

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XII.—No. IV.

---

JANUARY, MDCCCLX.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE SYNOD OF DORT.

It is proposed in this article to give a brief account of the much abused Synod of Dort, its origin, doings and results. Our principal authorities are, not only Brandt, and other Arminian writers, but “Hales’ Golden Remains,” “Balcanqual’s Letters,” and, more than all, a “History of the Synod of Dort,” “drawn up and published by the authority and under the sanction of the States General, the Prince of Orange, and of the Synod itself, referring, in every part, to the public records of the transaction in question.”\*

The Confession of Faith of the Low countries, commonly called the Belgic Confession, was published in the year 1563. It accords with the confessions of the other Reformed Churches, establishing the Presbyterian form of government, and embracing all those points of doctrine which have usually been denominated Calvinistic. It was confirmed by repeated Synods, and by repeated acts of the States. Other sects were

---

\* This valuable work was translated from the Latin, by the late Rev. Thomas Scott, and is published by the Pres. Board of Publication.

statements of ancient writers, prove it to have once been a land of exuberant fertility. A great change has passed over it, but not too great for the causes which we have named fully to effect. Its present desolation, therefore, does not invalidate the truth of the Bible, which declares it once to have been a land flowing with milk and honey; a good land, eminently fertile and desirable to possess.

We may add, did the land of Palestine appear otherwise than it does, most truthfully might we look upon the Scriptures with a shade of suspicion. Has not this barrenness, death and desolation been foretold by God's prophets, in case his people should prove faithless to him? "Your country is desolate," says Isaiah; "your land strangers devour, and it is desolate as overthrown by strangers." "You shall be as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water." "Behold, the Lord maketh the land empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof."

---

ARTICLE VII.

*Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, presented at the Meeting held at Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 4-7, 1859. Boston: Press of T. R. Marvin & Son, 42 Congress Street. 1859; pp. 196, 8vo.*

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions has been long and justly held in the highest esteem by all the Christian people of this country. As to ourselves, for nearly one quarter of a century a profound respect for it was one of our most vigorous and cherished sentiments. Perhaps that Board never was entitled to be considered a national society. Yet confessedly it was an honor to the whole land, and the lustre which it shed on the American name throughout Christian Europe, and even in darkened Asia and Africa, was of the highest, the noblest, the truest kind. Now, however, we

grieve to say, it has ceased to have any just title to be called the American Board, for it has declared itself a sectional thing. No longer, in any sense, can it claim to represent this confederacy of Christian States. This is the fiftieth year of its existence, and it has made this year to mark a new era in its history. This year it has elected to claim no longer a national but a sectional status. *Sectional?* What does that word signify? We at the South, for the most part, (few indeed are the exceptions *now*,) have felt the mighty power of a filial instinct impelling us to be sectional—for the section that is *our mother* has been assailed. But there are many at the North who have been sectional without this sacred necessity. They have been sectional in order to assail us. It is with these gratuitous and voluntary sectionalists, these fiery and bitter assailants of the South, that this Board has now elected to be sectional. It is a new era, therefore, in their history. The course which they have adopted towards the venerable Fathers and Brethren of their Choctaw Mission at the late meeting of the Board in Philadelphia, was altogether unwelcome to many of the leading New School Presbyterians who cooperate with them. It may turn out, as these gentlemen apprehended, that their churches will not be satisfied with the position assumed. For this and for other reasons, we expect to see no long continuance of the union between the New School and our Congregational friends in the work of Foreign Missions. The American Board will soon be simply the New England Board—the organ of the Congregationalist churches alone. Will it be the organ of *all* of these? Will it re-unite with itself once more those Abolitionist elements in New England that broke off from it some years ago and formed the American Missionary Association? Logically, that should be the very next step in their new course. Will the inauguration of such a re-union form part of the programme in their next year's Jubilee Meeting?

There are several distinct grounds upon which our long and profound respect for the Board based itself, independently of those ties of personal friendship which bound us to one of its deceased Secretaries, and which still bind us to its oldest living Secretary; and independently, also, of those ties of common

service which twenty-five years since united us to the Prudential Committee. One of these grounds is, that this Board has sent out so large a body of Missionaries and their helpers into all parts of the world. Excluding from the account those seven Missionaries to the Choctaws, recently cut off, they have now 162 ordained Missionaries in the field—more, perhaps, than any other organization in this country can report. Their whole number of laborers from this country, (excluding again the 22 assistant Missionaries cut off,) is 375. They support (again excluding the 4 Choctaw Ministers cut off) a band of 493 native helpers of various kinds in the various nations. Their churches (excluding the 16 Choctaw churches cut off) are 137. The church members now alive (excluding again the 1,400 members of the Choctaw churches) number 23,394. These results are certainly enough to make a Missionary Board worthy of profound interest and respect. It is the largest and most flourishing Missionary Society of our country. Their receipts for their last year were \$350,915 15, being an advance upon the year previous of \$16,816 97. It is the oldest missionary organization, if we mistake not, now existing in this country. Not that theirs were the first American missionary efforts ever made. Far from it! To say nothing of the “Society for propagating the Gospel in New England,” which, in 1649, was incorporated in England, and which sustained Eliot, Mayhew, Bourn, and other American Missionaries to the American Indians; and to say nothing of the Missionaries supported among the Indians by the Society in Scotland for promoting Christian Knowledge, in whose service the great Jonathan Edwards labored as an Indian Missionary for six years, and which, (aided to a considerable extent by the Presbyteries of New York and New Brunswick,) supported both David and John Brainerd during all their labors—to say nothing of these, there were tentative efforts by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia to establish a mission in Africa, made as early as 1774, but effectually hindered by the commotions of our revolutionary struggle. There was a Missionary society incorporated in Massachusetts in 1787, which passed, however, into the hands of the Unitarians, and still feebly exists. In

1796, the New York Missionary Society was formed; in 1797, the Northern Missionary Society, in the northern part of the State of New York; and in 1802, the Western Missionary Society, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In 1803, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church made its first appropriation for a mission to the heathen. It was \$200, for the support of Rev. Mr. Blackburn of Tennessee, who had, in 1797, proposed to Union Presbytery in Tennessee the establishment of schools among the Cherokees. Mr. Blackburn's labors can be traced from 1803 down to 1812, when it is probable they were broken up by the war, in which, on one side or the other, all the Southern Indians were engaged. Thus missions to the heathen were not the invention of this century. From 1646 to 1675, New England did more (says Mr. Tracey) in proportion to her ability, for the conversion of the heathen, than she did from 1810, when the American Board was founded, down to 1839. From 1646 to the present time, there has been in this country an uninterrupted course of expenditure of wealth and life for the conversion of the heathen world to God.\*

But though not the first, the American Board is the oldest Missionary institution of this country, and it has more Missionaries and more churches and more church-members among the heathen than any other society. Hence our respect for it. But what do we mean by this statement? In what sense has it got these Missionaries and churches? It *supports* the former and *they have gathered* the latter. And where do they get the funds with which to support all this army of Missionaries? The Churches of New England and the New School Presbyterian Churches give it to them. They are Commissioners for Foreign Missions. They are the agents of all these churches to disburse their benevolence towards the heathen. And they are the representatives of all these missionaries. They have it in charge to collect and to disburse Missionary funds, and by diffusing intelligence from the Missions among the churches, to increase the interest taken by them in the cause; and they have it also in charge to direct, to a certain limited extent, the

---

\* See Rev. Jos. Tracey's History of the American Board, p. 21.

operations of the Missionaries abroad. This is what gives them their honorable character. It is this *official position* sustained by them which we always respected, perhaps without knowing the individual members of either the Board or the Committee. Is it not needful sometimes to make this distinction we are pointing out? Do we not sometimes clothe an institution of this kind with honors that belong not to it, but to the numerous patrons that support it, or to the humble, unnoticed workers that make it what it is? The Missions of this Board do not belong to it, nor even to the churches which act through this Board. On the contrary it is those Missions and the fruits God gives them which confer upon the Board to a great extent its honorable character and position. It is conceivable that the Missions could live without the Board. There could be Missions and very flourishing ones without it. But what would the Board be, and what use would there be for a Board, without the Missions?

These remarks suggest themselves, because there seems to prevail at the Annual meetings of the Board, and sometimes to run through the letters of the Secretaries, the notion that somehow the Missionaries are the inferiors of these Secretaries, and the dependents of these churches. Alas! we are, all of us together, the mutually dependent as well as the unprofitable servants of a Master, whose long-suffering, patience and forbearance, is our only hope. Men in official position need to be watchful of their spirit, and to walk humbly before God. And when they deal with the character and standing of His Ministers and His Churches among the far off heathen, they must remember that these are His representatives, nor should they forget how jealous He is for His Word and His Ordinances. When a whole Presbytery with all its churches, (some of the members of this court of the Lord's house being Missionaries of 40 years standing) are cut off by a Committee and its Secretaries, that have dogged them long and cruelly, for the "*immorality*" of building up Christianity amongst slaves and slaveholders, and when, in less than two months after this act, one of these Secretaries, a member of this same Committee, has to be suddenly and disgracefully turned out of his office

upon a charge of *sinful and scandalous conduct*, it appears very much like a voice of special and solemn warning to all who "trust in themselves that they are righteous, and despise others." If this allusion appear to any reader unkind, we beg him to pass it over until he shall have read the remainder of this article.

Another reason why the American Board has commanded so much respect, is, because they have been rightly considered as being engaged, along with their large band of Missionaries all over the world, in working out the true principles of the conduct of American Christian Missions. We think it is not presumptuous to say that the American Churches have some advantages for the Foreign Missionary work. There is a certain kind of practical wisdom that belongs to the American character, there is a simplicity and a directness belonging to all our forms and modes, and there is an independency of all political connexions or aims or objects, which make it easier for our missions to adapt themselves to the various phases of things among the heathen nations. Accordingly it will probably be found a universal fact that American Missions escape certain difficulties that stand in the way of missions from most other countries. Moreover, as to the Missionaries themselves, we speak what we do know, at least to a certain extent, when we say that this Board counts many men of the highest character amongst those whom it represents. Its Missionaries in Turkey for example, (speaking now of those whom we left there in 1846,) are a band of choice spirits—men of large heart—in many cases of eminent learning and distinguished ability, and perhaps, universally, of humble piety. It has been given them to guide their Missionary bark through dangerous seas with successful skill. There in Turkey, and in many other countries, have the Missionaries and their friends, the Prudential Committee and the Secretaries, been long considered as engaged together in studying and finding out the right methods of the Foreign Missionary work. To lay down the precedents which are to guide the conduct of a work like this, is certainly an office and an employment of the grandest and the noblest kind. And there have been amongst these Secretaries and

members of the Prudential Committee, not a few men of real prudence and true wisdom. Worcester and Evarts, and Cornelius and Wisner and Armstrong, Secretaries in the old times, and Bartlet, Spring, Morse, Reed and Woods, early members of the Prudential Committee, were all princes in Israel.

It is a painful sight to see such a Board as this guided amiss, and persuaded to adopt principles of Missionary policy which will not stand the test of Scripture. To witness a serious blunder, by those we were long accustomed to venerate, is distressing—it is like witnessing the stumbling of one's father. The American Board may have often erred—but it can be demonstrated, perhaps, that they never before committed so great an error as this.

For yet another reason, we acknowledge that this Board long deserved our respect—namely, that it endeavored for years to remain true to the original principles of its constitution, whilst the Abolitionists were striving to enlist its influence for their cause. We do not ascribe to this Board the merit of a perfectly firm and unflinching attitude, at the beginning, in favor of their own non-intervention with a subject over which they had no just control; nor can we assert that they very long continued to resist, without any yielding, the unfair pressure to which they were exposed. Neither yet can we say that, once drawn into a discussion with the Abolitionists, they expressed, even as early as 1845, at Brooklyn, such sentiments respecting slavery as a full and just understanding of the whole subject would have enabled them to do. But we say that, considering their position and circumstances, they deserved our respect for the efforts they made to keep their Institution true to the original principles of its constitution. They have been forced into their present position, after vain efforts at resistance.

This Missionary Board was instituted by the General Association of Massachusetts, on the 29th June, 1810, for the purpose of “devising ways and means, and adopting and prosecuting measures, for promoting the spread of the Gospel in heathen lands.” They were incorporated on the 20th June,

1812, by the commonwealth of Massachusetts, "for the purpose of propagating the Gospel in heathen lands, by supporting Missionaries, and diffusing a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." To devise the *ways and means, and to adopt and prosecute measures, for the support of Missionaries and the diffusion of the Bible*, was, therefore, the end of their creation. And their name corresponds to this end—"Commissioners for Foreign Missions." To them, as *Commissioners*, were the funds of the friends of Foreign Missions all over the United States invited to be sent, and they would faithfully carry out the wishes of the donors. Now, we say that they made long and earnest efforts to continue faithful to this original design and end of their creation, and for this, as long as it continued, they were entitled to respect.

It is curious to notice the history of the pressure that has resulted in forcing them to ally themselves to the Abolitionists. It commenced in 1840, when the Board was meeting at Providence, Rhode Island, with a memorial from sundry ministers in the State of New York, remonstrating against the Board's sending their collecting agents to the South, or accepting the subscriptions of slaveholders. The report adopted by the Board, on this memorial, acknowledges the justice of the memorialists' ground, that God will not accept the fruits of robbery for sacrifice; suggests caution in judging the character and motives of donors to missions; but, declines to take any order on the subject, on the ground of the practical difficulties that would attend any attempt to apply the principles of the memorial.

This, of course, was enough gained by the Abolitionists, through this first movement, to encourage their renewal of the onset. Their principles and reasonings are acknowledged as, on the whole, correct. Practical difficulties in the application of them, alone, are pleaded before the bar of the rising fanaticism, as though it could recognize any such difficulties.

Thus, after thirty years receipt and use of the money of slaveholding Christians—after all the foundations of the foreign missions of the Board have been laid in blood and sin, it begins to be determined that no more of such materials shall be employed in the superstructure!

The next year, 1841, at Philadelphia, there is a memorial from ministers in the State of New Hampshire, complaining of the Board's "studied silence" on the subject of slavery, and calling on them to "make known their views and feelings, so that they should be recognized by all, as sympathizing with those Christians who deeply abhor that system of abomination." The memorialists, "in addition to the consideration that it is right," say, also, that "a regard to the pecuniary safety of the Board renders it expedient." "The contributions must ultimately, and that before long, be suspended, if the Board shall think it their duty to observe such a studied silence."

In reply to this memorial, the Board urge that they were "incorporated for the express purpose of propagating the Gospel in heathen lands, by supporting Missionaries and diffusing a knowledge of the Scriptures;" that they and their Missionaries "have always confined their efforts to this *one object*—great enough for angels as well as men;" and they declare it "a duty of the first importance—a duty required by a conscientious regard to the sacred trust committed to us, to continue to pursue our one great object with undivided zeal, and to guard watchfully against turning aside from it, or mixing any other concern with our appropriate work as a Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions."

Had they stopped there, the memorialists would doubtless have felt that they had gained nothing at all by this effort. But the Board's reply goes on to say, that "it is indeed evident that *this Board* of Commissioners for Foreign Missions can sustain no relation to slavery which implies *approbation* of the system, and, *as a Board*, can have no connection or sympathy with it. And, on the other hand, it is equally evident that *the Board* cannot be expected to pass resolutions or adopt measures against this system, any more than against other specific forms of evil existing in the community."

Next year, 1842, at Norwich, Conn., there are several memorials on this subject. Amongst other things, it is urged that the Board had expressed opinions relative to other prevailing evils, as intemperance, &c.

The Board say, in reply, if they have referred to any hindrances to the progress of Christianity, as prevailing in the countries where their missions are established, and as counteracting the work there, it was, of course, a legitimate subject of their animadversion. "But if, at any time, it had gone any further than this, and expressed opinions relative to immoralities or evils of any kind prevailing in this country, and not directly counteracting the labors of the Missionaries, such action was a departure from the great principles on which the Board was organized, and by which its proceedings should always be governed." And then they conclude their deliverance on this subject by intimating that, if any do not approve of their position, they can choose some other agency for carrying out their efforts to spread the Gospel abroad.

In 1844, at Worcester, Mass., more memorials are presented, to which the Board make no new reply, referring simply to its former declarations, and repeating its hint that those dissatisfied with its conduct should employ other agents—which accordingly was done, about this time, by the formation of the "*American* (!) Missionary Association" by a few Abolitionists. This year, however (1844), occurs the first reference in the memorials of the disaffected to the subject of Choctaw slaveholding. Nothing can be done with the Board on the subject of slaveholders' offerings, and, therefore, a new point of attack is sought out and found. And the Board promises, this year, to look into the subject of the Christian Choctaws' connection with slavery, and report the next year;—and thus the ball rolls along.

In 1845, at Brooklyn, New York, the Board come out with sufficiently strong expressions relative to the "wickedness of the system of slavery," respecting which there is "probably among the members of the Board and its friends little difference of opinion." But they declare as "among the fundamental principles to be adhered to in planning and conducting every mission undertaken under the authority of the great Redeemer and Head of the Church" these two:

1. "That the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper cannot be scripturally and rightfully denied to those who give credible evidence of repentance and faith in Christ."

2. "That the Missionaries in connection with the Churches which they have gathered, are the rightful and exclusive judges of what constitutes this adequate evidence."

We recall to mind just here that it was this same year (1845), about four months previous to this meeting of the Board, that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, Old School, meeting at Cincinnati, Ohio, while they condemned what no good man at the South, no Christian slaveholder, will approve, viz: the evils that are incidentally connected with the system of slavery, as with all human institutions, did yet declare to the same effect with these two fundamental principles adopted by the American Board, that "the Church of Christ is a spiritual body, whose jurisdiction extends only to the religious faith and moral conduct of her members, and that she cannot legislate where Christ has not legislated, nor make terms of membership which He has not made." They added that they could not "denounce the holding of slaves as necessarily a heinous and scandalous sin, calculated to bring upon the Church the curse of God, without charging the Apostles of Christ with conniving at such sin, and introducing into the Church such sinners." Standing firm on this Scriptural ground, this church has ever since enjoyed peace and quiet on the subject of slavery, while at the same time, through her ministers and churches at the South, she has been humbly endeavoring to preach the Gospel to both bond and free. What an honor and what a blessing it would have proved to the American Board, if New England, instead of being a country where a little knowledge generally diffused, has proved itself a dangerous thing, (making every man, and many a woman, a teacher and a reformer, to set up his or her miserable "half-truths" oftentimes against even Christianity itself,) had enjoyed a sober and enlightened state of public sentiment, which could have acquiesced in these fundamental Christian principles, and allowed the Board, like the Presbyterian Church, to go on with its good work of forty years standing amongst the Choctaw Indians and their African slaves! And surely, it would seem as though these plain Scriptural principles, maintaining alike the rights of our Head and King to prescribe His own terms for the admission of any man into the fel-

lowship of His kingdom, the Church, and also the rights of His Church, untrammelled and uncontrolled by any outside pressure, to judge through her Representatives, respecting the application of these terms; surely it would seem as though these principles would have been enough to settle forever the right of the Choctaw Christians to be free of the spiritual tyranny of their Congregational brethren in New England! But, on the contrary, the Prudential Committee had now at length so far succumbed to the rising power of this tyrant fanaticism, that on the 19th November, 1845, immediately after this Brooklyn meeting, they write to the Choctaw Missionaries that they should "train their Church members to the duty of emancipating their slaves," and that they "should do whatever they could as discreet Christian men and Missionaries of the Lord Jesus to give the Indians correct views on this subject, and to induce them to take measures, as speedily as possible, to bring this system of wrong and oppression to an end." In other words, the Prudential Committee now take the ground that "Missionaries of the Lord Jesus" *may, nay must, as such, interfere with the politics* of the countries and peoples they are sent to,—but *discreetly!* How far does this fall short of the course pursued by the Jesuit Missionaries in various countries, which has made their name deservedly so odious? And is the American Board willing to be understood as requiring its Missionaries to interfere with the politics of all the governments to whose subjects it sends them, and from which governments it at the same time claims for these Missionaries protection by the United States? Or, is it only the poor Choctaw Indian Government with which it makes so free?

Let us proceed with our sketch of the progress of this pressure on the Board.

In 1846, the subject of slavery was barely introduced. In 1847, (says the *New Englander* for May, 1849,) it appeared to be the "impression on some minds that the letter of instruction by Mr. Greene (the letter just now referred to) had not been regarded" by the Missionaries to the Choctaws; but, as it was proposed to send out shortly a Secretary to visit that mission, the whole subject was deferred till the subsequent meeting.

At the same meeting in 1847 the question appears to have arisen whether indeed the Board had *the power* to give *instructions* to its Missionaries about their teaching. The Prudential Committee is requested to present a written report at the next meeting "on the nature and extent of the control to be exercised over the Missionaries, and on the moral responsibility of the Board for the nature of the teachings of the Missionaries, and for the character of the churches." Meanwhile two vacancies occurring among the Secretaries, they are filled with two men of abolitionist sympathies, viz: Rev. Mr. Treat and Rev. Dr. Pomroy. And now you shall see a more rapid progress of the American Board towards the point whither fanaticism has long been driving it.

The meeting of 1848, at Boston, comes on, and the report on the control of the Missionaries' teaching is presented. Amongst other points, the Prudential Committee claim that the Board has the right to enforce *correct religious teaching*—and the rule by which they propose to judge of the teaching of the Missionaries is "the Evangelical doctrines generally received by the churches and set forth in their confessions of faith," and "the ecclesiastical usages prevalent among the churches operating through the Board." As to the mission churches, they can be reached only "through the Missionaries," but "the Committee may and must inquire whether the Missionaries are doing their duty."

The reader who has patiently followed us from the beginning down to this point is no doubt astonished to perceive how far, in a few years, driven by the lash of faction, and led by two Secretaries (out of three) that sympathize with abolitionists, the Prudential Committee has travelled from the original principles of the Board's Constitution? Did any of its founders or patrons at the beginning dream, or did the Legislature of Massachusetts design to clothe this junto of gentlemen in Boston—this Board *ad interim*, consisting of eight laymen and three ministers—with all this power? Were they expected to interpret confessions and judge of doctrines for all Europe, Asia, Africa and America? Let us do the Board the justice to state distinctly that they did not adopt this document, but

resolved that "the whole subject be left for the present where it now is, in the hands of the Prudential Committee." We believe it has never been taken out of their hands since that time. The doctrines of the report have, however, been publicly denied in the Board's meetings.

At this same meeting of 1848 was also read the report of Mr. Secretary Treat's visit to the Choctaw Missions, and his famous letter addressed to those Missionaries on behalf of the Committee. This letter takes the ground distinctly that "the system of slavery is always and everywhere sinful," and that "all slave-holding is sinful, too, except where it is involuntary or continued solely for the benefit of the slave." The Missionary must denounce it, "but *discreetly*," and must require of all slaveholders who would come to the communion table, "proof that they are free from the guilt of the system." The Missionary must also "abstain from using slave labor, for thus he helps to make the system profitable to the owner of the slave." And the Committee has "the right to withhold support from them" if they do not obey these instructions.

This monstrous production, so unscriptural in its doctrines, so false in its philosophy, so low in its moral tone, so confused in its reasonings, and so narrow in its spirit, was reviewed by the Rev. Dr. Hodge, in the *Biblical Repertory* for January, 1849, and along with it the report of the Prudential Committee, before referred to, was also reviewed. The reviewer described the letter as unexceptionable in manner. It was "couched in the blandest terms. It was evidently penned with the determination that no word should grate on the most delicate ear. Nevertheless, it is perfectly Archbishopal in its tone. It is written just as 'the Servant of Servants' is wont to write." The reviewer also pointed out how preposterous as well as dangerous were the claims of this Committee to the control over Missionaries and Missionary Churches. He also dwelt upon the position taken by the Committee against allowing the use of slave labor in the domestic and farming operations of the Missionaries. Their poor, sickly wives must not hire a slave to cook or to wash for their large boarding-schools, lest the system of slavery be thereby encouraged!

And yet the whole North, and the Committee, doubtless, likewise, were daily using the products of slave labor! This, said the reviewer, is "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. It is being dreadfully troubled about the mote in our brother's eye, while totally unmindful of the beam that is in our own eye. We are sincerely sorry to say that this whole letter seems to us full of a mistaken, self-righteous spirit—carping at trifles in laborious, devoted men in the wilderness, while blind to ten-fold greater evils of the same nature, which pass without rebuke in our pampered churches at home."

The reviewer also thus sets forth the general character of this letter: "The doctrine, then, of this letter is, that slavery is everywhere and at all times sinful. Christ condemned it, though not in words. The Apostles abstained from denouncing it only on motives of expediency. Slaveholding is excusable and consistent with church-membership only when involuntary, or when temporarily continued at the request of the slave, and for his benefit. The Missionaries are to inculcate these principles, and to pursue such a course as shall free the mission churches from all participation in the system. Even hiring slaves is to be abstained from, though the consequence should be the disbanding the missionary schools. We have never understood that the avowed abolitionists go any farther than this. They inculcate these doctrines in plainer terms, and in a more straightforward, clear headed manner. They are more peremptory in their demands, and violent in their spirit. But as to all essential matters, their doctrines are those here presented."\*

The effect of this review was sensibly felt at the Missionary House, Boston. In February, 1849, immediately on its appearance, the Secretaries issued a printed circular, over their own names, setting forth that there was a "misapprehension" in the minds of many regarding the nature of the Prudential Committee's correspondence with the Choctaw Mission. Mr. Treat's letter "had not an authoritative character"—did not "give the *instructions* of the Committee, but only their opin-

---

\* See Bib. Rep., Jan. 1849.

ions, suggestions and arguments, to be replied to by the Mission, with its opinions, suggestions and arguments." "With this practical distinction in view (they plead), it will be seen that the Committee and the Secretaries have done nothing inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the two fundamental principles recognized by the Board at Brooklyn, namely, that credible evidence of piety is the only thing to be required for admission into the churches gathered among the heathen; and that the Missionaries and their churches are the rightful and exclusive judges as to the sufficiency of this evidence." They add, what now sounds even more strangely: "We merely add, that the Committee have never had any intention of '*cutting off*' the Choctaw Mission from its connection with the Board." On the contrary, they "would repeat the sentiment in the letter of Mr. Treat, expressing their undiminished confidence in the integrity and faithfulness of these servants of Christ."

In 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, nothing worthy of note, in respect to this matter, occurs at the meetings of the Board, except that, in 1852, it falls to the lot of this same Mr. Treat, whose letter made the Choctaw Missionaries partakers in the sins of Choctaw slaveholders, to bring in a report on the success of the Indian missions, in which, along with the strongest expressions, repeatedly employed, in praise of the growing temperance, improving agriculture, advancing education, excellent government, and consistent, prayerful, intelligent and zealous piety of these same slaveholding Choctaws, we find the following language about their churches: "When we enter their churches, we feel that the Lord, in very deed, is in the midst of them." In 1852, then, the Choctaw churches were not very great sinners, in the Board's apprehension, albeit fully tolerating in their communion a system pronounced, in 1849, to be "always and every where sinful;" nor were the Choctaw Missionaries, condemned in 1849, in a very bad position in 1852—for where they were, their Lord was likewise. They allowed slaveholders to come to the Lord's Table, without "proving themselves free from the guilt of the system," and their Lord allowed it, too, for in very deed He was Himself "in the midst" of those churches to bless them!

In March, 1853, there is held, at the Mission House, Boston, a formal correspondence on slavery, between the two Secretaries of the Board sympathizing with the Abolitionists, in which one of them asks, and the other answers, certain questions about the connection of the Choctaw missionaries with slavery. This is printed for use, as a circular. Mr. Treat is author of the answers, and gives the most favorable account possible of the progress of things in that mission! In like manner, he reads at the annual meeting this year, 1853, another very fine report of progress among the Choctaws. It is evidently the policy of the Prudential Committee, and the Secretaries, to let their action in 1848 pass into oblivion, if the Abolitionists will only let them alone.

But this may not be. In 1854, at Hartford, Connecticut, this Choctaw question again comes up under the full blast of the Kansas excitement. There had, also, been some legislation by the Choctaws against Abolitionists, excluding from the Nation any citizen of the United States who should be found interfering with the rights of slaveholders. This legislation, it is quite possible, had been provoked by the visit and letter of Mr. Treat, referred to before, for he was somehow regarded by the Choctaws as an Abolitionist—especially by the application which the Mission, it was suggested, should make to the Nation to release them from their contract about the boarding schools, rather than continue to hire the slaves who cooked and washed for the Mission families. This legislation of the Choctaws, deemed by them, no doubt, a measure of self-defence, was extremely offensive to all the Abolitionists in the Board. At the close of a debate, which, like the one preceding the recent action at Philadelphia, terminated at a very late hour of the night, the Treat letter was endorsed in full by the Board.

Soon after this, the Prudential Committee appears to have felt that they had gone too far, for such men as Horace Holden, in New York, were found to be protesting against their course. Their New York Secretary, Rev. G. W. Wood, is, therefore, sent off to the Choctaw country to arrange a new platform. Amongst ten thousand men that might have been employed

on such a mission as this, very few would be capable of conducting it as skillfully as did Mr. Secretary Wood. We know Dr. Wood, personally, well, and personally, love him much,—albeit his proceedings in this case did not consist perfectly with the estimate we had formed of his character during an intercourse of several years whilst we were colleagues in missionary labors in the East. He has so much genuine kindness of heart, and so much softness and gentleness of manner, and so clear and discriminating a mind, that, coming as he did, a deputation, clothed with so much power, he of course proved a most persuasive legate of the Board. The platform which he drew up, and which the Missionaries signed, was so completely pervaded with the principles of abolition, that it is amazing how such men as those Missionaries are well known to be, could ever have given it their assent. Their own statements of the views they held, which had been previously published, are in utter inconsistency with that Goodwater platform. When, however, Dr. Wood's report of the result of his embassy was published in the *New York Observer*, soon after his return, presenting this platform and his comments upon it, the Missionaries felt so sensibly that they were put into a false position by it, that, as we happen to know, they immediately forwarded to the Secretaries and Committee, their protest against the whole report.

In October, 1855, the Board meets at Utica, New York. The senior Secretary, Rev. Dr. Anderson, is absent in India. The other two Secretaries, Rev. Mr. Treat, and Rev. Dr. Pomroy, attend that meeting, having, as we have been credibly informed, and can see no reason at all to doubt, this protest of the Missionaries with them; and yet, they suffer the whole case to be publicly settled on the basis of that Goodwater platform, and Dr. Wood's narrative and comments, without the most distant allusion to the Missionaries' protest then folded away in their own pocket! So much aggrieved by all this are the Missionaries when the tidings reach their ears, that they, or some of them, send in their resignation without delay. The senior Secretary by this time has returned from India, and he is anxious to have the Missionaries withdraw their resignation. The

Committee accordingly propose this. The Missionaries consent, on condition that the Treat letter and all the previous legislation of the Board about slavery be considered as withdrawn, and the Missionaries be allowed to go on in their work "according to the instructions of our Lord and His Apostles." "To entertain this proposition for a moment was impossible," said the Hon. Linus Child, the Committee's representative in the late Philadelphia discussion; yet with these terms as demanded by the Missionaries lying before them, the Committee voted for that year the usual annual appropriation for the Choctaw mission, and have continued to do the same ever since, until the last meeting of the Board!

At the next meeting, which occurs at Newark, New Jersey, in 1856, the Board, now guided by the senior Secretary, seeks by one stroke of policy to set itself right with the New School Presbyterian Church (which has always been of their constituency), in relation to the East India Missions, and at the same time with the Old School Missionaries amongst the Choctaws. They substantially renew the Brooklyn platform, declaring that they have themselves no ecclesiastical power, and no control over the missionary churches, and remitting to the Missionaries and their churches, all questions of internal discipline, as belonging rightfully to them alone.

In 1857, the Board say of their Indian Missions: "We can not too highly appreciate the perseverance, the faithfulness, and the cheerful and self-denying labors of our Missionaries." The Prudential Committee tell of the Missionary stations among the Choctaws, that have "received decisive marks of the Divine favor." And they close their report about these Choctaws with this language: "We may hope that He who keepeth covenant, and sheweth mercy, will not forsake this interesting people, but that His grace will abound to them more and more." The Committee, then, hoped, in 1857, that He who keepeth covenant will not forsake this interesting people, notwithstanding the guilt that still lay upon them by their slaveholding! Where is, meanwhile, the resignation of the Missionaries? It is sleeping and taking its rest. The Committee's conscience will not, at this time, suffer them to accept it:

they have before them the fear of the Covenant-keeper, who has not forsaken, and will not forsake, the poor Choctaw churches. On the other hand, however, the fear of the Abolitionists is also before the Committee's eyes, and they dare not refuse to accept this resignation. It must rest for a while, till the Committee can see the path of duty, and of safety, more plain and clear before their eyes!

In September, 1858, the Board meets at Detroit. In May of that year, the Abolitionists had met with a humiliating defeat in the Tract Society at New York, and one of their leaders, the Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon, a corporate member of the Board, is present at Detroit, and is smarting under his own and his party's discomfiture. He is appointed Chairman of the Sub-Committee on that portion of the Board's Annual Report which relates to the Choctaws and some other Indian Missions. In his report he speaks of "various religious bodies in the States nearest to the Choctaws, among whom there has been, as is well known, a lamentable defection from some of the first and most elementary ideas of Christian morality, in so much that Christianity has been represented as the warrant for oppression, and Christ as the minister of Sin." This report was adopted unanimously! At a subsequent meeting, on Dr. Bacon's own motion, the language was amended so as to read thus: "Insomuch that Christianity has been represented as the warrant for a system of slavery which offends the moral sense of the Christian world, and Christ has thereby been represented as the Minister of Sin." Reference is had in this report to the fact that "Our brethren among the Choctaws are in ecclesiastical relations with religious bodies in the adjoining States, the States from which the leading Choctaws are deriving their notions of civilization and of government." The report concludes by expressing the wish that "the Board might be relieved, as early as possible, from the unceasing embarrassments and perplexities connected with the Missions in the Indian territory." The Congregationalist newspaper of Boston, commenting on this report, gives the sense of it thus: "By the adoption of Dr. Bacon's report, incipient measures have been taken to withdraw from all connection with the

Cherokee and Choctaw nations, the Board thus bearing its testimony against slavery as existing among them. This action, so harmoniously secured, has relieved the Board of what, as some feared, might prove a serious embarrassment."

Thus the Board has, at length, been driven to the resolution of withdrawing its support from the Choctaw Missionaries, and so, its connection with the Choctaw churches, and of withdrawing "*as early as possible.*" But how shall this be done? With the prompt decision of men believing what they assert, namely, that the religious bodies with which their Missionaries are in full sympathy as well as outward connection, and *therefore*, of course, *these Missionaries themselves*, and the *Indian churches* they have gathered, "have made a lamentable defection from some of the most elementary ideas of Christian morality; have made *Christianity the warrant for 'the sum of all villainies,' and Christ the minister of Sin*?" Oh, no! Not thus did the Committee proceed; but they open a fresh correspondence with these degraded, immoral and blaspheming Missionaries!! It is again the Rev. Mr. Treat who writes to these abandoned sinners, and he has not yet laid aside his smooth blandishments. We subjoin his letter, with the answer of the Missionaries, and we request the reader to notice with care, not only the fraternal kindness expressed in these letters for the wicked Missionaries themselves, but the "most cordial and friendly sentiments" entertained towards those corrupt and degraded Choctaw churches. Let him also carefully observe the grounds on which the Committee base the proposed separation from men and churches that have abandoned the most elementary ideas of Christian morality—namely, to free themselves from "embarrassments," and to save their "treasury" from loss. The necessary sinfulness of slavery, and the dishonor and wrong of being in any way connected with it as a sinful thing, are not felt.

*Letter of Mr. Secretary Treat.*

"MISSIONARY HOUSE, BOSTON, October 5, 1858.

"*To the Choctaw Mission:*

"DEAR BRETHREN: The proceedings of the Board at its recent meeting are already in your hands. You will have read, with special

attention, the report of the Committee on that part of the Annual Report which relates to your mission. This paper, you will remember, has the following sentence: 'It seems to your Committee desirable that the Board should be relieved, as early as possible, from the unceasing embarrassments and perplexities connected with the missions in the Indian Territory.' The Prudential Committee, concurring in this opinion for various reasons, respectfully submit for your consideration, whether, in existing circumstances, it be not wise and expedient that your connection with us should be terminated.

"You will readily believe that this suggestion is made with unfeigned regret. We have always felt a deep interest in your labors. For the churches which you have gathered, we entertain the most cordial and friendly sentiments. For yourselves, we have a strong fraternal feeling. For the older brethren, especially, we must ever cherish the tenderest affection. It is with emotions of sadness, therefore, that we contemplate a separation from you.

"We are not able, however, to call in question the facts on which the Committee at Detroit founded their opinion. We find in our churches an increasing desire that the Board may be freed from the 'embarrassments' above referred to. By reason thereof, it is said, the donations to the treasury are less than they would otherwise be, to the manifest injury of our churches, on the one hand, and of our missions, on the other. It is said, too, that the political agitations, which are likely to take place in coming years, must, of necessity, aggravate the evil.

"The report to which your attention is now called, refers to difficulties which you have encountered, because of your present relation. This consideration you will at once appreciate; the Committee have no occasion, therefore, to enlarge upon it. They will only add that these difficulties will be likely to increase hereafter.

"But there is another obstacle to our future co-operation, which the report, already mentioned, did not notice. The Prudential Committee question their ability to keep your ranks adequately filled. When tidings came to us, a few days ago, that our excellent friend and brother, Mr. Byington, was dangerously sick, an inquiry of painful interest arose, 'Who can take his place?' We had no person ready to occupy such a post; and, in view of our past experience, we could hardly expect to find one.

"The Committee do not propose to raise any question as to the agreement of your opinions with those of the Board. In any view of the case, which they have been able to take, the result would be the same. The measure is proposed as one of Christian expediency; and it is on this ground that we present it for your consideration.

"We have said that this communication is made with unfeigned regret. But our sorrow is lessened by the hope, that the interests of the people among whom you dwell, will not suffer. We have thought it probable that you would come into connection with that Missionary Board, under which two of your number formerly labored—a Board which has your cordial sympathy and your entire confidence. Its mis-

sionaries are your 'fellow workers unto the kingdom of God,' in a common field. This would facilitate a transfer of your relation. Ecclesiastically you would make no change.

"Praying that the God of missions may keep you henceforth, and direct all your labors, so that the comfort and joy which you have hitherto received therein, shall be forgotten by reason of the more abundant coming of the Spirit of promise, I am,

Very respectfully yours, in behalf of the Prudential Committee.

S. B. TREAT, *Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M.*"

*Reply of the Missionaries.*

"YAKNI OKCHAYA, CHOCTAW NATION, December 24, 1858.

*To the Rev. S. B. Treat, Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M.:*

"DEAR BROTHER: We have received your kind letter in behalf of the Prudential Committee, under date of Oct. 5. We cordially reciprocate to yourself and the Committee the fraternal feelings which you have expressed towards us.

"You refer us to the report in relation to our mission, adopted by the Board at Detroit, and especially to the following sentence: 'It seems to your Committee desirable that the Board should be relieved, as early as possible, from the unceasing embarrassments and perplexities connected with the missions in the Indian Territory.' And you add, 'The Prudential Committee, concurring in this opinion for various reasons, respectfully submit for your consideration, whether, in existing circumstances, it be not wise and expedient that your connection with us should be terminated.'

"You do not mention the source of these 'embarrassments and perplexities;' but, we presume, they arise from our relation to slavery. Such have been the peace and quiet among us on this subject, for the past two years, that we fondly hoped the agitation had ceased, not to be renewed in such a way as seriously to affect us. Hence the action of the Board at Detroit took us by surprise.

"We have taken into prayerful consideration the question submitted to us by the Prudential Committee. We have sought for light on the subject. As for ourselves, through the favor of a kind Providence, we see nothing in our present circumstances requiring a separation. Our position and course in reference to slavery are defined in our letter from Lenox, dated Sept. 6, 1856. These, so far as they are known to our people, meet with their cordial approbation; we are, therefore, going forward without disturbance in our appropriate work as missionaries. Whether circumstances may not hereafter arise, which will render a separation necessary, we are of course unable to say; but we apprehend no such difficulty from the Choctaw people, or from others in this region.

"In regard to our course above mentioned, we would remark, that it is the same as has been uniformly practiced by the mission from its commencement, more than forty years ago. It had the full approbation of the Secretaries and the Prudential Committee for more than

five-and-twenty years, and was finally approved with perfect unanimity by the Board at Brooklyn in 1845. However great may have been our shortcomings in duty, we believe this our course to be right and scriptural; and we cannot believe that it is unwise and inexpedient for the Board to sustain us in what is scriptural and right.

"In your letter you say, 'We have thought it probable you would come into connection with that Missionary Board under which two of your number formerly labored.' That Board, as you have said, 'has our cordial sympathy and entire confidence.' But that Board is the organ of the 'religious bodies in the adjoining States,' with which we 'are in ecclesiastical relations;' and 'the various religious bodies' in these States are charged, in the report adopted by the Board at Detroit, with 'a lamentable defection from some of the first and most elementary ideas of Christian morality.' Is not this an implied censure upon us? If not, is there not an inconsistency in the above suggestion of the Prudential Committee? We have no assurance that, under these circumstances, that Board would consent to a transfer of the mission to their care.

"We, therefore, refer the question back to the Prudential Committee, to be disposed of as they shall deem best. We regret that either the Board or the churches should sustain injury on our account. We, however, do not think that, in our labors as missionaries, we have done that which, by the gospel standard, can be regarded as just cause of offence.

"Be assured, that it is not a light matter with us to differ with the Prudential Committee and the Board, as respects the question which you have submitted to us. In our opinion important principles are involved.

"We trust and pray that the great Head of the Church may give wisdom from above, that wisdom which is profitable to direct.

Most respectfully yours, in behalf of the Choctaw Mission,  
C. KINGSBURY, *Chairman.*

"C. C. COPELAND, *Clerk.*"

We confess ourselves amazed at the tortuous windings of this whole transaction, as we have been tracing it along from the beginning, but at no portion of it more than at this last strange proceeding of the Committee. Our wonder is not diminished when we recall how, at the Board's meeting in Detroit, after the unanimous adoption of Dr. Bacon's Report, the President of the Board, Rev. Dr. Mark Hopkins, in his closing address, declared that "this Board is not an Anti-Slavery Society, and may not be used either directly or indirectly for any of the specific purposes of anti-slavery men." This speech and the report of Dr. Bacon are surely not both to be taken as

representing the sentiments of the American Board! How are we to account for this use of language, *semi-officially*, which contradicts the official expressions before employed? Were the resolutions of the Board designed as a plaster for Dr. Bacon's wounded feelings, and as a gratification of the Abolitionists, while the closing speech of the President was to serve as a net to encompass the Conservatives? Or, does the Board say things it does not mean, and utter charges it does not believe? When they talk of Slavery as contrary to the most elementary principles of morality, and resolve, on account of it, that they are bound to abandon their own work of forty years' standing, and yet say, at the same time, that their Board is not anti-slavery, and may not be used directly or indirectly for anti-slavery purposes, and then, through their Prudential Committee and Secretaries, write and *submit to the Missionaries* the *wisdom* and the *expediency* of severing the connection, we are reminded that it has been said, there are a class of Christians, so called, who, when convinced that a thing is sinful, must after that be also convinced it is *expedient* to abandon it.

The reader is no doubt impatient, and so are we, to reach the end of this painful narrative. We have seen how, after the Board has publicly declared that *Slavery is a sin*, and the Missionaries *involved in the guilt of it*, and that they must therefore *be got rid of*, the Committee "*respectfully submit*" to these very men "whether in existing circumstances it is not *wise and expedient* that the connection should cease." And we have seen how the Missionaries refuse to fall into the snare set for them, by acquiescing in any sense in the wisdom or expediency of their own excision. Had they expressed the opinion that it was *wise and expedient* that the connection should be severed, the Committee might then have acceded to it, as *desired by the Missionaries*, and would thus have avoided what (by Mr. Treat's own acknowledgment to one of the members of the Mission) the Committee all along strove to avoid: namely, the creation of a sympathy at home on behalf of the Missionaries. But, while more than two years before this time, the Missionaries had resigned for injustice done them, they will not say now that wisdom, or truth, or justice, requires them to be cut

off; and if they are to be cut off, the Committee and the Board must take the whole responsibility of the act.

At length, therefore, the Committee despair of either forcing or persuading the Missionaries in any respect to change their ground, either as to their work among the Choctaws, or as to their relation to the Board. They will stand just where they have stood for forty years, and the changes shall all be on the part of their friends in Boston. So the Prudential Committee, beat out by the firmness and prudence of these simple-hearted, but clear-headed brethren in the wilderness, resolve to "*discontinue*" the Choctaw Mission. Of course, Mr. Treat again appears on the stage. He has a difficult part to act. We subjoin his letter, that it may be seen how he acquits himself. The reader who has traced with us the progress of this history from the beginning, needs no commentary on this letter. Let him notice, particularly, the grounds on which the cutting off is placed. Let him also observe the acknowledgments of the Committee in their remarks appended to this letter of their Secretary. We take them from their late Annual Report:

*Letter of Mr. Secretary Treat.*

“MISSIONARY HOUSE, BOSTON, July 27, 1859.

“*To the Choctaw Mission:*

“DEAR BRETHREN,—Your favor of December 24 would have received an earlier answer, but for the desire of the Committee to give it their most careful attention. Seldom have they felt more deeply their need of that wisdom which cometh from above, than during the deliberations which this letter has occasioned. It is their prayer and their hope, that the Divine approval will rest upon the result to which they have been brought.

“The suggestion which was submitted to your consideration, in regard to the discontinuance of the efforts of the Board among the Choctaws, you have referred back to the Committee, ‘to be disposed of as they shall deem best.’ In doing this, however, you have made the following statement: ‘Our position and course, in respect to slavery, are defined in our letter from Lenox, dated September 6, 1856. These, so far as they are known to our people, meet with their cordial approbation; we are, therefore, going forward without disturbance in our appropriate work as missionaries.’ Had this extract been received in September last, it might have given a different direction to our correspondence.

“It is proper that we should review, in the fewest possible words, the history of a question which has received so much attention within the

last few years. You remark that your policy had 'the full approbation of the Secretaries and the Prudential Committee for more than five-and-twenty years, and was finally approved with perfect unanimity by the Board at Brooklyn.' For much of the time *since* the meeting at Brooklyn, we have supposed that there was no material difference between your mission and ourselves. In the year 1848, indeed, there seemed to be some divergency; but in the following year you declared your assent to the letter of the Cherokee mission, dated March 21, 1848, 'as expressing in a clear and condensed manner' your 'main views and principles;' and verbal statements, subsequently made by some of your number, gave the Committee very great satisfaction. Whatever doubts may have arisen in 1854, they were effectually removed by the report which Mr. Wood presented to the Committee in June, 1855. The statement of principles which received your assent at Goodwater, fully confirmed our previous impressions. When, therefore, we received from four of your number the letter of November 13, 1855, asking that their connection with the Board might be dissolved, we were slow to believe that there was any substantial disagreement, and immediately requested them to take the subject into consideration a second time. We could harmonize the facts which had come to our knowledge, only by supposing that these brethren had written under very serious misapprehensions. Hence, too, the Committee did not regard the letter of September 6, 1856, signed by six of your number, as final. The view which they entertained of the case, was embodied in their minute of December 8, 1857, in which they affirmed their belief that the sentiments of the brethren who signed the Goodwater document, were in substantial accordance with those of the Committee, and that their difficulties were the result of misapprehensions, which could not be easily removed without a personal conference.

"In looking back from their present position, the Committee were constrained to admit that their action, after receiving the letter of September 6, 1856, was of doubtful expediency. The brethren who signed it declined to withdraw their 'letter of resignation,' and, at the same time, embodied their main difficulties in the following propositions, viz. '1. The objections which we have had to endorsing the letter of June 22, 1848, still remain. Nor can we acquiesce in the suggestions and arguments of that letter, or declare our readiness to act in accordance with them. 2. We were much grieved by the action of the Board at Hartford; and we still deeply regret it. 3. The construction put upon the Goodwater document, by the Board at Utica, makes it impracticable for us to regard that as an exponent of our views.'

"The event has proved that an acceptance of the 'resignation,' just at this point, would have been the simplest and easiest solution of a problem, which has occasioned so much perplexity. The friends of the Board would have felt that the Committee were justified in taking this step; indeed, it would have been generally supposed that no other course could have been safely pursued. It would have been better for your work also, so far as the Committee can judge, if they had assented to the proposal at once. Still, in view of all the circumstances, the

appropriations for 1857 were made as usual. With the previous history of the question distinctly in mind, the Committee might reasonably hope that your position, sooner or later, would materially change; and they were then, as they always have been, extremely reluctant to entertain the idea of closing their labors among the Choctaws.

“In 1849, as we have already remarked, your mission accepted the letter of the Cherokee brethren, dated March 21, 1848, ‘as expressing in a clear and condensed manner’ its ‘main views and principles.’ In 1855, the members of that mission accepted the declaration of principles, which received your assent at Goodwater. By these they still abide. Your late communication, however, refers to the letter of September 6, 1856, as defining your position; and you also say that its sentiments, so far as they are known, have the cordial approbation of your people, and therefore you are going forward without disturbance in your appropriate work. A recent letter from the Superintendent and Trustees of the Choctaw schools, in this connection, has a special significance. It requests the Committee to ‘authorize some person to meet’ them, and ‘make a final separation from the American Board.’ ‘We have no apology to make,’ it continues, ‘or argument to offer.’ ‘We only hope it might be effected in peace and friendship.’

“The result therefore to which we are obliged to come, is briefly this: 1. The position which the Board, with the Committee, on the one hand, and you, with the Cherokee mission, on the other, occupied at the annual meeting in 1855, six of your number, after the maturest reflection, and with entire conscientiousness we doubt not, have relinquished. 2. In doing this, they dissent from the opinions, not only of the Board and the Committee, but, as we believe, of the great majority of our constituents. We are thus taken back to the circumstances in which we found ourselves in October, 1853, when these brethren declined to withdraw their resignation; with this difference, however, that no additional delay can be expected to issue in a favorable change. The letter of November 13, 1855, had said, ‘We are fully convinced that we cannot go with the Committee and the Board as to the manner in which, as ministers of the gospel and missionaries, we are to deal with slavery;’ and it had also said, ‘We have no wish to give the Committee and the Board further trouble on the subject; and as there is no prospect that our views can be brought to harmonize, we must request that our relation to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions may be dissolved in a way that will do the least harm to the Board and our mission.’ The Committee find themselves compelled at length to act in substantial accordance with the desire which was then expressed. It has been our cherished and earnest hope, as the long delay will have shown, to escape the necessity of this result. Now, however, we are persuaded that the greatest efficiency of the Board, as also the highest success of your efforts, require that a connection which awakens so many pleasant reminiscences, should in its present form come to a close. A wide-spread dissatisfaction has arisen among the churches, which, as the case now stands, is almost certain to

increase. Aside from the injury that will accrue to the spiritual interests of our constituency from a prolonged agitation, the income of the Board must inevitably suffer; while the claims of nearly all the great missionary fields are so urgent, that any diminution of our receipts would prove a serious calamity. On the other hand, continued discussion can hardly fail, as it seems to the Committee, to embarrass your labors.

"We do not forget what you say in regard to the peace and quiet which have prevailed among your people for the last two years. The fact is easily explained. The Board has been free from agitation during this period, and so you have felt no disturbing force. But if your relation to the Board continues on its present footing, neither you nor we can rely on this exemption hereafter. The letter from the Superintendent and Trustees of the Choctaw schools, already referred to, shows us what we have reason to expect.

"The inquiry may possibly occur to you, 'Why did the Committee send us the letter of October 5, 1858?' The answer is to be found in the peculiarities of the case. They said in that letter, you will remember, that they did not raise any question as to the agreement of your opinions with those of the Board. They could not assume that you accepted the Goodwater statement; nor, on the other hand, could they assume your final rejection of it. Hence they pursued a line of argument, suggested by the action of the Board at Detroit, which rendered any discussion of this topic unnecessary.

"All that was said in that letter to express our sorrow in view of the contemplated change, and our affection for you and your people, we would repeat with additional emphasis. The thought that this letter brings your mission to a close is exceedingly painful! There is no other course, however, which we can properly pursue. It is the recorded judgment of the Board that it should be relieved, as early as possible, from the difficulties which have grown out of its operations in the Indian Territory. In this opinion, for the reasons already set forth, the Committee are obliged to concur.

"It only remains that I apprise you of the formal action of the Committee, on the 26th of July; which is as follows:

"*Resolved*, 1. That in view of the embarrassments connected with the missionary work among the Choctaws, which affect injuriously, as well the labors of the brethren in that field, as the relations sustained by the Board to its friends and patrons, it is incumbent on the Prudential Committee to discontinue the Choctaw mission; and the same is hereby discontinued.

"*Resolved*, 2. That the members of this mission be informed that the preceding resolution does not at once terminate their *personal* relations to the Board; that they are, nevertheless, at liberty to make such arrangements for the future as they shall severally judge proper, and that the Committee fully recognize their claim to such pecuniary aid, whenever they shall retire from their connection with the Board, as, in accordance with its rules and usages, it is able to afford.

“I am also authorized to say, (1) that the Committee propose to give you as a retiring allowance, in whole or in part, the property now in your possession and occupancy, (except so much as may be in the boarding schools;) and, (2) that they regard Messrs. Kingsbury and Byington, in consideration of their advanced age and long continued service, as having special claims upon the Board; and, therefore, unless they shall elect to become united with some other missionary organization, these brethren will be at liberty to look to the Board for such annual assistance as shall be needful for their comfort and support during the residue of their lives.

“I remain, dear brethren, very respectfully and affectionately yours, in behalf of the Prudential Committee,

“S. B. TREAT, *Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M.*

“It gives the Committee great pleasure, in closing this report, to believe that a work has been accomplished among the Choctaws, of high and permanent value. Whatever may be said of Indian missions, in the general, this is no failure. The efforts of the Board have demonstrated, beyond all controversy, that the red man, in favorable circumstances, may attain to all the blessings of a Christian civilization. For the honor of our aboriginal tribes, and, still more, for the honor of the Gospel of Christ, this truth should live forever.”

When the Board meets in Philadelphia, in September last, it confirms the act of the Committee, and so the affair ends. We append here the report of the Sub-Committee of the Board to whom that portion of the Prudential Committee's Annual Report was submitted, that it may be seen how unwilling were some of the Board to acquiesce in this course; also, a Minority Report from the same Sub-Committee. Neither of these reports was accepted, yet both have great significance. The one exhibits the attitude of the conservative elements in the Board. The other is the production of Hon. Linus Child, who was elected, at the last meeting, a member of the Prudential Committee, and who took, as we would judge, the most prominent part amongst the speakers who defended the action of the Committee. After a long debate, both this report and Mr. Child's substitute are laid on the table, and not well knowing what to do in the premises, the Board, at 1 o'clock at night, agree to adopt and sanction the action of the Prudential Committee, as set forth in Mr. Treat's last letter.

*Majority Report.*

The Committee, to whom the Report on the Choctaw Mission was referred, would respectfully submit the following Statement and Resolution, as expressive of their views:

"This Mission, as it was one of the earliest, so it has been one of the most cherished under the care of this Board. For more than forty years it has been in existence, occupying, during all this period, a large place in the interest and affection of the churches here represented. It has passed through trials, but in spite of them it has flourished and prospered.

"Repeated revivals of religion; the ingathering of many, from time to time, into the Church; the holy lives of those brought out of pagan darkness into the light of the Gospel, have been the divine attestation to the faithfulness of the Apostolic men who, for so many years, have labored in this field. The wild Indian reclaimed from barbarism, and the savage brought into a state of civilization, has refuted the oft-repeated assertion that, in his case, to civilize was to destroy.

"Were these churches fully prepared to sustain the institutions of religion without further aid, their separation from this Board would be the natural and necessary result of their growth—a result full of joy to those who had so long contributed to secure it. But when such a separation is contemplated before this time has arrived; when it is proposed to discontinue the Mission, and dismiss the laborers from the field, solely on the ground of a difference of opinion between the Missionaries and this Board, in respect to the manner of preaching the Gospel, or the application of its principles to the evil of slavery, then it is fit that such a step should be taken only after a thorough investigation of the real difficulties of the case has satisfied the members of this Board of its necessity.

"It may be that the best interests of the Mission and the usefulness of the Board will be greatly promoted by the separation; but, in this case, it should be brought about deliberately, and after the whole subject has been fairly presented to the churches. Your Committee feel that, for this Board to confirm, at this meeting, the action of the Prudential Committee in discontinuing this Mission, would be regarded by many of the churches contributing largely to its resources, as at least premature.

"In order, therefore, to secure deliberate and intelligent action on this question, your committee recommend:

"That this whole subject be committed to a Committee of \_\_\_\_\_, (members of this Board,) with instructions to examine it; and if, in their opinion, it is expedient to discontinue the Choctaw Mission, to consider what arrangements are necessary to render such discontinuance least perilous to the interests of religion in that nation, and just to the members of the Mission, and report thereon at the next meeting of the Board.

"Your Committee also recommend that, for this year, the Prudential Committee should grant the Mission the usual supplies."

*Minority Report.*

"I. *Resolved*, That, in consideration of the facts involved in the intercourse between the Prudential Committee and the Missionaries in the Choctaw Mission, since the year 1847, the happiness of the Missionaries and their prosperity in their work, will be promoted by their separation from this Board, while, at the same time, the termination of their connection will greatly relieve the Board of the serious and painful embarrassments to which it has been subjected.

"II. *Resolved*, That this Board entertain feelings of the highest respect, confidence and affection for the devoted men connected with this Mission, and cordially and gratefully appreciate their self-denying and faithful labors, which have been signally blessed of God to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the Choctaw Nation, and most earnestly desire that larger fruits of these years of toil may cheer them in the future prosecution of their benevolent and christian enterprise.

"III. *Resolved*, That, while we cannot withhold an expression of deep regret at the withdrawal of this Board from a field which has been cultivated for so long a period, with so much prayer and Christian zeal on the part of the churches, and with so many severe hardships and struggles on the part of the Missionaries, we are constrained to recommend that the action of the Prudential Committee, terminating the connection of the Choctaw Nation with the Board, be concurred in, with this distinct modification, that the usual appropriations for a year be made and placed at the disposal of the Missionaries, in order that, with comfort to themselves, they may go on with their work until they shall have fully matured their plans for the future.

We also here put on record, as a concluding portion of this history, the correspondence of the *discontinued* Mission with the General Council of the Choctaw Nation. This body has appropriated, we learn, \$8,000 for NEIGHBORHOOD schools in different parts of the nation, besides the \$800 referred to in the resolutions, for the Female Boarding Schools at Pine Ridge, Wheelock and Iyanobbi—this being the amount heretofore appropriated to these three schools by the American Board.

"STATEMENT BY THE MISSIONARIES

"*To the General Council of the Choctaw Nation, relative to the three Female Boarding Schools, recently under the care of the American Board.*

"To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives  
of the Choctaw Nation, in General Council assembled :

"As the American Board of Missions has withdrawn its patronage from the Mission and the schools which it had in this nation, the un-

designated, having been appointed by the Mission a Committee to lay the subject before your honorable bodies, beg leave to make the following statement :

“The Choctaw Mission was commenced forty-one years ago last June. The Missionaries were sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to establish schools for the education of Choctaw children, and to preach the Gospel. What we have done in the way of education is known to the nation. We need not speak of that now.

“In accordance with the directions of the Saviour, we preached the Gospel, as we had opportunity, to all who were willing to hear it. We made no distinction between the red man, the white man, and the black man, and when any gave evidence of piety, whether they were masters or slaves, we received them into our churches.

“For laborers, both in-doors and out, we hired such as we could find in the country. We hired white people, and red people, and slaves, as we had need, and as we had opportunity.

“Our practice, in relation to these subjects, was the same from the commencement of the Mission ; and for many years it received the unqualified approbation of the Board, and of its officers. In 1844 memorials were presented to the Board against our receiving slaveholders into our churches ; and before this time objections had been made to our employing slave labor. These memorials were referred to a Special Committee.

“In 1845, this Committee made their report. It was a long and able document, and fully sustained the course the Mission had taken. The report of this Committee was approved by every member of the Board that was present at that meeting.

“But notwithstanding this unanimous approval of the Mission by the Board, the subject was not suffered to rest. There were those among the supporters of the Board who continued to agitate the question of slavery in the Choctaw Mission at the annual meetings of the Board.

“In 1848, Mr. Treat was sent out to confer with us in relation to the difficulty. We could not agree with Mr. Treat. He went back and wrote us a letter, in which we were strongly urged ‘to pursue such a course as shall deliver the Choctaw churches from all connection with slavery ;’ and ‘to dispense altogether with slave labor.’ To this letter we could not give our assent. For years efforts were made to obtain our assent to that letter, but it was never obtained.

“At almost every annual meeting of the Board, slavery in the Choctaw Mission was brought up, and remarks were made, and resolutions passed, which we could not approve, and which were calculated to disturb the peace and harmony of our people. Believing that we could never come to an agreement with the Board, in 1855 we sent in our resignation. This was not accepted, and we were requested to reconsider the whole matter, and to withdraw our resignation.

“In 1856, we informed the [Prudential] Committee that we could

not withdraw our letter of resignation ; that our difficulties still remained. At the same time we stated concisely, but clearly, the points on which we differed from the Committee and the Board, and that, so far as our views were known to the people among whom we labored, they met their approbation. Having thus frankly stated our position, we told the Committee they could do as they thought best as to granting our supplies. Our supplies for 1857 and 1858 were granted as usual.

“ At the meeting of the Board at Detroit, in 1858, the Sub-Committee on ‘ North American Indians No. 1,’ in their report, say, ‘ It seems to your Committee desirable that the Board should be relieved, as early as possible, from the increasing embarrassments and perplexities connected with the Missions in the Indian Territory.’

The [Prudential] Committee of the Board, finding that there was no hope that their Missionaries among the Choctaws would change their ground, resolved to *discontinue* the Choctaw Mission ; and in July last they addressed us a letter containing their decision. Thus our relations to the American Board have been brought to a close by this act of their Committee.

“ In our correspondence with the Committee of the Board we have contended that we were not sent here either to advocate slavery or to oppose it—that so far as the relation between master and slave is concerned, we had nothing to do with it. In accordance with the example and instructions of the Apostles, we have preached the duties which masters owe to their servants, and servants to their masters. This the Apostles did ; and this, as ministers of Jesus Christ, we ought to do.

“ The letter which the Committee addressed to us in July last was kind and courteous in its expressions of friendly feelings towards ourselves, towards the Choctaws, their churches and their schools. They regretted the step they felt compelled to take in discontinuing the Mission. They also expressed a willingness to aid us, as individuals, until we should get help from other sources.

“ The Female Boarding Schools at Pine Ridge, Wheelock, and Iyanobbi, having been given up by the American Board, are now in the hands of the Council, to be disposed of as they shall think best. These schools have not been discontinued for a single day. They were commenced on Wednesday last by those who have them in charge.

“ If it should be the wish of the Council to have these schools continued for a time by those who now have the care of them, they will be willing to do it on such terms as may be mutually agreed on.

“ All which is respectfully submitted.

C. KINGSBURY,  
J. E. DWIGHT,  
*Committee of the Mission.*

“ BOGGY DEPOT, October 10, 1859.”

ACTION OF THE COUNCIL.

“ *Report of the Committee of the Choctaw Council.*

“ Your Committee, to whom was referred the communication on be-

half of the late Missionaries of the American Board of Foreign Missions among the Choctaws, would report,

"That the General Council of the Choctaw Nation can but regret the agitation of a question which has brought to a close the long and successful operations of the American Board of Foreign Missions in behalf of the Choctaw people.

"They, however, rejoice that those who have been so long the laborers under the patronage of that Board are not disposed to leave their field of labor, so long as they can be useful, and can obtain a comfortable support therein.

"That the General Council of the Choctaw Nation do accord to the Missionaries referred to, their confidence and good will; and would wish that their lives and labors may be even more abundantly blessed in the dissemination of light, knowledge and truth among the Choctaw people than at any former period.

"Your Committee would further recommend the accompanying resolutions in reference to the schools which have been heretofore under the care of the American Board of Foreign Missions.

"All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed.)

JOSEPH P. FOLSOM,	} Committee.
JAS. DUKES,	
P. P. PITCHLYNN,	
J. McCURTAIN,	

"Read in the House and approved.

ADAM CHRISTY, *Speaker.*

"October 22d, 1859.

"Read in the Senate and approved.

GEO. W. HASKINS,  
*President of the Senate.*

"October 22d, 1859.

*"Resolutions recommended by the Committee.*

"*Be it resolved, &c.,* That the General Council of the Choctaws are disposed, on behalf of the Choctaw people, to make a contract for the continuance of the Female Boarding Schools, which have been heretofore under the care of the American Board of Foreign Missions, of such a nature that they may still be under the charge of the present Superintendents thereof, provided such a contract can be made on terms agreeable to all parties concerned.

"*Be it further resolved,* That Joseph Dukes, the present Trustee for schools in Apukshanobbi District, and R. W. Nail, Superintendent of Trustees, be authorized, on the part of the Choctaw Nation, as soon as possible, to enter into a contract with the several Superintendents of the several Female Boarding Schools at Pine Ridge, Wheelock, and Eagle Town, or with others, whereby these Female Schools may be continued.

"*Be it further resolved,* That whenever the above desired contract is effected, R. W. Nail, Superintendent of Trustees, shall forthwith in-

form Gen. D. H. Cooper, U. S. Indian Agent, of the existence of such a contract, and further request that the appropriations for the above named Female Schools be paid to the Superintendents thereof, as heretofore.

*"Be it further resolved,* That the sum of two hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-seven cents be appropriated annually, for four years only, out of the National Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to each Female School named above, in case the contract be entered into between said Joseph Dukes and R. W. Nail, and the Superintendents thereof.

" Read in the House and passed.

ADAM CHRISTY,  
*Speaker of the House.*

" October 22d, 1859.

" Read in the Senate and passed.

GEO. W. HASKINS,  
*President of the Senate.*

" October 22d, 1859.

"Approved, October 22d, 1859.

BASIL L. LEFLORE,  
*Governor of Choctaw Nation."*

We have no apology to offer, either to the American Board or to our readers, for taking up this subject. It is true the Old School Presbyterian Church long since ceased to act in the matter of Foreign Missions through this Board of Commissioners, but up to the time of its late meeting at Philadelphia, our Church was still connected with the Board through this Choctaw Mission. In defence of our own Old School *Presbytery of Indian* from unjust charges made against them in common with our Church generally, we have felt bound to discuss this question. Again, our own past relations personally to the American Board give us a necessary interest in the case; we knew the Board, and respected and loved it, in its better days, and we claim the right to mourn its fall. Moreover, the important principles which the case involves, and the grave consequences of which it is, perhaps, significant, seem to open the whole subject to all the world, and to invite who will to take part in its consideration.

The first topic, then, upon which we shall freely comment, is the way in which this step is likely to affect the Mission and the Board, respectively.

We have no doubt whatever that, borrowing the language of the Minority Report, "the happiness of the Missionaries, and their prosperity in their work, will be promoted by this separation." To be rid all at once, and forever, of the constant barking at their heels which has been kept up for fifteen years, we suppose these brethren must doubtless estimate as constituting of itself a pretty tolerable share of carnal comfort and worldly happiness for poor Indian Missionaries to enjoy! As to their support, of course the Presbyterian Church will not suffer them to want. And as to prosperity in their work, their faith, we should think, might very confidently look up to "the Covenant Keeper"—to the Lord whose "presence has always been in their churches." They have suffered for their adherence to His truth, and He may well be trusted to be with them to give prosperity in their future labors.

But we do not believe the Board will find itself in any respect the gainer by this step. Will it, indeed, gain "peace from serious and painful embarrassments"? Is it, can it be, sure of this? Will the Abolitionists have no more demands to make upon it—no more work for it to do in their service? Will there arise no future "serious and painful embarrassments" out of this precedent? Does the experienced and sagacious senior Secretary find it impossible to conceive of any troubles in any quarter that may arise hereafter out of the principles which have now been established as part of the Board's policy?

Again: Will the Board gain income by this measure? Will the increased gifts of the Abolitionists overbalance their losses in conservative quarters? We could not, if we would, give any answer to this question; but if we could, we would not. In the Board's behalf, and as one of its true friends, we scorn the whole inquiry. The time was once when the American Board would have scorned it too! We verily believe the old Secretaries and members of the Prudential Committee would have resented the insinuation conveyed in almost the first effort of Abolition to control their action; they would have told the memorialists of New Hampshire, in 1841, that their appeal to pecuniary motives, by way of persuading the

Board to depart from its own proper path, was offensive, and that it was enough for the Board that any given course was right or wrong. Still more would they have resented the imputation made upon the Board by the New Englander of May, 1849, wherein the Rev. Dr. Dutton, of New Haven, after about 18 pages devoted to the "*sinfulness*" of slaveholding, and "*the duty*" of the Board to separate itself from this Choctaw Mission, brings out at the close, as the chief and crowning consideration which should affect the conscience of the Board, this idea: that "the American Board *cannot afford*, in the present state of public sentiment, to sustain" these Missionaries, and that it had already "*lost more aid* from that cause than from any other." It would appear that amongst "the first and most elementary ideas of Christian morality," according to the estimate of this New Haven Doctor, and, we are compelled to add, of the Prudential Committee, with its Secretary, Mr. Treat, are to be reckoned the "wisdom and expediency" of so conducting the Board's operations as by no means to fail of securing as much money as possible from its numerous patrons. But so reasoned not, and so felt not, the fathers of this institution.

There is another question: Will the Board gain in point of character by this step? And this question refers not only to the immediate associates of the Board, the ministers and the churches of New England, but to those of the whole country and the whole Church; and not only to the men of this generation, but to those who are to follow. Will impartial history honor the institution for this step? This depends upon another question: Did the Board act on Scriptural principles in this whole transaction? Did it act an honest part throughout? Did it first adopt right principles, and then carry them out with a simple, truthful consistency?

We assert that it did not act on principle at all, but always on *expediency*, and most especially so at the last. Look at Dr. Bacon's Detroit report, where this action is put upon the ground of "relieving the Board from unceasing embarrassments and perplexities." The same ground is taken in the final action of the Committee and Board, although very skil-

fully "*the happiness of the Missionaries, and their prosperity,*" and also the avoiding of the "*injury that will accrue to the spiritual interests of our constituency from a prolonged agitation,*" are coupled with this *relief to the Board*. Nowhere is the pretence made that the Board is cutting off the Missionaries because they have committed an offence, or because they are guilty of sinful conduct in their relations to the "wicked system." "Wicked" the system is; subversive of "the most elementary ideas of Christian morality," is the attitude of those churches which receive slaveholders to their communion; but still these Missionaries, that have themselves so done, are "devoted men, whose self-denying and faithful labors have been signally blessed of God to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the Choctaw nation;" and so Mr. Treat can "pray that the God of Missions may keep you henceforth, so that the comfort and joy which you have hitherto received therein shall be forgotten by reason of the more abundant coming of the Spirit of Promise"—albeit the Missionaries still pertinaciously maintain the very same principles with those "religious bodies which have made a lamentable defection from some of the first and most elementary ideas of Christian morality." Who can trace, as we have done in this article, the whole course of this transaction, from the beginning to the end of it, without feeling ashamed of the Board's, and still more the Committee's and the Secretaries' failure, all along, to act from any higher motive than that of mere expediency? Has not this Board been whipped to its late work for the Abolitionists, as perhaps not one Southern slave in one million ever was whipped to his labor? Has it not been ever prone to stop in its onward progress as soon as the tyrant Fanaticism would for a while cease to urge it forward? In 1844, when the senior Secretary visited Smyrna, we remember telling him that the Board was yielding inch by inch to the pressure of the Abolitionists, then recently commenced, but he resented the imputation with considerable feeling. But where does he find them now?

And what are those unscriptural principles to which, for the sake of expediency, (that is, for ease and money's sake,) they have now lent their sanction?

1. One is, that these eleven gentlemen of Boston, eight of them not Ministers of the Gospel, may compel a whole Presbytery to teach certain doctrines, on pain of being cut off from support. It is, in other words, the principle reported to the Board by the Committee in 1848, but not adopted by the Board; nay, repudiated in form frequently, and yet in fact often asserted, and now carried out into actual operation. Dr. Pomroy, for example, in 1854, in a published letter, defined the position of the Board thus: "Now the question is asked, in some quarters, why does not the Board interfere and cause these slaveholders to be cast out of the churches? \* \* \* The Board is not an ecclesiastical body, and has no more right to interfere with the internal discipline of those churches than it has with the churches in Vermont. \* \* \* But why does not the Board instruct its Missionaries to teach the true Scriptural doctrine on this subject, and use such influence as they properly may, to abolish this evil? My answer is, that they *have done, and are doing, this very thing.* (The italics are Dr. P.'s.) The views expressed by the Prudential Committee, as read by Mr. Treat in 1848, have not been lost sight of in their correspondence with the Indian Missions. \* \* \* But the Board can certainly withdraw support and call home its Missionaries, if these churches persist in their sins; can it not? Undoubtedly it can. But, would that cure the evil? Besides, it may be doubted whether that is the Gospel method of converting the world. At any rate, we have not supposed it to be the proper way of conducting Christian Missions to go and say to a people, 'If you will not abandon your sins you shall be deprived of the Gospel.' The Board does not manage its Missions in this way." In 1854 it did not, but in 1859 it does so manage. The claim so to manage, if it chooses, was then made, and now is acted on, however ridiculous and absurd the actual exercise of it then looked even to Dr. Pomroy's eyes. The claim is not to exercise *ecclesiastical* control. Oh, no! That is a terrible thing ever since Dr. Hodge, in the Repertory, pointed out how unfounded was the Committee's claim to that power! But without ecclesiastically controlling, the Committee may, *pecuniarily*, control

the Missionaries! That is, of course, a very different affair! The Committee may *starve* the Missionaries, if they will not consent to look through these Boston gentlemen's spectacles. The junto in Boston may control the teaching of the Missionaries, if only they do it not *ecclesiastically!* The thing to be objected to is not *control*, but only *ecclesiastical* control—and so, of course, nothing can be said against a control that is *pecuniary*. Such was the exposition, in 1854, of the Committee's rights and powers, by one of the Secretaries. And wherein does this late "discontinuance" of the Choctaw Mission differ from what was thus claimed? The Committee take a certain ground in 1848, and in 1854 the Board confirm it, but the Missionaries persist, down to 1859, in holding contrary opinions, *and this, and nothing but this*, on their part, is the cause of their being cut off. The majority report of the Sub-Committee, which we inserted above, states that "it is proposed to discontinue the Mission *solely on the ground of a difference of opinion* between the Missionaries and this Board in respect to the manner of preaching the Gospel, or the application of its principles to the evil of slavery." If they had assented to Mr. Treat's, or to Dr. Wood's, views of slavery, the Committee would have gladly retained them; they protested against those views, and could neither be forced nor persuaded to change their ground, and therefore, they have been *cut off*, that is, *discontinued!* We say, then, that in this act the Boston Committee not only exercised ecclesiastical power, but exercised it in a way, and upon grounds, that no Synod or Assembly of Presbyterians, and no truly Protestant Bishop of the Episcopal Church, would consider sufficient. Outside of the Bible, none of these would go to find cause for such summary and severe discipline.

2. A second unscriptural principle which the Committee sanction for the sake of expediency, is, that men may make new terms of church-membership, not laid down by our Lord or His Apostles. We need not argue this point. It is plain that the Missionaries are cut off because of their not acting upon the Treat doctrine, that voluntary slaveholders may not be church members. And this is now the attitude in which the Ameri-

can Board is placed! Good and true, and faithful Missionaries are cut off because they would not agree to deprive the King of his crown-rights! All honor to the Choctaw Missionaries that would not betray their master for money, nor barter away his honor and kingdom for their very bread! Alas! for this great Board, that has so sadly been led astray!

3. A third unscriptural principle, which the Committee have carried out, is, that Missionaries of Jesus, *as such*, must sometimes interfere, "discreetly" with the politics of the nations. This the Committee instructed these brethren to do in this case. Had they obeyed, and done it with sufficient secrecy and craft, they might have been, to-day, in connection still with the Committee. They refused, and have been "discontinued."

4. There is yet another very unscriptural principle enacted by the Committee, namely: that a Missionary Board may properly quit their work in any given field, although the Lord smiles on that work, if only they have to encounter very great "embarrassments and perplexities" in carrying it forward. In this case the Board were perplexed and embarrassed by reason of the calm and quiet firmness of their brethren in the wilderness, whom neither the letters nor the visits of Secretaries could induce to give up their judgment upon important questions of principle. Moreover, this Board was grievously worried and harassed by the constant agitation, at their annual meetings, and elsewhere, which the Abolitionists produced; and so, after nineteen long years of patient endurance of this severe trial of their faith, the Lord meanwhile blessing the labors of the Missionaries, the Board, for the sake of ease and money, conclude to give up their Master's work! So did not Paul nor the other Apostles. What trials and troubles did not he patiently endure from the Corinthians and the Galatians! So do not any other Missionary organizations of this day; while the Lord smiles on their work they never abandon a field that is in need of their labor. So does not this very Board in regard to any other description of difficulties or embarrassments.

The great error and misfortune of the Board is, that they consented, many years ago, to yield a little to the spirit of abo-

lition, and, by so doing, helped to nurse its vigor for their own complete overthrow. Once involved in this difficulty, there was, possible for them, no more consistent action. God gave them a testimony to maintain for him against rampant error clothed in the garb of truth—but they have failed to keep it. Subterfuges and shams and shuffling have long marked their course. Had the senior Secretary, obeying the impulses which we dare to say he sometimes felt, but resisted the Committee's action, and rallied the conservative strength which he could, doubtless, have commanded at the last meeting of the Board, there might have been achieved, by him, the glory of another Tract-Society victory—a victory over fanatical clergymen by sober and rational laymen! There remains for the American Board the lasting dishonor achieved for it by false friends! Impartial history will condemn it as selling principle for gold! How vainly will any future apologist seek to represent them as cutting off their Missionaries for the sake of some important principle—suppose, for example, the principle that slaveholding church members may not be acknowledged; seeing that they dare not base their excising upon this ground, but dismiss these brethren with sugared words—nay, actually vote them a year's pay, and present them with a considerable amount of property! If the Missionaries were scandalous sinners, why give them all this money of the churches? If they were not such sinners, why cut them off? There is but one answer, and that one the Board itself gives—it was for money and for quietness.

There is another topic upon which, in closing this review, we shall offer a few observations:

We look upon this act of the American Board as having great significance in a political point of view. This Board has a wide constituency, extending over all New England, and through New York, into Ohio, and the other North-Western States. It is, therefore, one of the great pulses of the country. Our friends in New York and Philadelphia would have us believe *the North* is sound enough upon the question of the rights of masters in the South; it is only a few rabid fanatics here and there who make a great noise, which we are not to regard

as of the least consequence. With great respect for their authority, it does not silence the loud contrary testimony of this act of the American Board. Not on principle, but confessedly upon expediency, we see it here doing what it would gladly not do to those excellent Choctaw Missionaries. How strong and how general must be the anti-slavery sentiment which has thus governed that Board! What a mighty thing was that "expediency" which forced the reluctant Board so far down from its former position! Here is another bond of union broken—another bulwark thrown down for the waves of civil strife to break in upon our country!

We are well aware of the distinction that will immediately be drawn by our sincere friends at the North, when they read these remarks. They will say that, of course, the North generally, perhaps universally, is anti-slavery, but they will reiterate that there are very few real *Abolitionists* to be found. We reply to our friends, that it matters little to us what distinctions of names they make. Be it, if they will have it so, that the Abolitionists at the North have little weight! We point here, then, to a fact which shews how dangerous to the peace of our country is that *Anti-Slavery*, which they acknowledge to be so general. It is, indeed, the misfortune of the United States, that a generation has grown up at the North during thirty years past, under the influence of a great misapprehension of the principles of the slavery question, and a systematic misrepresentation of its facts. And now the fruits of this training begin to appear. The sentiments inculcated so long and so zealously, are developed into actual form and life before us. They appear in one shape at Harper's Ferry; they appear in another shape, not so bloody, but quite as significant, at the Board's last meeting at Philadelphia.

We reiterate the opinion expressed by us before, in this journal, that there is but one hope for a peaceful future to our country, and that is the hope of a great change of sentiment at the North regarding the principles and the facts of the question of slavery. Do our friends in New York and Philadelphia cherish any such hope as this? Doctrines must produce their own proper fruit. Ideas rule. Can there be brought about a

great change of ideas at the North? As for the South—the *Christian* South—we believe her views are sustained by truth and reason. She has carefully, intelligently and prayerfully examined the whole question. She will not, can not, ought not to abandon her defence of slavery. The negro being here, and being a negro, the relation in which he stands to the white man must be maintained. If it is essential to the white man's peace, it is likewise essential to the black man's existence on this soil. For the South, no change of sentiment is possible. She must stand where she is standing, and if need be and God so order, there she must fall and perish!

Our true friends at the North must bear with us when we say, that it is not to be expected the Southern people should put the very highest estimate on the value of the demonstrations now making in the great commercial centres of the North. We do not believe and would not intimate that there are none, or that there are but few of those who make those demonstrations, that are sincere. Those meetings have called out, we do not doubt, many a retired patriot, influenced by none but the purest motives. But we say the people of the South must be expected to give a considerable portion of the credit of these demonstrations to the interested motives of those centres of commerce which draw their wealth, in large proportions, from this section. What is needed is to see this kind of demonstration, or rather *to have seen them* at the very outset, in the rural communities, and especially in the second and third rate cities and towns of the North, not so immediately affected by the loss of Southern trade. These demonstrations are too late in their appearing. It appears to us, in this aggrieved section, that there ought to have been witnessed, at once, a simultaneous movement at a thousand points all through the non-slaveholding States, abjuring and denouncing the late invasion. We cannot but think such a movement would have been witnessed, had this thing happened thirty years ago, and that it would have been witnessed now, also, but for those anti-slavery sentiments which prevail almost universally at the North; we say those *anti-slavery* sentiments, those *innocent* sentiments, which our best friends at the North do not expect

us to condemn. What is needful to give the South confidence in the friendship of the Northern masses, is for us to see the ballot-box repudiating enmity to the South; is to see the action of such bodies of men as gather at the meetings of the American Board rebuking denunciation of us and our churches; is to see the Northern press put away the sneers and taunts of slaveholders, with which it has long teemed. It has been said that, in relation to the Harper's Ferry case, the Northern press did, for the most part, discharge well their duty. We acknowledge that much of what has come under our own eye of this "well-discharged duty" has seemed to us to lack heart. Even among those papers which have the most manfully and earnestly spoken out, as it became brethren and patriots to speak for brethren and for their country, there has been evinced sometimes a singular deadness to the just claims of our much-abused South. A New York paper, which stands nearly at the head of the list in that city, for its bold advocacy of what is our due, after glorying in the late patriotic meetings there, turns to Richmond and Charleston and New Orleans, and putting into one and the same category, "the disorganizing movements of the Northern Abolitionists and Southern Fanatics," calls on these cities to come out, like New York, Philadelphia and Boston, and denounce all "non-intercourse" and "retaliation" movements, as equalling "the rampant sectionalism of the North." Thus do the best friends of the South, in New York, misconceive her position. Is this people—for thirty years harrassed unceasingly and increasingly by a most unjust persecution; irritated by meddlesome and mischievous impertinence, and provoked by officious ignorance; threatened with every loss that can befall a free and brave people, and the threats actually beginning to be executed, while our Northern friends for a long time keep silence and stand still—is this people to be classed with their very assailants? When the best informed and best intentioned Northern newspapers use such language, they demonstrate how complete a revolution in the sentiments of the North is necessary, in order to warrant the hope of any peace for these United States in the future.

We believe such a revolution of sentiments might take place

if there were but time for truth to work. Slavery is stronger now at the South than ever, and is daily getting stronger. We mean the Christian doctrine of slavery, viz., that Slavery is government, and as such is good, and is sanctioned of God; that masters have rights and duties; that slaves also have rights and duties; that ignorance and superstition, barbarism and licentiousness, indolence, disobedience and deceit, are all evils, but that slavery, as regulated by Christian communities, should and does lift the negro out of these evils, and is therefore good; that whilst God, in His providence, has given to us these people to serve us, He has given us to them to protect them; to govern them; to restrain them by wholesome and firm, yet kind, discipline; to improve them; above all, to go forward in the fear of God with them to the judgment seat, and to give them all the assistance in our power to prepare for that meeting with Him. We say that this Slavery, this existing relation between two races which can never be separated—which relation is the source of such great advantages to them both, and without which relation each race would speedily become, here on this one common soil, an unspeakable and an intolerable curse to the other—this Slavery is daily growing stronger in the confidence and affections of the South. Give it time, and it would vindicate itself also at the North, and to candid Europe. But those *innocent* anti-slavery sentiments which confessedly possess the Northern mind, have already raised a whirlwind of passion there, and an answering whirlwind of passion here is rising fast to meet it, and only our Maker knows what the end will be. Before Him we firmly believe that the South, the Christian South, is representing His truth in this controversy, and in Him we do calmly confide that He will vindicate His truth in the South, and by the South against all opposers! Equal rights to all things He never gave to all men. Freedom from just and necessary and wholesome restraints He grants to no creatures in Heaven, Earth or Hell. The restraints of slavery, which neither we nor our fathers established, He has already made the greatest blessing to the slaves of the South of which they are capable. We are in His hands with them, and going forwards in the effort to discharge

our duties to God in this relation, whilst in His fear we maintain, at every hazard, our just rights in respect to all who assail us, we anticipate the coming storm with a steadfast and a fearless heart.

Recurring to the main point of this article, we disclaim all unkind feelings to the American Board, although we have spoken in simplicity and sincerity just what we think. For that Board, as a Christian organization of great importance, we have prayed, and will pray, that their folly and weakness and sin, in this case, may be overruled of God for good. We would not injure their good name unjustly, but would rejoice to see them retrieving their damaged character. And so we bid them, affectionately and faithfully, farewell!

To the Presbyterian Church, Old School, so far as we represent them, and so far as our feeble voice can reach them, we would say that it must be ours to take up what the American Board has thrown down. Precious in the sight of the Lord Jesus are those churches of His and those servants of His! Let *Southern* Presbyterians, especially, exhibit their sympathy with these brethren, who have been cast off and cast out for being of us and like us. Let us swell our contributions to this cause during this new year. Let us, each one, try to do this without depending on its being done by his neighbors. There is a special call to us, as slaveholding christians, to rally to the support of the deserted Mission. Let us not fail, depending on the Master's grace, to meet it in full!