off into an annual conference; and, when Bishops Hedding and George went over to hold the Conference in August, they met with great, and sometimes bitter, opposition, being told, in one instance, "We do n't want

you here; we do n't want any Yankee bishops; we can take care of ourselves." They visited many places, allayed the excitement, and the work moved on for the following four years smoothly; Bishop Hedding holding the Conference each year, and in 1828 with the result already given, and returning in 1832, by invitation, to ordain the candidates for orders. That Dr. Myers is in error is evident from the authority which he quotes, page 311, where the writer, Bishop Clark, speaking of granting a division, says, "This the General Conference could not do." Dr. Elliott and others have proved the same point. It is clear from the records that if the General Conference ever refused to do any thing, it refused to divide the Church in 1828.

Dr. Myers applauds the Methodist Episcopal Church for its wisdom and charity, and for the happy adjustment of these delicate affairs, but he is severe in denouncing the same Church, and many of the same men, for their course in relation to the Southern organization, which history shows to have been more careful and yielding in the latter than in the former instance. If the one division was peaceful and the other turbulent, the character of the latter must have been owing to the intolerance of the pro-slavery element in the South.

This whole chapter is devoted to the task of proving that the General Conference divided, or authorized the division of, the Church twice; and, after this, the author finds the body to be still a unit; and that, not until the night of June 10, 1844, sixteen years after the separation of Upper Canada,

did the "last ecumenical delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church adjourn *sine die*;" and from that date it has had no successor. May we ask, If the division of 1844 was like that of 1828, how does it happen that the former left the Church entire, while the latter destroyed it? or, to reverse the proposition, if the separation of Canada did not destroy the ecumenical General Conference, how did a like separation of the South effect this dissolution of the "original Church?" Dr. Myers in Chapter XI plainly contradicts Dr. Myers in Chapter VII of the same volume. In his efforts to mislead others he becomes confused. The facts are, that in all of these cases there were withdrawals from the Church, but the original body was left complete, and is so still—the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States—and each of its General Conference gatherings is the legitimate successor of that of 1844, fully as much as of 1828. If his points could be put together, they would make out the Southern Church to be only an illegitimate branch of an illegitimate Church—we hold of them all a better opinion.

We pass to the twelfth chapter, which is upon "The Legal Aspect of the Subject." Instead, however, of a discussion of the main points of the decision of the Supreme Court at Washington, as might have been expected, we have only special pleading, of a weakly sort, based upon the decision of Judge Leavitt in the *Cincinnati* case, and the speech of Dr. Hamline in the General Conference of 1844, both of which were in favor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and agree with the views held in these

pages; and neither can be made to do service to Dr. Myers and the Southern Church, unless it be by garbling, misconstruction, or misrepresentation. If arguments in support of the extraordinary claims of the Church South had been brought forward from the decision of the Supreme Court; we should answer them. The documents from which to do so are at hand. Though the author of "The Disruption" has, of course, made the strongest case that he was able to out of the facts, together with these perversions of the language of Judge Leavitt and of Dr. Hamline, he has so completely failed to prove his positions that we will not enter into a formal reply to his assumptions, because that is not necessary. A few points, briefly stated, will meet all of the requirements of the case.

On page 169, Dr. Myers says: "I come now to consider the legal aspects of the Plan of Separation. These, indeed, have been settled by the highest tribunal of the nation." This is a favorite method of putting the matter by the Southern writers, in order to make the impression upon the minds of their readers that the "Plan of Separation" has been before the Court for a decision upon its validity and merits; and that there was found to be in it obligations binding the Methodist Episcopal Church not to preach the Gospel in the Southern States; and that the Supreme Court has decided that the Southern Church was right, and the Methodist Episcopal Church wrong, in the course which each has pursued. This is the impression which was sought to be made from the first, and the idea is still kept prominently

before the minds of the Southern people; as if the M. E. Church South was in some way "legitimized" (as Dr. Elliott says) by this decision, so as to give it, aside from a portion of the Book Concern, rights which, as a Christian body, it could not otherwise claim; as if it was thereby made a sort of State Church in the South, with privileges not granted to other Methodist bodies, by being "legalized" by the Court in a way different from other denominations; and as if the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church had no "legal" right to preach in the South; and as if to organize societies here was in violation of law, or, at least, against an order of the "highest tribunal of the nation." Absurd as the supposition is, such an impression has been made upon the minds of thousands by the Southern Church, and on this ground some of our preachers have been threatened with legal prosecution if they should attempt to organize classes in school-houses. This idea, at least as an indistinct or vague notion, is now prevalent in the Southern Church, but it is utterly fallacious, having no foundation whatever in fact.

I. There is not, and never has been, any law of Congress, or of any State Legislature, establishing, "legitimizing," or "legalizing" the M. E. Church South in preference to any other denomination; or prohibiting the Methodist Episcopal Church from entering, or organizing societies, or maintaining worship, schools, and all of the operations of the Church, in any State, territory, county, or district, within the American Union. Even the Southern Confederacy was not so stupid as to do such a thing. Had it

been done, it would have been in palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution guarantees the rights and protects the interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church *in the South* as much as it does those of the Southern Church. Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, and of each of the States severally, the one is as "legal" as the other. Our Southern brethren have wasted volumes of twaddle in vain endeavors to show that their organization was specially "legitimized" and "legalized" under the laws of the country by the "highest tribunal of the nation."

2. The Supreme Court had nothing to do directly with the "Plan of Separation" or in dividing the Church. It had no more authority to decide upon the action of the General Conference in 1844 or 1848, as to the method of its treatment of the members of the communion in the South in relation to ecclesiastical affairs, than it had in determining what doctrines the ministers of the various denominations should preach, or what books they should publish. It had no more right or authority to pronounce the Southern Church "legitimate," or the Methodist Episcopal Church "illegitimate," in the South, than to decide upon the merits of the controversy between Paul and Barnabas; and if it attempted any thing of the kind, it was in the most manifest violation of the Constitution of the United States, which expressly prohibits the establishment, or "legitimizing," of any religious sect, order, or Church, or "legalizing" one in preference to another. If the claims of Dr. Myers and of the Southern Church are correct, the Supreme

Court has done this in behalf of the M. E. Church South, and thus formed a union of that Church with the State, the State having adopted or approved the Southern Church in preference to other denominations, and so constituted it, in so far, a State affair, a *recognized political* body, "legalized," if not established, by the "highest tribunal of the nation." If it was thus legalized by the State, it must receive its authority from that source, or this legalizing process amounts to nothing; and if its authority comes from the State, it is a political organization. If it is not a political body, it has not been legitimized by the State through the Supreme Court, as they claim. On which horn of this dilemma does Dr. Myers choose to hang? He now, like the cause he represents, dangles from a high political antler.

3. Neither were the churches, parsonages, campgrounds, cemeteries, or any one of them, belonging to the Church, or to any of its members in the North or South, or any claims to them, or dispute about them, or any question of the kind, before the Court for adjudication. Dr. Myers seems oblivious of this fact, and expresses surprise that such a statement should be made.

4. The case was this. The Southern Church, through commissioners, brought suit against the Methodist Episcopal Church, represented by the Book Agents and commissioners, acting with sole reference to the Book Concern property, for a division of the Book Concern in New York and Cincinnati. The case in New York was decided by Judge Nelson in favor of the South, and the Methodist Episcopal

Church paid the amount awarded without any further dispute or unnecessary delay. That did not, and could not, have come up before the Supreme Court. The case in Ohio was decided by Judge Leavitt in favor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was appealed by the Church South to the Supreme Court of the United States. The decision was pronounced by Judge Nelson, who had decided the case in New York, in favor of the Southern Church. The case, and the only case or question before the Court or submitted for decision, was the division of the Western Book Concern at Cincinnati. Not a church, or parsonage, or a dollar of other property, was involved in the suit.

5. In giving reasons for his decision, Judge Nelson said much about the "Plan of Separation," the division of the Church, the Church North, and various other things, but the decree of the Court only divided the property of the Western Book Concern. It did not assess any fines or penalties upon Methodist preachers for holding services or forming classes in any State, or "legalize" the Church South, or prohibit the Methodist Episcopal Church from prosecuting its work anywhere. As in New York, so in the West, the money was paid to the Southern Church.

6. This decision was made at a time when slaveholders ruled the nation, and by a Court which also indicated, when giving another decision, that a negro had no rights under the Constitution that a white man was bound to respect, and apparently on the principle that the Methodist Episcopal Church had

no rights that the Church South was bound to respect. But times have changed since then, and, under the new order of things, the original body is able to maintain its rights in the South; and it proposes to do so in peace with all men, so far as that is possible; but, in any case, its ministers and members claim the right to worship God, and to unite in Church fellowship, according to the dictates of conscience and as their choice may incline, in all of the States of this Union, under the Constitution and laws, and the protection of the supreme and subordinate courts of the country, Dr. Myers to the contrary notwithstanding.

CHAPTER VII.

SUNDRY MOVEMENTS IN BOTH CHURCHES FROM
1858 TO 1866.

THE matters discussed in these pages will be better understood if some facts in relation to the course pursued by both of these Churches, in regard to national affairs, from 1858 to 1866, or during the war, are given. At the separation of the Church the Southern branch assumed that slavery was a civil institution, and therefore the Church had no voice or responsibility in its perpetuity. The General Conference of 1858, as we have already seen in the first chapter of this "Appeal," expunged the General Rule on slavery from the Discipline; and the Church, by adopting Rivers's "Philosophy," Dr. Smith's Lectures, and otherwise, placed itself upon the highest pro-slavery ground that could be taken, holding slavery to be right, and to be defended from the sacred Scriptures. Slavery was then admitted to be the cause of the division of the Church, as set forth in the Southern Discipline, as follows:

"In the judgment of the delegates of the several annual conferences in the slave-holding States, the continued agitation of the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church, the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference, and especially the proceedings of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of 1844, in the case of the Rev.

James O. Andrew, D. D., one of the bishops, who had become connected with slavery by marriage, produced a state of things in the South which rendered a continuance of the jurisdiction of that General Conference over the conferences aforesaid inconsistent with the success of the ministry in their proper calling. This conviction they declared in solemn form to the General Conference, accompanied with a protest against the action referred to, assured that public opinion in the slave-holding States would demand, and that due regard to the vital interests of Christ's kingdom would justify, a separate and independent organization. The developments of a few months vindicated their anticipations. The Church in the South and South-west, in her primary assemblies, her quarterly and annual conferences, with a unanimity unparalleled in ecclesiastical history, approved the course of their delegates, and declared her conviction that a separate jurisdiction was necessary to her existence and prosperity. The General Conference of 1844, having adopted a "Plan of Separation," provided for the erection of the annual conferences in the slave-holding States into a separate ecclesiastical connection, under the jurisdiction of a Southern General Conference, the delegates of the aforementioned conferences, in a published address, recommended that a convention of delegates from the said conferences, duly instructed as to the wishes of the ministry and laity, should assemble at Louisville, Ky., on the first day of May, 1845.

"The convention met, delegates having been formally appointed in pursuance of this recommendation; and, after a full and minute representation of all the facts in the premises, acting under the provisional 'Plan of Separation,' declared, by solemn resolution, the jurisdiction hitherto exercised by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church over the conferences in the slave-holding States *entirely dissolved*, and erected the said annual conferences into a separate ecclesiastical connection, under the style and title of the *M. E. Church South*, the first General Conference of which was held in the town of Petersburg, Va., on the first day of May, 1846." (Discipline of the M. E. Church South, Part I, Chap. I, Sec. 2, pp. 9-12, edition of 1855.)

This perversion of history has been expunged from the Discipline apparently to give license to the

customary assumptions now made: first, that slavery was not the *cause*, but only the *occasion*, of the division; and, second, that, as the Southern bishops say, the Church South did not separate from the Methodist Episcopal Church in any sense that it did not separate from the Southern conferences. These claims do not harmonize with this section of the Discipline, hence this expunction.

The position of the Southern Church in reference to slavery indicated where it stood in relation to the great questions of national interest at that time, and during and since the war. Holding that slavery was right, the secession of the Southern States from the American Union for the purpose of protecting and perpetuating that institution was fully justified, and the terrible struggle in behalf of the slave confederacy approved. Slavery being defended as right according to the Scriptures, emancipation was very naturally held to be wrong, and, being effected by a "tyrant" and "usurper," as a "military necessity," was resisted as unjust; and now to claim pay from the Government for the value of slaves set free by the proclamation of President Lincoln is reasonable and just. Slaves, they say, were property, recognized by the law and protected by the Federal Constitution, and, as such, should be paid for; and, this people, being designed by their Creator for service to the white man, should be kept in subjection, though now nominally free. Such is the theory of that Church; and, under the teaching of Drs. Rivers, Smith, and others, thousands have accepted these ideas as correct, and continue to act accordingly.

The hope of finally establishing a Southern confederacy in some form, of reducing the colored people to a condition of dependence and vassalage, at least to a rank of subordinate citizenship, or of receiving pay from the Government for the freedmen, is the chief cause of the continued sectionalism of the South, and of opposition to the Methodist Episcopal Church in these States, and to the elevation of the colored race.

The idea of the secession of the South and the formation of a slave-holding confederacy, was the growth of generations. Its development and maturity were greatly hastened by the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which left the perhaps stronger, more popular, and aristocratic element in that communion free to defend slavery and cultivate that idea. Southern Methodism lost no opportunity to do both. It readily took a position in the front rank of the disciples of John C. Calhoun. The Church separated from the parent body in the interest of slavery, as every candid reader of the movements of 1844 and afterward must admit. That it should favor the proposed government, which was to protect the institution, was to be expected, and that it should become the recognized high-priesthood of the slave-holding power was not strange. These terms express its relations, as a body, to the Confederacy. It is sometimes said, however, that the Church South did not indorse the rebel government, that the General Conference was not in session during the war, and so could not have recognized this power, if so disposed. This is true, so far as the General

Conference is concerned. That body was to have met in New Orleans, May, 1862. At that time the city was held by the Union forces, and if the Southern Church had desired to hold a conference there, under the laws of the United States and the protection of the American flag, it could have done so; and had this Church, at that time, adhered to the Union and proved itself loyal to the country, its influence for peace, submission to Federal authority, and the reconstruction of the South, would have been very great, and the means of saving thousands of precious lives and millions of treasure. But the General Conference did not meet, nor was any gathering of the authorities of that Church held in New Orleans at that period. This fact alone determines the position of that denomination on national matters. Had it been loyal to the United States, a large number of the members could have assembled at the time and place appointed. It was not loyal, but intensely disloyal, to the Federal Government. This is the reason why the General Conference was not convened in 1862. But there are a few facts which show the attitude of the Church on national affairs as clearly as any action of the General Conference could have done. These are:

1. The bishops of the M. E. Church South all adhered to the Confederacy. Most of them were intensely partisan, and gave their undivided influence to its support, in the pulpit, at the conferences, and before the people in public and private.

2. The annual conferences formally and repeatedly indorsed the Confederacy in the most explicit and

emphatic manner. The report of the Southern Holston Conference, found in the next chapter, is an illustration of the character of the action of the annual conferences upon this subject, generally.

3. The traveling ministers of the M. E. Church South usually were among the most forward, enthusiastic, and persistent promoters of the cause. They advocated it in the pulpit and on the Sabbath. Their prayers were often interlarded with shocking, if not blasphemous, imprecations upon the Government, the army, and the people of the North.

4. The press of the Southern Church was bitterly and fearfully rebellious. The official paper of the Church, the *Nashville Advocate*—then edited by Dr., now Bishop, M'Tyeire—in September, 1861, said: "We have called upon heaven and drawn the sword, and vowed to defend them or die. It is a vow and a resolution that ennobled our Confederacy, and will be recorded on one of the most glowing of historic pages. It is an ennobling vow only because it is not an idle one. We have resolved to do and suffer whatever may be necessary to win our success." Dr. Summers, the present editor of the *Nashville Advocate*, in a letter to the *Southern Advocate*, May 22, 1862, at the time when the General Conference ought to have been in session, wrote: "Patriotism is to be wedded to piety, and who but God's ministers are to solemnize the service? At all events, they are to take the lead in promoting the interests in question. As our fighting bids fair to assume the character of inland guerrilla warfare, every minister will have to be, as it were, a chaplain in the army, mixing, per-

haps, not a little gunpowder with the Gospel. Our altars and our hearth-stones must be defended from *vandal* desecration, at whatever sacrifice."

These quotations are comparatively tame, and are only straws to show the way of the wind. Volumes of denunciation, vituperation, and falsehood of a similar character from the Southern press might be given if it were necessary; but the writer takes no pleasure in repeating any thing of the kind. Neither does he wish to soil these pages with these unhallowed excitations to treason and rebellion. A document has been prepared by Rev. J. W. Lee, A. M., upon the claim of the Southern Church against the Government for about a half a million of dollars, for the use of the Nashville Book Concern during the war, that necessarily gives extracts of this sort, which are appalling in character and extent. The position of the Church South on national affairs can not be mistaken.

Slavery being abolished, it was supposed that soon after the war the country would settle into harmony and union, so that all Churches would be more free than ever before to extend their work from North to South, and co-operate in these sections in building up the Redeemer's kingdom; and as the South had been impoverished by the war, while the North had suffered comparatively little, it was the prompting of Christian love that led the Methodist Episcopal Church to follow close after the victorious army with messages of grace. The duty to reoccupy the South and help rebuild its moral wastes was early impressed upon the Church. At the General Con-

ference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of 1864, the bishops in their address to the Conference called attention to this matter in these words, to wit:

“The progress of the Federal arms has thrown open to the loyal Churches of the Union large and inviting fields of Christian enterprise and labor. In the cultivation of these fields it is natural and reasonable to expect that the Methodist Episcopal Church should occupy a prominent position. She occupied those fields once. Her net-work of conferences, districts, and pastoral charges, spread over them all—all, indeed, both within and beyond the Federal lines. For nineteen years they have been in the occupancy of the M. E. Church South, to the wrongful exclusion of the Methodist Episcopal Church. But her days of exclusive occupancy are ended. The wall of partition is broken down by that very power whose dreadful ministry was invoked to strengthen it. And now, the way being open for the return of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it is but natural that she should re-enter those fields and once more realize her unchanged title as ‘The Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America.’ She ought never to have been excluded from any portion of the territory of the United States. She ought never to have consented, on any ground, to such exclusion. And now that the providence of God has opened her way, she should not be disobedient to her heavenly calling, but should return at the earliest practicable period.

“But how? This is the great question. And while we defer for the full answer to the wisdom of the General Conference, we feel that we ought to say that she should enter those fields as she enters all fields; she should enter preaching Christ and him crucified to all classes of people, laboring with all her might to bring sinners to repentance, and to build up believers in that holiness without which no man can see the Lord, and welcoming back such ministers and members as were cut off from her communion without their voluntary act. Yet it is our solemn judgment that none should be admitted to her fellowship who are either slave-holders, or are tainted with treason.

“We suggest such a change in the Discipline as will permit the recognition of such members and ministers as it may be proper to receive into the Church.

“We may add to what is here said, that the bishops, at

their meeting in November last, arranged among themselves to have the Southern territory then within the Federal lines explored, with a view to making such temporary arrangements as might be found to be practicable for the spiritual supply of the forsaken people. The bishops have made the exploration more or less thoroughly, either by personal visitation or correspondence, and have temporarily appointed a few preachers.

“We deem it proper to call attention to the section in the Discipline in relation to our colored membership. The provision adopted by the General Conference of 1856, though an advance on former legislation, is not, we believe, sufficient to meet the necessities of the colored people. The time has now come, in our judgment, when the General Conference should carefully consider what measures can be adopted to give increased efficiency to our Church among them.” (Journal of the General Conference, 1864, pp. 278, 279.)

This address was signed by Bishops Morris, Janes, Scott, Simpson, Baker, and Ames.

The General Conference, agreeing with the bishops upon this subject, so altered the Discipline as to admit of receiving such ministers of the Church South as might offer to unite with the Methodist Episcopal Church upon the same conditions granted to those coming from other Methodist bodies, “provided they give satisfactory assurances to an annual or quarterly conference of their loyalty to the National Government, and hearty approval of the antislavery doctrine of our Church.” (Journal of the General Conference, 1864, p. 241.) This was a recognition of the Southern Church as an accredited Methodist body, putting it upon an equality, as to ecclesiastical *status*, with all other branches of Methodism in America and Europe. The provisions required were only such as prudence dictated, such as would have been demanded of all others under like circumstances. Loy-

alty to the Government was exacted by the twenty-third article of religion, and the times were not calculated to suggest a lowering of the standard of Wesley in regard to slavery. Members from the Southern Church were always received as if in the same communion.

The Delaware and Washington Conferences of colored members were provided for and their boundaries fixed by the General Conference (Journal, pp. 217, 224), and the bishops were authorized to form mission conferences in the South, as the interests of the work, in their judgment, should require (Journal, p. 198). This is the whole of the scheme for the "disintegration and absorption" of the Southern Church, about which so much has been said. The Pastoral Address adopted by the General Conference embodied these words, namely: "We have held our session in the midst of the fearful agitations and struggles of war. Our nation has reached a most eventful crisis. Ambitious and wicked men have led the people and the States of the South into a most cruel and unprovoked rebellion. . . . We call your attention to the fact that slavery is the evident and guilty cause of this terrible war, and express to you our deliberate opinion that there will be no peace or safety to the Republic till this vile usurpation is utterly destroyed." (Journal, p. 435.) An able report on the freedmen was also adopted, in which it was held that, "In the present struggle of our country for nationality, liberty, and law, God is manifestly causing the wrath of man to praise him. A rebellion, begun in the interests of American slavery; a

ruthless war, prosecuted by rebels for the extension and perpetuation of the 'sum of all villainies,' is now certain to cause its overthrow and extinction, and prepare the way for the elevation of the people it has so long crushed and degraded." (Journal, p. 440.)

The antislavery and loyal sentiment of the Church are here distinctly avowed. Believing them to be right before God and men, they have never been concealed; but nothing was said or done against the Southern Church. On the basis of national unity and antislavery principle, the Methodist Episcopal Church entered upon the Southern work, to do the labor and fill the place which Providence might assign it without a disposition to antagonize the Southern Church more than duty would require, and willing to toil side by side with that denomination in harmony with it, exchanging such fraternal courtesies as might be suitable, or as were agreeable to the other party. After the surrender, the work rapidly enlarged. The Holston Conference was organized June 1, 1865; Mississippi, December 25, 1865; Tennessee, October 3, 1866; South Carolina, April 2, 1866; Texas, January 3, 1867; Virginia and North Carolina, January 3, 1867; Georgia, October 10, 1867; and Alabama, October 17, 1867.

The Methodist Episcopal Church indicated its catholic spirit in the provision made for the celebration of the centennial year of American Methodism, in October, 1866. The report of the committee upon this subject, at the General Conference of 1864, closed in these words, to wit: "We cordially invite our breth-

ren in all the branches of the great Methodist family, in this and in other lands, to unite with us in this grand centennial celebration, that together we may lift our thanksgivings to the God of our fathers, and renew our consecration to his spiritual service." (Journal, pp. 445, 446.) None of these bodies were asked to contribute any thing to the benefit of the Methodist Episcopal Church. All that they should do for the advancement of Methodism was to go to the assistance of the various denominations of Methodists severally. This, on the part of the parent body, was an expression of fraternal interest in the prosperity of all branches of Methodism.

The Southern bishops speak of action taken at a meeting of the bishops and missionary secretaries of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Erie, Penn., in June, 1865, as objectionable to the Southern Church. There was nothing done at this meeting which was not authorized by the General Conference in the preceding year. The efforts there suggested were here put into further execution. The Church was carrying, at the commencement of the war, a number of grand missionary enterprises, at a cost of \$250,000 a year. As gold advanced in price, the expense of exchange in foreign countries was materially increased, so that year by year additional contributions were necessarily called for. The Church responded with such liberality that a surplus of four hundred thousand dollars had accumulated in the treasury at the close of the war. This was regarded by many as providential, and as an indication that the Church ought at once to move forward in aiding in the moral recon-

struction of the South. The work was undertaken in a spirit of Christian charity, and with holy purpose.

Meanwhile, the Southern Church was not inactive. With remarkable pertinacity and surprising *unwisdom*, it adopted the most positive measures for reconstruction on its former basis of pro-slavery opinions and sectionalism. Though the General Conference did not meet in 1862, the bishops and others gathered, at different times, for consultation and co-operation in behalf of the Church. Such a meeting was held in Atlanta, Ga., another in Macon, Ga., and another on the 4th of May, 1865, in Montgomery, Ala. What transpired at these convocations, the writer is not advised. The *Southern Advocate* of February 11, 1864, contains a call from Bishop Andrew for the Montgomery meeting, in which he says:

“The unhappy war, which has been cursing and desolating the land for the last three years, has very seriously deranged the operations of the Church. At the regular time for holding our General Conference, such was the state of things that it was judged best to omit calling the Conference together, particularly as the place where it was to have been held was *regarded as unsafe*, so we postponed the calling of the General Conference; and, instead of that, issued a call for a meeting of the bishops and Book Committee and Board of Managers of the Missionary Society. This meeting was held in Atlanta, and adopted divers resolutions, looking to the proper and successful operations of the Church.”

A similar meeting was held in Columbus, Ga., on the 16th of August, 1865, from which the bishops issued an address to the Church, which is here given in full. It was widely circulated, and seems to have been designed mainly to counteract the general tend-

ency toward fraternity and union among Methodists. The *Southern Advocate*, of Macon, Ga.—then edited by Dr. Myers—in the following Spring, March 2, 1866, spoke of this meeting, and of the address of the bishops, in the following terms, namely :

“There is a desperate effort through the country to draw off our members by misrepresentations. Some of our preachers have been perverted, and others are plied with constant solicitations. Money is freely promised out of the rich missionary treasury of the Northern Church. It has its effect. Disguise it as we may, the contest is on us, and we have to enter it, however little to our taste. We would much prefer—in the language of a contemporary—‘to see the Southern Methodist Church pursue its avocation of trying to save souls, plucking them out of the fire; its bishops, as flaming torches, going forth with illuminating truth; the zeal of its ministry displayed in calling sinners to repentance; and its editors joining in the glorious work in their marshaled columns.’ All this we want done; but if this is all the editors do toward meeting the misrepresentations respecting us, industriously circulated throughout our borders by newspapers, pamphlets, and the living voice of filibustering preachers and of perverts, they will soon see a hostile Church contesting every foot of ground with us. We abhor conflict; but we can not consent to a cowardly surrender. We need not ‘come down’ from the ‘great work,’ but at least the ‘builders’ should have ‘every one his sword girded by his side,’ and so ‘should build.’

“On the 16th of August, 1865, those of the bishops of the M. E. Church South who could then get together, met in Columbus, Ga. From that meeting they issued a ‘Pastoral Address,’ signed only by themselves, but afterward adopted by the other bishops, and so stated in the papers, over their own signatures. When this Address was agreed upon, all the leading facts respecting the purposes of the Northern Church were before them—the ‘Erie Resolutions,’ the Discipline as it has been amended, the utterances of conferences and editors. They were not acting in the dark; and when they declared what they did on the subject of the union, they said only that which facts compelled them to say, or they would have been traitors to truth,

and false to principle. They showed clearly that the Northern, not the Southern, Methodist Church is alone responsible for any hostility between the two communions."

This, says Dr. Myers in the article from which the above is taken, is the "only official action had on the subject by the M. E. Church South." The Address of the bishops is as follows:

"Reconstruction or reunion with the Methodist Episcopal Church North has, within the last few months, been brought before the public by the denominational papers, preachers, and members of that Church, in published addresses and resolutions. Their bishops and missionary secretaries held a meeting in June, the proceedings of which, embracing this subject, have been published by order. Under these circumstances, some allusion to it may be proper for us.

"You are aware that at our first General Conference a delegate was appointed to visit the General Conference of the Northern Methodists, and present to that body our Christian salutations, with the offer to establish fraternal relations and a closer intercourse between us as members of the same spiritual family. He was in all respects a most proper and unexceptionable minister, and performed the part assigned him in a most proper and unexceptionable manner. He presented his credentials to that body, and asked and awaited their decision. They granted him no hearing in their presence. They declined to receive him in his official character. They rejected his offer. He closed his ineffectual mission by informing them, in a communication which he assured them was final, that, as they had rejected our offer, we could no more renew it. We held ourselves acquitted of any breach of Christian unity that might appear. But if, at any time, they should formally and officially make the same offer to us, the door would be open for its consideration. This was in 1848. They have since made no such offer. There the matter rests; and we might well be excused from any further reference to it.

"We feel bound to say to you, however, that since then the position of Northern Methodists toward us has been somewhat changed. Having agreed with us on a Plan of Separation into two independent jurisdictions, and for an equitable division of

the Church property, they afterward sought to repudiate their covenant and to evade payment; and we only brought them to settlement at the end of the law. This Plan, though granted by themselves, who were in a majority, and subsequently confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States as the basis of our legal and constitutional rights, has been, whenever convenient, ignored by them.

“They have endeavored, by misrepresentations, to fix on us the invidious character of secessionists and schismatics, without authority or cause, from the parent body; whereas we are, in all respects, coequal and coeval with themselves.

“The abolition, *for military and political considerations*, of the institution of domestic slavery in the United States, does not affect the moral question that was prominent in our separation of 1844. Nor is this the only difference, or the principal one, between us and them. While testifying with pleasure to the nobler conduct and sentiments of many brethren among them, we must express, with regret, our apprehension that a large proportion, if not a majority, of Northern Methodists, have become *incurably radical*. *They teach for doctrine the commandments of men. They preach another Gospel.* They have incorporated social dogmas and political tests into their Church creeds. They have gone on to impose conditions upon discipleship that Christ did not impose. Their pulpits are perverted to agitations and questions not healthful to personal piety, but promotive of political and ecclesiastical discord, rather than of those ends for which the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ was instituted. Without such a change, as we see no immediate prospect of, in their tone and temper and practice, we can anticipate no good result from even *entertaining the subject of reunion with them*. Fidelity to what seems our providential mission requires that we preserve our Church, in all its vigor and integrity, free from entangling alliances with those whose notions of philanthropy and politics and social economy are liable to give an ever-varying complexion to their theology. Let us abide in our lot, and be true to our calling, doing what we can to spread Scriptural holiness through these lands, and to *oppose the tide of fanaticism* which threatens their overflow.

“We therefore most earnestly would exhort you, brethren, to stand firmly on our platform of doctrine and Discipline. Know your high calling. Preach Christ and him crucified. Do

not preach politics. You have no commission to preach politics. The divinity of the Church is never more strikingly displayed than when it holds on its even, straightforward way in the midst of worldly commotions. Be not turned aside from your path by local, specious, temporary influences. And in all your teaching, and administration of discipline, keep in view that rule of our faith which declares that 'the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that, whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man.'

"The conduct of certain Northern Methodist bishops and preachers, in taking advantage of the confusion incident to a state of war to intrude themselves into several of our houses of worship, and their continuing to hold these places against the wishes and protests of the congregations and rightful owners, cause us sorrow and pain, not only as working an injury to us, but as presenting to the world a spectacle ill calculated to make an impression favorable to Christianity. They are not only using, to our deprivation and exclusion, churches and parsonages which we have builded, but have proceeded to set up a claim to them as their property, by what shadow of right, legal or moral, we are at a loss to conceive. We advise our brethren who suffer these evils to bear them patiently, to cleave closely together, and not indulge in any vindictive measures or tempers. A plain statement of the case, and an appeal to the justice of those in authority, can not fail to defeat such scandalous designs, and secure to us the full restoration of all our rights.

"While some *talk of reunion* of the two Churches, we forewarn you of a systematic attempt, already inaugurated, and of which the foregoing is only an instance, to disturb, and, if possible, disintegrate, and then absorb, our membership individually. In the meeting of their bishops and missionary secretaries alluded to, it was resolved to send preachers and plant societies in our midst wherever there is an opening. Their policy is evidently our division and ecclesiastical devastation. Against all this, be on your guard. Internal dissensions will do us much more harm than such outward antagonism. Be true to your principles, and, under the divine favor, they will triumph. In this connection you will be pleased to hear that our people are steadfast. The border conferences, under special trials, present a noble example of steadfastness.

“Not less as loyal citizens than as Christian men do we deplore the friction, the irritation, and the waste of power, that must mark such unprovoked conflict—the passions that will be aroused, and the influences that will be generated, more or less, not only in the membership of both communions, but in those who sympathize with them. Reaching and affecting, as it will, directly or indirectly, so large a population, and stirring the popular feelings so deeply, as religious feuds ever do, the effect must be seriously to retard that settlement and agreement of an estranged and heated public temper, already begun, and the consummation of which is devoutly to be desired by every patriotic mind. For any such untoward results we shall not be responsible.

“Your General Conference, Providence permitting, will convene in New Orleans, on Wednesday after the first Sunday in April next. To it will belong all such disciplinary changes and legislation as a wise regard to the wants of the Church and the times demand.

“We can not close our address without an urgent and explicit recommendation to you, to adjust yourselves, as citizens of the United States, promptly, cheerfully, and in good faith, to all your duties and responsibilities. Whatever may have been the opinions or prejudices of any of you concerning the political changes that have occurred in the Government, we deem this course to be called for on your part, both by a sound judgment and an enlightened conscience.

“Finally, brethren, we exhort you, above all things, to cultivate personal holiness. Keep up your family altars. Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together for the regular and public worship of God. And may he give you the spirit of love and a sound mind, and guide you in all things to his glory!

J. O. ANDREW,
R. PAINE,
G. F. PIERCE.

“COLUMBUS, GA., August 17, 1865.”

(Southern Advocate, March 2, 1866.)

The above address needs no reply. It has the true “Southern” ring, and is of the style and spirit of '44 and '74. To put some of the words in italics

serves both as explanation and answer. It is well to remember, however, that Dr. Myers says that "they were not acting in the dark." It is evident that they proposed that the Methodists of the South should neither unite nor fraternize with the Methodist Episcopal Church if they could prevent such a result. It is also equally clear that their opinions have undergone very little, if any, change since this non-fraternal message was issued.

After a lapse of eight years, the Southern General Conference met in New Orleans, April 4, 1866. The bishops in their address to this Conference review briefly the eight years preceding, speak of the meetings at Atlanta, Macon, Montgomery, and Columbus, and of the foregoing address as "giving such advice as seemed to us appropriate to the peculiar circumstances of the times," and proposed to leave "Providence to vindicate in due time our Scriptural relation to the colored people." Referring to reorganization and fraternity they say:

"In respect to the separate and distinct organization of our Church, no reasons have appeared to alter our views, as expressed in August last. No proposal of fraternal relations has come to us from others, neither do we regard ourselves as in any wise responsible for hostility evinced toward us. While the attempt to take forcible possession of our property and to disintegrate our Church declares the mind that would destroy us, let it be ours to show the mind that was in Christ. In our conscious integrity we should calmly await the inevitable hour, when, in the providence of God, an enlightened public opinion will vindicate our claims as a Church of God, and a true type of Methodism. Let us not be impatient for our vindication before the world. The great future is before us, and the Great Head of the Church smiles upon us. Our fidelity to God will most perfectly reply to the voice of defamation.

“In this connection, it is with pleasure that we refer to the fact that many Christians in the North, and especially in the North-west, sincerely sympathize with us; and this sympathy, we have reason to believe, is daily assuming a more tangible and impressive form. That there have, at the same time, been some defections in the Church, we can not disguise. A very few of the whites have gone from us. This was perhaps to have been expected. Our regret is rather for them than for ourselves. But, while we speak of small defections, we may refer also to most gratifying accessions. The Baltimore Annual Conference is now represented by a delegation in this body. In February last, Bishop Early formally received into our ecclesiastical connection this Conference, consisting of one hundred and four ministers and a membership of twelve thousand.

“It is a grateful duty to welcome these brethren among us, and to commend them to the confidence and affection of our people. This is a large accession to our numbers and territory. It is also a testimony in our favor that is nobly borne by men whose former position and long deliberation upon the subject, as well as their known intelligence, will entitle it to a special respect. In our hearts we welcome them, and cordially extend to them the right hand of fellowship.

“As a fact of interest to us and of promise to our future influence, we may state that in the city of Baltimore there have been organized several flourishing Churches upon an independent basis, composed of Methodists whose warm sympathies are with us, and whose liberal kindness has already contributed largely to aid us in our time of need, laying us under obligations by their love and good works.” (Journal of the Southern General Conference, 1866, pp. 15, 21.)

One is tempted to inquire how these bishops failed to express gratitude for the bounties of the North, bestowed upon the South during the months preceding this General Conference. Only the Confederate element of Baltimore are by them esteemed worthy of thanks. If only “small defections” and a “very few whites,” toward whom there is “regret for *them*,” have left their communion,

they have made a fearful outcry for very little cause ; and but for the persecution and ostracism of the Southern Church, the "regret for *them*," would have been a waste of sympathy. And it is somewhat surprising to see the bishops rejoicing in that in the Southern Church, in reference to the Baltimore Conference and the Illinois Ditzler movement, for which, in their August address, they severely censured the Methodist Episcopal Church. It seems to make a wide difference with some whose ox is gored.

The New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church being in session at this time in Brooklyn, a fraternal telegram was sent to the Southern General Conference, which it was hoped would be productive of much good, and soon lead to open and avowed fraternal relations, and possibly to a union between the two Churches. At the instance of Dr. Whedon, editor of the *Quarterly Review*, the New York East Conference in its gratitude for the return of peace and to express Christian regard to the ministers, members, and friends of the Southern Church, on Thursday, April 5th, adopted the following by a vote of eighty to eight, to wit:

" *Whereas*, the General Conference of the M. E. Church South is now in session in the city of New Orleans; therefore,

" *Resolved*, That we, the New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, hereby present to that venerable representative body our Christian salutations, and cordially invite them, together with us, to make next Sabbath, April 8, 1866, a day of special prayer, both in private and in public congregations, for the peace and unity of heart of our common country, and for the full restoration of Christian sympathy and love between the different Churches, and especially between the different

branches of Methodism within this nation; and upon the reception of an acceptable affirmative reply, this concert of prayer will be considered by this Conference as adopted.

“*Resolved*, That the Secretary of this Conference be requested to forthwith transmit by telegraph a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, at New Orleans.

GEORGE W WOODRUFF, *Secretary*.

(Journal of the Southern General Conference, 1866, p. 26.)

The Secretary did as he was directed, sending this dispatch on Thursday, April 5th, but it was not presented to the General Conference till noon, on Saturday, the 7th. It evidently left Brooklyn on time, and, being for the General Conference, could hardly have remained in the office at New Orleans till Saturday, twelve M. We have been told that it was “inadvertently” overlooked on Friday. Why it was presented as the last item before the adjournment, as the Journal shows it to have been, or after, as Dr. Newman suggests, we are not advised. When read, the *Southern Advocate* of May 25, 1866, says: “The Conference was taken quite by surprise.” It was “unexpected,” “created some sensation.” Dr. Doggett, now bishop, writing to the *Episcopal Methodist*, observed:

“The telegram duly authenticated, it was unanimously responded to, as an act of Christian charity, and an official message to that effect was immediately dispatched. We rejoice that the Church South had the occasion to evince to the world that neither the stern realities of war nor the bitterness of sectional strife had extinguished its piety, nor impaired the grandeur of its vocation. It is a symptom, we trust, of the repression of asperities, and the cultivation of those kindly relations which triumph over those external differences which no existing wisdom is competent to adjust.”

Dr. M'Anally wrote to the St. Louis *Advocate*:

"The telegram was received, read to the Conference—which caused a profound sensation—and after a few remarks by divers members of this Conference, a resolution was adopted, unanimously accepting, and concurring in, the request of the annual conference of New York. This is the first step from the North. It has been received and met in a kind, dignified, and Christian manner; and every step forward they may choose to make will be met in the same manner."

Dr. Newman, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who was present, said, in the New Orleans *Advocate*, of which he was editor:

"This beautiful message was received in a manner that evinced the lingering of precious memories of a happier past, and of a sincere desire that brethren beloved, long separated by misunderstanding and prejudice, might again dwell together in unity. The Conference had been engaged during the morning in the discussion of important questions, and at noon Bishop Kavanaugh informed the Conference that an important telegram had been received, and requested the members to be seated. Dr. Summers, the Secretary, then read the message amid respectful silence. The blessed effect of this fraternal greeting was well expressed by the appropriate response proposed by Dr. Wightman, and adopted by a rising vote. Such was the alacrity with which the Conference voted, that scarcely had the Bishop put the motion when the members rose *en masse* to greet their brethren of the North.

"Blessed be the Lord God of our fathers who hath brought us to see this day!"

After some discussion, in which doubts were indicated of the wisdom of the course, the following reply was adopted by a standing vote, which was transmitted to Dr. Woodruff by the Secretary of the General Conference, namely:

"I am instructed by the General Conference to acknowledge the receipt of the communication of the New York

East Conference to the General Conference, and to forward to you the accompanying response to the proposal of your Conference:

“*Whereas*, a telegram has been received from the Secretary of the New York East Conference, now in session in Brooklyn, and addressed to the Secretary of the General Conference, respectfully inviting this body to meet with the Conference aforesaid, on to-morrow (Sunday, April 8th), in prayer to God for the restoration of Christian sympathy and love between the Churches, and especially between the different branches of Methodism of this country; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the General Conference of the M. E. Church South is always ready to entertain with Christian courtesy any proposal looking to the cultivation of kind and brotherly relations with other branches of the common Methodism of the country, and do cordially agree to unite on to-morrow with the New York East Conference in special and solemn prayer, in private and in the public congregation, for the very desirable object specified in the fraternal message of that Conference.

“*Resolved*, That the foregoing response be forthwith telegraphed by the Secretary of the General Conference to the Secretary of the New York East Annual Conference.

W. M. WIGHTMAN,
J. HAMILTON, JR.,

“Very respectfully,

“THOS. O. SUMMERS, *Sec’y General Conference.*”

(Journal of the Southern General Conference, 1866, p. 26.)

In a letter to the writer, Dr. Woodruff says, that, “on the fifth day of the session (Monday, April 9th), the Secretary announced the reception of this telegram at about half past ten o’clock, on Saturday night, and stated that, after consultation with the presiding bishop, he sent information of the fact of its reception to the various Methodist Churches in New York and Brooklyn.” The delay of this dispatch was, to say the least, very remarkable. By way of apology, it has been said that the messenger by whom

it was sent to the office in New Orleans "inadvertently" neglected to forward it till night.

This delay from Thursday, till ten and a half o'clock on Saturday night, too late for further action to be taken in making preparation for the Sabbath service, or for announcements to be made of the interesting occasion, was regarded, and not without reason, as a declinature of the proposal made by that body. Had it been received in Brooklyn before the adjournment of the Conference on Saturday, it would have been highly honored, though it must be admitted to have the appearance of coolness and decided formality, repeating, "inadvertently" or otherwise, some of the words from New York. Special care was also taken to show that the message was from an annual conference, a body "not authorized to treat of the subject of fraternity." The impression made by it was unfortunate, and caused some caustic discussion in the Conference; and it was understood that while the General Conference consented to unite in prayer for the Church, it declined to do so for the country. This was denied by the *Southern Advocate*. In an article from which a quotation has been made, it said:

"The Southern General Conference did not 'decline to pray for national peace and concord.' It was done frequently, and that body would doubtless have had daily prayer-meetings to that end, if it could have been thought that thereby the bitter hate and tyranny with which radicalism is now pursuing the utter ruin of the Southern people could be substituted by the benign influences of the Spirit, and of a tender, loving, forgiving Christianity; or if prayer would make the radicals as loyal to our common Constitution as it is, as we of the South are."

May the spirit of these prayers be judged of by the style of the *Advocate*? It can not be denied that when politicians of the General Toombs stripe accused the preachers of praying for the country on this occasion, as if their prayers could be accounted treasonable to Southern interests and Southern sentiment, the reply given would be to the effect that only the *Church* was thus remembered; and we have it on good authority that one of the bishops said, "they had no country to pray for." This well intended and truly fraternal effort on the part of the brethren of the New York East Conference ended, whether so designed by the South or not, in an unfortunate defeat. More telegraphing, however, immediately followed. On the 11th, the following was sent North. We again quote from the *Southern Advocate*, of the date given:

"NEW ORLEANS, April 11, 1866.

"To Bishop E. R. Ames, Tarrytown, N. Y.:

"Have New York Conference request Southern General Conference to appoint commissioners, one from each of their annual conferences, to confer with like commissioners, appointed by bench of bishops, one from each of your annual conferences, in May, at Washington, to agree on a reunion of the Churches this Centenary year of Methodism, subject to the approval of your General Conference. Favored by leading men in the Southern General Conference. Telegraph your action immediately.

"Signed, J. P. NEWMAN, and three others.'

"This 'favored by leading men,' etc., is, of course, only a guess, and, we judge, a pretty 'wise' guess. They did not 'lead' much.

"Acting upon this suggestion, on motion of Dr. Foster, a committee of five preachers and four laymen was appointed to prepare and report to the Conference such action as in their

judgment would be proper to take in relation to the General Conference of the M. E. Church South. The committee were: Revs. R. S. Foster, S. Van Deusen, L. H. King, J. W. Beach, and W. C. Smith; and laymen, Isaac Kipp, Jas. M'Cord, N. W. Husted, and A. S. Newman.

"The next day, Friday [Thursday], the following telegram was sent:

"*'New York Conference to the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, in New Orleans assembled, greeting:*

"*'We would express the hope, desire, and expectation that, at no distant day, the bodies unhappily severed will be united, and suggest the propriety of your body providing a conference with a commission that may be appointed by our bishops, with reference to reunion, subject to the action of our General Conference, May, 1868, thus crowning our glorious Centenary.'*

"This reached the General Conference on Saturday, and, when read, it was suggested to refer it to a committee to frame a proper answer to so grave a proposition. Eventually, the bishops were constituted this committee. Before their conclusions were made known, the Conference learned the fate of its former telegram, and how that it had been made the occasion of fresh insult, and they became wholly indifferent to the entire subject. Many, we know, thought the proposition, as Dr. Curry calls it, 'a most preposterous affair.' He says, 'That an annual conference should assume to lead off in a subject of outside negotiations, and call on the bench of bishops to appoint delegates, is something new in Methodism.'

"Dr. Deems wrote truly to the *Watchman*, 'What shall we do? Every possible obstruction is put by Northern men in the way of a union, and these measures are resorted to in order to create the impression that *we* are ugly and contumacious. All this is in very bad taste, not to say bad faith. *The General Conference of the Northern Church is the only body on earth that can decently originate overtures for a union, or for amity and comity.* The General Conference of the Southern Church is the only body to be addressed on this subject. When the Northern General Conference shall remove the offensive political test from its Discipline, it may decently address us—not before. Every thing before that is a delusion and a snare. All other parties are meddlers.'"

Dr. Myers further quotes Dr. Curry as saying, in reference to this affair:

“Our Southern brethren repel the advances made on our part with such hearty self-depreciation, and tell us that our advances are impertinent and ‘indecent.’ We quite agree with them in all this, and confess that we richly deserve the slap in the face which they give us.’

“The following was the answer eventually given:

“NEW ORLEANS, April 29, 1866.

“To Rev. T. W. Chadwick, Secretary of New York Conference:

“The General Conference of the M. E. Church South heartily reciprocates the kind expressions of the New York Annual Conference, but can not consent to appoint commissioners on the plan proposed. T. O. SUMMERS, *Secretary.*’

“So ends this episode in ecclesiastical history. The full narrative is necessary, that the Church South may be not accused of rejecting a proffered union with the Church North—as some unscrupulous proselyters will perhaps declare has been done.”

This last effort concluded more strangely than the first—that is, if it is concluded, which is a matter of some doubt, as the dispatch seems to have been befogged and run aground in some unknown land. April 11th was Wednesday, and the telegram from the New York Conference to the General Conference, on the “next day,” must have been received on Thursday, instead of *Friday*; but the Journal shows that it was not presented to the General Conference till *Saturday*, the 14th, at the *adjournment of the session*, as in the former case. Then, on motion of Dr. Deems, it was referred to the bishops. It was well known that the New York Conference would adjourn by Tuesday, or Wednesday, the 18th, at farthest; but the reply, according to the *Southern*

Advocate of the 25th of May, 1866, was not given till April 29th, *eleven days after* (as the bishops and the Secretary knew), in the nature of things, that the Conference must have adjourned and the members dispersed! It is evident that the Southern brethren had "become wholly indifferent to the entire subject," or that they were unaccustomed to the use of the telegraph. We have looked through the Journal and the proceedings of the Conference, published in the papers, for this answer, but have not been able to find it, except in the editorial quoted; but, as the 29th was on *Sunday*, and as the new bishops were ordained on that day, this telegram may not have found its way into the documents through "*inadvertence.*"

The objection to this movement, because proposed by an annual conference, though insisted upon in the South, is not valid. Certainly an annual or quarterly conference has a right to cultivate fraternity with any and all Christians, and the former is authorized by the Discipline to inaugurate changes in the constitutional law of the Church. Subsequent events show still more clearly where the real difficulty was to be found.

This Conference, as indicated by the bishops' address, was full of hope for the enlargement and rapid spread of the Southern Church. It evidently expected soon to capture the most of the old Baltimore Conference, and to intrench itself strongly in the North-west. Many of the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, will remember the operations of

one Ditzler in those States, and the glowing accounts given in the Southern papers of the great success in planting the Southern Church there, under the name of the Christian Union, and the Episcopal Methodist Church. Quite a number of those who sympathized with the Southern Confederacy were for a time delighted with the enterprise. But, like the cause it represented, it now languishes for want of financial, intellectual, and spiritual vigor. Mr. Ditzler was at the General Conference in New Orleans. On the second day of the Conference,

“The President, Bishop Kavanaugh, stated that if there were any persons present in the character of representatives of other denominations, an opportunity was then afforded them to report; whereupon, Rev. Jacob Ditzler came forward, and was introduced to the Conference as a delegate from the Christian Union Church of Illinois.

“Mr. Ditzler stated that in 1862-64, a number of persons of various denominations throughout the West believed that they were justified in forming themselves into a distinct religious organization that restricted themselves to preaching Christ and the resurrection. They began to organize privately in 1863, in 1864 they more fully developed their plans, but not till 1865 did they take the field. In 1865, they held a General Council at Terre Haute, Indiana, in which six States were represented. In September, 1865, they formed their articles of religion and polity in Illinois. Each State has a distinct organization, and is independent of the Church in any other State. They now number between four and five thousand members, about sixty traveling preachers, having four superintendents, and are increasing daily by fifties. If they had fifty more preachers to-day, they could find work for them in Southern Illinois. The speaker proceeded at some length to state the peculiar circumstances that gave rise to their denomination; referred to the past history of Wesleyanism, and closed by thanking the Conference for their kind reception.

“Rev. R. A. Young, of Tennessee, stated that Mr. Ditzler is a native of Kentucky; in 1845, was transferred to the St. Louis

Conference, and stationed in Sixteenth-street Church, St. Louis, and remained a faithful and zealous member of the Conference until the commencement of that fraternity to which he now belongs. He said that he was happy to state that he knew him well, that he was a good and true man, and represents the sentiments of his Church." (Journal of the Southern General Conference, 1866, p. 14, and Southern Advocate, April 20, 1866.)

The matter was referred to a committee, which in due time reported upon the Ditzler movement, and upon the telegraphic dispatches suggesting fraternity and union, from the New York and New York East Conferences. On the presentation of the report, April 19th, considerable discussion was had. R. A. Young moved to send one of the bishops, with an additional delegate, to attend the meeting of the Christian Union, and the motion was adopted. Dr. Young said :

" We understand, through the fraternal messenger from the Christian Union Church, who is with us, that at their next General Conference there would be about seven States represented. We understood from him that while ministers from various denominations in that country helped to make up this Christian Union Church, there was at least a majority that had come from the M. E. Church South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church North. They were Methodists. Now, let us allow that their next General Council will meet at the appointed time, that there will be representatives there from at least seven States, and you have a very considerable body of Christian ministers together, who represent a very large and intelligent membership in the States bordering on the Ohio. Their communication with us seems to be extremely cordial. The words of their fraternal messenger here are extremely cordial ; and I do think it befitting in our Church, and due to their Church, that we send one of our bishops to attend their next General Council ; for, suppose a union should be consummated between this Church and ours, then and there, we should all be pleased and particularly gratified to have one of our bishops to give direction to their future operations. How do we know, but, like the Baltimore Conference, they will want a bishop there to

read out their appointments, if the union is consummated. It is befitting our Church that we should send one of our bishops and the Rev. —, as delegates to this National Council of the Christian Union Church."

Mr. Ditzler made, on this occasion, the following astonishing false statements, which the General Conference affected to believe; to wit:

"The people of the South have but little knowledge of the pressure that was brought to bear upon us in the North during 1862-64. Utterances of the pulpit were of the most inflammatory character. I allude to no one single Church or denomination, but to all as a rule, and those who preached the pure Gospel of Christ were an exception to the rule. It was common to hear ministers of the highest standing preach murder and bloodshed, and grow eloquent and fervid in denunciation of their brethren, with whom they were formerly accustomed to kneel at the same altar. We could not endure it, and we rejoice to say that the theme of our Church is only Jesus Christ and the Resurrection. It was common to hear them speak of those who bowed at the same altar with them as deserving of being hung to the limbs of the nearest oak-tree, and that it was their duty so to act that they could not go along the highways without seeing their brethren hanging at every by-way and cross-road. This was the customary habit throughout the land. We concluded, therefore, that we would hold forth only the pure Word of God, and determine to know only him crucified. Our success has been great. Many brethren held back for a year or two before making a public movement. We never met together in General Convention until 1865, though some of us had been preaching and corresponding in 1862. To-day we are spread through seven or eight States. Our entire body numbers twelve to fourteen thousand members. In Illinois alone we have six thousand members and seventy preachers now, and I have learned since coming here that ten more ministers are awaiting my return to join with us. Wherever we are operating we are spreading.

"You, who have never been persecuted and borne heavily upon, are not prepared to appreciate the jealousy of the people on the other side of the former line. They have been persecuted by the presiding elders and preachers of their denomina-

tions. Many men have been turned out of Church for taking the Chicago *Times*, the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, and the New York *News*. We were keenly alive to these things, and therefore we introduced a lay delegation as a part of our polity—not admitting them into the cabinets of the Church, but into the General Council, and giving them legislative powers. We believe it desirable to set forth our principles to the world. I rejoice that Dr. Deems has proposed to raise a committee to prepare a certain document. I know that such a document would have a most happy effect throughout the whole country, from New York to St. Louis. I return you, again, my sincere thanks for the kindness with which you have received us, and know that our brethren in Illinois and throughout the North-west will rejoice exceedingly to receive as fraternal messengers one of your bishops, and the brother you will send along with him; we will meet them most cordially. Perhaps we may be regarded as having made a voyage of one hundred years across the stream, and are not at anchor. Some may think we are veering and being driven about amid the mad billows of a revolution, but we believe the anchor has a hold in the ocean of the national heart that is firm and secure. Our General Council meets in May, but our next Council meets in September, at which we expect to meet your fraternal messengers.” (Southern Advocate, May 4, 1866.)

These stories of Ditzler were as false as those told our first parents in Eden; but, under the newborn hope created by them, the General Conference wanted no geographical line to limit the expanding boundaries of the Southern Church. The Conference then felt wholly indifferent to the “Plan of Separation,” and said nothing about it in cultivating this faction in the West, or in receiving, on the next day, the Independent Baltimore Conference; but, as we shall see, abrogated it by direct action. Why do they now plead so piteously for the observance of the “Plan?” These falsehoods of Ditzler were accepted by the Conference as truth, reported

in the daily *Advocate*, copied into the papers of the Church with the proceedings of the General Conference, and, thus indorsed, scattered over the whole South at a time when the people were prepared to believe any thing against the North. This is a fair illustration of one of the obstacles the Methodist Episcopal Church has had to contend with in the Southern States, and one which has not been appreciated in the North, nor has so much effort been made to counteract it as would have been wise.

The report of the committee, which was adopted without dissent, is as follows:

“The session of the General Conference has been gladdened by the presence of messengers and letters, official and unofficial, from the branches of Christ’s Universal Church. In the North and North-west, there are many persons of unimpeached Christian character who have been forced from their former ecclesiastical relations by reason of having dared to protest against the secularization of their Churches. They have thus been driven by the spirit of fanaticism from more than one so-called Christian communion. Common suffering for righteousness’ sake made for them a common bond of love and union. Animated by a desire to bring the Church back to evangelical purity, they have organized ecclesiastical associations, whose members are men and women of intelligence and piety, and whose ministers were ornaments to the Churches from which they have been ejected by reason of their devotion to an unsecularized Christianity. Denounced by the spirit which originally proscribed them, and having no sentiment of schism, they recognize in the M. E. Church South a Christian Church founded upon the prophets and apostles, Christ being the chief corner-stone, and they send us their godly greetings and their fraternal messengers, thus kindling in us the glow of brotherly love, which leads us to pray that they may be guided and strengthened until they shall have the blessed reward of seeing the separateness and supremacy of Christ’s kingdom acknowledged in all this land.

“The committee has carefully observed all that has passed in this body in which the Northern Methodist Episcopal Church has been concerned.

“The committee most respectfully presents the following resolutions for the consideration of the General Conference.

“1. *Resolved*, That the M. E. Church South stands this day, as she has always stood, ready and willing to consider, with Christian candor, any unequivocal and Scriptural overtures for sympathy and fellowship which may be tendered her by any body of Christians in their general representative capacity.

“2. *Resolved*, That the General Conference most warmly reciprocates the fraternal greetings and expressions of Christian love borne from the Christian Union Church, by their messenger, our brother, the Rev. J. Ditzler.

“3. *Resolved*, That one of the bishops and the Rev. John H. Linn be, and they are hereby, appointed fraternal messengers from the General Conference of the M. E. Church South to the next Annual Council of the Christian Union Church.

“5. *Resolved*, That in the interval of the General Conference, if any number of ministers representing a respectable number of Churches and congregations, occupying territory not embraced within the prescribed boundaries of any of our annual conferences, shall signify and formally express a wish to unite with the M. E. Church South, and shall give satisfactory assurance that they heartily believe our Articles of Religion, and are cordially willing to be governed by our Discipline, our bishops may organize such district or territory into a conference, which shall be recognized as one of the annual conferences of the M. E. Church South, which shall be entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of any other annual conference holding connection with said Church.

“6. *Resolved*, That if there be any Church or Churches, or associations of Churches, which shall signify a desire to unite with us, they shall be received upon giving any of our bishops satisfactory assurance of their belief in our Articles of Religion, and their willingness to conform to our Discipline; and the ministers of such Church or Churches shall be received among us in the grade in the ministry held by them in the Churches from which they came, according to the mode prescribed in our Discipline.” (Journal of the Southern General Conference, 1866, pp. 49-51.)

The fourth resolution appointed fraternal messengers to the General Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church.

The whole Ditzler element was organized, first, as the Episcopal Methodist Church; then, as the Illinois Conference of the M. E. Church South, as originally intended under the above provisions; and now, ten years after this flaming report of its founder, it numbers 5,879 ministers and members. It was wholly composed of those who sympathized with the Confederacy, and the pretense of persecution, and of being driven out of other Churches for their piety, was sheer hypocrisy. The General Conference disposed of the correspondence from New York by telegraph, in a few words; but these are sufficient to measure the depth of the fraternity of that body.

On the next day, April 6th, the third day of the Conference, the Baltimore Conference was formally received. This Conference, it will be remembered, occupied a large portion of Virginia, including the valley as far south as Salem and Christiansburg, as in 1844. Early in the days of secession, most of the preachers in Virginia, like General Lee, on the plea of State sovereignty followed the State into the rebellion; and, at the time of the annual session in Staunton, Va., March, 1861, the minority resolved to constitute an independent conference, not under the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but still claiming to be a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This Conference numbered, in 1861, 43,581 members and probationers, 190 traveling preachers, including the superannuated,

of whom 24 were probationers, leaving 166 voters. Of this number, less than half of the preachers, and about one-fourth of the members, determined upon assuming this independent position. At the following session, held in Baltimore, in March, 1862, these ministers, forming the independent body, 66 in number, were returned as withdrawn from the Church. They claimed to be still in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and so retained the conference records, and held the property in churches and parsonages, though not under the General Conference. But the regular Conference, adhering to the Church, considered the "independents" withdrawn, and, at the Conference of 1862, took the following action in relation to them:

"*Whereas*, those brethren who have not seen proper to be present and participate in the business of this Conference at its present session, nor in any way to communicate to it a desire to reconnect themselves therewith;

"And *whereas*, said brethren, in an assumed form of organization, on the 23d day of March, 1861, in Staunton, Va., made the following declaration in what is known as the 'Rev. N. Wilson's Proposition,' adopted by them conventionally, to wit: 'We hereby declare that the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Buffalo, in May, 1860, by its unconstitutional action, has sundered the ecclesiastical relation which has hitherto bound us together as one Church, so far as any action of theirs could do so; that we will no longer submit to the jurisdiction of said General Conference, but hereby declare ourselves separate and independent of it;'

"And *whereas*, in order to set forth the fact as well as the grounds and aims of their separation, they appointed a committee to prepare a pastoral letter, in which they declare that their Secretary was directed, by a resolution, to correspond with the bishops, that they may have opportunity to avow or disavow the act of the late General Conference referred to;

"And *whereas*, the said pastoral letter further declares that they can not submit any longer to the oversight of the bishops

of the Methodist Episcopal Church, unless they disavow their allegiance to the late General Conference; and that the separation resolved upon by them was not made dependent on any condition, but was positive and entire; and that they will enter into no convention with other non-concurring conferences for the organization of another General Conference that may recognize the authority of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, without certain guarantees stipulated them; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That it is the judgment of this Conference that justice, as well as courtesy to said brethren, require that their action, as above set forth in their own language, be understood as a withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that the names be so returned on the Journal and Minutes; provided, nevertheless, that if any of the above-named brethren be present, and co-operate with us in the business of the Conference at its next session, or shall sooner signify to the bishop their acknowledgments of the jurisdiction of the Church, this Conference will consider that their act of withdrawal is null and void.” (General Minutes, 1862, pp. 10, 11.)

In the following action of the independent branch adhering South in 1866, observe that Mr. Register said, “This body had *now* reached a point when he considered it time to unite with the M. E. Church South.” In their preamble they say, “It was *impossible* for us earlier to have completed the course of action *inaugurated in 1861*.” In the first resolution they add, “In pursuance of the action of this body in 1861, we do unite with, and adhere to, the M. E. Church South.” Bishop Early, Drs. Schon, Doggett, and others were there present to welcome them home after their perilous four years’ sojourn in the wilderness. They assumed independence in the midst of the secession excitement, March 23, 1861, about two weeks before the attack on Fort Sumter, April 15, 1861, but after the secession of South Carolina, December

20, 1860; Mississippi, January 9th; Alabama, 11th; Florida, 12th; Georgia, 19th; and Louisiana, 26th, 1861. During the same month the measure was defeated—nominally, at least—in Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Missouri, and Arkansas. They united with the Church South at the earliest opportunity. This faction of the Conference was compelled, by the continuance of the war, to hold this anomalous position—claiming to be both in and out of the Church—till February, 1866, when it united its fortunes with the M. E. Church South, as herein set forth. The account of this transaction we take from the *Southern Advocate*, of March 2, 1866:

“Rev. Mr. Register said that this body had now reached a point when he considered it time to unite with the M. E. Church South. The change in their relation he considered second only to the conversion of the soul to God. After so long a period, and after passing through so many trials, he thanked God that so many have met under such auspices. He found it, under the circumstances, impossible to again unite with the Methodist Episcopal Church; but in the M. E. Church South they met with all the requirements necessary for a union. In answer to questions as to boundaries of the Baltimore Annual Conference, the Virginia Annual Conference will accord all this body will ask. In taking the present course they may lose much—nearly all but honor, integrity, and religion—but, trusting in God, the future holds out bright prospects, and under his guidance they will go forward. In conclusion, Mr. Register offered the following paper:

““*Whereas*, the regular annual sessions, in the strictest sense thereof, of this Conference were prevented for several years by the existence of civil war in the country, so that it was impossible for us earlier to have completed the course of action inaugurated by this body at its session held in Staunton, in 1861; and, preferring, as we do, the connectional principle of Church government, including episcopacy as an element thereof, and believing any further continuance of conference

independency would be prejudicial to the efficient working of our itinerant system ;

“ ‘And *whereas*, the animus and practice of the Methodist Episcopal Church is such as to make it improper for us to resume our submission to the jurisdiction of said Church, and the organization, doctrines, and discipline of said Church ; and the organization, doctrine, and discipline of the M. E. Church South fully according with our own views of what constitutes a Scriptural branch of the Church of Christ ; therefore,

“ ‘1. *Resolved, by the Baltimore Annual Conference, in Conference assembled*, that, in pursuance of the action of this body in 1861, we do hereby unite with and adhere to the M. E. Church South, and do now, through the President of this Conference, invite Bishop Early to recognize us officially, and preside over us at our present session.

“ ‘2. *Resolved*, That, in taking this action, we adhere to no dead political institutions, questions, or issues, being actuated by sentiments of sincere loyalty to the Government of the United States, and to that of the States, respectively, to which we may be assigned to labor, but are influenced by motives of a far higher and holier nature, such as usefulness among the people whom we serve, and the best interest of the kingdom of Christ, whose headship alone we acknowledge in things pertaining to salvation.

“ ‘3. *Resolved*, That, having no unkind feelings toward brethren from whom we differ, we do hereby assure our former fellow-laborers of our Christian affection and fraternal sympathy, and shall do all we can, consistently, to prevent strife between them and us, and to promote good will and brotherly kindness to them, and do most sincerely cherish the hope that the day may speedily come when at least a hearty and universal fraternal fellowship shall be established between the two co-ordinate branches of the great Methodist family of this continent.’

“ Rev. Mr. Brooke suggested a call vote. He thanked God that he had lived to see this day, and he wanted his name recorded in favor of this paper.

“ Rev. Mr. Martin moved that the vote be taken by ayes and noes—decided in the affirmative.

“ On motion of Rev. Mr. Martin, all admitted during the war were recognized as members of the Conference, and allowed to vote.

"The roll was then called on the adoption of the paper, and it was adopted, without a negative vote, as follows:

"S. Register, F. C. Tebbes, L. R. Jones, A. Q. Flaharty, J. P. Etchison, C. A. Joyce, J. S. Martin, J. J. Engle, W. R. Stringer, H. A. Graver, D. Ball, J. W. Wolff, W. Hedges, J. W. Tongue, H. Hoffman, C. L. Torreyson, J. H. Temple, D. Thomas, J. H. Wolff, S. S. Roszell, F. H. Richey, J. H. March, J. N. Gray, J. P. Hyde, J. S. Gardner, S. Keppler, J. W. Ewan, L. C. Miller, A. A. P. Neal, P. S. E. Sixeas, L. Butt, S. H. Griffith, J. Beatty, S. B. Dolly, T. Briley, E. R. Veitch, S. C. Dice, R. Smith, G. R. Jefferson, A. P. Boude, J. E. Armstrong, L. Lenz, W. J. Baird, W. G. Eggleston, F. H. Whisner, J. Poisal, E. Welty, N. Wilson, G. G. Brooke, J. Landstreet, J. M. Grandin, W. G. Coe, P. B. Smith, S. Rodgers, L. W. Hasup, W. R. M'Neer, T. Hilderbrand, E. H. Jones, A. W. Wilson, E. F. Busey, T. E. Carson, W. J. Perry, W. V. Tudor, W. H. Wilson, J. W. Bull, A. B. Dolly, J. L. Gilbert, D. Shoaf, F. N. Mills, [the following afterward] E. F. Hendrick, J. P. Hall, E. F. Kreglo, W. M'Donald, G. H. Zimmerman, J. L. Liggett, D. Harris, and S. Rodgers.

"A motion that absent members, and those that may be received during the session of Conference, be allowed to record their votes after this, was adopted; and a motion that those who are not present may send their acquiescence to the Secretary; to be recorded, was likewise adopted.

"Dr. Doggett and Rev. N. Head were present as fraternal messengers from the Virginia Conference. The former addressed the Conference very impressively.

"Dr. Sehon, Corresponding Secretary of the M. E. Church South, was introduced, and spoke in his usual happy manner. New fields were every-where inviting us; torn, oppressed, distracted, and suffering, we still go forward in our deeds of labor and our works of love. The ordination of twelve native Indians, representing four different tribes, which he had lately witnessed, was, to him, the sublimest spectacle on earth. He had waited on the authorities at Washington, many of them his old and long-tried friends, and had been assured by them that the missions of the Church South among the Indians should not be interfered with. If ever he felt proud of being a Southern man, it was when sojourning in the North. He had seen resolution after resolution from religious bodies of the South,

saying they would not pause or be turned aside from the work of preaching the Gospel to the colored population. The great sentiment we had to combat was the dogma that, because we love the Church South, therefore we are not loyal. It was for the Church to show that loyalty to the country was a part of our religion.

"The question of a Church paper was before the Conference. Dr. Hamilton, financial manager of the *Watchman*, represented that paper; Dr. Doggett, the *Episcopal Methodist*; and Rev. J. A. Duncan, the *Richmond Christian Advocate*. The final action was, that a request was made to the *Episcopal Methodist* to move to Baltimore, and take Dr. T. E. Bond, Jr., as an associate editor. The proposal is favorably entertained.

"A resolution of interest and sympathy with the freedmen was passed, stating a purpose to do all the Conference can do to better their condition.

"The Chatsworth (Independent) Methodist Church, of Baltimore, sent to the Conference \$466, and the M-street Church, Washington City, \$200, for destitute members of that body.

"The Home Missionary Society held a meeting. Drs. Doggett, Poisal, and Sehon addressed the meeting, and about \$500 were collected.

"Last week we gave an item stating that the houses of worship heretofore occupied by the members of this Conference had been ordered to be turned over to the Methodist Episcopal Church North, by the President of the United States. So the papers reported; and we see that the *New Orleans Advocate* (filibustero) says, it has seen a letter from Bishop Ames, dated 29th January, which reads: 'The President has issued an order putting us in possession of two hundred and ten churches and thirty-two parsonages, which the rebel Methodists in Virginia have occupied during the war.' This matter came before the Conference, on the report of the committee which had been appointed to wait on President Johnson. They reported through Rev. N. Wilson that they had a most interesting and pleasing interview with the President, who had entertained them very kindly, to the exclusion of other important business.

"The committee had laid before the President the case of the Churches of this Conference, which had been taken possession of by the military, and a rumor that this seizure was in accordance with an order issued by the President. The President

said there was no such order that he knew of. The committee promised the President a written statement of the facts in regard to the Church property and the position of this Conference.

"At the conclusion of Mr. Wilson's report, Hon. John Hogan, Member of Congress from Missouri, who had accompanied the committee in their visit to the White House, rose and substantiated the statements of Mr. Wilson, and stated further that, in a conversation with the President, Mr. Johnson had unhesitatingly said that no such order as the one referred to had emanated from him. He referred to an order from the War Department that had been issued relating to a church in Winchester, but that it had been directed to General Hancock to investigate the facts and report, and thought that it had been satisfactorily adjusted. Mr. Hogan referred to the case of a church in Missouri, in which the President had directed an investigation to be made, and the facts reported to him for adjustment, and stated that the policy of the President was to restore the rights of all loyal people, and leave future questions to be settled by the courts, after the parties shall have been placed in the status that they occupied prior to the difficulties.

"Mr. Roszell stated that the President had received the committee with great kindness, and returned his thanks to the Conference for their kind remembrance.

"Dr. Bond, also of the committee, made some remarks in reference to the visit to the President, and spoke hopefully of the future prospects.

"On motion, the same committee were instructed to prepare a statement of facts in relation to the churches in the bounds of the Conference that have been seized, to be forwarded to the President for his action.

"A committee was appointed to confer with the Trustees of Randolph Macon College, for the purpose of establishing a college jointly with the Virginia Conference.

"On claims of preachers, the Board of Stewards paid thirty-four per cent. Bishop Early was paid two hundred dollars. The committee on necessitous cases distributed \$1,708.

"It appearing that there were one hundred and two members on the roll of this Conference, Bishop Early announced that it was entitled to six delegates in the General Conference. The following were elected on one ballot: S. Register, Norval Wilson, S. S. Roszell, J. S. Martin, E. R. Veitch, and W. G.

Eggleston. Alternates, J. S. Gardner, J. Poisal, and S. Rodgers. The numbers were reported as follows: In full connection, whites, 9,323; colored, 561; on probation, 1,866 whites, 66 colored, and 57 local preachers—total, 11,873 members. Of these, about six hundred are in Maryland.”

On Friday, April 6th, the Baltimore Conference was recognized by the following action of the General Conference at New Orleans, namely:

“The names of the delegates from the Baltimore Conference were called by the Secretary, and the following were present: Samuel Register, Norval Wilson, S. Samuel Roszell, John S. Martin, E. R. Veitch, and Wm. G. Eggleston.

“Bishop Early introduced the delegates, and stated that he had taken the liberty of admitting the Baltimore Annual Conference into the M. E. Church South, and wished the delegates to be received by this General Conference.

“Rev. Dr. Doggett said: ‘I move the adoption of the following resolution:

““*Resolved, by the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, in Conference assembled, That we approve of the action of Bishop Early in admitting the Baltimore Annual Conference into the M. E. Church South; and that we cordially receive and recognize the delegates elect from that Conference as members of the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, now in session in the city of New Orleans.*”

““I suppose no question will be raised as to the validity of this action, and therefore nothing is required in vindication of it at this stage of our session. I was present on the occasion, acting in the capacity of a fraternal messenger from the Virginia Conference to that Conference. I never witnessed a scene that made a greater impression on my mind than the solemn, deliberate action of that body in their unanimous vote to adhere to the M. E. Church South. I observed the most deliberate action in all their measures. They had calculated the whole step; they took into consideration all the sacrifices and dangers, which might have appalled men under ordinary circumstances. They met the emergency fairly and squarely, and I personally hail them as an important acquisition to our membership. It is a Conference of great weight, great integ-

urity, and great piety, as I honestly believe. As I have acted in the capacity to which I have referred, I feel it a duty to offer the resolution which I have taken the liberty to present for the deliberation of this General Conference, and I hope it will be unanimously adopted.'

"Rev. Mr. Wilson, of the Baltimore Conference: 'The action to which the Rev. Dr. Doggett has referred, was taken with great unanimity. There was not a dissenting voice in the Conference, and yet perhaps we are not entitled to all the credit that he attaches to that action. There is something resembling a necessity resting upon us; we could not have done otherwise without falsifying our pledges. As far back as 1845, we had given solemn pledges to our people that we would not allow questions to be agitated in our midst that would disturb the tranquillity of the Church within our bounds; that if such questions should be agitated, and such action attempted, on the part of the Church with which we were then in connection, or that General Conference, we would sever our connection with it. Such action was taken in May, 1860. As men of veracity and as men of honor, we were bound to adhere to our pledges of 1845, and repeated time and again afterward. There was a necessity of our action. Why any man, or class of men, who were associated with us in giving those pledges, should afterward trample them under foot and take a different course, I never could comprehend, and can not to this day. When the question came up, after due deliberation, I was glad then, and I am glad now, to assert that there was not a dissenting voice. [Applause.] It was taken with perfect unanimity, and the brethren, with the greatest cordiality imaginable, transferred their relationship to the M. E. Church South, with a firm conviction that at this time that Church embodies more true primitive Methodism, as well as more vital and real Christianity, than any other of the Wesleyan bodies on this continent. We are rejoiced to be in your midst; we have traveled far, and labored much, to get here; but we feel compensated already, by being permitted to associate with you this morning, and on receiving these hearty and cordial greetings.' [Applause.]

"Rev. Dr. Deems, of the North Carolina Conference: 'I beg leave to second the resolution offered by my friend, the Rev. Dr. Doggett, of the Virginia Conference. I do not know how other brethren feel, but there are many things of late that

have endeared the Church of my choice to me, even more than ever before. One thing is this, that the M. E. Church South, in the last five years, has been subject to such a strain as never was imposed upon the Church of Christ since the time of the early apostles to this day, and that the hearts of many of us feared and trembled for the result of this prodigious trial. Now, sir, at the end of this ordeal, what hath not God wrought? When I came into this assembly and beheld our bishops in their places, with sweet, precious greetings from our venerable senior bishop; when I see our conferences represented so largely, all our business going on so regularly, the presidents of our colleges and universities here, editors of divers of our newspapers here, and the whole machinery of the Church in such successful operation, I, for one, feel there is no precariousness in the position of Southern Methodism now. And, as though God intended to give us the crowning blessing, whatever may have been our personal difficulties heretofore, he has rendered us forgiving and loving toward one another. He has added to our number of members these blessed brethren, who have come here from the Baltimore Conference. I was started in my educational career by one of the fathers of this delegation here to-day, and many are the memories and religious associations of former years that have been awakened in my heart by their presence among us. My heart is right glad to-day, and I love every bishop and member of this General Conference more than I ever did before, and I ask these brethren to let us love them so also. [Applause.] I beg that you will allow us to pass Dr. Doggett's resolution with a rising vote.'

"The resolution was then passed unanimously, amid much enthusiasm, by a rising vote.

"Bishop Early; 'I have the pleasure of introducing to the conference Rev. Thomas B. Sargent, of the East Baltimore Conference.'

"Rev. Thomas B. Sargent: 'I wish to correct the Bishop. *Late* of the East Baltimore Conference, but now no longer. I have come, sir, to stay home. I have been longing after home for many, many years, and I feel now that I am at home, and, if God permits me, I will stay at home until I go to a better home. I never could come to this home until now. I have been always like Abraham, still journeying toward the South, and I am happy, at last, to have arrived there.' [Applause.]

“Bishop Early then introduced to the Conference Rev. John Poisal, who said: ‘Allow-me, brethren, to express the sincere and undissembled satisfaction which I feel in meeting you here to-day. I am here under similar circumstances to those just referred to by my good brother, Dr. Sargent. I am not here to address you—I have no speech to make—I am a very modest, unpretending man, and simply refer you to my past life as a Methodist preacher. Perhaps, if it were proper, it would not be uninteresting to some of my brethren to refer to the peculiar pressure under which I was impelled to tender my resignation as pastor of a Church in one of our Northern conferences. But it is not proper to refer to circumstances of this description. For a period of more than thirty-seven years I have had an honored place in one of the conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church. At a very early period of my life, I was received into the fold of that one. That is the conference of my home. In the progress of our busy itinerancy, by my revered and honored friend, Bishop Soule, when yet a young man, I was transferred to the New York Conference. I was there for ten years, all told, first and last. Under the very trying ordeal, far from my home, removed from my cherished field of labor, I was impelled to offer my resignation as pastor of Bedford-street Church in the city of New York. I left many friends there. The simple issue with me was this: I could not turn my back upon my father; I could not consent to be a party to the war. I was willing, with the blessing of God, under the guidance of that good Providence that had watched over me and mine, and taken care of our beloved Methodism in the Southern States and conferences, to link my fortunes with hers. And without a Church, and without an income, I tendered my resignation and left the people of my Church—parting with them in good faith, and receiving expressions of confidence and friendship. At this moment I have the satisfaction of knowing that, however unpretentious in other respects I may be, I have the treasure of a consistent record. I feel here to-day among you, Mr. President, and these esteemed brethren, although now very much embarrassed—notwithstanding this distinction of a formal introduction—I feel, I say, at home. I have the pleasure of knowing many of the bishops and members of this General Conference personally. I tender to you for this friendly greeting my most earnest prayers to God that his blessing may rest

upon this body in your deliberations, and that Methodism in your hands, through the instrumentality of these ministers, may continue pure and primitive until the great mission we are called upon to perform shall have been accomplished. I thank you for this indulgence, and the brethren for their very cordial reception.' ”

This action is found in the Journal of the Southern General Conference, 1866, page 15. The accompanying remarks are taken from the proceedings, as published in the *Southern Advocate*, for a file of which the writer is indebted to Rev. Alfred Dorman.

This General Conference also adopted the following presented in reports number three and four, of the Committee on Boundaries, namely :

“*Resolved*, That as the geographical line defining the territorial limits of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the M. E. Church South, established by the General Conference of 1844, has been officially and practically repudiated and disregarded by the Methodist Episcopal Church, therefore, we are bound neither legally nor morally by it; and that we feel ourselves at liberty to extend our ministrations and ecclesiastical jurisdiction to all beyond that line who may desire us so to do.

“Your committee have also had before them the resolutions of the delegates of the Kentucky, Louisville, and St. Louis Conferences, asking authority to annex territory in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, to their respective conferences, and recommend the following resolution for adoption :

“*Resolved*, That such Churches and societies as are now, or may hereafter be, organized in sections of the country not now under our ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and which wish to be united with us in Church fellowship, may be connected with the conference most convenient to them; and that the bishops be authorized and requested to form such Churches into separate annual conferences, whenever, in their judgment, the interests of the work demand such action.” (Journal of the Southern General Conference, 1866, pp. 88, 89.)

This action is indexed in the Journal as the "*re-pudiation* of the line between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South." Is not Dr. Myers mistaken, and is not this, instead of the declarations of 1848, "that direful repudiation that lies at the bottom of all present difficulties?" Why did not the Southern Church abrogate the line before commencing operations on the other side?

From the foregoing it is apparent: 1. That the Secession element in the Baltimore Conference assumed an independent position in March 23, 1861, for the purpose of holding the Church property, and transferring that with themselves to the Southern Church. So, at least in part, they unanimously declare in their preamble and first resolution in February, 1866, and so Dr. Wilson reaffirmed at the New Orleans General Conference, a little over a month afterward. This was done in connection with the Southern movement, only about two weeks before the attack on Fort Sumter, April 15th; but after the secession of South Carolina, December 20, 1860; Mississippi, 9th; Alabama, 11th; Florida, 12; Georgia, 19th; and Louisiana, 26, 1861. That this action met the approval of, and was encouraged by, the Southern Church, and that it was a part of a well-devised scheme of aggression upon the Methodist Episcopal Church, intended to drive it out of slave territory, there can be no doubt; and that it would have been consummated in 1862, if the Southern General Conference had met at the usual time, is evident. The Methodist Episcopal Church did not commence work in the South, nor arrange to do so, till after the General

Conference of 1864, more than three years later than this secession in Baltimore.

2. That the Southern movement in the West began in 1862; Rev. Jacob Ditzler operating there as a *secret* agent of the Southern Church, organizing the "Christian Union," and afterward the "Episcopal Methodist Church," for the purpose of co-operating with, and becoming a part of, the M. E. Church South, as is evident from the proceedings of the New Orleans General Conference, and as is still more apparent from his letters to the Southern papers. The Methodist Episcopal Church did not open its work in the South by sending out secret agents to work under other colors, like Ditzler in the West, nor by seeking to "disintegrate and absorb" (Church property and all), like the secession of Baltimore; but the bishops and the General Conference laid down their "platform" fully, and honestly presented it before the people, leaving them to act for themselves without compulsion or dictation.

3. That ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the Baltimore Conference, in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, or elsewhere, as in the case of Drs. Sargent and Poisal, were permitted to adhere to the Southern Church without restraint or censure. Such as desired to were allowed to go in whatever relation, order, or office, they held at the time, if the Church South wished to receive them in that relation. Others from the South were accepted by the Methodist Episcopal Church in the same manner, precisely, as if they had come from any other Methodist body.

4. That the New Orleans General Conference ab-

rogated, annulled, and repudiated, by positive and direct action, the line of 1844, which was the only feature of the report of the Committee of Nine that it was capable of rescinding, it having no power to reverse the decision of the Courts, or to restore the societies in the South to their original status in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Further, the General Conference did this after it had been operating over the line, succeeding the reception of the Baltimore Conference and the recognition of the Ditzler faction, while the Methodist Episcopal Church sacredly observed the line till it had investigated the case in the General Conference of 1848, and declared the provisions of the report null and void.

5. That, as in 1844 and subsequently, so during and after the war, the records of the New Orleans General Conference show that the M. E. Church South, indirectly, but afterward approved by the General Conference, commenced operations on the territory of the Methodist Episcopal Church, years before that denomination began its work in the South.

Who, then, is the aggressor? Which Church has offered the olive branch to the other? What vindication does the Methodist Episcopal Church need but a knowledge of the facts? Dr. Myers was an active member of this General Conference, and therefore must have been acquainted with these matters. Why, then, does he urge his surprising and unjust demand?

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RETURN SOUTHWARD.

METHODISM sprang up in Maryland and Virginia under the labors of Robert Strawbridge, about the time that it did in New York through Philip Embury, and has always been strong in that portion of the country. We have already seen that Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and not less than half of Virginia, remained in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the division of 1844, so that for more than a hundred years this, though slave territory, has been uninterruptedly occupied by this Church. Societies also along the border in Kentucky and Missouri adhered North, and thus a foothold has been preserved in those States from the time of their settlement.

At the General Conference of 1848, the reorganization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South was begun in behalf of the adhering members. From the Pittsburg and Ohio, the West Virginia Conference was formed, during that year, in the State of Virginia, though not within the thirteen seceding conferences, and in 1849 reported 14,278 members. The Missouri Conference, the first on seceded territory, was reorganized the same year, and reported in September, 1848, a membership of 1,562, ten of whom

were colored. In 1852, four years after, Kentucky appears on the Minutes as a part of the Cincinnati Conference, but in 1853 it became a separate Conference, the second formed south of the line, holding its session at Covington, Kentucky, October 14th to 17th of that year, Bishop Janes presiding. It then had a membership of 2,258 whites and 143 colored.

Arkansas, which was attached to Missouri in 1852, was also organized as a separate conference during the following year, this being the third within the borders of the Southern Church, holding its session at Fayetteville, Arkansas, October 26, 1853, under the presidency of Bishop Morris. A membership of 1,784 whites and 23 colored was reported at this session. This work of reconstruction moved forward slowly from the General Conference of 1848 till the breaking out of the war in 1861. At that time our membership, within the territory of the thirteen seceding conferences, was as follows: Kentucky, 3,405; Missouri and Arkansas—again united in a session held in St. Louis, in March—6,245; total, 9,650; which, owing to the disturbed state of the country, decreased during the next year, and in 1862 presented a less encouraging aspect. The falling off in Kentucky was 606; in Missouri and Arkansas, 4,104; in all, 4,710; leaving only 4,940 in the Minutes of that year. But before the close of the war the tide had turned in favor of the Methodist Episcopal Church in many portions of the South.

In Kentucky, eighteen ministers of the Southern Church withdrew in 1865, and offered themselves to Bishop Clark in a body, and were accepted and

appointed to work in 1866. Many of their members came with them. All were embodied in the Kentucky Conference. (Life of Bishop Clark, pp. 317-319.)

Probably the first one to unite with the Methodist Episcopal Church in East Tennessee, after the war, was Rev. J. W. Peace, of Rhea County, who crossed the mountains to Maysville, Kentucky, two hundred miles distant, for that purpose. Revs. W. C. Daily, R. H. Guthrie, and G. A. Gowin, from Chattanooga and Cleveland, joined the Kentucky Conference, and were employed in East Tennessee by Bishop Simpson; and in July 7, 8, 1864, a convention was held in Knoxville, at which the loyal Methodists of East Tennessee determined to adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, the communion of their fathers, and prepared for forming a conference in the following year.

Dr. Curry, in the "Life of Bishop Clark," gives an account of the Bishop's labors in opening this work, from which the following is taken:

"Anticipating the not distant suppression of the rebellion, and the consequent opening of the South to its evangelizing agencies, the General Conference of 1864 empowered the bishops to organize annual conferences in the South as might seem practicable and necessary. Three lines of movement southward were resolved upon: one down the Atlantic Coast; one down the Mississippi to New Orleans; and one through the central region, across Kentucky and Tennessee, into upper Georgia and Alabama.

"About the last of February, 1864; the session of the Kentucky Conference was held at Augusta, where four ministers from the M. E. Church South—Revs. W. C. Daily, R. H. Guthrie, G. A. Gowin, and M. H. B. Burket—were admitted.

Of these, all but the last, who was a chaplain in the Union army, were assigned to 'East Tennessee,' where they resided. And Mr. Daily was named as the Presiding Elder of 'Mt. Sterling District,' with instructions to fix definitely the charges of his associates; to form classes, circuits, stations, and districts; and to employ preachers to man the work as it might open, and as suitable men could be found; in short, to do all that should be necessary to make the work complete.

"The times were perilous in the extreme, as both armies were in that country, swaying forward and backward, and holding the various places by turns. On the first Sabbath in March those brave men entered formally upon their work, and organized a Church of twenty-five members at Mars Hill, Bradley County. Cleveland Circuit was soon after regularly laid out, and Rev. Patrick M. Read, a recruit from the Southern Church, put in charge. The preachers already named, and others who joined them afterward, engaged actively in traveling through the country, as they had opportunity preaching and delivering addresses, setting forth the purposes for which they were there, and what they proposed to do. They invited all who desired to belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church as it was before the division in 1844 to come together and become so enrolled, with no other tests or conditions than those laid down in the Discipline. They were well received by the loyal portion of the people, who constitute a large majority of the whole; for such was the disfavor among them toward the Southern Church, because of its manifest sympathy with the rebellion, that they would not longer remain in it; and had not another Methodism come among them, they would either have set up one for themselves, or scattered into other denominations, or been lost to the Church and religion all together. The mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church in East Tennessee, and indeed in all the South, was to a people asking for her ministrations—to sheep without a shepherd; and her ministers came not as intruders, but as invited by the people to whom they came. Many were then still living who had been connected with the Church before the separation, and who had always been opposed to slavery, and had been carried over to the Southern Church against their decided and earnest protest. They hailed with joy the privilege of returning to the old fold,

and of course were ready to receive with open arms the men who came to receive them back again." (Life of Bishop Clark, pp. 203-5.)

Accordingly, the Holston Conference, embracing East Tennessee and portions of Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia, met for reorganization in Athens, Tennessee, on the first day of June, 1865. A full and interesting account of the proceedings, from the pen of Thomas H. Pearne, D. D., was published in the *Western Christian Advocate* of the 14th of that month, from which the following report is taken. A large audience assembled in the Methodist Church of the place, and the services were opened at nine o'clock A. M., by Bishop Clark, who presided on the occasion. He was accompanied by Adam Poe, D. D., of Cincinnati, and others whose names appear in the report. Devotional services were conducted by the Bishop, assisted by Dr. Poe and James Cummings, after which Bishop Clark addressed the Conference and those in attendance as follows:

“BELOVED BRETHREN,—I am not insensible of the responsibilities of this hour, nor of the solemnity of the occasion that has called us together. Indulge me for a few moments in reference to sundry matters, that we may more fully understand ourselves, our relation to the work before us and the work we have to do. On referring to the records of the Church, I find that the Holston Conference was organized in the year 1824, with a membership of 14,934, and forty-one ministers. From that time forth there was a gradual increase of members till in 1844 there was a membership of 40,063, and a ministry of seventy-three. Twenty years ago the last entry in the Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the Holston Conference was made. But since that time what scenes have transpired—the division of the Church, or, rather, a separation of a large number of its members from its communion! Strange coincidences, or, rather, provi-

dences, sometimes occur. I see that twenty years ago, according to those Minutes, the Holston Conference was to have assembled in this place. Before the time arrived, the separation had occurred. But here, in the very place where it disappeared, we meet to reorganize it. I do not know whether it was designed [A voice: 'It was'], but the coincidence is marked. I remember with what reluctance the old Holston Conference went out of the old Methodist Episcopal Church; how tenacious the quarterly conferences were for adhering. And in connection with this, let me say, that, not only the whole Methodist Church, but the whole country, has had its eye upon East Tennessee. Your love of country was well in harmony with your love for the old Church. And we felt deeply that it was not in the power of the Government to afford you the protection you needed, and that you suffered so much from your devotion. But, thanks be to God, deliverance came to the nation, and I trust deliverance will come to the Church, and, as you have taken your place under the Stars and Stripes, that you will also take your places under the old banners of the Methodist Episcopal Church. [A voice: 'We will.']

“Why am I here at this hour? Last year, after our General Conference was held, a convention, largely representing your laity and ministry, was held at Knoxville; and there and then you announced the purpose to reunite with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and invoked our aid. During the last year, we have done what we could to aid you in your work, and I am here to organize your Conference.

“I touch upon a point which I had not intended to name; but it seems proper, from facts which have come to my knowledge with regard to this organization. The question has been asked, ‘Why reorganize?’ The plan that has been suggested is, that it would be better to leave the Southern Church territory undisturbed; let us leave this ground untouched, and hold a General Conference of both Churches, and reunite the entire Church South, by a simple act, to the Methodist Episcopal Church. I do not say this proposition has been made in a formal manner, for no conferences have been held in the Southern Church to make it; but it has been made by prominent members and ministers of the M. E. Church South, with singular concurrence and unanimity.

“I cite one reason why I think this proposition, that we

should stay out of the South, can not be entertained. If we refuse to respond to these calls from East Tennessee, and elsewhere—for the calls are from different parts of the South—the effect would be to leave to the men who have not been with the Government of the United States in its fearful struggle against rebellion the work of reorganization of the Church. Now, if there is any class of men in the South who should take part in the rebuilding of the Church and the State, it is the loyal portion. I do not feel that we should subject them to this deprivation.

“The division of the Methodist Episcopal Church had one single ground, and that was slavery. You can not find any other. No man can find any other. We preach the same Gospel, have the same organization of conferences and districts and circuits, and the same allotments of labor, and no man can fasten upon any other fact than slavery, and that is being rapidly taken out of the way. What reason, then, is there for keeping apart? There is none. I can conceive of no other than pride of position, pride of place and power, the maintaining of power in hands that have wielded it other than for the peace and prosperity of the Government.

“Why, again, am I here to organize the Holston Conference? At our last General Conference, held in May, 1864, provision was made especially for the reception of ministers of the Church South into the Methodist Episcopal Church. It was provided that they should be received on the same conditions as those on which we receive those from the British and Canada Wesleyan Conferences, with the proviso that they should give assurances of their loyalty to the United States, and of their agreement with us on the subject of slavery. The old Methodist Episcopal Church has been, all through this struggle, loyal to the United States. All her influences have been unmistakably in this direction. Conferences, ministers, and members, almost without exception, have all cast their influence on the side of the Government. And it was the purpose that, in the reorganization and extension of the Church, as we foresaw its extension, no element should enter into the Church that should disturb its harmony on the question of slavery, or of loyalty to the Government. We have no doubt that thousands, all through the South, have been led into this rebellion by the influences, well-nigh irresistible, thrown around them, and that

perhaps tens of thousands have been conscientiously led into it. But I believe that, with the dawning of the signs of the times, there must come a conviction that they were mistaken, were in the wrong, and with that conviction, if they were good men and true men, that they will be with us in these matters of loyalty and slavery. And I can not see any other reason for their remaining aloof from our Church, unless it be the want of loyalty, or adhesion to a system now nearly defunct.

“ ‘In addition to the provisions for receiving ministers, the General Conference authorized the organization of conferences in the South, when, in the judgment of the bishops, they should deem it important or proper; and, at a meeting of the bishops, they saw that the time had come to organize a conference in East Tennessee.

“ ‘In pursuance of these facts I am here. I recognize the following ministers as composing the Holston Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church: W. C. Daily, G. A. Gowin ; R. H. Guthrie, transferred from the Kentucky Conference; T. S. Stivers, transferred from the Ohio Conference; Thomas H. Pearue, transferred from the Oregon Conference; and J. F. Spence, transferred from the Cincinnati Conference.’

“The Bishop then announced, that, in determining the *status*—that is, the relation as effective, or supernumerary, and as probationers, deacons, or elders—of the ministers applying for admission, he should take as his guide the published Minutes of the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church South, for 1862. Since then no Minutes had been published; nor had any session of the Conference been held, other than a gathering of a portion of it within the rebel lines.

“Profound interest and considerable sensibility was manifest during the address of the Bishop. Brother Spence, at the request of the Bishop, acted as temporary Secretary.

“The following brethren were severally admitted by the vote of the Conference, each one making a statement, as his name was presented, of his agreement with the Methodist Episcopal Church, as to loyalty and slavery, namely: E. Rowley, James Cumming, Jesse A. Hyden, W. H. Rogers, John W. Mann, W. C. Graves, W. H. Duggan, William Milburn, J. L. Mann, R. G. Blackburn, T. H. Russel, J. B. Little, Andrew J. Greer, and John Alley.

“Dr. E. Rowley said he had been a slave-holder; did not

consider himself so now ; regarded slavery as removed by the war, and accepted the fact as a blessing to the whites, whatever its effects might be on the blacks.

“J. Albert Hyden said he had been educated to believe that slavery was religiously right ; on that subject he gave himself no uneasiness or trouble, but that he had come to see differently. He believed with the former speaker that the removal of slavery would be a great blessing, the greatest blessing since the gift of Christ, to us and our children’s children. Let slavery go. He was never suspected of being loyal to the Confederacy. He remained quiet during the rebellion, and as soon as practicable he went into the service of God and his country as a chaplain.

“W. H. Rogers said : ‘It may have been my misfortune that I was never a slave-holder. I was taught to hate the institution of slavery. In 1828 I joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. When the question of secession came up, my mind was made up at once. I was among the first in East Tennessee to put my name to a public card in favor of allegiance to the Government. A few months afterward, nine gentlemen, fully armed, came to my house. One of them, a young man, said, “I presume you will take the oath ?” I replied, “You presume too much. What oath ?” He answered, “That of allegiance to the Confederacy.” I replied, “No, sir !” I was taken to Knoxville and thence to all the Southern prisons ; was in the penitentiary. I had heard of the palaces of the South. I did not find them palaces, except in the sense of the poet,

“Prisons would palaces prove,
If Jesus would dwell with me there.”

I had opportunity “to preach” Christ “to the spirits in prison”—the Union soldiers imprisoned. Many of them were converted. I closed their eyes in death, and they took their flight from prisons to the palaces of light and glory. They went home. I returned, and, when put on my trial before an ecclesiastical court, adhered to my loyalty.’

“John W. Mann said : ‘I am ready and willing to take a place among you. As far as slavery is concerned, my skirts are clear. I never owned a negro. My wife owned one or two, but they were sacrificed on the altar of my country. I was arrested in this town, and required to take the oath or go to prison. Through the entreaties of my wife I reluctantly took the oath of

allegiance to the Confederacy. I was called "Lincolnite" in this town; was proscribed and persecuted. I left here, and since then have preached in Louisville one year; afterward in Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana.'

"A venerable brother, William Milburn, remarked: 'I was never connected with slavery; was not raised up to believe it was right; was taught, from boyhood, to believe it was wrong; there was never an hour in which I approved it; I do not expect there ever will be. Have tried to be loyal to God and loyal to my Government. I have suffered much for my loyalty; was three times arrested by the authorities of the would-be Confederacy. I have had a saber presented to my throat, and, with oaths, have been required to take the oath. I said to the youth who made the demand, "Young man, your mother has taught you better than this." I was trotted off, lame as I was, to Greensboro. My guard all sleeping, at about one o'clock I arose, stepped off, and moved homeward, and, at daylight, found myself five miles from my prison. I had to remain concealed till John Morgan was killed. I united with the army, and have been with it ever since. I was ordained a deacon by Bishop Roberts, and an elder by Bishop Morris. I love the Church next to my life. I was arrested four times by the M. E. Church South for my loyalty; but they always had to write, "We find nothing immoral against him." I understand that I was expelled by the Abingdon Conference for my loyalty. I would sooner live and die out of the Church and be unburied, than to be in connection with the Church South. But for the clergy of the Church South this rebellion could never have occurred. The power of politicians was comparatively circumscribed; but when the clergy undertook, in co-operation with them, to rend the nation, an influence was wielded which reached to every hamlet and fireside. I would rather have the artillery of a Bonaparte and the guns of a Wellington united upon me than the groans and tears of the widows and orphans which have been caused by the influence of those preachers. I want to live in this Conference and to die here; and I shall do so, unless an element of treason gets into it, with which I can not and will not associate myself. I can not describe my feelings when I first saw, in a gap of the mountains, the honored flag of my country. Have been forty-one years a member of the Church.'

“J. N. S. Huffaker said he had been a Union man till it seemed that secession was an accomplished fact; the State had gone out, and it looked as though the Confederacy were established. He had then taken the oath of allegiance. In this view and course he was mistaken. But when the Federal Government afforded protection to loyal men, he went to headquarters at Knoxville and stated his desire to be a loyal man, no oath being required; that, as soon as it was required, he took the amnesty oath. He was a conservative man; was opposed to the proceedings of the Holston Conference of 1862 touching the rebellion. He believed the organization of the Holston Conference of the Church South would be required, by the force of public opinion, to disband.

“J. L. Mann said: ‘It was my fortune or misfortune to be born in Tennessee. I was reared among all the influences of negro slavery, and efforts were made to make me believe it was right. But I have ever been an original, unmitigated, Simon-pure Abolitionist. I consider it my misfortune that I was ever connected with the Church South. I joined this Conference in 1860, at the brewing of the rebellion. I remained in the northeast corner of the State two years. The Conference of 1862 was not a conference, it was a political inquisition. I found it was too hot for me. I went to the Federal army. I took my saddlebags and went to the Federal army, and for sixteen months I served God and my country in the army.’

“R. G. Blackburn said: ‘I was a member of the Holston Conference. My heart is with this movement, and it has been from the beginning. As this is my country, and where I have been between the grates, I may perhaps say, that I took the stand that politics and religion should be separate; and that it was not the business of a conference to inquire into a man’s sentiments, and certainly not to require him to support or favor a disloyal organization. I regard it as the duty of every Methodist in this country to give a hearty support to this movement. I regard it as the blackest treason to attempt to keep up the Methodist Church South in this country. Rebellion has been crushed, but to keep up another Methodist organization like that of the Church South, it is in danger of rising again, and efforts would be made to try to divide the country. And if we expect to remain one people, we must have one Church in this country.’

"Some of the speeches, which differed little from those given, are omitted for want of room. T. H. Russell, J. B. Little, John Alley, made similar statements, and were received.

"This occupied the forenoon session, constituting one of the most interesting meetings I ever attended. Tears and sobs and shouts and responses were intermingled with the exercises.

"In the afternoon, fast-day services were held in the church, Bishop Clark and Rev. T. H. Pearne making addresses. A large audience was present.

"The second day's proceedings were opened with the usual services, conducted by J. A. Hyden.

"P. H. Read, Augustus F. Shannon, S. D. Gaines, E. E. Gillenwater, Samuel B. Harwell, and David Fleming were received from the Church South.

"H. B. Burkitt, a probationer of the Kentucky Conference, was transferred by the Bishop.

"Brother G. M. Hicks, T. S. Walker, T. P. Rutherford, Joseph P. Milburn, and John Forrester, probationers in the Holston Conference of the Church South, were received.

"Joseph Milburn, a located elder, was recognized and readmitted.

"Pending the reception of several, a warm discussion arose touching the loyalty of applicants, the Conference carefully guarding against admitting those who had been active aiders of rebellion, and receiving those who had taken the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy only upon full confession and promises of amendment.

"Chaplains Drake, Bowdish, and Black; and brother Webb, of the Minnesota Conference; and Rev. Dr. Poe, were introduced to the Conference.

"The third session, on Saturday, was opened with customary exercises, conducted by W. C. Graves. The session was occupied in the ordinary Saturday work of examining candidates for admission into full connection, and answering the questions, 'Who are admitted on trial? Who remain on trial? Who are the deacons? Who are the elders?'

"The following series of resolutions, touching the principles to govern the Conference in admitting persons to the Conference who had been tainted with disloyalty, was adopted:

"*Whereas*, it is expected by the loyal Methodists of the South, and especially of East Tennessee, that, in the reorgani-

zation of the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, strict inquiry will be made touching the opinions concerning, and relations to, the late rebellion, of applicants for admission and recognition as accredited ministers; and that said opinions and relations will shape, to a greater or less extent, our official action in these cases, we therefore deem it necessary to state briefly the general principles controlling us in the premises; therefore,

"1. *Resolved*, That it is the sense of this body that those who entered into the late rebellion, and imbibed the spirit thereof, are guilty of a crime sufficient to exclude them from the kingdom of grace and glory, and must not be admitted into this Conference save upon full confession and thorough repentance.

"2. *Resolved*, That those ministers who abandoned their work and their homes, and absconded the country upon the approach of the national flag, have so far forfeited claim to our confidence and Christian fellowship that they should not be recognized by members of this Conference as accredited ministers, till they shall have been restored by the proper authorities of the Church.

"3. *Resolved*, That in the reception of preachers into this body, constant regard will be had, not only to their personal qualifications and claims upon our Christian kindness and charity, but also to the opinions, feelings, and wishes of our people; and none ought to be admitted whose conduct, during the late rebellion has been such as to make them odious to the masses, and whose usefulness as ministers of the Gospel has been sacrificed to the unholy cause of treason and rebellion.

"4. *Resolved*, That, while we feel constrained thus to indicate what is now the necessary policy of this Conference, we, with hopeful hearts, look forward to the time, and hope it is not far distant, when general confidence, friendship, and good will shall be restored, and when, as in better days, we shall be one in heart, one in purpose, and one in our great work and labor of love.

"The Report on the State of the Country was adopted as follows:

"Your Committee on the State of the Country respectfully report: The Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in resuming the place she occupied among her sister

annual conferences up to 1844, takes a decided position of loyalty, and heartily agrees with them in their outspoken antagonism to slavery.

“Our people have given costly proof of their devotion to the National Government, and, by their votes, slavery in Tennessee has been buried beyond, as we trust, a hope of resurrection.

“In assuming this position, this Conference makes for herself a very different record from that of the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church South touching these questions.

“That Conference, held at this place in 1862, expelled one of its members “for joining the enemies of his country;” that is, for being a loyal citizen and aiding his Government in suppressing rebellion. It suspended another of its members for similar cause. In an elaborate report presented by John N. M’Tyeire, on these cases, and others similarly accused, “the continued agitation of the subject of slavery” by the Churches North is falsely assigned as the cause of the late wicked rebellion. We say “falsely,” because it was not the agitation of the slavery question, but the ineradicable tendencies and vices of the system itself, which brought about the unhappy events which have transpired.

“That report also openly avows and advocates the rightfulness of the late attempted disruption of the United States; and gravely urges “the duty of the M. E. Church South, alike because of her historical antecedents, and her doctrinal peculiarities touching Southern institutions generally, and this institution, slavery, especially, to be found arrayed side by side with the great masses of the Southern people in religiously contending in part for the same rights—political, civil, and religious—for the security of which they were compelled, in 1844, to adopt measures for a separate and independent ecclesiastical organization. . . . But now that these questions—*abstract* political questions of secession and rebellion—have assumed a concrete form, and, under the inspiration of abolition fanaticism, have kindled the fires of the most brutal and ruthless war ever known to the history of man, involving every interest, political and religious, held to be most sacred and absolutely vital to the present and future weal of our people, it is the deliberate conviction of your committee that no patriot, no Christian, and, least of all, no Christian minister, who claims to be a citizen of the Confederate States of America, and who is

presumed to be even partially acquainted with the merits of this unhappy controversy, can throw the weight of his opinions, words, or acts, into the scale of our enemies against us with moral impunity, or with a conscience void of offense toward God and his fellow-countrymen."

"Such treasonable deliverances, by a body of ministers in the nineteenth century, and in the United States, as well as the apparent spirit in which they were adopted, and the intolerant, relentless, and bitter persecutions of dissentients by which they were followed, justly produce surprise and astonishment; for they present a most humiliating fact in the history of a religious organization—a fact from which it would seem all good, true, patriotic, and Christian men must turn away with ineffable shame and regret.'

"In view of the foregoing facts and considerations, it is therefore,

Resolved, That we hail, with intense, inexpressible pleasure and profound gratitude to God, the triumph of the national arms over a gigantic, unprovoked, and wicked rebellion; the dispersion of the rebel armies, which crimsoned the land with the blood of our sons and brothers, swept our homes with desolation, and filled our hearts with anguish; the established unity and integrity of our country and Government; and, also, the assured future of our priceless national heritage of peace and liberty, civilization and religion.

Resolved, That, as contributive to these results, we cherish, with liveliest interest, the hope, and we will labor with earnest zeal to realize its fruition, that soon the banners of true Methodism, loyal to country, to freedom, to right, and to God, shall wave in triumph over the whole country, from East to West, and from North to South, as now waves the banner of the Republic.

"It was stated by brother Spence that brother Fitzgerald had been waylaid by guerrillas, marched to the woods and robbed of watch, clothing, and money, on his way to the Conference and that he was expecting to be appointed to North Carolina, and had no means to go with. A collection of fifty dollars was raised for him.

"After the Report on the State of the Country was adopted, brother Drake, of the Ohio Conference, and other brethren, sung the 'Battle-hymn of the Republic.'

"An immense audience crowded the Church during the entire exercises of the Sabbath. At nine o'clock a Sunday-school meeting was had, under the direction of brother Spence. Brethren Black, Hyden, and Gibson, army chaplains, and Pearne and Spence, addressed the meeting, the children singing sweet hosannas.

"Bishop Clark preached at half past ten o'clock an effective sermon. At times the audience seemed quite transported by the eloquence and fervor of the Bishop. At the close of the sermon, eight deacons were ordained.

"At three o'clock, P. M., T. H. Pearne, preached, at the close of which six were ordained elders.

"The Conference finished its session on Monday morning, at half past ten o'clock. Greenville was fixed as the place of holding the next session.

"Several preachers additional were received from the Church South.

"The Conference has received forty-three, including probationers, making, with those transferred, fifty in all. Besides these, there are eighteen appointments left to be supplied. The Conference has preachers stationed in Tennessee, North Carolina, and Georgia. The statistics show a membership of 6,494, including probationers; 51 Sunday-schools; 336 officers and teachers; 2,425 scholars; 55 local preachers; and 101 churches. What a glorious result from the labors of about a year spent in hunting up the sheep scattered in the wilderness! What a precious, glorious future may not, shall not, follow this wonderful beginning!

"At the close of the Conference, Bishop Clark made the following address, which was reported by Rev. C. G. Bowdish:

"BRETHREN,—Though the time for the departure of the train which must bear us away is at hand, indulge me in a few remarks at this closing hour.

"And, first, allow me to return my thanks for the kind mention you have made of my services, and the generous expression of confidence and affection made by you in the resolution just passed. Next to the approval of God and my own conscience, I hold my brethren in highest honor. If my official services among you, in the new and anomalous state of affairs in which we have been placed, have received your approbation, I am glad. And truly thankful shall I be if they are

approved by the great Head of the Church, and shall tend to promote the great ends of a pure Christianity among you.

“The uniform kindness and courtesy that has characterized your intercourse throughout, the harmony of thought and purpose and feeling, is worthy of all commendation. We came together strangers to each other. You were without organization. Every thing was in a chaotic state. You had to become acquainted with each other's views and feelings and purposes. You had to learn, to a great extent, who among you could be relied upon, and how much reliance could be placed upon the movement as a whole. To see you, then, blending together so harmoniously, becoming one in feeling, sympathy, plan, and purpose, and giving shape to your movement with as much system and order as an old-established conference, was not only a sight beautiful to the eye, but a cause of profound gratitude to Almighty God, who has given you this will and purpose. But into this you have been schooled, in a great measure, by the common perils through which you have passed, and the common sufferings you have endured, in this ruthless war, which has swept over and desolated so large a portion of this land. From questions that have been proposed to me, I judge it may not be amiss to repeat the explanations that have already been given on one or two points: First. With regard to the specific conditions upon which ministers coming from the M. E. Church South are received among us. You will observe these conditions are the same as those required of ministers coming from the Wesleyan Connection in England, with the addition that they are to give satisfactory assurances to the annual conferences of their loyalty to the National Government, and also of their hearty approval of the antislavery doctrines of our Church. This was not designed as a reflection upon any individual minister; but you are aware, brethren, that while the old Methodist Episcopal Church has been intensely loyal to the Government, the Church South has, in every department, been tainted with treason. So, also, in regard to slavery; while the old Church has been developing into clearer and more decisive forms of practical application the antislavery doctrine she held from the beginning, the case has been widely different with the Church South. The cause of her separation from the old Church, the corner-stone on which she built, was slavery; and, as a result, she has not only re-

ceived "*the great evil*" as a great good, but has become stained all over with the crimes of oppression and treason. I repeat it, then, that it is not a reflection upon any individual minister, but to guard against the possible creeping in again of either of those two elements, that the old Church has placed there two sentinels at the door of entrance. No true man will wish them removed. No one true to his allegiance to his country or his Church would hesitate to assume the obligation.

"Brethren, in going forth from this place to engage in your work, I am aware that you are going forth to a very delicate as well as important mission. There is no annual conference in all the bounds of Christian labor where the work is environed with so many difficulties, and where so much wisdom, so much gentleness of spirit, so much patience under provocation, will be required as here in this work.

"I do not say that we are utterly and entirely to ignore the past, or that you can obliterate from your minds the scenes through which you have been called to pass. Those of you who have been called to suffer; who have been hunted down by men thirsting for your blood; who have been fugitives from your homes, seeking hiding-places among the mountains; whose substance has been wasted; whose sons have been slain upon the battle-field, or foully butchered in the presence of beseeching mothers and sisters; I do not say that you can obliterate these sufferings from your memory; I do not say that without hearty repentance and amendment on their part you can associate on familiar or brotherly terms with those who have assisted in bringing on this fearful state of things. And yet, brethren, it does appear to me that you are placed, precisely of all others in the bounds of the Church, where, in all her history, you can best exhibit the magnanimity of Christianity; where you can exhibit that forgiveness and that love that rises above every injustice and wrong. I pray God you may go forth bearing this spirit in your heart, and may manifest it in all your labor in the vineyard of your Lord and Master. Wherever you go from this place, let it be seen that you bear this spirit with you. See to it that the precious seed you sow be not rendered unfruitful. Your provocations are great, but the indwelling spirit of Christ will make you superior to them all.

"Upon the point of reconstruction I will add another word. If you wish to lay deep and broad the foundations of

the Church here, you can not do it by excluding all who have been in any way connected with this rebellion, as some propose. You can not lift up your banner and say, we will have no member or minister that has been swept away in this fearful tide of secession, this whirlwind of desolation, that has passed over this land; but it appears to me that when such persons become convinced of their error, that they were mistaken, that they were led astray by the leadership of others; when men come feeling thus, with open arms and Christian love, you should receive them and press them to your breasts, and bid them God speed in the way to heaven.

“The announcement of the appointments of an annual conference is always an hour of oppressive sadness, and my feelings have always shrunk from this duty, as a burden I should never have willingly undertaken, had not God in his providence placed it upon me. I am aware that all my brethren here can not be satisfied; that their views and their feelings can not always be met; their convenience, their comfort sometimes, must be sacrificed, and the comfort of their families. The social relations of our itinerants, the comfort of their wives and children, are to be considered. I do hold that the wife of an itinerant should not be forgotten, but that her feelings and her interests should be taken into account in the adjustment of these appointments. These women who share in the labors of the itinerant, and do their part in carrying forward the great work of an itinerant ministry, all honor to their devotion, and the blessing of heaven rest upon them!

“My brethren, your mission may sometimes appear hard and uninviting, but you will remember that it was the same mission that brought the blessed Redeemer from heaven to earth. O, when you view it in this light; when you remember that this work was considered of such transcendent importance as to bring the blessed Redeemer to earth, how it swells into grandeur and importance! You go forth to-day upon the same mission, and to work in the same vineyard. You will remember that he came not here to enjoy the palaces of ease and luxury. He came not here to enjoy the comforts of home or the conveniences of life, but he came to be a homeless wanderer, that fallen humanity might be blessed, redeemed, and saved. You go forth to the same mission, and in all your joys, in all

privations and toils in the vineyard of your blessed Master, remember *your* Savior trod in the same path, endured the same toils, shared in the same triumphs, and reaps the same rewards. As you bow at this sacred altar, in these closing services, take of the same love that was in the heart of your blessed Master, let that spirit be kindled in your hearts, go forth bearing this spirit, and God will bless you and your labors in his vineyard.

“I must now leave this work with you and with God. O, may his blessing be upon you! As your beautiful country is just beginning to recuperate from the desolations of war, and gives promise of returning beauty and prosperity, so may the spiritual heritage you cultivate “bud and blossom as the rose.” May the Great Master go with you, may you be armed and equipped as good soldiers for your work, and the blessing of God be upon you, upon your families, upon the Churches over which you have the oversight, and through your instrumentality sinners be brought home to God! And if you should fall in the work, and this may be the case, it may be that some of these fathers, full of toils and labors in the past, will cease to live, and go to their reward; or it may be that some of the middle-aged, in the strength of their manhood, and bearing the burden and heat of the day, will pass away; or, it may be, some young man, just rising in the morning of life, and girding himself for the work, may be called; WHOEVER it may be, God grant that he may pass away with the light of heaven shining all around, and go from these scenes of toil and trial to the joys and the rewards which are immortal, at God’s right hand!

“Through all my life, down to my dying hour, shall this session of the Holston Conference live in my memory. I shall cherish with fond recollections the thought that I have been permitted to come among you; and that here the banner of the old Church, after an interval of twenty years, has again been unfurled—that Church that has won so many victories in the past, that is spreading her agencies all through the land, that is following up the tide of life along our Western frontier, that is prosecuting her missionary work all over the golden plains of the interior of our country, and spreading along the Pacific Coast, that is raising her standard in India and China. I rejoice to come among you, and here, in the South, to raise up the

fallen standard of the old Church where so many victories have been achieved in the past. Amid these scenes of former toil and triumph may that standard be lifted up forever, and onward may it be borne to still greater victories in the future!''

From the period of its reorganization, as here noted, the Holston Conference has had a healthy and vigorous growth, and is now strong in every respect, though the opposition which it has encountered has been formidable. The addresses of Bishop Clark show the object and animus of the Church, and the remarks of the brethren who were received indicate the spirit and stamina of our people in East Tennessee and the South generally, at this time, and afford ample reasons for the reorganizations. If any think them to have been severe in the expressions used, or in the action taken, they must remember that this Conference was held in 1865, immediately after the war, and that these men had endured hardships for their principles, unparalleled in modern times. As showing the willingness for conciliation and fraternity always cultivated by these brethren, the fourth resolution adopted by the Conference, may be borne in mind, also the following report on the property question, which was adopted by this Conference at the session in Jonesboro, 1869. The Southern Conference had reorganized, and, in May, 1868, represented to the General Conference, in Chicago, that our people had wrongfully wrested their houses of worship from them. The matter was referred back to the Holston Conference, and it was met by that body in a manly and Christian manner. Commissioners from the Southern Church attended the session of the

Conference, presented their claims, and were met as indicated in the report. The memorial was as follows :

“To the Bishops and Members of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Chicago, Ill., May, 1868 :

“The undersigned were appointed a committee, at the session of the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church South, held at Cleveland, East Tennessee, in October last, to memorialize your reverend body, and to set forth distinctly the wrongs which we are suffering at the hands of agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church within our bounds; and also to entreat you to devise some means by which an end may be made to these outrages, for the honor of Methodism and for the sake of our common Christianity.

“Our churches have been seized by ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, are still held and used by them as houses of worship.

“To give the semblance of legality to these acts and of right to this property, trustees have been appointed by the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and these churches are annually reported by your ministers in their conference statistics.

“From these churches our ministers are either excluded and driven, or allowed only a joint occupancy with your ministers. From some of them our ministers, in their regular rounds of district and circuit work, are excluded by locks and bars, or by armed men meeting them at the doors; from others they are driven by mobs, and threatened with death should they attempt a return; at one, a presiding elder and a preacher in charge of the circuit, at a quarterly-meeting appointment, were arrested and marched fifteen miles amidst indignities and insults; at another, an aged and godly minister was *ridden upon a rail*; at another, the same man found at the door bundles of rods and nails, and also a written notice prohibiting him from preaching, at the risk of torture; at another, a notice was handed to our preacher, signed by a class-leader of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in which was the following language: ‘If you come back here again, we will handle you;’ and, true to the threat, on a subsequent round, not two miles from the place, this worthy minister, as he was passing to his appoint-

ment, on the second Sabbath in February last, was taken from his horse, struck a severe blow upon the head, blindfolded, tied to a tree, scourged to laceration, and then ordered to lie with his face to the ground until his scourgers should withdraw, with the threat of death for disobedience. All this he was told, too, was for traveling that circuit and preaching the Gospel as a Southern Methodist preacher; from another, the children and teachers of our Sabbath-school were ejected while in session by a company of men who were led by a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“Our parsonages also have been seized and occupied by ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, no rent having been paid to us for their use.

“Thirty-six hundred dollars, appropriated upon our application to the United States Government, for damages done to our Church at Knoxville during the war, were, by some slight of hand movement, passed into the hands of a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This money is still held from us.

“In other cases, school and Church property of ours on which debts were resting has been forced upon the market by agents in your interests, and thereby wrested from our poverty and added to your abundance.

“Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church constitute, in part, the mobs that insult and maltreat our preachers, while ministers of the same Church, by words and acts, either countenance or encourage our persecutors. In no instance, so far as we are advised, has any one for such conduct been arraigned, or censured even, by those administering the discipline of your Church.

“We could specify the name of each of these churches and the locality. were it necessary, in which our ministers and people are either permitted sometimes to worship, or from which they are excluded and driven by locks, threats, mobs, and bloody persecutions. Their names are in our possession, and at your disposal. About one hundred church edifices are held in one or another of these ways, with a value of not less than seventy-five thousand dollars.

“Of this property, it should be added, some was deeded to the Methodist Episcopal Church before 1844, and the rest, since that time, to the M. E. Church South. That it is all

claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church in East Tennessee, we suppose to be true, or it would not be reported and received in their annual conference statistics. That it belongs to the M. E. Church South, we suppose also to be true, inasmuch as all deeds since 1844 have been made to us, and all the remainder were granted to us by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Church suit; unless the ground be assumed, by your reverend body, that, when Lee surrendered to Grant, the M. E. Church South surrendered also to the Methodist Episcopal Church all her property rights. Surely, if the United States Government does not confiscate the property of those who are called rebels, the Methodist Episcopal Church in her highest legislative assembly, will hardly set a precedent by claiming the property of their Southern brethren.

“ But it may, perhaps, be said that we have been sinners, rebels, traitors, touching our civil and political relations to the Government. If this be so, we are unable to comprehend by what authority we are to be punished by the Methodist Episcopal Church, since, for our moral obliquities we are responsible alone to God, and for our political crimes only to the United States Government.

“ It may also be asked, what jurisdiction has your General Conference over these deeds of injustice? No civil jurisdiction, we are aware; but your reverend body does possess a moral power, of such weight that, if brought to bear in East Tennessee, there would be an end to these acts of oppression and cruelty. A word of disapproval even from your Board of Bishops, or the publication in your Church papers of some of the above cited facts, with editorial condemnation, would have done much to mitigate, if not entirely remove, the cause of complaints; but we have neither heard the one nor seen the other. Why this has not been done is believed by us to be a want of a knowledge of the facts of which we now put you in possession. Familiar as we are with the condition of things in East Tennessee, and with the workings of the two Methodisms there, we are satisfied that your body could, by judicious action, remove most, if not all, of the causes which now occasion strife, degrade Methodism, and scandalize our holy religion. We therefore ask:

“ 1. That you will ascertain the grounds upon which the Methodist Episcopal Church claims and holds the property in church buildings and parsonages within her bounds in East

Tennessee, as reported in her Holston Mission Conference statistics.

"2. If in the investigation any property so reported shall be adjudged by you to belong of right to the same M. E. Church South, that you will designate what that property is, and where; and also instruct your ministers and people to relinquish their claims upon the same, repossess us, and leave us in the undisturbed occupancy thereof.

"3. Inasmuch as your words of wisdom and of justice will be words of power, that you earnestly advise all your ministers laboring in this field to abstain from every word and act the tendency of which would be the subversion of good order and peace in the communities in which they move.

"In conclusion, allow us to add that, in presenting this memorial to your reverend body, we are moved thereto by no other spirit than that of ardent desire to promote the interests of our common Redeemer by spreading Scriptural holiness over these lands.

E. E. WILEY,	W. G. E. CUNNYNGHAM,
WM. ROBESON,	B. ARBOGAST,
C. LONG,	J. M. M'TEER,
GEORGE STEWART,	

"Members of the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church South.
 "APRIL, 1868." (Martyrdom in Missouri, vol. i, pp. 267-271.)

This is a remarkable document, remarkable for its falsehoods. In this respect it compares favorably with the words of the tempter to Eve in the garden. The memorial was presented to the General Conference by Bishop Clark, on the 13th of May, and referred to a committee, consisting of L. Hitchcock, J. M. Reid, J. Castle, N. Shumate, G. W. Clarke, John Kiger, and J. M. Walden, who reported on the 2d of June, as follows, namely:

"Your committee have had before them a memorial from a Committee of Seven, appointed by the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church South, stating that our ministers and people within that region have seized the churches and parsonages belonging to said Church South, and maltreated their ministers.

The statements of the paper are all indefinite both as to places, times, and persons, and no one has appeared to explain or defend the charges. On the contrary, we have also before us, referred to our consideration, numerous affidavits from ministers and members of our Church, in various parts of this country, evidently designed to refute any charges that might be presented by this Committee of Seven. It seems, from these papers, that, as soon as the Federal power was re-established in East Tennessee, whole congregations came over to the Methodist Episcopal Church, bringing with them their churches and parsonages, that they might continue to use them for worship. It also seems that much of the property in question is deeded to the Methodist Episcopal Church, it being so held before the secession of the Church South. We have no proof that any in contest is held otherwise. The General Conference possesses no power, if it would, to divest the occupants of this property, paid for by their means, of the use and ownership of it, and would be guilty of great impropriety in interfering at all, at this time, when test cases are already before the Courts. If, however, we should proceed so to do, with the evidence before us—largely *ex parte*, it is true, but all that we have—the presentation of the memorialists can not be sustained. By personal examinations we have endeavored in vain to ascertain what foundation there is for the affirmation that our ministers and people encourage violence toward the ministers of the M. E. Church South. We believe and trust there is no foundation for the charge; for, if true, it could but meet our unqualified disapprobation. Our own ministers and people in the South suffer severely in this way, and sometimes, we apprehend, at the hands of our Southern brethren, but neither the Spirit of our Master, the genius of our people, nor our denominational interest, could allow us to approbate in any parties the practice. We are glad to know that our brethren laboring in that region had their attention early called to these matters, and we content ourselves with repeating the sentiments of their address to the people. It was, in effect, as published in the 'Knoxville *Whig*,' by authority of at least four presiding elders, and several other members of the Holston Conference, as well as often stated from the pulpits in the South, and through our Church papers in the North, that violence toward the preachers and people of the Church South is unwise, unchristian, and danger-

ous. Our preachers and people in the South, so far as we are apprised and believe, have, all and ever, held this position on the subject. We recommend the following :

“*Resolved*, That all the papers connected with this matter be referred to the Holston Conference, believing as we do, this Conference in the future, as in the past, will be careful to do justly, and, as much as lieth in them, to live peaceably with all men.

“Your committee have also had before them a letter, published in various Southern journals, and signed S. F. Waldo, being dated from Chicago, and presuming to state the objects and intentions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the prosecution of its Southern work. We are also informed that several similar letters have been published in the South. No effort that we have been able to make has enabled us to discover any such person in this city. Certainly no such person has a right to speak in our behalf, or declare our purposes; much less does he declare them correctly. We recommend that the paper be dismissed as anonymous, and unworthy of our further consideration.” (Journal of the General Conference, 1868, pp. 150, 153, 344, 632.)

The subject was treated with more consideration by the committee and Conference than its merits demanded. At the next session of the Southern Holston Conference, the commissioners were appointed to visit the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which they did in 1869. These commissioners were Dr. Wiley, B. Arbogast, R. N. Price, F. W. Earnest, and E. C. Reeves, Esq. The report in reply to their demands was written by the lamented Dr. Cobleigh, and signed by N. E. Cobleigh, F. M. Fanning, J. B. Little, J. A. Hyden, and J. R. Eads. We give it entire, as a correct exponent of the feelings and views of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South in relation to this question :

“The committee appointed by the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to meet and confer with a committee of the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church

South, on the subject contained in their memorial to this Conference, and to whom said memorial was referred, have attended to their duty as best they could under the circumstances, and submit the following as their report:

“Our interview with that committee was very pleasant, and, so far as the spirit manifested is concerned, was to us perfectly satisfactory. They were frank and clear in all their statements in regard to the subject before us. We endeavored to meet them in the same Christian spirit of frankness, courtesy, and kindness.

“The main object of your committee in the interview was to ascertain, as definitely as possible, precisely what they wanted, and their views as to the best manner in which the whole subject pending could be satisfactorily adjusted.

“The following is their own statement of their views, in regard to which they express the belief that they properly represent the views of their Conference:

“1. That the M. E. Church South is entitled to all the property acquired by the Plan of Separation adopted by the General Conference of 1844, as well as to all property acquired by our Church since the separation, except such as may have passed out of our hands by due process of law.

“2. That all such property should be restored to our Church immediately.

“3. That, if the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church have, by paying debts or otherwise, acquired a just lien on any property of the M. E. Church South, they are entitled to have such lien properly satisfied.

“4. That, in case of restoration of property, it will be highly proper for our ministers and members to exercise toward the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church courtesy and magnanimity.

“5. That where a majority of those who may have contributed to the acquisition of the Church property may have adhered to the Methodist Episcopal Church, it might seem hard to eject them from such property; and it would, therefore, be right that our congregations should, in such cases, make such concessions and compromises as may alleviate the cases, as far as possible, without the surrender of vested rights.’

“Before making our reply and recommendation in reference to the whole subject thus presented, a preliminary question

seems to require a little consideration at this time and in this report. This question has reference to the grounds on which the members of our Church justify themselves, both in originally possessing and afterward holding the property in dispute. The necessity of this consideration arises from the fact that unjust charges are frequently made in the newspapers, public addresses, and very often in private conversation, against us as 'church thieves' and 'robbers of churches.' These things are very unpleasant to us, and damaging to the cause of God and our reputation in places where the facts in the case are not fully understood.

"These charges were not made nor insinuated by the committee of the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church South. Their language to us was far above such insinuations and charges, indicating that, in their view of the case, such charges could not, in any sense of propriety, be made against our Church, except in the application of principles which, in other sections of the country, would make the Church South equally guilty of precisely the same crimes. There is ground on which both parties can stand and do stand without involving a particle of the guilt of theft or robbery.

"We are satisfied that wherever members of our Church have possessed themselves of property claimed by the Church South, they have done so on the ground of honest and settled belief that, before God and men, they had a just right to do so, either in equity or in law.

"This subject, as related to civil and ecclesiastical law, is of such a nature, so complicate and involved, that we find many lawyers of acknowledged ability who entertain on the subject the same beliefs as our people do, and, when consulted, give corresponding legal opinion. We can not, therefore, reasonably expect that our people will be clearer headed or wiser in their judgment on this subject than such devoted students of the law. Acting honestly, therefore, under these beliefs and under legal advice, they can not, in any just sense, be either *thieves* or *robbers*.

"We are willing and do cheerfully accord the same honesty of belief and intention to members of the Church South, wherever they have done similar things as it regards property which they occupy claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church as rightfully vested in it.

“ In coming to the subject as now presented for our consideration and action, we earnestly desire, in the spirit of Christ, so to act, and so to recommend action on the part of others, that peace may speedily ensue throughout our entire work; and that all unsettled questions of property in dispute between us may be so amicably and satisfactorily adjusted that brotherly love and a fraternal spirit may both exist and abound between these two branches of Methodism; and that, if God so will it, organic union may soon succeed to this oneness of spirit.

“ The propositions of our brethren of the Church South, contemplate the settlement of questions occurring only within the bounds of the Holston Conference. Our first convictions were that our report should have reference to these questions only; but the more we considered the subject that our Methodism is one, and that the settlement of the questions here should be upon the same principle as similar questions elsewhere; and when we take into account the fact that more Church property claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church is in the possession of the Church South, in the States of Virginia and Maryland, than they claim that we occupy of theirs within the bounds of the Holston Conference, we thought that it would be better and wiser, and, we trust, quite as acceptable to our brethren on the other committee, to base our action and recommendation on some general principle which might be adopted throughout the Church in every case where similar difficulties have arisen, or may arise, in the final settlement of the right to Church property.

“ And we hereby declare our entire willingness to settle, so far as we have power, all the questions within the bound of the Holston Conference, on the same basis which our brethren of the Church South will agree to in Virginia and Maryland, where churches claimed by us are occupied by the Church South. This we have no reason to doubt will meet the views of our brethren of the Church South, who, as well as we, will rejoice to observe the Golden Rule: ‘All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.’

“ The plan of settlement which your committee recommend is this:

“ Inasmuch as pacific and fraternal measures were recommended by our last General Conference, and a board of commissioners having been appointed to treat with a like board

which we expect will be appointed by the M. E. Church South, at its approaching General Conference, in reference to a prospective union of the two Churches; and as the satisfactory settlement of these property questions is necessarily involved and must be effected prior to any union; and as the response of the Bishops of the Church South to the fraternal letter of our Bishops, officially informing them of the action and desire of our General Conference, breathes a kind and Christian spirit, and indicates the same strong desire on their part to have the existing difficulties properly adjusted, so that there may be peace between us; and as we do not wish, in any manner, to increase the difficulties in the way of their prospective action—your committee, therefore, recommend the reference of this whole question, for a uniform plan of adjustment, to that joint board of commissioners of the two Churches; and that the Conference now pledge itself, so far as it may be concerned and has power and influence, to abide by and conform to any plan or principle which that joint commission shall agree to recommend to both Churches; and that, as members of this Conference, we will use our influence to induce all our people to carry out the same plan in the adjustment of our difficulties which may remain unsettled.

“In the mean time, we earnestly recommend to the members of our Church holding property claimed by the Church South, to endeavor amicably to adjust all existing disagreements, so far as in their power, upon the highest principles of equity and Christian charity. And we earnestly hope that our brethren, in any attempt at adjustment, will treat with the members of the M. E. Church South in the true spirit of Christian courtesy and magnanimity.” (Minutes of the Holston Conference for 1869.)

It is just cause for congratulation that our people in the South have very generally cultivated the Christian sentiments indicated in this document, and it would afford us pleasure to record a similar course on the part of the Southern Church; but we have not this privilege, and it is with emotions of sadness and pain that we put on record such facts in refer-

ence to that Church as are needful to give a correct view of that Church and its doings in those days; and we are only prevailed upon to do so because a like spirit is still manifested, to a great extent, from the same quarter.

At the Southern Holston Conference, held in Athens, in October, 1862, W. H. Rogers, W. H. H. Duggan, William C. Daily, J. A. Hyden, P. H. Reed, John Spears, James Cummings, Thomas H. Russell, and Thomas P. Rutherford—*nine* in all—were charged with *disloyalty* to the Confederacy, and against but *two* of the nine was any other charge preferred. Their cases were referred to a committee, which reported, in wide contrast to those just given, as follows, namely:

“The committee to whom was referred for suitable investigation certain complaints against the following named brethren: W. H. Rogers, W. H. Duggan, William C. Daily, Jesse A. Hyden, Patrick H. Reed, John Spears, James Cummings, Thomas H. Russell, and Thomas P. Rutherford, beg leave to present the following report:

“Solemnly impressed with the duty and responsibility devolving on this Conference, touching the exceedingly delicate and momentous issues involved in any action which it may take in reference to its Scriptural and ecclesiastical relations to the great and terrible controversy now shaking the foundations of Church and State, your committee feel constrained to preface their specific report on the cases of the brethren above mentioned, with a declaration of a few general facts, essential, in their judgment, to the proper exhibition, before the public mind, of the causes and reasons of such recommendatory action on the part of the Conference as is hereafter set forth.

“The jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church having been entirely dissolved over the conferences of the slave-holding States, in May, 1845, by a Convention of Delegates, formally appointed in pursuance of

a 'Plan of Separation' adopted by General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844, the Church in the slaveholding States, in her primary assemblies, the quarterly and annual conferences, with a unanimity unparalleled in ecclesiastical history, approved the course of the delegates, and declared her conviction that a separate and independent jurisdiction was necessary to her existence and prosperity. In the judgment of the wisest and best men throughout the South and South-west at that time (a conviction since attested by the most overwhelming proofs), the continued agitation of the subject of slavery, and its actual and practical abolition in some portions of the South, not only rendered necessary, but absolutely demanded, separation from the Northern portion of the Church, in order to the successful preaching of the Gospel in the South, and the establishment of Christ's kingdom in the hearts of both master and slave.

"The history of the M. E. Church *South*, since its formal organization in 1845, has furnished, and still furnishes, multiplied evidences of the wisdom and far-reaching sagacity of the fathers and chief masters of Southern Methodism at that time, in having divorced themselves and flocks from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of those who came among them as *wolves in sheep's clothing*, openly and covertly undermining the foundations of our *social system*, stirring up internal commotion, aiding and counseling the sedition and insurrection of our slaves, by alienating them from their masters and disaffecting them toward their *providential* allotment.

"It is with profound regret that it remains to be written, as the sequel of this unholy and anti-Scriptural crusade of abolition fanaticism and higher-law infidelity against the Southern institutions generally, that it has eventually culminated in the permanent and irrevocable dissolution of the Federal Government, and has forced upon the sovereign people of the Southern States (as the case of the Southern Methodists in 1844) the ineradicable conviction that the only alternative left them, in the providence of God, is to appeal to the Sovereign of the universe for the righteousness of their cause, and, under his blessing and guidance, to organize for themselves a government, founded upon the great principles of justice and equity, for mutual protection and for the better security of all those rights of religion and good society guaranteed to us and all other people by the God

of heaven. It can not now be gainsayed, with all the light before us, that to the people of the Confederate States has been committed, in a sense true of no other people on the face of the globe, the guardianship and moral and intellectual culture of the African race; and that the M. E. Church South is, to a great extent, charged, in the providence of God, with the religious destiny of the colored race.

“Peculiarly and intimately related to the institution of domestic slavery in the Confederate States as the M. E. Church South has ever been, and deeply involved as she is in the future weal of that people, it is gratifying to be able to state that still, as ever, she holds it to be her religious duty to throw the whole weight of her influence, ministerial and lay, into the scale against the encroachments of religious fanaticism and infidelity.

“It was no unnatural result, therefore, that the ministry and membership of the M. E. Church South, alike because of her historical antecedents and her doctrinal peculiarities, touching Southern institutions generally and this institution specially, should be found arrayed side by side with the great masses of the Southern people in religiously contending in part for the same rights—political, civil, and religious—for the security of which they were compelled, in 1844, to adopt measures for a separate and independent ecclesiastical organization.

“And now that the Abolitionists and Black Republicans of the North, and out of Northern Churches, have inaugurated, without just provocation, causelessly and wickedly, a terrible and relentless warfare of invasion, plunder, and wholesale confiscation against all our rights of person, property, and conscience, by an utter and base prostitution of all the sacred sanctions of constitutional liberty, with the repeatedly avowed object of subjugation or extermination, the people called Southern Methodists could not so far forget their past history, or become so blinded to their providential destiny, as not to perceive, with the clearness of a sunbeam, that the success of the Federal Government, in any form and under any circumstances, as at present related to this terrible controversy, could only eventuate in the utter destruction of Southern Methodism, as well as of true republican liberty.

“And now, moreover, that the Southern States, under the blessing and providence of Almighty God, have been enabled

to organize themselves into a permanent Confederacy, with all the machinery of government in motion, and with all its resources, internal and foreign, laid under contribution for the preservation and perpetuity of our political, civil, and religious rights, your committee, in common with the M. E. Church *South*, as a whole, hold it to be the religious duty of her ministry and membership within the limits of this Confederacy, not only to be subject to the supreme authority of our country where they may reside, but also to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to all established powers. The Scriptures and Discipline of our Church enjoin these obligations. Touching the duty with which your committee has been charged, in behalf of the Conference of Southern Methodist preachers, invested with the spiritual oversight of a flock of perhaps fifty thousand souls, they beg leave to say they are pained at the very thought that any suspicion, much less well-grounded complaint, of disloyalty to our established Government, or disaffection to, and want of sympathy with, our Government in its earnest and mighty struggle against its ruthless foes for the blessings and rights of political and religious liberty, should lie against, or attach to, any member of this body.

“They feel constrained, furthermore, to say, for the sake of not only themselves and this Conference, but for the sake of all the people of our various charges, that no member of this body is held obnoxious to complaints or allegations because of former or present opinions touching the *abstract* political questions of secession and revolution, and that such a representation of the acts of this body would be as false as malicious. But now that these questions have assumed a *concrete form*, and, under the inspiration of abolition fanaticism, have kindled the fires of the most brutal and ruthless war ever known in the history of man, involving every interest, political and religious, held to be most sacred and absolutely vital to the present and future weal of our people, it is the deliberate and religious conviction of your committee that no patriot, no Christian, and, last of all, no Christian minister who claims to be a member of the M. E. Church *South*, and a citizen of the Confederate States of America, and who is presumed to be even partially acquainted with the merits of this unhappy controversy, can throw the *weight* of his *opinions, words, or acts* into the *scales of our enemies against* us with moral impunity, or with a conscience void of offense

toward God and his fellow-countrymen. Therefore, in the judgment of your committee, the following simple principles are held to be true and unanswerable:

"*First.* The Word of God and Discipline of the M. E. Church South, as far as it respects civil affairs, make it the religious duty of Christians, and especially all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to its established powers. See Romans xiii, 1, 7; Titus iii, 1; 1 Peter iii, 13; also Articles of Religion, pages 32 and 129 of Discipline.

"*Secondly.* The Scriptures make it a duty to offer supplications, prayers, and intercessions for rulers and all in authority, that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty. See 1 Timothy ii, 1.

"*Thirdly.* In a moral point of view a willful and persistent violation of these preceptive truths of the Gospel and religious obligations, involves legitimately a grave offense against the Word of God and Discipline of the Church.

"Your committee hold, therefore, that in applying these general principles as a test of moral character in this body, instead of being liable by such action to the imputations of instituting an inquisition into the *peculiar abstract political dogmas* of any member, we are only fulfilling our obligations to God and the Church in thus guarding its purity and integrity.

"1. *Resolved,* That, in view of the manner in which W. C. Daily defined his present position in reference to his loyalty to, and support of, the Confederate Government, your Committee do recommend the passage of his character.

"2. *Resolved,* In the case of Thomas P. Rutherford, that, for as much as he had opinions on that subject which he did not choose to communicate, and gave the committee no satisfaction *pro* or *con* on the subject of the complaint alleged, he be discontinued.

"3. *Resolved,* That, in the case of Thomas H. Russell, it is the judgment of your committee that our brother acted imprudently in organizing a class composed of persons transferred from a society on another circuit; but that he is believed to have acted without a knowledge of the facts, and intended no wrong, and should therefore be excused. And in view of the entire satisfaction he gave the committee touching

his fealty to our country, it is recommended that his character be passed.

"4. *Resolved*, In the case of James Cummings, that while the committee disapprove and deplore his course touching this unhappy controversy, they do, nevertheless, in view of his advanced age and consequent infirmities, and in view of former valuable services to the Church, recommend the passage of his character.

"5. *Resolved*, That, in the case of Jesse A. Hyden, it is the judgment of the Committee that while his course has been culpably inconsistent in reference to this controversy, no evidence appearing against his loyalty to our Government at present, but to the contrary, we do recommend the passage of his character.

"6. *Resolved*, That, in the case of Patrick H. Reed, while his statements before the committee do not satisfy them touching his loyalty, yet, in view of the fact that he asks a location through us, the committee recommend the passage of his character, and the granting of his petition.

"7. *Resolved*, That, in the case of William H. H. Duggan, while his statements before the committee do not satisfy them concerning his loyalty, and therefore, in their judgment, render him an improper person to receive an appointment in the regular pastoral work, the committee would, however, recommend the passage of his character, and that he be left without an appointment for one year.

"8. In the case of William H. Rogers, your committee would report that he has made before us and others ample protestations of loyalty; but we are pained to find evidence of want of veracity, and therefore prefer the following charges and specifications:

"Charge First. *Duplicity*.

"Specification. In solemnly affirming to John H. Bruner, that he, Rogers, was a Southern man, and occupied precisely the same ground that he, Bruner, did; and then in affirming directly the contrary, time and again; and also in making similarly contradictory statements to John H. Woodfin.

"Charge Second. *Criminal Falsehood*.

"Specification. In saying that, as he passed through the town of Knoxville, the Confederate authorities applied to him, Rogers, to bear certain documents to William G. Brownlow, as

they had confidence in him and supposed that he knew where Brownlow was; and that he, Rogers, conveyed said documents to Brownlow; whereas he made substantially contradictory statements before the committee, both as to the fact of his knowing Brownlow's whereabouts, and of his bearing said documents to him." (Minutes of the Southern Holston Conference, 1862.)

How do the statements in this report appear in the light of history?

These ministers thus charged and submitted to inquisitorial investigations were known to be good men, with untarnished Christian character, their only fault being disloyalty to the Southern Confederacy. But it may be said that this Conference has made amends for these things, and that it is now desirous of cultivating peace and fraternity. If so, we shall ever be glad to recognize the fact upon its earliest manifestation. Rev. J. L. Mann, in his Review of the Holston Conference, speaking in reference to this occurrence, says:

"None of these men were charged with having committed an overt act of treason against the rebel government, or even of having committed any act whatever. They were arraigned because rebels believed that their hearts and sympathies were with the Government, in its grand struggle to crush an unholy rebellion. Here we have presented to us the strange spectacle of a body of Christian ministers trying its members for their political opinions! Several of these men were among the ablest members of the Conference. Father Cummings was above seventy years of age; still he must be humiliated by a mock trial, and that in his absence, by a committee of rebels—his own children in the ministry. Rev. J. A. Hyden was also absent, and very sick at the time, and his recovery even thought doubtful, yet rebel vindictiveness must follow its helpless victim even to the very verge of death.

"On the sixth page of the published Minutes of this Conference, we find quite a number of rebel dignitaries were hon-

ored with a life membership in the 'Parent Missionary Society,' namely: 'General Sterling Price,' 'Colonel N. M. Menefee' (who was a murderer), 'Hon. Jefferson Davis, P. C. S. A. ;' 'General Stonewall Jackson ;' 'General John H. Morgan,' who met his death only a few hundred yards distant from the writer's desk; 'General Buckner,' 'General Robert E. Lee.' To all of this William Robison, 'Treasurer' of the 'Society,' adds, 'The LAST is FIRST of American generals. Let all the editors say, *yea!* YEA!! YEA!!!'

"The following resolution was also passed:

"*Resolved*, That this Conference will observe such days of thanksgiving or of fasting and prayer as may be set apart by the Confederate or State authorities,' etc. (Pages 25, 26.)

"They were now more hostile toward Unionism than ever before, and some of them actually began the work of expulsion from the Church, for the sin of being loyal to the United States. For the truth of this remark, we could furnish scores of witnesses and *victims* in different parts of East Tennessee. In the mean time, Union preachers were made to suffer more than ever from the cruel hate and persecution of rebels. Long before this, our present noble Governor, W. G. Brownlow, and old Father Cummings, had been forced to secrete themselves in the fastnesses of the Smoky Mountains, from the prowlings of rebel murderers. W. H. H. Duggan, a true man and a patriot, and then past the meridian of life, had been arrested, and driven on quick time for miles through the heat and dust, at the points of rebel bayonets, until he fainted and fell to the ground, and has been ever since a perfect wreck, mentally and physically. W. H. Rogers, a firm and faithful man of God, was arrested and taken South, where, for months we believe, he was the inmate of the most loathsome of rebel prisons. William Milburn, another zealous and true minister of Christ, who had seen above sixty years of life, was arrested, and finally released on condition that he would not pass beyond the limits of his own farm, except to mill and for a physician. John Spears was expelled at the Athens Conference, in their own laconic language, 'for joining the enemies of his country.' This was the only charge, and for this they expelled him. Others were arrested and forced to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy, or otherwise go to prison or to death.

"Scores of our local brethren were compelled to flee from

their homes, and take refuge in the Union army, some of whom were afterward brutally murdered. Such was the case with Chaplains Patty and M'Call. From the Athens Conference—through which the writer had passed only on the strong recommendations of Rev. F. M. Fanning, who was a true Union man, and had been his presiding elder all the time he had been traveling—he was sent to the Cleveland Station, Tennessee; A. G. Worley being his presiding elder. He had only been there a short time when the first quarterly conference was held by Mr. Worley. On Monday morning, after the conference was over, Mr. Worley called at his room, and soon proceeded to inform him that he had heard some complaints in the station about his prayers; which was that he had not been praying for Jeff Davis, the Southern army, the success of the rebellion, and we will add for the devil's kingdom generally. Mr. Worley then continued his not 'godly,' but ungodly 'admonitions' by saying, 'You are a stranger here, and no one knows what you are; and now if you will just pray as I have advised you, and name the President of the Confederacy in your prayers, and pray for the success of our arms, you will be all right;' the writer then turned to the gentleman, and looked him in the eye, and said: '*Sir, I want it distinctly understood that I am going to pray just as I please, and no man, nor set of men, shall dictate to me how I must pray.*'

"This sealed the writer's doom with Worley, who from that moment became his worst and bitterest enemy. Worley and his minions finally raised the pressure so high, that the writer was forced to leave the country. Rebel spies were sent to the church, to watch the prayers and sermons, and then report them to headquarters at Knoxville. Newspaper correspondents wrote lying and inflammatory articles about the case, and on one occasion an anonymous note was placed upon the Holy Bible, in the pulpit, requesting the pastor to offer up prayers for 'the President of the Confederacy,' and sundry other things too tedious to mention; to all of which no attention was paid. About the last conversation had with Mr. Worley, he informed the writer that *he* intended to prefer charges against him at the next session of Conference, and would see that an appointment was not given him. When asked *what kind* of charges would be preferred, the reply was, '*I can't touch your moral character, but I intend to prefer charges*

against you because you did n't pray as I wanted you, or as I DICTATED, as you are pleased to term it, and I'll see that you do n't get an appointment.' True to his declaration, at the next meeting of Conference, which was at Wytheville, Virginia, such charges were preferred and sustained, and the writer expelled, because he would not pray for Jeff. and the Confederacy to succeed in their diabolical rebellion.

"In October, 1863, the Conference met at Wytheville, Virginia. They here *expelled* 'Jonathan L. Mann, William H. Rogers, William Milburn, and W. H. H. Duggan.' All of these were expelled for their loyalty to the General Government, and no other charges were preferred against them, so far as we have been able to ascertain. Hence, loyalty to the United States was deemed by the Southern clerical knights a crime sufficient to exclude a Christian minister from the fellowship and holy communion of Christ's Church. Only think of a body of men, claiming to be Christian ministers, meeting in Conference, and expelling their absent brethren, simply for their adherence to the great principles of the Gospel, of human freedom, and of eternal right!" (Pages 27, 28, 29.)

"At Bristol, in 1864, they continued their old work of ejecting Union men from their connection. Here they expelled 'James Cummings, Jesse A. Hyden, and Thomas H. Russell,' all for their Unionism. It will be remembered that all of these brethren's cases were before the great inquisition at Athens, in 1862. In the case of Father Cummings, they then *resolved*, 'that while the committee disapprove and deplore his course touching this unhappy controversy, they do, nevertheless, in view of his advanced age and consequent infirmities, and in view of his former valuable services to the Church, recommend the passage of his character.' But alas for Father Cummings, here at Bristol! 'advanced age,' nor 'infirmities,' nor 'former valuable services,' were enough to save the good old veteran." (Page 32.)

The foregoing are but a few of the items bearing upon the general subject where volumes could be written, but they are sufficient to impress the inquiry, "Is this the Methodism that the country needs?" In the Introduction to this Review, by

Thomas H. Pearne, D. D., we find these items, to wit :

“ Father Bird, a local preacher in Hawkins County, was a victim of rebel barbarity, under circumstances of fiendish atrocity. He was venerable alike for years and for piety. In his early manhood, he had fought under Jackson against the British. He could not be seduced nor intimidated into the support or countenance of the rebellion, and he was too old and feeble to take refuge across the mountains in Kentucky. This man was taken from his house and killed by inches before his family, by heartless ruffians who mocked his dying agonies with derisive taunts and jeers.

“ Young Sizemore, of the same county, a lad of some sixteen years, was taken from his father's door by a company of rebel youth of the neighborhood, and was shot down in cold blood. The father followed them some distance, entreating them to spare his son. They compelled his return by threatening to shoot him instantly, should he follow them further. He returned; but, before he had gone beyond hearing, the crack of the fatal rifle was heard, and that son lay a mangled corpse, watering the earth with his young life-blood.

“ In Lower East Tennessee, Rev. Mr. Castor and son were both brutally murdered by the rebels, after which the incarnate fiends cut out the eyes of the young man, and carried them around in their pockets, as a terror to the Unionists.

“ East Tennesseans were generally loyal. More than thirty thousand of them fled their homes, crossed the mountains, volunteered in the United States service, and returned to Tennessee, under the gallant Burnside, to defend their homes and firesides from rebel soldiers. They were true to the free mountain air they had breathed and also to the memories of the Republic. They were not only consciously free, they were freedom-loving. Slavery had never been rank and vigorous in this section. Both slaves and slave-holders were here comparatively few in numbers. Hence the greater loyalty which prevailed. But this fact only enhances the folly and crime of the Holston Conference of the M. E. Church South, who, notwithstanding this comparative absence of slavery, and in spite of the popular current of patriotism which prevailed, were intensely sectional and bitterly disloyal.

“This state of facts also strongly commends the sterling, incorruptible integrity of East Tennesseans, who remained true to the Republic in spite of the example, teachings, prayers, and Church influences, which these preachers—their own pastors—arrayed against them; in spite of Church censures, official degradation, and even expulsion, often employed against loyalists, ‘Lincolnites,’ as they were sometimes called. History may safely be challenged to produce examples of a loftier heroism, a sterner virtue, a more exalted or enduring patriotism. In the pantheon of earthly heroes no names will shine more brightly than theirs.” (Review of the Holston Conference, pp. 8, 9, 10.)

Dr. Myers informs us that there can be no fraternity between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Church South, except on the basis of the “Plan of Separation,” as interpreted by him. We will not discuss the question here, but simply repeat, “Is this the Methodism that the country needs?” We will give the Southern Holston Conference the credit, if it be a credit, for having passed at the session of 1865, these resolutions, to wit:

“*Whereas*, loyalty to the Government under which we live is a Christian duty, so taught in the Scriptures, as well as in the Discipline of our Church; and *whereas*, the Federal Government has now re-established itself over these United States; and *whereas*, some of the acts of this Conference, passed at its sessions held at Athens, 1862; Wytheville, 1863; and Bristol, 1864, *might be so construed* as to place us in the attitude of disloyalty to the Government under which we now live; and *whereas*, duty requires that we clearly define our position touching these matters; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That we are, and *intend* to be, loyal citizens of the Government of the United States; and that any acts heretofore passed by this Conference, which are in conflict with this declaration, are hereby rescinded.

“*Resolved*, That the action of this Conference at Athens, by which John Spears was expelled, and W. H. H. Duggan was suspended for twelve months; and the action at Wytheville, by

which Jonathan L. Mann, William H. Rogers, William Milburn, and William H. H. Duggan were expelled; and the action at Bristol, by which James Cummings, Jesse A. Hyden, and Thomas H. Russell were expelled, was hasty; and since we can not legally restore them here, we do instruct our delegates to the next General Conference to ask that body to do so.

“*Resolved*, That the taking of the amnesty oath, or the oath of allegiance, required by the Government of the United States, is the duty of Christian ministers; and we have accordingly taken such oath, that both by example and precept we might teach the Christian doctrine of loyalty.

“*Resolved*, That if any brother has withdrawn from this Conference, and connected himself with any other ecclesiastical body, under a *misapprehension* of any kind, but now desires to return, he shall be cordially received by us.” (Review of the Holston Conference, pp. 34, 35.)

These may have been well intended, but they came far short of meeting the demands of the case. Remembering that what is here given is but the merest intimation of what our people have suffered, and that the action offered from the Southern Conference as an olive branch is little else than adding insult to injury, after our Holston Conference was reorganized, is it strange that our brethren answered those of the Southern Church, if they replied at all, that they had not acted under any misapprehension of the case, or that they continued to adhere to the old Church? Can any thing be more clear than the conclusion that these people were justified in returning to the Church of their choice, and of their fathers, out of which they had been taken, contrary to their will? We ask, in view of all the circumstances, Was not the action of the Conference at Athens both just and mild? Did not the Conference assume the ground which the interests of the Church and Government required, that

is, of loyalty to both? What could have been more just and generous, and more manly and more Christian, than the report on Church property in 1869? These principles have been generally carried out, the people keeping pace with the ministers in Christian conduct and fraternal love. The course of the Holston Conference may be taken as a fair exponent of that of the Methodist Episcopal Church throughout the South since the reorganization. It has not caused the Church to blush for its proceedings or remonstrate against its policy.

Bishop Clark, who organized the Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama Conferences, and held their sessions, as well as those of the Holston, for four consecutive years (1865, 1866, 1867, 1868), also, every-where expressed the same high and noble Christian sentiments, and the writer knows, from personal acquaintance, that, toward the Southern people and the M. E. Church South, he was always kind and fraternal. On the other side, it would be easy to show another, opposite, and exceedingly bitter spirit, in the widest contrast with his, from the Southern bishops; and while this might be done in justice to them, and should be, to make our argument complete, yet, we refrain from doing so, from a desire to be better to them in this particular than they have been to themselves. Volumes might be filled with vituperation of the Methodist Episcopal Church from the press and pulpit of the Church South, but we forbear, and proceed in the examination of the records.

As we have seen, the Holston Conference at first included North Georgia, Western North Carolina, and

South-western Virginia. Other sections were also open to the old Church. On the Tennessee River, within the bounds of the Tennessee Conference, was a body of Methodists who had refused to unite with the Southern Church in 1844, and from that time forward had maintained an independent existence, and were known as the Crews Methodists. At the close of the war they numbered about three hundred, and gladly returned to the communion from which they had been separated against their will.

In Alabama, a considerable number withdrew from the Southern Church, and formed an independent branch. Rev. J. C. Self and Rev. J. J. Brasher, very excellent men, now in the Alabama Conference, were leaders in the movement. These willingly united with the Methodist Episcopal Church at the earliest opportunity. Mr. Brasher was a young man in the Church in 1848, an official member and one of the remonstrants against the action of 1844.

In a letter to the writer upon this subject, Rev. J. J. Brasher says:

“After the war, I determined to sever my connection with the Church South, unless they struck from their Discipline the word ‘South.’ The cause of the separation had been removed, and consequently there was no further necessity for this distinction. But my wish in this, as in 1844, was not regarded, and I determined, as did two others, to form a separate organization, to be known as the ‘United Methodist Church.’ We sought to revive the Methodism of the fathers, to go back to the old landmarks, particularly in relation to class-meetings, which had fallen into disuse in the Southern Church. We had the regular conferences and organization of the old Church, with all of the characteristics of Methodism except the episcopacy. Rev. A. B. Watson, was elected President for four years, while

we were waiting the development of events, when, happily, the Methodist Episcopal Church came to our relief. The number of communicants with us was something over three hundred and fifty, with five ministers, namely, A. B. Watson, Walter B. Drennon, John C. Self, Joseph Beasley, and the writer. One of the tests of membership among us was loyalty to the Government of the United States."

This body formed the nucleus of our present work among the white people of Alabama, which now numbers about six thousand members. Had not the Methodist Episcopal Church entered this field, and had the "united" movement been vigorously pushed, it would no doubt have become a very considerable body. Thousands had practically severed themselves from the Southern Church never to return to its fold. Mr. Brasher was rejected by the annual conference for signing the remonstrance (with all of the official members upon the circuit) against the division of 1844, but was afterward earnestly solicited to unite with the traveling connection. These facts clearly indicate the existence of a strong union element in Alabama in 1844, and also in 1861.

Thousands welcomed the Methodism of their fathers back to the South, and pushed their way into it, eager to return to their spiritual home. It is a matter of the most profound regret that the situation was not more fully understood at the North at that time, and as direct, vigorous, and persevering efforts made in behalf of the white people as of the colored. In the central portion of the South the work began with the white population, but, true to the Gospel and to Methodism, they have not neglected the colored. In South Carolina, Florida,

Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, it has been almost exclusively limited to the latter, except in the Southern German Conference in the State last named.

The Washington Conference was organized in 1864, embracing Western Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, and the territory south.

Preceding the General Conference of 1868, several mission conferences had been formed besides the Holston, which at this time were recognized, and the delegates admitted, as follows: Tennessee, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas; and the formation of the North Carolina and the Lexington Conferences was also provided for. The General Conference of 1872 set off the State of Florida from South Carolina into a conference, and authorized the organization of the West Texas, and Southern German Conferences, which have been since formed; thus making eighteen entire conferences, and also a large portion of the Washington Conference, upon the territory of the thirteen which seceded in 1844.

These thirteen seceding conferences were: Virginia, bounded on the north by the Rappahannock River, except Fredericksburg and Port Royal, which thus formed the northern boundary in Virginia, of the "new connection," with, in 1843, 30,808 members; Kentucky, 50,168; Missouri, 26,049; Arkansas, 13,269; Memphis, 27,405; Tennessee, 37,998; Holston, 40,063; North Carolina, 25,267; South Carolina, 69,610; Georgia, 54,067; Alabama, 39,043; Mississippi, 20,516; and Texas, 4,970; making an aggregate of members and probationers of 439,233; leaving, at

that time, in the Methodist Episcopal Church 632,-123. The eighteen conferences now occupying this territory present the showing found in the following statistical tables:

TABLE I.—PREACHERS AND SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

CONFERENCES.	PREACHERS.			SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.		
	Travel'g.	Local.	Total.	Schools.	Officers & T'chrs.	Scholars.
Alabama.....	81	186	267	103	492	3,995
Arkansas.....	36	87	123	59	359	2,032
Florida.....	32	71	103	55	142	1,636
Georgia.....	101	294	395	194	716	8,738
Holston.....	110	219	329	240	1,548	10,670
Kentucky.....	89	183	272	178	1,295	8,529
Lexington.....	55	93	148	43	256	2,498
Louisiana.....	78	243	321	96	447	5,698
Mississippi.....	80	299	379	221	876	11,670
Missouri.....	108	181	289	217	1,735	10,557
N. Carolina.....	46	80	126	104	483	3,804
S. Carolina.....	92	256	348	241	789	10,414
S. German.....	22	9	31	23	107	666
St. Louis.....	131	220	351	171	1,279	9,296
Tennessee.....	98	176	274	188	884	7,845
Texas.....	91	177	278	84	312	4,009
Virginia.....	56	73	129	98	833	4,035
West Texas.....	66	66	132	62	240	3,336
Total.....	1,372	2,913	4,295	2,377	12,730	109,428

TABLE II.—MEMBERS AND CHURCH PROPERTY.

CONFERENCES.	Members and Probationers.	CHURCH PROPERTY.			
		Ch'ches.	Probable Value.	Pars'n-ages.	Probable Value.
Alabama.....	11,555	162	\$46,305	1	\$165
Arkansas.....	5,299	50	58,205	3	620
Florida.....	2,459	47	21,065	9	4,880
Georgia.....	15,995	193	112,345	15	5,720
Holston.....	23,201	159	153,450	8	6,350
Kentucky.....	19,365	157	388,350	14	20,113
Lexington.....	7,007	51	136,050	4	4,000
Louisiana.....	12,235	84	252,000	9	4,980
Mississippi.....	30,236	256	171,110	16	10,375
Missouri.....	17,569	145	284,625	39	21,535
N. Carolina.....	8,302	99	39,185	2	410
S. Carolina.....	29,844	213	165,850	11	5,270
S. German.....	770	15	24,600	7	4,250
St. Louis.....	16,597	125	382,150	38	38,060
Tennessee.....	12,051	161	195,520	7	2,675
Texas.....	12,893	69	52,320	3	1,350
Virginia.....	6,595	98	109,700	13	14,225
West Texas.....	6,729	21	31,975	2	1,100
Total.....	238,702	2,105	\$2,624,805	201	\$146,078

TABLE III.—BENEVOLENT COLLECTIONS.

CONFERENCES.	Conference Claimants...	Missionary....	Woman's For. Miss. Soc...	Church Ex- tension.....	Tract Soc....	Sunday-Sch'l Union.....	Fredmen's Aid Soc.....	Education....
Alabama.....	\$3 35	\$67 05	\$13 75	\$4 00	\$4 00	\$4 40	\$29 25	\$2 00
Arkansas.....	9 50	379 70	4 50	17 85	2 05	8 05	7 05	2 30
Florida.....	7 50	416 79	1 00	26 91	2 70	7 77	8 90	3 75
Georgia.....	21 10	353 70	107 38	12 80	37 70	79 35	19 60
Holston.....	66 25	998 49	3 85	113 01	20 82	43 12	28 70	184 33
Kentucky.....	676 68	2,316 58	491 42	726 30	127 60	135 10	234 80	84 30
Lexington....	9 55	122 93	5 95	69 90	5 20	5 50	6 60	4 45
Louisiana.....	30 60	531 20	194 90	32 80	41 50	156 45	38 50
Mississippi....	4 50	317 45	3 50	112 65	51 15	521 10	48 45
Missouri.....	278 90	1,362 76	48 00	135 90	37 66	66 55	66 45	28 35
N. Carolina....	136 85	36 65	6 95	8 55	13 85
S. Carolina....	18 25	2,584 58	112 25	4 20	31 69	47 35	6 75
S. German.....	20 85	710 00	3 00	56 80	15 65	20 00	2 00	9 00
St. Louis.....	184 55	2,083 36	455 93	138 65	43 10	61 80	57 89	36 06
Tennessee.....	13 05	650 76	8 35	82 80	14 95	22 95	91 55	13 20
Texas.....	282 50	8 00	54 60	2 50	42 30	41 10	10 85
Virginia.....	18 00	769 63	10 75	106 05	20 35	33 90	11 90	21 12
West Texas....	215 40	54 10	4 20	15 60	8 80
Total.....	1,362 63	14,310 23	1,058 00	2,150 70	177 53	637 63	2,422 09	543 01

The number of members and probationers given in the second table is 238,702. Add to this 4,295 preachers, and we have the aggregate of 242,997. These figures are taken from the reports of last year, 1875. Fourteen of these conferences were to meet during the Winter and Spring, before the session of the General Conference, and their reports for this year will probably show a total membership of over 250,000 on the territory which seceded in 1844, not including the 10,000 members in the portion of the Washington Conference within the same bounds. Of the 242,997 given above, not less than 100,000 are white people, the Virginia, Kentucky, and St. Louis Conferences being all of that class. Missouri, Arkansas, and Holston are mostly whites, while Tennessee and Alabama are about equally divided, and

Georgia and North Carolina have a considerable number of the same.

The 143,000 colored members in these conferences are firmly attached to the Church, and many of them are among the most intelligent and enterprising of their people. The Delaware Conference has 12,781 members, which, with the 26,508 of the Washington Conference, makes an aggregate of more than 180,000 colored members in the Church.

The Church property of the conferences occupying this territory is given in the second table; showing the value of the churches to be \$2,624,805, of parsonages, \$146,078; total, \$2,770,873 in churches and parsonages. Add to this at least a quarter of a million of school property, and we have \$3,020,873 in all. If it is asked how much of this property belongs to the Southern Church, we answer, Not one cent. If it is asked how much is in dispute between the two Churches, we answer, Scarcely any, perhaps none; unless it be in Virginia, where the Southern Church holds the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or in sections where the writer is not acquainted. If it is asked how much is claimed by the Southern Church? we answer, on the theory of Dr. Myers, All, because it is pretended that we have no right to hold property, or even exist as a Church on this sacred soil. This property has been created by and for the Methodist Episcopal Church since 1844, and nearly the whole of it since the war. In 1862 the Kentucky, Missouri, and Arkansas Conferences reported the value of the churches and parsonages within their bounds, as \$70,075. This, taken from the \$3,020,873,

leaves the sum of nearly *three millions* of dollars, which has been raised and expended on this territory by the Methodist Episcopal Church since the war. Very little of this property was ever held or occupied by the Southern Church, though that body seems to ask it now as a part of the price of its fraternal favor, by refusing fraternity except on the basis of their idea of the "Plan of Separation." What is to be done with this quarter of a million of members, and three millions of dollars in Church property, on the territory that seceded in 1844-5, is not an open question. They have already been recognized and provided for, the same as other portions of the Church; and in this respect the General Conference of 1876 will follow the example of its predecessors since 1848, and take care of these interests in Southern territory. It is not well to forget the facts of history, lest their lessons for good be lost.

In addition to the eighteen conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, occupying the territory of the thirteen Southern conferences which seceded in 1844-5, we have also, on slave territory, the West Virginia, Baltimore, and Wilmington, white, and the Washington and Delaware, colored. The membership, with the ministers, on the territory that seceded, according to the Minutes of last year, is 242,997: in the West Virginia Conference, 31,152; Baltimore, 33,607; Wilmington, 27,330; Delaware, 12,781; Washington, 26,508; making a total of 374,375. Add to this, 1,557 ministers in the conferences named, and we have the whole number of 375,932 members and ministers on what was

slave territory. Of this number, over 190,000 are white.

The Church property of the Methodist Episcopal Church on this seceded territory is \$3,020,873; and on the slave territory outside of this, \$5,627,133; total on slave territory, \$8,648,006. There would be as much propriety in discussing a suggestion to send these conferences to the Southern Church as those farther south. Neither thought will be entertained for a moment. The Methodist Episcopal Church is in the South to remain, and to prosecute the work which God has so wondrously committed to its hand. Retreat from the field! No. Is the Southern Church promoting a broad, earnest, progressive, and holy evangelism in the Northern States? It has been operating upon free territory twice as long as the Methodist Episcopal Church has been in Tennessee and south of that State since the reorganization. Its spirit and character in the South may be judged of, in part, by its inefficiency and lack of adaptation to the times there, though it is not possible for the people of the North to comprehend the measure of its pro-slaveryism, Confederate sympathy, or sectional prejudice. "Is it the Methodism which the country needs?" Has the time come to repeat the experiment of placing any section of our common country in its special keeping?

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRESENT RELATIONS OF THE TWO METHODISMS.

FROM the preceding chapter it appears that the Methodist Episcopal Church has, according to the Minutes of 1875, within the territory of the thirteen conferences which seceded in 1844, eighteen conferences, with 242,997 members and ministers—of which not less than 100,000 are white, and mostly natives of the South—and \$3,020,873 worth of Church property; and, on what was slave territory, in addition to the above, five conferences, with 131,378 members and preachers, and \$5,627,132 of Church property; making a total, south of Mason and Dixon's Line, or in the South, of 375,932 communicants, and \$8,648,006 of Church property.

The efforts of the Southern Church to extend northward, from 1844 to 1848, will be remembered. These were continued from year to year, no opportunity being lost to occupy free territory, none of which was included in the thirteen conferences. The most vigorous efforts were made to lead, if not to control, the Methodism of the Pacific Coast and of Kansas in the early settlement of those sections. The Pacific Conference of the Southern Church was organized April 15, 1852, and reported in 1853 twenty-four traveling and seven local preachers, and 294

Church members. This was twelve years before the reorganization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Tennessee, and southward. Now that Church has, at this time, according to the Minutes published at Nashville in 1875, six conferences in the North, with members and preachers as follows: the Western Conference, embracing Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Idaho, 2,720; Denver Conference, including Colorado, Montana, and New Mexico, 666; Los Angeles Conference, in South California, 826; Pacific Conference, in Central California, 3,447; Columbia Conference, including Northern California, Oregon, and Washington, 1,019; and Illinois Conference, which embraces Illinois and Indiana, except New Albany and Jeffersonville, 5,879; total, 14,357. This is what the Southern Church has on free territory with which to offset the eighteen conferences, with 242,997 ministers and members, of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the territory of the thirteen seceding conferences. On slave territory not included in these thirteen, the Southern Church has two conferences, namely, Baltimore, with 24,132, and West Virginia, which reported, in 1854, 35 traveling, 200 local, preachers, and 6,524 members, and now has 12,264 members and preachers, including 2,000 or over in Kentucky, leaving about 10,000 members, aside from those in Kentucky; total, 34,132, as an offset to the five conferences, with 131,378 members, of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the same territory; that is, the Southern Church has 48,489 members in the North and West, or outside of the original thirteen conferences, and the Methodist

Episcopal Church has 375,932 members and ministers, nearly 200,000 of whom are white, in the South; being an excess in favor of the Methodist Episcopal Church of 336,443. If a comparison could be made in Church property, the contrast would be equally striking.

The two Churches are thus spread over the whole country, the Methodist Episcopal Church occupying every State and Territory, and having organized societies in nearly every county of the Union. The Church South also nominally covers the whole country, the Baltimore Conference, as bounded in the Discipline, extending "northward so as to include all the territory which may be now or hereafter under our [Southern] jurisdiction." The extension of that Church to the North has never been opposed by the Methodist Episcopal Church; its ministers have not been mobbed or vilified, but, instead, they have been recognized as Methodist preachers, welcome, with others, in all places, to preach to those who desired to hear them, and to organize societies wherever they could find persons to unite with their communion. No General or Annual Conference has passed resolutions against them, refused to fraternize with them, or censured any for joining their ranks. So far as the Methodist Episcopal Church is concerned, they have been, are now, at liberty to preach the Gospel and build up the Southern Church, from Key West to Behring's Straits, and from San Diego to Iceland. Why, then, may there not be "formal" fraternity between these two bodies of Methodists? Dr. Myers answers this question, from his stand-point, in the

thirteenth and last chapter of his "Disruption," under the title adopted for this, "The Present Relations of the Two Methodisms," illustrates the case, and lays down the "platform" of the Southern Church, thus:

"Immediately after the rejection of Dr. Pierce [in 1848] came that now noted *ex parte* action which, in effect, declared the Church South the illegitimate offspring of schism—put upon it the brand of a 'secession' from the 'Mother Church,' to use the proselyting cant much in vogue where facts are not known. This nullification of the Plan of Separation remains to this day the nucleus of the grievances the Southern Church has to urge against her congeneric sister.

"After that transaction followed the lawsuits, and the judgment of the Supreme Court, reversing, in effect, the decision of the General Conference of 1848, and dividing with the South the Book Concern property. Since that contest has been settled, the 'border' has been obliterated. In 1860-61 the Baltimore Conference took a position respecting the advanced action of the General Conference of that year in reference to slavery, which resulted, in 1862, in the division of that body, and the adhesion of much the larger section, in 1866, to the Church South. About the same time, a body of Illinois Methodists, who had organized an independent conference, applied also to be received. In both these cases the movements toward the South were spontaneous, and not procured by aggression or sustained by an outlay of missionary moneys. The Methodist Episcopal Church, on the contrary, has mapped out the entire Southern territory into conferences, with a considerable membership, formerly of the Church South, but mostly blacks. It was made no secret among high officials that the purpose in view was to 'disintegrate and absorb,' Southern Methodism; and the assertion has been made by the author of this 'slogan' that the policy may be considered to have measurably succeeded.

"The attitude assumed toward the Church South by the other communion, during and after the Confederate war, farther complicated the difficulties. After the Federal forces had forced the passage of the Mississippi River, and occupied large sections of Southern territory, Bishop Ames, and some of the

preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, followed the victorious army with a circular order issued to its officers, under date of November 30, 1863, from the Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, in which he said :

“You are hereby directed to place at the disposal of Bishop Ames all houses of worship belonging to the M. E. Church South in which a loyal minister, who has been appointed by a loyal bishop of said Church, does not officiate—the very terms of the order giving the army and officers the right of judgment as to who were ‘loyal’ bishops and ministers.

“Armed with this order, officials of the Methodist Episcopal Church took possession of several houses of worship in the occupied cities of the South, in spite of the remonstrances of the members owning them, and their pulpits were filled by preachers whom they considered their political enemies. Even after the war had closed, possession of several of these houses of worship was maintained until, after many obstructions and vexatious delays, they were restored to their rightful owners by order of the Government. Others of them—notably some in New Orleans—have never been surrendered.

“Changes of Church relations have given rise to sundry other difficulties about houses of worship, parsonages, and other Church property, some of which have been settled by compromise and some by the courts, while others are still pending, with a view, as we have seen, to get the matter, if possible, before the Supreme Court. The justification alleged in many of these cases for the retention of this property is, that a large part, or all, of the congregations went over with the houses, though in some cases the houses went one way, and a large part, or all, of the worshipers another. The difficulties are more complicated still, it may be, by the alleged fact that it is mutual—that in both Churches are to be found congregations which, transferring their membership, still retain possession of the Church property they previously held. This fact is alleged against the Church South, respecting property within the bounds of the old Baltimore Conference.

“Meanwhile, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was not wholly silent. In 1864 it added to the conditions on which it would receive ministers from ‘other Christian Churches,’ one expressly for the reception of any who might offer from the Church South; namely, ‘Provided they

give satisfactory assurances to an annual or quarterly conference of their loyalty to the National Government, and hearty approval of the antislavery doctrine of the Church.' This political condition of transfer was rescinded in 1868; but not until after the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at their meeting at Erie, June, 1865—when resolving 'to occupy, as far as practicable, those fields in the Southern States' which 'might be open to them,' and which 'gave promise of success'—extended 'a cordial welcome to all ministers and members, of whatever branch of Methodism, who will unite with us [them] on the basis of our [their] loyal and antislavery Discipline.'

"In 1869 the Southern bishops met in St. Louis, where they were unexpectedly visited by Bishops Janes and Simpson, commissioned by the Episcopal College of the Methodist Episcopal Church to bear fraternal greetings. They were self-moved to do this, believing that, as 'chief pastors,' it became them to suggest a reunion of the two Churches. They were received with the utmost respect, and their communication answered courteously but candidly. The Southern bishops did not conceive 'reunion' the first question to be considered; it must be preceded by the establishment of fraternal feelings and relations between the two Churches. They cited the final words of Dr. Pierce in 1848, which, in 1850, had been adopted as the language of the Church South.

"'If the offer of fraternal relations is ever made upon the basis of the Plan of Separation of 1844, the Church South will cordially entertain the proposition,' Dr. P wrote; and they add, 'You can not expect us to say less than this, that the words of our rejected delegates are our words.' And again: 'Allow us, in all kindness, brethren, to remind you, and to keep the important fact of history prominent, that we separated from you in no sense in which you did not separate from us. The separation was by compact, and mutual; and nearer approaches to each other can be conducted, with hope of successful issue, only on this basis.' They also called attention 'to the conduct of some of the missionaries and agents sent into' the South, and to their 'course in taking possession of some of our houses of worship;' and, granting it not impossible 'that our own people may not have been in every instance without blame toward you,' they add: 'If any offenses against the law of love, committed by those under our appointment, any aggressions upon

your just privileges and rights, are properly represented to us, we shall stand ready, by all the authority and influence we have, to restrain and correct them.'

"There was no response; but, in 1870, Bishop Janes and Dr. (now Bishop) Harris visited the Southern General Conference at Memphis. A commission had been appointed, in 1868, to consider certain overtures for union from African Zion Church; and its powers were enlarged 'to treat with a similar commission from any other Methodist Church that may desire union.' This commission went somewhat beyond the letter of its 'instructions, and sent these delegates to suggest the propriety of "union,"' and of the appointment of a similar commission to confer with that of their Church on said subject. This was acknowledged to be an overture not emanating directly from the General Conference, and the Southern body did not esteem the authority of the commission sufficient to warrant its being relied on as an expression of the wish or sentiment of the Church;—and the visit, as was probably expected, ended in only the cordial reception and hospitable entertainment of the distinguished visitors. Among the resolutions which the occasion elicited was this:

"*Resolved*, That the action of our bishops in their last annual meeting, in St. Louis, in response to the message from the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has the full indorsement of this General Conference, and accurately defines our position in reference to any overtures which may proceed from that Church having in them an official and proper recognition of that body.'

"Here, then, is the platform on which Southern Methodism stands—propounded by Dr. Pierce in 1848, confirmed by the General Conference in 1850, reasserted by the bishops in 1869, and again confirmed *unanimously* in 1870 by a full General Conference of lay and clerical delegates; namely, her foundation, as a separate ecclesiastical organization, was, by authority, laid in the Plan of Separation; and this fact must be recognized as the basis of a permanent peace and cordial fraternization." (Disruption, etc., pp. 185–192.)

It is difficult to see how more perversions of fact could be crowded into this space. Let us glance at some of the points in these extracts.

We have demonstrated that the "Plan of Separation," as held by the Church South, is a fiction; that there never has been any such "Plan" as they claim. The "*ex parte* nullification" of 1848, which is the "nucleus of the grievances of the Southern Church," we have also seen to be simple justice to all parties concerned, offering Church fellowship to adhering members in the South, and annulling nothing but the line of 1844, which had been utterly disregarded and trampled under foot by the Southern Church. The statement in relation to the Baltimore Conference is equally distant from truth, and the distinction drawn between the course of the Southern Church in the North and the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South is false; and the statement about seizing and holding churches by military order equally so; as is also that in reference to Church property in general.

He tells us that the military order was dated November 30, 1863. That was during the war, and the order applied in cases where the pastors of the churches in question had either gone into the rebel army and were fighting against the Government, or had fled the country, or were holding their pulpits as a safe place from which to encourage treason and harangue the people in behalf of the Confederacy, in desecration of the holy Sabbath. No minister or church was disturbed but for such reasons. All of the churches referred to were given up on the return of peace, and when their hostility to the Government ceased. And yet Dr. Myers has the audacity to say, "Others of them—notably some in New Orleans—

have never been surrendered." This is simply false. He seems to have drawn both his information and inspiration from the fiction known as "Martyrdom in Missouri."

The churches in New Orleans, about which they have complained, were built, owned, and occupied by the colored people. They were held by white men as trustees for the people of color before the war, because, as slaves, they were not allowed to hold property in their own names. These people, who were the *bona fide* owners of this property, united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, hence this accusation of Dr. Myers. The Southern Church claimed the property, ostensibly, in behalf of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America, and yet, in some cases where the white people of the M. E. Church South have obtained possession of this class of property, they have taken it from the colored people and applied it to their own use. Why should they not do this? Have they not acted upon this principle for two hundred years? Is the occupation of these churches by those who have always owned them a sufficient reason for refusing fraternity with the Methodist Episcopal Church?

The Baltimore Conference unitedly adhered North in 1844, but, during the excitements of the war, a majority of the ministers met in Virginia and resolved to secede in a body, and yet claimed to remain as a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and under this pretense held the records of the conference and the churches and parsonages. They were "out" on national questions, but always "in" when

a bit of property was to be had. Only a minority of the people, however, went with them. In 1866 the Southern General Conference in New Orleans received these ministers, who still claimed to be a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and as such held the property, as a Conference, into the Church South, on the "Plan of Separation" of 1844, twenty years after the "Plan" would have been dead if originally adopted on the Southern idea. The whole transaction, from first to last, was supremely absurd, and would be merely ludicrous but for the serious consequences in the form of schism that attended the farce. It is on the basis of the action of the seceding portion of this Conference that the Southern Church now claims our property in Virginia and Maryland. These brethren held that they formed a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and so kept the property; at the same time they were an independent Conference, and finally united with the Church South, still holding the property either as a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or under the "Plan" of 1844! That is, they were an independent Conference and in both Churches at the same time. That was independence with a vengeance. If the Methodist Episcopal Church does not object to fraternity, because of this entanglement, why should the Church South?

On the principles held by the New Orleans General Conference, and advocated by Dr. Myers in reference to the Baltimore Conference, every church, parsonage, and school-house in the Southern Holston Conference before the war; that is, in East Tennessee,

Western North Carolina, and South-western Virginia now belongs to the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Northern Church, so-called. And yet, for the sake of peace and "fraternity," our people have given up this property all over that country, while the Church South holds ours in the other States. On the same basis a large amount of property in other portions of Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama, now belongs to us, but our people do not claim or use it, or cause any trouble or confusion in the matter. The principle governing the Southern Church on the property question has been, that they have the property in all cases. And yet they accuse us of taking their property! When? where? how? Why should the Southern Church object to fraternity on the property question, if the Methodist Episcopal Church does not?

Dr. Myers here gives us the platform of the Southern Church on fraternity so plainly that it can not be misunderstood. Though there are some preachers, and a large number of members, who dissent from him, this, as we have always claimed, is the official position of the Church. This is the ground on which the *Nashville Advocate* repeatedly avows, that none of our bishops, secretaries, or others in the service of the Church in the South, can expect fraternal courtesies from the Southern Church. On this platform, with their interpretation of the "Plan," the only road to fraternity with the Southern brethren is for the Methodist Episcopal Church to leave the South. Very well, let them so decide, if they think that position to be commendable.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has not only offered formal and official fraternity to the Church South, but its ministers and people are every-where fraternal toward that body. And they purpose so to continue, but not to desert their friends, or to leave the work in the South undone. The author of the "Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church" says that is an effort in behalf of fraternity. If so, that is a commodity which is dear at any price, and for which the Methodist Episcopal Church will not be willing to pay very liberally.

We believe in, and the Methodist Episcopal Church holds to, fraternity among all Christian people, on Christian principles, for Christian purposes, at all times and under all circumstances. This is our platform. Which is most in harmony with the Gospel, the reader may judge.

In the foregoing paragraphs one fact has been stated, that is, "The border is obliterated." So one would suppose from the proceedings of the Southern Church from 1844 to 1848, and from reading the boundaries of the conferences in the Discipline of that denomination, from which it will be seen that every General Conference held by the M. E. Church South has disregarded the line of division indicated in 1844; and yet that Church can not, or will not, fraternize with the Methodist Episcopal Church now in 1876, thirty years after they have butchered and buried the "Plan" except on the *basis* of the "Plan of Separation," which alone has designated or indicated the border now "obliterated!" According to him, the "border" is not, and yet is, at the same time.

With the hope of establishing friendly relations between these two branches of Methodism, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Brooklyn, in May, 1872, adopted the following report on fraternity, to wit:

“The Committee on the State of the Church, to which were referred sundry petitions, memorials, and resolutions respecting our relations with the M. E. Church South, respectfully reports:

“We believe that very generally there has hitherto existed among our people a disposition of good will and Christian fraternity toward the M. E. Church South. This disposition and purpose we still hold and maintain. In whatever degree of success in preaching the Gospel, edifying believers, and saving souls, God has given to that Church, we devoutly rejoice; and we will continue to pray for the prosperity and success of the labors of our brethren of that Church, and for its increase in all spiritual and temporal good; and in all our labors, in proximity to the local Churches and societies of that body, we desire to maintain with them relations of Christian good-will.

“Respecting whatever intercourse there has been between us and them since the beginning of the separate existence of the M. E. Church South, we do not propose to say any thing at this time. We are content to let past events go into history or be forgotten, as the case may be; and, recognizing that Church and its people as a portion of the great Christian Methodist family, we wish them abundant success in their efforts to promote the cause of Christ and his Gospel.

“Within the parts of the country in which the M. E. Church South has nearly all its membership and institutions, to wit: all the States formerly known as slave States, except Maryland and Delaware, over three hundred thousand of our members reside, with their houses of worship, institutions of learning, and other Church arrangements.

“Our Church is as really settled in that region as in any other part of the land; and every consideration of good faith to our own people, and of regard to the integrity of our Church, and especially of the unmistakable evidences of the favor of God toward our efforts there, forbids the thought of relaxing

our labors in that part of our work. We must therefore continue to occupy that part of the country in perpetuity; and we have need to strengthen and re-enforce our work in it as God shall give us the means and the opportunities. But in all this we desire to avoid all unfriendly rivalries with our brethren of the Church South. There is abundant room for both us and them, and God may use both of these Churches for the promotion of his cause in these parts.

“ To place ourselves in the truly fraternal relations toward our Southern brethren which the sentiments of our people demand, and to prepare the way for the opening of formal fraternity with them, be it hereby

“ ‘*Resolved*, That this General Conference will appoint a delegation, consisting of two ministers and one layman, to convey our fraternal greetings to the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, at its next ensuing session.’ ” (Journal of the General Conference, 1872, pp. 402-3.)

After a brief discussion, this report was adopted by a rising vote, all of the bishops asking the privilege of rising with the Conference, and but two voting in the negative. Another part of the report was as follows, to wit:

“Your committee have also investigated the subject of Church property in dispute between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South; and believing that no rule can be prescribed in advance that will apply with justice in all cases, we therefore recommend the following action by the General Conference :

“ 1. *Resolved*, That where conflicting claims exist to the same Church property, we advise that they be adjusted as speedily as possible by negotiation, compromise, or arbitration, by the parties more immediately interested, upon principles of equity and Christian charity.

“ 2. *Resolved*, That the General Conference appoint a Board of three Commissioners to meet a similar Board to be appointed by the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, who shall agree upon some uniform principles or plan of adjustment.” (General Conference Daily; and Disruption, page 195.)

This portion of the report was withdrawn, as it was supposed to be unnecessary for such action to be taken. There is not a shadow of doubt that it would have been adopted by a majority of at least three-fourths, had it been supposed desirable. Dr. Myers seeks to make capital out of this non-action, by representing that the General Conference was not willing to meet the property question fairly. As the Holston Conference is the only one in the connection against which the Southern Church has complained in this particular, though newspaper writers have made many unfounded charges in other places, and as this Conference took similar action in 1869, there is no ground for these assumptions. Apprehending that such use would be made of the course pursued, the writer favored the adoption of these resolutions, for the purpose of demonstrating to the world that the Methodist Episcopal Church was ready to hear and consider every thing that the Southern brethren had to say upon the subject, if for no other reason.

The fraternal delegates appointed by the bishops, as provided for by the General Conference, were, Albert Hunt, D. D., of New York; Charles H. Fowler, D. D., of Chicago; and General Clinton B. Fisk, of St. Louis. They visited the General Conference, held in Louisville in May, 1874, and were favored with all of the courtesy and marked attention that they, or the Church, could have desired. They were received by the Conference on the 8th, Bishop Doggett being in the chair. The Committee on Introductions escorted the messengers to the platform, and introduced them to the Chair. Dr. Hunt was

introduced by Leroy M. Lee, D. D. ; Dr. Fowler, by Jas. E. Evans, D. D.; and General Fisk, by Mr. Simpson Bobo. The Chair introduced them to the bishops and to Dr. Lovick Pierce, and presented their credentials, as follows:

“To the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, to assemble in Louisville, Ky., in May, 1874:

“REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,—The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at its session in Brooklyn, New York, in 1872, adopted the following preamble and resolution:

“‘To place ourselves in the truly fraternal relation toward our Southern brethren which the sentiments of our people demand, and to prepare the way for the opening of formal fraternity with them, be it hereby

“*Resolved*, That this General Conference will appoint a delegation, consisting of two ministers and one layman, to convey our fraternal greetings to the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, at its next session.’

“In carrying out this resolution the General Conference made it the duty of the bishops to appoint the delegates for which it provides.

“In pursuance of this action the Board of Bishops have appointed Rev. Albert S. Hunt, D. D., Rev. Charles H. Fowler, D. D., and General Clinton B. Fisk, said delegates.

“The Board of Bishops also directed the undersigned, the senior members of said Episcopal Board, to furnish said delegates with proper credentials.

“We therefore hereby certify that the three brethren above named have been duly appointed, by the authority of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, delegates to bear the ‘fraternal greeting’ of the said General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the General Conference of the M. E. Church South.

EDMUND S. JANES,	} <i>Committee.</i>
LEVI SCOTT,	
MATTHEW SIMPSON,	
EDWARD R. AMES,	

“NEW YORK, April 20, 1874.”

The Chair then addressed the Conference as follows:

“BRETHREN OF THE CONFERENCE,—On yesterday you set this hour for receiving the delegates from the Methodist Episcopal Church. They are now present with us, and I have the pleasure of introducing them to you.”

The delegates then severally addressed the Conference with eloquence and much ability, and acceptably alike to the General Conference and to those who had sent them upon this errand of Christian love. The addresses were published in full by the Methodist papers of the North and South at the time, and need not be repeated here. Upon the receipt of the news of this reception, the writer, then editor of the *Methodist Advocate*, wrote the following, which appeared in that paper of May 20, 1874. It is given here, not to show his personal views and uniform course upon this question, but because it indicates also the position of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South in relation to the fraternal movement:

“If one were to judge from the reception given our fraternal messengers at Louisville, he would say that fraternity between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South is an accomplished fact. We hope that this will prove to be the case, though it is not difficult to see that there are members in the General Conference, at Louisville, who will find it easy to decline these Christian salutations. The Conference, we trust, will respond in the same cordial, brotherly spirit in which it was addressed, though it may possibly reiterate the often

pronounced bill of charges against us, and stand by the *ex parte* interpretation of the so-called "Plan of Separation," which has been given by some. But we look for advanced ideas and a fraternal spirit from this General Conference.

"Our representatives acquitted themselves nobly. They were sent to bear the Christian greetings of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the M. E. Church South. They did this admirably. They were not commissioned to treat about Church property, organic union, the true meaning and intent of the action of the General Conferences of 1844 or 1848, or any thing else. This was needless until the way is opened to do this in a practical, brotherly manner. If the Church South is ready to enter into friendly relations, we are not only ready, but waiting, to do so. The Christian world can not mistake our sincerity or frank avowal of good feeling toward that Church, or readiness to do full justice in any matter of controversy with that body. If there are reasons in the mind of the General Conference why we should not be treated as a part of the Christian family, we shall now be explicitly informed of the fact. And we say, without hesitation, that nothing which Christian people, as a whole, would demand of us, will be left undone to bring about a better state of things. We hope now to be spared the spectacle of further needless strife and bitter feeling between those who should be one in aim and effort.

"Some will ask, How is this movement likely to affect us in the South? It is right to be courteous under all circumstances. Then let us cultivate this

grace at whatever cost. On general principles, however, we have no doubt that we shall find the course of liberality and love toward our brethren of the Church South morally remunerative. This visitation to Louisville will help us, because it is a demonstration of the Christian spirit and purpose of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South. The people must some time recognize this fact. The fraternal greeting at Louisville can not be so far misconstrued as to make upon the public mind other than a favorable impression in our behalf. If by chance it could and should be used against us in any direction, still, we, as a Church, have done a right thing, in the right way, at the right time, and we are willing to leave final results with God and the people.

“That we are gratified with the present aspect of the case may be supposed, but the measure of that gladness is not easy to determine. It is a triumph, not of one Methodism over the other, or of Methodism alone as a whole, but of Christian love over pride of opinion, of principle over prejudice, of manliness over meanness on both sides; and the Church South will share in the benefits of the occasion according to the cordiality of the reciprocity given.

“When this paper was started, it was outspoken in favor of opening fraternal relations with the Church South, and it has never faltered on this line. The end, now apparently so near, was then seen as plainly as at the present, though whether it should be realized now, four years hence, or forty years afterward, was uncertain. The principle was right, and, because right, was sure to win at some time.

Of this we have not lost hope for a day. When attacked, we have defended our cause (always being on the defensive), not running from the challenge to battle when that was the only resort for truth and manhood. If we have said plain things of matters pertaining to that Church, their power has not been in their want of correctness. If we have held the sword toward brethren of that communion, it was not only drawn in defense, but carried in the left hand, while the right bore to them the olive branch. Our right-hand blows have always been reserved for sin in some of its forms. But enough of this.

“If the General Conference at Louisville shall respond to our overtures with a cordiality outstripping ourselves, and laying us under obligations by their wisdom and goodness, no one will be more prompt or hearty in recognizing their magnanimity than the editor of this paper. If it choose another course, the responsibility does not rest with us. In either case our course in the South is plain. Wherever the Church South treats us with courtesy, we will accept the favor with thankfulness, and push on our work. If it does otherwise, we will be the same as before, just, considerate, charitable always, and push on the work in any circumstance. May the Lord help both Churches to pursue such a course as shall result in the greatest good to all people!”

The matter was referred to a committee, but, before that was ready to report, the fraternal visitors took their leave of the body, with renewed expressions of friendship. On this occasion, May 13th, the following resolutions, offered by Judge Jackson, of

Georgia, and Governor Trusten Polk, of Missouri, were read:

“Resolved, That the message of love and brotherly kindness from the Methodist Episcopal Church has been cordially received, and has been referred to a Committee of Nine, who will, in due time, formally and fraternally reply thereto.

“Resolved, That we regret that the distinguished messengers sent by the Church can not remain to await the presentation and reception of that report, but, understanding that they leave us to-day, we are unwilling that they should return home without carrying with them the knowledge of our appreciation of their courteous and fraternal bearing among us, and our wishes and prayers for their future happiness and prosperity.

“F. W. Earnest suggested the word ‘Christian’ instead of ‘courteous.’

“Judge Jackson accepted the word ‘Christian,’ but retained ‘courteous’ also.

“Dr. Granberry said he highly approved the spirit of the resolution, but objected to the form. It should read ‘whereas,’ etc., ‘we therefore give,’ etc.

“Judge Jackson: ‘I am utterly indifferent as to language. I desire simply to show to the world that we let nobody be above us in courtesy and fraternal love; and I wish to express to the whole Christian brotherhood from whom these brethren are sent, and to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, that we respect their greetings as children of him who we are told is love.’

“Dr. Sehon said: ‘I know the importance and responsibility of this hour. The adoption of that resolution is due to our distinguished visitors, to the occasion which brought them to us as a General Conference. The appearance of this Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church has brought an hour which my soul has long desired to see. I pray the blessing of God upon them as a member of the old fraternity; and, as a member of the new, I rejoice at any omen of peace and good feeling. It is the demand of the age, of the period in which we live, and of our glorious religion, that we extend to them a fraternal hand. I say nothing of differences. Let the future take care of itself. Let us now extend to them our hands in Christian fraternity.’

“Dr. Sehon’s remarks were received with great applause.

“Dr. Edwards, Dr. Lee, Judge Brown, and Dr. S. M. Anderson made eloquent speeches in support of the resolution, the last named being interrupted with cries of ‘Vote!’ ‘Vote!’ and the resolutions were adopted.” (General Conference Daily.)

The departing Commissioners then addressed the Conference and bade the brethren a Christian farewell. In giving the above in the *Methodist Advocate*, May 20, 1874, the writer said, “We publish this with devout thanksgiving to God for this auspicious day.”

The committee presented their report on the 23d of May, and a lengthy and animated discussion occurred, occupying the morning and afternoon session, a portion of the members desiring simply to exchange fraternal greetings without reference to past differences; others, and the majority, saw otherwise. The report was returned to the committee and slightly modified and rearranged, and was then adopted by a vote of 109 to 61. We give the report as adopted:

“The committee to whom was referred the matter of the fraternal greetings, conveyed to this General Conference by delegates duly commissioned from the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, respectfully report:

“We have considered the action of the General Conference of that Church at its session in Brooklyn, New York, in May, 1872, and which is partially incorporated in the certificate of the delegates, in the following terms, to wit:

“‘To place ourselves in the truly fraternal relations toward our Southern brethren which the sentiments of our people demand, and to prepare the way for the opening of formal fraternity with them; be it hereby

“‘*Resolved*, That this General Conference will appoint a delegation, consisting of two ministers and one layman, to convey our fraternal greetings to the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, at its next ensuing session.’

“On Friday, May 8th, this delegation, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Albert S. Hunt, the Rev. Dr. C. H. Fowler, and General Clinton B. Fisk, having announced their presence, were formally received, and their communications heard by the Conference.

“It is with pleasure that we bear testimony to the distinguished ability, and the eloquent and courteous manner, in which these Christian brethren discharged their trust. Their utterances warmed our hearts. Their touching allusions to the common heritage of Methodist history, to our oneness of doctrines, polity, and usage, and their calling to mind the great work in which we are both engaged for the extension of the kingdom of their Lord and ours, stirred within us precious memories.

“We are called upon, by the terms of the action of their General Conference, to consider measures necessary ‘to prepare the way for the opening of formal fraternity.’ Every transaction and utterance of our past history pledges us to regard favorably, and to meet promptly, this initial response to our long expressed desire.

“It is admissible to review briefly what has been done or attempted by us in this direction. Our General Conference of 1846 resolved, by a rising and unanimous vote, that Dr. Lovick Pierce be, and is hereby, delegated to visit the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to be held in Pittsburg, May 1, 1848, to tender to that body the Christian regards and salutations of the General Conference of the M. E. Church South.’ In pursuance of this action, Dr. Pierce, duly commissioned, was present at the seat of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and by a note courteously advised them of his errand. The answer of that body was a unanimous vote, declaring that ‘there are serious questions and difficulties existing between the two bodies;’ and they did ‘not consider it proper, at present, to enter into fraternal relations with the M. E. Church South.’ Had our delegate been received and allowed a hearing, a more definite understanding might have been obtained of those ‘serious questions and difficulties,’ and the result, we think, would have been in the interest of peace. He closed his letter to the General Conference, on receiving a copy of its action, in these words: ‘You will therefore regard this communication as final on the part of the M. E. Church South. She can never renew the offer of fraternal relations

between the two great bodies of Wesleyan Methodists in the United States. But the proposition can be renewed at any time, either now or hereafter, by the Methodist Episcopal Church. And if ever made upon the basis of the Plan of Separation, as adopted by the General Conference of 1844, the Church South will cordially entertain the proposition.' He reported the failure of his mission to our General Conference in St. Louis in 1850, which, thereupon, adopted the following :

“‘*Resolved*, That we will steadfastly adhere to the ground taken in the last communication of our delegate to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Pittsburg, in May, 1848, to wit: That we can not, under their act of rejection and refusal, renew our offer of fraternal relations and intercourse; but will, at all times, entertain any proposition coming from the Methodist Episcopal Church to us, whether it be by written communication or delegation, having for its object friendly relations, and predicated of the rights granted to us by the Plan of Separation adopted in New York in 1844.’

“Here the matter rested until May, 1869, when the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church opened negotiations with our bishops, at their annual meeting in St. Louis, inviting them to ‘confer’ as to ‘the propriety, practicability, and methods of reunion.’ Our bishops respectfully declined to consider that subject, but invited their attention to one having precedence—the cultivation of fraternal relations. They suggested the removal of causes of strife; and this was done in a manner and spirit that met the hearty approval of our Church. They reaffirmed the position in which Dr. Pierce had left the matter, saying, ‘The words of our rejected delegate have been ever since, and still are, our words.’

“One passage of this correspondence we quote. The Northern bishops, in their letter, used these words: ‘That the great cause which led to the separation from us of both the Wesleyan Methodists of this country and of the M. E. Church South has passed away.’ To which the Southern bishops replied :

“‘We can not think you mean to offend us, when you speak of our having separated from you; and put us in the same category with a small body of schismatics who were always an acknowledged secession. Allow us, in all kindness, brethren, to remind you, and to keep the important fact of his-

tory prominent, that we separated from you in no sense in which you did not separate from us. The separation was by compact, and mutual; and nearer approaches to each other can be conducted, with hope of a successful issue, only on this basis.'

"A deputation visited our General Conference of 1870, at Memphis proposing to treat with us, in the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the subject of union. They were received and heard with great respect. But it appeared, upon due inquiry, that they were not commissioned to us by their General Conference—the only body with which we can treat, on Connectional interests. Nevertheless, the General Conference referred their communication to a committee, whose report, unanimously adopted, contained these resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the action of our bishops in their last annual meeting in St. Louis, in response to the message of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has the full indorsement of this General Conference, and accurately defines our position in reference to any overtures which may proceed from that Church, having in them an official and proper recognition of this body.

"*Resolved*, moreover, That if this distinguished Commission were fully clothed with authority to treat with us for union, it is the judgment of this Conference that the true interests of the Church of Christ require and demand the maintenance of our separate and distinct organization.

"*Resolved*, That we tender to the Rev. Bishop E. S. Janes, and the Rev. W. L. Harris, D. D., the members of the Commission now with us, our high regards, as brethren beloved in the Lord, and express our desire that the day may soon come when proper Christian sentiments and fraternal relations between the two great branches of Northern and Southern Methodism shall be permanently established.'

"Thus stood the case when the distinguished delegates of the Methodist Episcopal Church, duly authorized by their General Conference of 1872, brought us their fraternal greetings. We hail them with pleasure, and embrace the opportunity at length afforded us of entering into negotiations to secure tranquillity and fellowship to our alienated communions upon a permanent basis, and alike honorable to all.

"We deem it proper, for the attainment of the object sought, to guard against all misapprehension. Organic union is not

involved in fraternity. In our view of the subject, the reasons for the separate existence of these two branches of Methodism are such as to make corporate union undesirable and impracticable. The events and experiences of the last thirty years have confirmed us in the conviction that such a consummation is demanded by neither reason nor charity. We believe that each Church can do its work and fulfill its mission most effectively by maintaining an independent organization. The causes which led to the division in 1844, upon a Plan of Separation mutually agreed upon, have not disappeared. Some of them exist in their original form and force, and others have been modified but not diminished.

“The size of the connection, and the extent of territory covered by it, had produced on some thoughtful minds, before the events of 1844, the impression that separation would be convenient, and otherwise advantageous. The General Conference, upon any proper basis of representation, was becoming too unwieldy for the ends originally designed. If this reason was of force then, it is more conclusive now. The membership of the M. E. Church South exceeds six hundred thousand; our Northern brethren have more than twice that number. Our General Conference is now composed of nearly three hundred ministers and laymen; theirs is proportionately larger.

“It will be remembered that the last formal deliverance of the Southern representatives, in the united General Conference, was a protest against the power claimed for, and exercised by, that highest judicatory of the Church. The Northern members, who were a controlling majority, claimed for it prerogatives which seemed to us both dangerous and unconstitutional. In their view the General Conference is supreme. Although restricted in the exercise of its power by a constitution, it is the judge of the restrictions, and is thus practically unlimited. In our view, the General Conference is a body of limited powers. It can not absorb the functions of other and co-ordinate branches of the Church government, and there are methods by which all constitutional questions may be brought to a satisfactory issue. Each Church still maintains its own construction of these fundamental questions. They are not theoretical merely, but very practical in their bearing. Were the two Methodisms organically united, it would lead to serious collision, and expose the minority to harassing legislation, if not to oppression.

“The existence of slavery in the Southern States furnished an occasion, with its connected questions, fruitful of disturbance; and to this the division has been mainly attributed. The position of Southern Methodism on that subject was Scriptural. Our opinions have undergone no change. We held ourselves in readiness to carry the Gospel to the bond and to the free. Missions to the slaves constituted a large part of our work. Many of our ministers labored in this field, and much of our means was expended on it. These labors were eminently owned of God. At the beginning of the late war, a quarter of a million of negroes were in the communion of our Church, and thousands of their children were receiving catechetical instruction. The societies organized in the Southern States during the last ten years by our Northern brethren, and the members which swell their statistics, are made up largely of those who in slavery had been converted by our instrumentality. The colored preachers, exhorters, and class-leaders, by whom they have principally carried on their Southern work, and some of whom have been counted worthy of seats in their annual and General Conferences, were Christianized and trained under our ministry in other days. Following the indications of Providence we have, without abandoning this work, adapted our methods to the changed condition of the descendants of the African race in the midst of us. Many of them had been drawn away from us by appliances that we were not prepared to counteract, but a remnant remained. At their request, we have set off our colored members into an independent ecclesiastical body with our own creed and polity. We have turned over to them the titles and possession of the Church property formerly held by us for their use and benefit, and we propose to continue to them such moral and material aid as we are able to give.

“This method has met with encouraging success. We believe it to be the best for both races. They have now fifteen annual conferences, four bishops, 607 traveling preachers, 518 local preachers, 74,799 members, 535 Sunday-schools, 1,102 Sunday-school teachers, and 49,955 Sunday-school scholars. They dwell in the land side by side with us, and between us and them exist the kindest relations.

• “Our Northern brethren have pursued a different plan, and they seem to be committed to it by honest and conscientious

convictions. They have mixed conferences, mixed congregations, and mixed schools. We do not ask them to adopt our plan. We could not adopt theirs.

“We refer to these things in order that our position may not be attributed, by any, to prejudice, resentment, or other motives unworthy of Christians.

“But, while we are clear and final in our declarations against the union of the two Methodisms, we welcome measures looking to the removal of obstacles in the way of amity and peace. The existence of these obstacles is generally known, and they are frankly recognized in the addresses of of the delegates sent to us.

“Our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church will, we trust, appreciate our uniform and frequent reference to the Plan of Separation. No adjustment can be considered by us that ignores it. By that Plan we hold all our church-houses, cemeteries, school-buildings, and other property acquired before the division. Under it we claimed and recovered our portion of the common fund in the Book Concerns of New York and Cincinnati.

“When its validity was denied by our Northern brethren, and the share of the common property inuring to us under it was withheld by them, the Plan of Separation was taken for ultimate adjudication to the Supreme Court of the United States, and that highest civil tribunal, without a dissenting voice, affirmed its validity, and our rights under it.

“When the representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church asserted before that tribunal that they were the original Church, and that we were a secession, the Court said:

“‘It can no more be affirmed, either in point of fact or of law, that they are traveling preachers in connection with the Methodist Church as originally constituted, since the division, than of those in connection with the Church South. Their organization covers but about half of the territory embraced within that of the former Church; and includes within it but a little over two-thirds of the traveling preachers. Their General Conference is not the General Conference of the old Church, nor does it represent the interest, or possess territorially the authority, of the same; nor are they the body under whose care this fund was placed by its founders. It may be admitted that, within the restricted limits, the organization and authority are

the same as the former Church; but the same is equally true in respect to the organization of the Church South.'

"When the same parties attempted to set aside the Plan of Separation, on the ground that it was made without proper authority, the Court said:

" 'But we do not agree that this division was made without the proper authority. On the contrary, we entertain no doubt that the General Conference of 1844 was competent to make it; and that each division of the Church, under the separate organization, is just as legitimate, and can claim as high a sanction, ecclesiastical and temporal, as the Methodist Episcopal Church first founded in the United States. The same authority which founded that Church in 1784 has divided it, and established two separate and independent organizations, occupying the place of the old one.'

"However others may regard that instrument, the Plan of Separation is too important in its application to our status and security to be lightly esteemed by us. If it should be said that its provisions touching territorial limits have been violated by both parties, we have this to say: We are ready to confer with our Northern brethren on that point. A joint commission, having this feature of the compact under revision, might reach a solution mutually satisfactory.

"Measures, preparatory to formal fraternity, would be defective that leave out of view questions in dispute between the Methodist Episcopal Church and ourselves. These questions relate to the course pursued by some of their accredited agents while prosecuting their work in the South, and to property which has been taken and held by them to this day, against our protest and remonstrance. Although feeling ourselves sorely aggrieved in these things, we stand ready to meet our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the spirit of Christian candor, and to compose all differences upon the principles of justice and equity.

"It is to be regretted that the honored representatives who bore fraternal greetings to us were not empowered also to enter upon a settlement of these vexed questions. We are prepared to take advanced steps in this direction, and, waiving any considerations which might justify a greater reserve, we will not only appoint a delegation to return the greetings so gracefully conveyed to us from the Methodist Episcopal Church, but we

will also provide for a commission, to meet a similar commission from that Church, for the purpose of settling disturbing questions.

“Open and righteous treatment of all cases of complaint will furnish the only solid ground upon which we can meet. Relations of amity are, with special emphasis, demanded between bodies so near akin. We be brethren. To the realization of this the families of Methodism are called by the movements of the times. The attractive power of the Cross is working mightily. The Christian elements in the world are all astir in their search for each other. Christian hearts are crying to each other across vast spaces, and longing for fellowship. The heart of Southern Methodism being in full accord with these sentiments, your committee submit the following resolutions for adoption:

“1. *Resolved*, That this General Conference has received with pleasure the fraternal greetings of the Methodist Episcopal Church, conveyed to us by their delegates, and that our College of Bishops be, and are hereby, authorized to appoint a delegation, consisting of two ministers and one layman, to bear our Christian salutations to their next ensuing General Conference.

“2. *Resolved*, That, in order to remove all obstacles to formal fraternity between the two Churches, our College of Bishops is authorized to appoint a commission, consisting of three ministers and two laymen, to meet a similar commission authorized by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and to adjust all existing difficulties.

“Signed, A. W. WILSON, R. W. JONES,
 L. PARKER, S. BOBO,
 A. L. P. GREEN, J. L. DE YAMPERT,
 C. W. MILLER, D. K. PITTMAN.”
 R. ALEXANDER,

(Disruption, pp. 204-10.)

A few words in reference to this report seem to be desirable. That the Methodist Episcopal Church was disappointed by it is apparent, as it was hoped that the time had come to forgive and forget the past, as the fraternal delegates and the report of 1872 hopefully intimated. But the committee reviewed the former difficulties and opened the old

wounds afresh. The report details the rejection of Dr. Pierce in 1848, which may have been a mistake, though, from the facts given in our fifth chapter, it is plain that the General Conference of that year had many reasons for the course taken. But for the complications arising from the infractions of the provisions of the report of the Committee of Nine by the South, and the difficulty in relation to the division of the Book Concern, he would have been received officially, with cordiality and rejoicing. Personally, he was treated with great courtesy and consideration.

As soon as the fate of the Confederacy seemed decided, and the way was thus opened again for the Methodist Episcopal Church throughout the South, it began to offer the hand of love and fraternity in various ways to the Southern branch. In 1869 the bishops counseled with the bishops of the Church South on the question of friendship and possible union. Their overtures were rejected. In 1870 Bishop Janes and Dr. Harris, then Missionary Secretary, visited the General Conference, at Memphis, as a deputation from a board of commissioners, appointed by the General Conference of 1868, on the subject of union among the various Methodist bodies; but they were politely told that they had no business in Memphis. With special formality and care this last delegation was appointed by order of the General Conference of 1872, and was received. This is progress, if it be slow; and though this report may, in a measure, conceal the bearing of these facts from the observation of some, it will not wholly break their force.

The report discusses the question of organic union, which seems to be irrelevant, and assumes, with the protesting delegates in 1844, that the episcopacy is a co-ordinate power in the Church, and in so far denies the supremacy of the General Conference. These points have been considered in the second chapter of this "Appeal," and need not be dwelt upon here.

In regard to slavery, the report says: "The position of Southern Methodism on that subject was Scriptural. Our opinions have undergone no change." What that position was may be seen by reference to our first chapter, especially in Rivers's "Philosophy," before its revision since the war, as it was then used in the course of study for ministers. The organization of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America, and the general treatment of the colored people, is quite in harmony with this declaration. There are many reasons for believing the statement correct.

The committee proceed to consider the "Plan of Separation." The reader is referred to the third, fourth, and fifth chapters of this "Appeal" for complete answers to this whole question.

Another grave is opened to bring out the skeleton of the property question in the South, and a commission has been appointed. If the matter can be left to disinterested arbitrators, or reach any equitable adjustment, it will give us peaceable possession of numerous churches from which we are now excluded. Our people most deeply involved in this issue (of the Holston Conference) have been offering such a commission to the Church South for years.

The dispute should be so settled, on our part, that no blame, now or hereafter, can attach to the Methodist Episcopal Church. This denomination will continue to treat that branch with courtesy, live in peace with its members, fraternize with all who are fraternal, and prosecute its work with singleness of aim and gladness of heart, thankful to the General Conference for doing so much for it, and only regretting that it did no better for itself, and trusting that all things may yet be found working together for good.

The final action of the General Conference, May 26th, the last day of the session, was most singular of all, as if the want of harmony between the reception of our delegates and the report of the committee was so apparent as to demand explanation in three resolutions, declaring that the Conference was unanimous for fraternity. This may have been well, or, as the report was adopted several days after our messengers were gone, the public might have been left in doubt upon the subject. The resolutions were as follows:

“*Whereas*, the discussions and votes of this Conference on the subject of fraternal relations with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and its cognate subjects, present the appearance of essential differences which do not exist; therefore,

“1. *Resolved*, That upon the subject of fraternal relations with the Methodist Episcopal Church, upon a proper basis, this Conference is a unit.

“2. *Resolved*, That we are also a unit upon the propriety of appointing a commission, empowered to meet a like commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church, to settle all questions of difficulty between us, and that such settlement is essential to complete fraternity.

“3. *Resolved*, That the only points of difference between us on this whole subject are the best methods of accomplishing this desired end.” (General Conference Daily.)

A minority report was also presented to the Conference, but was rejected by a vote of sixty-five for, to one hundred and three against. The minority, in their report, embodied the first paragraphs of the report of the majority down to the seventh, commencing, “It is admissible to review,” etc. Omitting the body of the report of the majority, the minority said :

“But measures preparatory to formal fraternity would be defective that leave out of view questions in dispute between the Methodist Episcopal Church and ourselves. These questions relate to the course pursued by some of their accredited agents whilst prosecuting their work in the South, and to property which has been taken and held by them to this day, against our protest and remonstrance.

“Although feeling ourselves sorely aggrieved in these things, we stand ready to meet our brothers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the spirit of Christian candor, and to compose all differences upon the principles of justice and equity.

“It is to be regretted that the honored representatives who bore fraternal greetings to us were not empowered also to enter upon a settlement of these vexed questions. We are prepared to take advanced steps in this direction, and, waiving any considerations which might justify a greater reserve, we will not only appoint a delegation to return the greeting so gracefully conveyed to us from the Methodist Episcopal Church, but we will also provide for a commission to meet a similar commission from that Church for the purpose of settling disturbing questions.

“Open and righteous treatment of all cases of complaint will furnish the only solid ground upon which we can meet. Relations of amity are with special emphasis demanded between bodies so near akin. We be brethren. To the realization of this the families of Methodism are called by the movements of the times. The attractive power of the Cross is

working mightily. The Christian elements in the world are all astir in their search for each other. Christian hearts are crying to each other across vast spaces, and longing for fellowship. The heart of Southern Methodism being in full accord with these sentiments, your committee submit the following resolutions for adoption." (General Conference Daily.)

The resolutions appended were the same as the last two which were adopted in the report of the majority. This report was signed by J. Hamilton, Samuel Register, and John E. Ryland.

The Southern Church was not asked to withdraw from the North, or to take any action whatever for the accommodation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, neither will the latter be disposed to rescind the declarations of 1848, or retire from the South. Still, ought there not to be some system of co-operation between the two? Could not something like the following be adopted by both Churches?—namely:

1. Each Church shall recognize the other as a legitimate branch of Methodism—having equal rights and privileges.

2. Each Church shall recognize in the other the right to organize and maintain societies in all lands, among all people, according to the usage and Discipline of each, irrespective of territorial limits.

3. Each Church shall receive from the other, ministers, traveling or local, in good standing, who desire to change their relations from either Church to the other, in their orders, as deacons or elders (or in the office of bishop), on their credentials, either into the Church or traveling connection, giving to those ministers thus changing their Church relations all the rights and privileges in the Church which they join that

they had in the one which they left, subject always to the Discipline and usage of the Church with which they unite.

4. Each Church shall receive by letter, from the other, members in good standing, as if coming from the same Church.

5. Each Church shall co-operate with the other in the general work of circulating the Holy Scriptures and in support of the American Bible Society.

6. Each Church shall co-operate with the other in the support of foreign missions; and the M. E. Church South shall appoint a Committee on Missions to meet and act with the Committee on Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in relation to such foreign missions as are jointly supported by both Churches.

7. Each Church shall co-operate with the other in support of the Book Concern of both Churches so far as to constitute the Book Agents of both Churches, and the editors of books and tracts at New York, Cincinnati, and Nashville, a Joint Board of Publication for both Churches, as far as may be found practicable.

8. Each Church shall appoint a Board of Education, which Boards shall meet annually together, as the Joint Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South.

9. Each Church shall appoint a Sunday-school Board, which Boards shall meet annually together, as the Joint Sunday-school Board of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South.

10. Each Church, in case of any disagreement or

dispute concerning property or otherwise, between societies or persons belonging to the two Churches, shall recommend and urge the contending parties to settle such disagreement or dispute amicably between themselves; or, if they can not do this satisfactorily to both parties, to refer the matter for arbitration, according to the provisions of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church; or, if this can not be done satisfactorily to both parties, then, the aggrieved party, in whichever Church he, or they, may hold his, or their, membership, may be considered as justified in seeking to maintain his, or their, rights of property, or otherwise, by process of law.

11. Each Church shall co-operate with the other in efforts to suppress the evils of intemperance, Sabbath-breaking, licentiousness, and other vices, and to counteract the influence of infidelity and Romanism.

12. Each Church shall co-operate with the other in maintaining peace, charity, and Christian fellowship between the members of both, and with other Methodist bodies, and among all men; and in endeavors, with other evangelical Churches, to spread Scriptural holiness over all the earth.

The first item given above is only the formal declaration of an existing fact.

The second recognizes the present condition of things between the two Churches, from which neither can be reasonably expected to recede.

The third provides for what seems to be a want already felt to exist, and for which it is desirable that provision be made.

Items four and five simply express what is now generally practiced.

The sixth suggests an arrangement which might be made serviceable in many ways, and which might apply to American Methodism as a whole.

The seventh item may not be so easy to realize, and yet if some such system of co-operation could be entered into by all of the Methodist Churches of this country, good might come of it.

Eight and nine should be carried into effect by all American Methodists at an early day.

The tenth item covers all of the existing Church property cases between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church South, and all that might arise hereafter, as well as personal difficulties between members. Is not some such arrangement needed on the part of most, if not all, of the Methodist bodies in the United States? Certainly no denomination could ask to do less than is here indicated. The moral force of such a provision would, in the nature of things, be very great—all, perhaps, that the circumstances would require.

Items eleven and twelve ought to be in full force and active operation at this time.

These several items cover most, if not all, the connectional interests of Methodism, except home missions and Church extension. Perhaps these could also be embodied in the plan, though for the present, at least, we should fear too much of denominational rivalry for harmonious actions in those interests.

Why can not the various branches of Methodism, in the United States at least, co-operate upon some

such general plan, and thus gain both the chief advantages of unity and also of denominational interest?

At least, the Methodist Episcopal Church ought not to lay itself liable to the charge of bigotry, or indicate a disposition to overlook the rights of lesser denominations. It will not do either. While vigorously maintaining its own, and doing all in its power to fulfill the mission which Christ gave to the disciples, it should continue to follow the example of the fathers in bidding God speed to all who are laboring for the same end.

In his concluding pages, Dr. Myers reaffirms his positions thus:

“The Church South has grievances to urge against her sister Church. . . . The Church South has said that it desires fraternity, ‘amity, and peace.’ It has declared what ‘basis’ for fraternal intercourse it ‘esteems altogether honorable’ to itself. If it seem over-persistent in insisting that the Plan of Separation be recognized, it is because its *legitimacy and its rights of property depend on that Plan.*” (Pages 212, 213.)

“It believes that the General Conference of 1848, overborne by the excitements of that day, hastily pronounced sentence of outlawry against it when it had no opportunity to confront its accusers. *It now appeals to the calmer judgment of the present generation of Methodists against that precipitate action.*” (Page 214.)

“If the Methodists thus addressed will hear what the Church South can offer for its justification, and, reinvestigating the case, decide that the relations of the two Methodisms may be considered to have been finally and properly settled by the decision of the Supreme Court, notwithstanding any thing to the contrary declared by its General Conference prior to that decision—then, the fundamental fact of the validity of the Plan of Separation being thus agreed upon, all other dependent questions become proper subjects for renewed negotiation, for such review and readjustment of the details of the Plan as are

suggested by the General Conference (Louisville, 1874), when it says: 'If it should be said that its provisions have been violated by both parties, we have this to say: We are ready to confer with our Northern brethren on that point. A joint commission having this feature of the compact under revision might reach a solution mutually satisfactory.' Starting with the premises above indicated, and considering every part of the Plan which may have been infringed as before the commissioners of both parties for revision, a new treaty of peace may be made, more in accord with the present political and ecclesiastical condition of affairs." (Pages 214, 215.)

These demands are so extraordinary that the perusal of the preceding pages can hardly have prepared the mind of the reader for them. In surprise it may be asked, Are these the sentiments indorsed by Dr. Summers and by the Southern bishops? It is here demanded that, as a condition of fraternity with the Southern Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, in its General Conference in 1876, shall indorse the report of the Committee of Nine of 1844, and thus approve of the whole course of the Southern Church; rescind the Declarations of 1848, and thus withdraw from the South, and approve of the decision of the Supreme Court, and of the irrelevant sentiments expressed at the time by Judge Nelson! Verily, they estimate the value of the friendship of Southern Methodists at an enormous sum. Was ever such a price paid by any Christian Church for the love of another denomination? Is not this proof positive that the Methodist *Advocate* has been correct in affirming that some in the Southern Church were endeavoring either to expel the Methodist Episcopal Church from the Southern States, or to put it in an attitude in which it would

be compelled to reject fraternal intercourse? Do they expect to make capital for the Church South, as in 1848, out of the rejection of Dr. Pierce?

As to the "legitimacy" of the M. E. Church South, it is already granted the same standing as that of Canada, which, on Dr. Myers's ground, ought to be satisfactory, as it is the most that could possibly be given; and it is as fully recognized in the United States as is the Protestant, Wesleyan, African, or any branch springing from the Methodist Episcopal Church. The position of the Southern bishops, that the Southern Church did not leave the Methodist Episcopal Church in any sense that this did not leave the Southern, can not be indorsed, because it is not true, but, on the contrary, so absurd as to appear ridiculous.

As to Church property in the South, what better assurance can the General Conference give than that to be found in its entire course since 1844?

If the Church South desires a practical system of co-operation between these denominations, why is not the one suggested above feasible and acceptable? and, if this was the object to be gained, why did the Louisville General Conference *restrict* their commissioners to a *revision of the "Plan of Separation?"* or why appoint commissioners, at this day, on the "basis" of the Southern Confederacy? Does Dr. Myers intend to say that the Southern Church holds that the validity of the "Plan of Separation," the "legitimacy" of the M. E. Church South as a separate organization, the titles to its churches and parsonages, and its existence as a Christian Church, depend upon the decision of the Supreme Court in

the case of the division of the Western Book Concern? How can a decision be so much broader than the case upon which it is made? This "basis" is of sand, and little of that. We had hoped that the Southern Church rested upon a more sure foundation. If he be correct, it is no wonder that the edifice trembles in every breeze and rocks in every storm, that it allies itself to popular favor, and is governed by public opinion. On this "basis," it lacks so much, and its wants are so essential, that no indorsement of the Methodist Episcopal Church can possibly "legitimize" it as a Christian body, or as a "separate ecclesiastical organization." Again, if the Southern Church is the "legal" Methodism of the South, as so many claim, why is it still seeking to be "legitimized" by the Methodist Episcopal Church, through a "revision" and readoption of the "Plan of Separation?" In every advancing chapter through his book, the learned author becomes more and more entangled; his last pages, by demanding the impossible, being most unfortunate of all to the cause he has in view—the defense of the Southern Church.

It would not be proper to close these pages without more specific, though very brief, reference to the interests of the colored people which are involved in the questions here discussed. Our opening chapter gives the voice of the Church against slavery and in their behalf. In 1844 they were in bondage, apparently perpetual, and their condition seemed to be hopeless; and because the Methodist Episcopal Church was the friend of freedom and of the evangelization, education, and elevation of all races, it was practi-

cally driven out of the South; and from 1844 till near the close of the war, the bitterness of the slaveholding class made it impracticable, if not impossible, to preach the Gospel of Christ, as expounded by John Wesley, on slave soil, except along the borders of free territory. The most that could be done by Christians in the North for the slave population was to offer prayer for divine mercy and interposition in their behalf, which they did continually. But as the armies of the Union wrested different portions of the South from the grasp of the Confederacy, the Gospel minister and the Christian teacher from the North kept pace with the soldier, and made heroic and successful efforts to save this people from immorality and ignorance. In this mission the Methodist Episcopal Church followed the example of the blessed Savior, and of the founder of Methodism. Its missionaries shunned no hardships and feared no dangers while laboring in behalf of these outcasts. When reviled, they closed their ears to the jeers of the corrupt and to the sneers of the haughty, and moved on in their work of mercy. When persecuted, they breasted the storm and doubled their diligence. The murder of Randolph in South Carolina, Trammel in Alabama, and of Julia Hayden in Tennessee, instead of intimidating others, made them more determined to adhere to the cause, though, like these, it bring them to the crowns of martyrs. As the defender of their rights and a helper in time of need, the "John Wesley Church," true to its "original" principles, has been a wall of protection to the people of color. Since the proclamation of

emancipation was issued, it has had a high and most holy purpose not to be outdone in efforts to evangelize and educate these millions.

Conference has been added to conference till this Church has come within reach of all. The Washington Conference extended into Virginia, and has covered that State and accomplished great things for this race. In South Carolina, labor among them began before the noise of battle had ceased, and the results already achieved are a delight and a wonder to the philanthropist. The North Carolina Conference was organized with white ministers, whose labors were mostly among the white people, but, true to Christ and to a genuine Methodism, they did not neglect the lowly; and now, in this branch of service, the gap between Virginia and South Carolina is fully and forever closed. Florida has been occupied by these evangelists, and the harvest is yielding well. Along the Mississippi, down to New Orleans, and west throughout Texas, a similar work has been wrought. The conferences in the center, organized mostly or wholly among the whites, have been zealous in behalf of the colored people, and God has graciously blessed them both.

The old Church can not be spared by either. It pledged itself to its adherents in the South in 1848, when they were few and scattered, and hedged about with almost insurmountable barriers. Surely, now that they are counted by the hundred thousand of both races, and occupy one of the most promising fields ever open to missionary enterprise, it will not desert those who have made their way to its altars

through persecution, and whose bleeding feet have marked the path of its progress. No, it can not desert its adherents in the South, of either race, to win the fraternal favor of a sister Church. Remember Samson and the loss of his locks, wherein was his great strength. The fraternity of men is good, but faithfulness to duty is better, and the favor of God best. With that the Church can succeed.

From the facts set forth in the foregoing pages, it is concluded:

1. That the Methodist Episcopal Church has not divided itself into two bodies, a "Church North" and a "Church South," as has been taught by the Southern Church; and that the Supreme Court had no right or authority so to represent or even intimate.

2. That it exists now, as it always has existed, a unit; and that it now occupies all of the States and Territories of the American Union by right, with all of the protection and privileges enjoyed by other Christian denominations.

3. That the General Conference of 1848 violated no compact or agreement in extending Church fellowship to adherents of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South.

4. That it has not forfeited the respect and good will of Christian people in the South, or elsewhere, by injustice to Bishop Andrew, violation of obligations, or otherwise.

5. That in a large portion of the South it has been reorganized, in response to the demands of the times and the requests of the native white population in sympathy with its principles.

6. That its position in regard to slavery and the rights of all men is that of the Bible, of John Wesley, and of the original Methodist Episcopal Church.

7. That the interests of the colored people require the presence and labors of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, with its ideas and resources, not, however, as a Colored Church, but the Church of the people, providing for all, both white and colored.

8. That the Methodist Episcopal Church is needed in the South to set the example, and inculcate the lesson, of fidelity to the Government of the United States, according to the twenty-third Article of Religion, in both Churches.

9. That it is needed in the South to disseminate a broader charity and fraternal fellowship among Christians than has heretofore prevailed in this portion of our common country.

10. That it has a mission here in diffusing a more earnest evangelism, a higher type of morality, and a Christian sentiment in relation to temperance and general education, as elements of a genuine Methodism.

11. That the Methodist Episcopal Church therefore can not indorse the so-called "Plan of Separation" of 1844, nor rescind the declarations of the General Conference of 1848, nor approve of sentiments expressed by Judge Nelson in the Supreme Court of the United States, when giving a decision upon the Western Book Concern case, intended to debar the Methodist Episcopal Church from its constitutional right to preach the Gospel in the South.

12. That, however desirable in itself, the Methodist Episcopal Church can not barter the rights of its members for the fraternal favors of the M. E. Church South.

It is to be regretted that the Southern Church has made such extravagant demands; but, while the closing words of "The Disruption" propose to regard the Methodist Episcopal Church as a "heathen man and a publican," unless it yields to these exactions, the old Church will continue to love its enemies, to do good to all men, and to spread Scriptural holiness over these lands.

INDEX.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
ATTITUDE on Slavery.....	29	Bishops, Southern, on Slavery.....	52
Dr. Myers on.....	43, 44	Address in 1865.....	284
Advocate, Southern, quoted.....	282,	Address in 1866.....	288
283, 291, 294, 295, 300, 301, 308		Bishops of Methodist Episcopal	
Abolitionism, Resolutions against... 43		Church, Address in 1864.....	277
Growth of.....	47	On the Plan.....	200
In Tennessee.....	48	Observance of the Line.....	200
African Slave-trade, referred to... 51, 52		Resolutions on.....	200
Bishops on.....	54	Report on Infractions.....	214
Address of Southern Bishops, on		Always elected.....	96
Slavery.....	52	Not to hold Slaves.....	115, 133
In 1865.....	284	Their Notes on Discipline..	109, 111
In 1866.....	288	British Primitive.....	104
Address to the South, June 11, 1844.. 190		Ordained by Elders.....	103, 109, 110
Of Bishops of Methodist Epis-		British Conference and Dr. Coke... 102	
copal Church, 1864.....	277	Boundary of Southern Church. 196, 236.	
Of Bishop Clark at Athens.. 325, 336		Repudiated.....	304, 317
Pastoral of 1800.....	36	Baltimore Conference invaded..... 208	
Andrew, Bishop, Case stated..... 44, 81		Report of 1848.....	208
Dr. Myers on.....	84	Report of 1862.....	306
Was he deposed?.....	86	Bishops Report on.....	214
Law in Case of.....	114	Adhered North.....	382
To buy Slaves of.....	115	Divided in 1861.....	383
Proceedings, regular.....	121, 123	Church Property.....	383
Resolutions on.....	87, 175	On Slavery.....	43
Calls a Meeting.....	282	Independent.....	305
Chapel, Cincinnati.....	219	Report in 1866.....	308
Asbury, Bishop, elected.....	96	Goes South.....	313
Elected before 1784.....	97	On Church Property.....	311
Decision on Episcopacy.....	112	Border Obliterated.....	385
Angel of the Church.....	108		
Accomac County, Va., invaded..... 205		CHRISTMAS Conference on Slavery. 32	
Alexandria, Church at..... 103, 109, 110		Compromise, Dr. Smith on.....	40
Alabama opened.....	366	None made.....	42, 130
Abrogation of Line by Church		Church South, on Slavery. 49, 50, 52, 55	
South.....	304, 317	On Slavery not changed.....	79, 400
		Bishops.....	52
BASCOM, Bishop, on Slavery.....	48	Report, 1858.....	50
Bishop, no Slave-holder elected. 44,		Responsible for Division.....	171, 194
46, 126		Not established by Law.....	264

PAGE.	PAGE.
Church South, Origin of..... 270	Centenary of Methodism..... 280
On National Issues..... 272	Contract, Parties to..... 179
Violated the Plan..... 202, 241	DEDICATION, Dr. Myers's..... 23
Reorganization of..... 282, 284, 288	Discipline, Notes on..... 109, 111
Repudiation of Line..... 304, 317	In Case of Bishop Andrew..... 114
Persecutions by..... 352	On Origin of Church South..... 270
In the North..... 374	Methodist Episcopal Church,
Demands of..... 379, 380, 412	Change, 1864..... 278
Church Property, New Orleans. 378, 382	Declaration, Southern..... 148
Stanton-Ames Order..... 378, 381	Of Nullification, 1848..... 231, 254
Holston Conference on..... 347	Division threatened, Sacraments... 160
Baltimore Conference on..... 383	Episcopacy..... 161
Independent..... 311	Canada..... 162, 256
President Johnson on..... 312	Division Unconstitutional..... 162
Southern Memorial on..... 342	On the Ground of Slavery..... 165
Churches not before Supreme Court. 267	Committee of Nine on... 156, 157, 167
Coke, Bishop, ordained..... 94	Dr. Myers on..... 171
Elected..... 95	South Responsible for..... 171, 194
And British Conference..... 102	Dr. Olin's Testimony..... 194, 222
Restricted from acting..... 102	Doggett, Dr., on Fraternity..... 291
Ordination Sermon..... 102	At Independent Baltimore Con-
Confirmation of Orders..... 113	ference..... 310
Capers's Resolution of..... 145	Resolution, Remarks..... 313
Committee of Nine, Names of..... 149	Ditzler Movement, Bishops on..... 289
Papers before..... 150	First Speech at New Orleans.... 299
Report of..... 151, 235	Farewell..... 301
Opinions of..... 156, 157, 167	Report on..... 303
Clement of Rome..... 104	Deems, Dr., on Fraternity..... 296
Choate, on Division of Funds..... 158	On receiving Baltimore Confer-
Canada, Separation of..... 162, 256	ence..... 314
Convention, New York, June 1844. 174	Delegates, Fraternal received..... 388
Address to South..... 190	Demands of Church South.. 379, 380, 412
Violated Plan..... 203	
At Louisville..... 174, 176, 203, 211	EPISCOPACY, Co-ordinate or Subor-
Contradictions, Dr. Myers's..... 144,	dinate..... 91, 135
156, 171, 263	Bascom on..... 92
Conferences invaded, Philadel-	Peck on..... 92
phia..... 204, 220	Relations of General Confer-
Baltimore..... 208, 214	ence to..... 93
Ohio..... 209, 216	Always Elective..... 96
Conferences, Mission..... 280, 367	Coke's Sermon on..... 102
Seceding, 1844..... 368	Primitive..... 104
Provided for, 1864..... 323	Jerome on..... 103, 109, 110
Clark, Bishop, Addresses at Ath-	Conference Action..... 95
ens..... 325, 336	Restrictive Rule on..... 114, 162
Curry, Dr., quoted..... 297, 323	Episcopal Address, 1844..... 112
Crews Methodists..... 366	Southern, 1858..... 52
Co-operation, Plan for..... 408	Southern, 1865..... 284
Colored People, not in Plan of	Southern, 1866..... 288
Separation..... 185	Methodist Episcopal Church,
Interest of..... 415	1864..... 277
Report on, 1834..... 279	Elders ordained the Bishops..... 103
Conclusions reached..... 318	109, 110
Final..... 418	

PAGE.	PAGE.
Ecumenical General Conference, the Last..... 144, 263	Holston Conference reorganized.... 325
Extraordinary Demands of the South..... 379, 380, 412	Bishop Clark's Addresses.... 325, 336
Early, Bishop, at Independent Balti- more Conference..... 307, 313	Session at Athens, 1865..... 328
FEALTY to our Section..... 187	Reply to Commissioners..... 347
Fraternity, Reasons against.... 377, 412	On Church Property 347
Reasons against answered..... 381, 403, 413	Southern, Memorial to General Conference..... 342
By Telegraph..... 290	Report on Confederacy..... 352
Platform of Church South... 18, 377, 380, 384, 412	Persecution by..... 358, 362
Methodist Episcopal Church. 385	Retraction..... 363
Report on 1872..... 386, 387	INTRODUCTION, Dr. Whedon's..... 7
Church South, First..... 394	Dr. Summers's..... 27
Majority..... 395	Invitation to Bishop Andrew.... 87, 175
Final..... 406	Invited South, Methodist Episcopal Church 324, 367
Minority 407	Intention to divide..... 143
Methodist Advocate on..... 390, 403	Of this Work..... 4
Fraternal Delegates received..... 388	Interpretation of Plan, Southern... 204
Sentiments in the South 390	Ignatius, Epistles of..... 105, 108
Resolutions and Expressions..... 397	Infractions of Plan 202
Visits of Bishops to St. Louis.... 379, 397, 404	General Conference Report on.. 211
To Memphis..... 380, 398, 404	Bishops' Report on..... 214
Final Report of 1848..... 241	Final Report on..... 241
Four years of Sad Experience... .. 186	JEROME on Episcopacy..... 103, 109, 110
Freedmen Report on, 1864..... 279	Judge Nelson's Sentiments. 268, 413, 419
GENERAL Conference, South, 1858.. 50	KANAWHA Districts..... 209, 216
Delegated..... 100	Circuit, Resolution..... 209
Power in Case of Bishop Andrew. 114	LOUISVILLE Convention..... 174, 176, 203, 211
Proceedings Regular..... 121, 123	Violated Plan..... 203, 211
Last Ecumenical 144, 263	Leaders in the Separation..... 189, 194
Did not divide Church..... 154, 160, 169, 174, 178	Line of Division, 1844..... 196, 236
South violated Plan..... 202, 204, 213	Lee, Dr. I. M., promoting Strife.... 206
South repudiated Plan..... 304, 317	Legal Aspect of Plan..... 263
South Interpretation of Plan.... 204	Legitimizing by Supreme Court. 266, 414
General Conference of 1848..... 224	MVERS, Dr., on Attitude of the Church 43, 45
Report on Infractions 211	On Bishop Andrew..... 84
Final Report..... 241	On Powers of General Conference. 81
Of 1828 and Canada..... 162, 256	On Plan of Separation..... 141
Of 1864..... 276	On Last Ecumenical General Conference..... 144, 263
Of 1868, Reply to Memorial..... 345	On Division of Church..... 171
Gray, Rev. Mr., mobbed..... 205	On Demands of Church South.. 379, 380, 412
HAMLIN, Speech in 1844..... 116	Contradictions..... 144, 156, 171, 263
Refused to act for Division..... 155	Misrepresentations of Hamline 156, 184
View of the Report..... 156	Durbin..... 234
Misrepresentations of..... 156, 184	
Hargis, Rev. Mr., mobbed 207	

PAGE.	PAGE.
Myers, Dr., Misrepresentations of	People of Color, Interests of..... 415
Finley and others..... 183	Report on 1864..... 279
Relations of two Methodisms.... 374	Platform of Church South on Slav-
Minutes, General, quoted... 97, 98, 100,	ery..... 49, 50, 52, 55
101, 306	Not Changed..... 79, 400
Maysville Case..... 210	On Fraternity... 18, 377, 380, 384, 412
Mission Conferences 280, 368	Of Methodist Episcopal Church
Memorial, Holston, South, to Gen-	on Fraternity..... 385, 386
eral Conference..... 342	Plan of Separation..... 141
Reply to..... 345	Dr. Myers on..... 141
Methodist Advocate on Fraternity. 390	Text of..... 151
Methodist Episcopal Church, ob-	Southern Interpretation of..... 204
served Plan..... 198	Southern Repudiation of.... 304, 317
Always on Slave Territory.. 231, 321.	Compared with Nullification..... 238
Statistics of, South..... 369	Language of..... 158
Property in the South..... 370	Did not divide the Church... 154, 167
In the South..... 322, 374	Titles of, Spurious..... 156, 160
On Fraternity..... 385, 386, 387	Hamline on..... 156
Action in 1864..... 276	Finley on..... 157
Latest over the Line..... 320	Bishop Paine on..... 157, 167
NOTES on Discipline 109, 111	Bangs on..... 157
New York, Meeting June 11, 1854.. 174	Cartwright on..... 157
On Bishop Andrew..... 87, 175	Porter on..... 157
On Address..... 190	Winans on..... 167
Northern Line of Southern Church.. 196,	Fillmore on..... 168
236	Akers on..... 169
Preachers mobbed..... 205, 207	Committee of Nine on..... 167
North, Church South in the..... 374	Peck on..... 181
Nullifications, Reasons for..... 224	Choate on..... 158
Declarations of 1848..... 231	Each Resolution Conditional.... 159
Compared with Plan..... 235	Circumstances of Adoption..... 160
Nucleus of Grievances..... 26, 377	Submitted to Annual Confer-
Nelson, Judge, Sentiments of.. 268, 413,	ences..... 169
419	Southern Delegates on..... 174
New Orleans Church Property. 378, 382	Was it a Fraud?..... 178
National Issues, Church South on.. 272	Parties to "Contract"..... 143, 179
New York Conference Telegram... 296	Does not control Churches..... 185
East Conference Telegram..... 290	Does not include the Colored... 185
Newman's Telegram..... 292, 295	Observed by the Methodist Epis-
OCCASION of Writing..... 17	copal Church..... 198
Orders, Confirmation of..... 113	Broken by Church South.... 202, 241
Olin, Dr., on Division..... 194, 222	Abrogated by Church South. 304, 317
Ohio Conference invaded..... 209, 216	Analyzed 235
Origin of Church South..... 270	Plan of Co-operation..... 408
PROLEGOMENA..... 17	Philadelphia Conference invaded.. 204,
Position taken..... 18	220
Preface of Dr. Myers..... 24	Primitive Bishops..... 104
Pastoral Address, 1800..... 36	Polycarp 105
Proceedings, Andrew, Regular. 121, 123	Parties to the Plan..... 143, 179
Philosophy, Rivers's, on Slavery ... 55	Poisal's Journey South..... 316
People of Color, not in Plan..... 185	Pierce, Dr. Lovick, in 1848..... 225
	Persecution of Union Men..... 352
	Present Relations of two Method-
	isms..... 374

PAGE.		PAGE.
149	Protest, the Southern.....	29
150	Extract from.....	30
125	Reply to.....	31
98,	QUOTATIONS from General Minutes	31
100, 101, 306		34
297, 323	Dr. Curry.....	35
282, 283, 291,	Southern Advocate.....	38
294, 295, 300, 301, 308		39
41	RULE on Slavery, suspended, 1784..	36
50	Expunged by South.....	43
114,	Rule, Restrictive, on Episcopacy..	45
161, 162		49, 50, 52, 55
162	Ministers and members.....	52
229	Vote on change of.....	52
50	Report on Slavery, 1858.....	50
151	Of Committee of Nine.....	52
347	On Church Property, Holston	50
387	Conference.....	202
386	General Conference, 1872.....	264
394, 395, 406, 407	On Fraternity, Methodist Epis-	270
241	copal Church.....	272
279	Church South... 394, 395, 406, 407	282, 284, 288
125	Final, 1848.....	282, 284
345	On Freedmen, 1864.....	304, 317
55	Reply to Southern Protest.....	318
124	Memorial.....	310
124	Rivers's Philosophy on Slavery....	315
145	Resolution, Griffith, Davis.....	116
147	Finley, Trimble.....	102
149	Capers's.....	186, 188, 390
87, 175	Paine, Smith.....	217
224	M'Ferrin.....	263, 266, 413, 419
231	On Bishop Andrew.....	322
235	Repudiation in 1848, Reasons for...	369
304,	Declarations of.....	369
317	Compared with Plan.....	365
321	Of Line by M. E. Church South.	368
325	378, 381
282, 284, 288	40
374	Reorganization begins in 1848.....	21
374	Of Holston Conference.....	321
390	Of Church South.....	296
403	Relations of the two Methodisms...	297
321	Remarks on Fraternity.....	290
	On Report on Fraternity.....	292
	Return Southward.....	292, 295
		374
	SLAVE-HOLDERS not ordained by Bal-	
43	timore Conference.....	
49	Not ordained by Tennessee Con-	
44, 126	ference.....	
	Not elected Bishop.....	
	Slavery, Attitude on.....	
	Discipline on, 1780.....	
	Discipline on, 1783.....	
	Discipline on, 1784.....	
	Discipline on, 1796.....	
	Discipline on, 1800.....	
	Discipline on, 1804 to 1844.....	
	Discipline on, 1844.....	
	Pastoral Address on, 1800.....	
	Baltimore Conference on.....	
	Dr. Myers's Position.....	
	Church South on.....	
	Expunge Rule.....	
	Report, 1858.....	
	Not changed.....	
	Southern Bishops on.....	
	Rivers's Philosophy on.....	
	Southern Church violated Plan.....	
	Not established by Law.....	
	In the North.....	
	On Fraternity... 18, 377, 380, 384, 394,	
	
	395, 406, 407	
	Origin of.....	
	Position of.....	
	Reorganization of.....	
	Meetings in 1864-5.....	
	Repudiation of Line.....	
	Over the Line in 1861-2.....	
	Sehon, Dr., at Independent Balti-	
	more Conference.....	
	Sargent, Dr., joins M. E. Church	
	South.....	
	Speech of Hamline.....	
	Sermon, Coke's Ordination.....	
	Sentiments of the South... 186, 188, 390	
	Soule Chapel, Cincinnati.....	
	Supreme Court.....	
	Southern Work in 1861.....	
	In 1875.....	
	Statistics of.....	
	Spirit of the two Churches.....	
	Seceding Conferences.....	
	Stanton-Ames Order.....	
	Smith, Dr., on Compromise.....	
	TITLE-PAGE, Dr. Myers's.....	
	The Return Southward.....	
	Telegram New York Conference... 296	
	Reply.....	
	New York East Conference.....	
	Reply.....	
	Newman's.....	
	The two Methodisms.....	

	PAGE.		PAGE.
VOTE on Change of Rule.....	229	Wesley's Appointment of What-	
Violations of Plan by South.....	202, 205, 211, 241	coat	95
WESLEY a Scriptural Bishop.....	93	His Appointment of Whatcoat	
Had no Successor.....	94	rejected	95
His Appointment of Coke.....	94	Whatcoat elected.....	95
His Appointment of Asbury.....	95	Wilson, Rev. N.....	314
		YOUNG, Rev. R. A.....	299, 300

