

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 2.

---

JULY, MDCCCLXI.

---

## ARTICLE I.

NATURAL HISTORY AS A BRANCH OF SCHOOL EDUCATION; AND THE SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE UNIVERSITY, IN RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER AND TO ACTIVE LIFE.

In our article on the Principles of a Liberal Education, (Vol. XII., p. 310,) as also in an Inaugural Address delivered by us, we endeavored to show the importance of *organic science* as a means of mental culture. In our article on Morphology, (Vol. XII., p. 83,) we undertook to point out the philosophic connection of that branch of organic science with fine art. Finally, in our article on the Relation of Organic Science to Sociology, (Vol. XIII., p. 39,) we attempted to explain the philosophic connection of the same science with the most important concerns of life. If there is any truth in any of these views, (and we are perfectly confident there is,) the great importance of a full introduction of organic science into our courses of liberal education becomes evident at once. Our college curriculum, therefore, requires modification in this respect. It is in vain to contend that other equally or more

VOL. XIV., NO. II.—24

carries them, in His providence, to the pulpit, and promises them an unction from the Holy One to give success to those efforts of their preaching which may be the best that *they* can make. This is our judgment, in one sentence.

---

ARTICLE V.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861.

We still acknowledge ourselves to be, in one sense, members of the body which is called the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. This title is now, indeed, *a misnomer*, for the United States of America have ceased to be United, and have become two distinct, separate, and, alas! hostile governments. The Presbyterian Church, Old School, is, of course, in fact, no longer one Church, but two. And yet the separation will not, we suppose, be formally made until the regular fall sessions of our Presbyteries and Synods. Our readers will, no doubt, acquiesce in our decision to occupy some few pages with our usual Annual Review of the proceedings of the General Assembly—or, rather, of such of its proceedings as will be of any interest to Southern Presbyterians.

I. ORGANIZATION.

After the opening sermon, by the respected Moderator of the last Assembly, Rev. Dr. YEOMANS, from John xviii : 36—"My kingdom is not of this world"—the Assembly was organized, and the Rev. Dr. J. C. BACKUS, of the Presbytery of Baltimore, was elected Moderator, and Rev. D. J. WALLER, of the Presbytery of Northumberland, Temporary Clerk. There were present two hundred and sixty Commissioners, against three hundred and twenty-

nine at the preceding Assembly. From the Synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Arkansas, there were no Commissioners present. From the Synod of Virginia there were two; from that of Nashville, three; from Mississippi, seven; from Memphis, two; from Texas, two—in all, sixteen Commissioners from Synods in the Confederate States, against ninety Commissioners from those Synods in the last Assembly.

This general absence of Southern Commissioners seems to have been misapprehended by the Assembly. Dr. Hodge said “one-third of the Commissioners were absent through the force of circumstances they could not control.” Also, in his paper offered as a substitute for Dr. Spring’s, he says: “Owing to providential hindrances, nearly one-third of our Presbyteries are not represented;” and he refers to the absent Commissioners as such, “most of them, we believe, by no fault of their own.” Evidently, the Assembly in general ascribed this absence to a fear of the consequences which might overtake the Commissioners at their homes, and not to the patriotic feelings, either of our Presbyteries or of the Commissioners themselves. Thus, the people of the North will, on all occasions, it seems, lay the flattering unction to their souls that the South is divided into friends and foes of the so-called United States Government. Let the North sleep on. Time will put an end to their delusion and their dreams. It must be some mighty interest, however, which does so blind them to the real nature of this contest. It must be their not being willing to be convinced, which makes it so hard to convince them that we are both united and in earnest. It would seem as though, did they once appeal to their own hearts, they would find out how the South really feels, and why the Southern Commissioners generally would not go and sit down in council with the enemies of their country seeking her utter ruin and overthrow.

But what did our sixteen Commissioners present mean by the course which they pursued? On this point, as on others, we fear some of them very much misrepresented the South; unless, indeed, they have themselves been misrepresented in the newspapers, from which we have derived our accounts of the Assembly. Dr. WILLIS LORD, of Chicago, urging the adoption of Dr. Spring's resolutions, "honored these brethren for coming to this Assembly, and only wished that all the Commissioners from the South had been here. . . . But why are they not here? He had a letter from a distinguished source in the South, in which he was informed that some of the Presbyteries would not appoint Commissioners—and why? Because of the difficulty of travel? No; but because of their sympathies with the rebellion."

"Mr. McInnis (of New Orleans) and Mr. Baker (of Texas) besought Dr. Lord not to make the impression that such was the general state of things. That letter was a misrepresentation of the Southern Presbyteries, if true of any; and one of the gentlemen (the reporter could not see which one spoke) deprecated the harshness of the term 'rebellion.'"

We will not trust ourselves to make any comments upon the conduct of these brethren, as thus described by *The Presbyterian*. We hope that *The Presbyterian's* reporter did them injustice.

## II. PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Several places were put in nomination—amongst them Springfield, Illinois; Washington, D. C.; and Columbus, Ohio. The first named was soon dropped, the nomination, of course, having been only a compliment to Mr. Lincoln, as the Presbyterian interest is but small in that place. But it was seriously and urgently endeavored, by many in the Assembly, to choose Washington City, and no other place but that odious seat of a despotism abhorred by one-third

part of the Church, for the next place of meeting. At last, however, Columbus was victorious. The final vote stood, one hundred and seven for Washington, and one hundred and thirty for Columbus.

### III. THE BOARDS.

Upon the subject of two of these institutions there was protracted and earnest discussion, viz: the Board of Publication and the Board of Domestic Missions.

Respecting the former, the Secretary, Rev. Dr. Schenck, made, on the whole, an encouraging statement, notwithstanding the difficulties of the times.

The Board's publications were received every where with growing favor. *The Sabbath School Visitor's* circulation had increased. The number of Colporteurs was greater, by forty, than ever. And the number of Churches contributing to this Board was larger than ever before, by more than one hundred.

Dr. EDWARDS, of Philadelphia, objected to the resolution which endorsed the Board's economy and efficiency. We are not sufficiently informed in regard to the business of the Board, and can not find out what is its capital, its assets, its net profits, nor its expenses. The Board tell us of their *benevolent* operations, but not of their business transactions. He objected to the cost of management. He alleged that \$41,000 worth of business had cost \$3,000 for Secretaries only, besides a Treasurer at \$1,000, and a book-keeper at nearly as much more. He acknowledged the improvement made in *The Sabbath School Visitor*, but he characterized *The Home and Foreign Record* as an eminently dull and stupid paper, sent every where, to the number of fifteen thousand, but never read, and only lumbering up ministers' studies and the reading-rooms of theological seminaries. All that was worth reading in it was soon copied into the papers, and it were better given up, and the cost saved. He charged that the Board gave all their printing to one publishing house, whereas, competition would cheapen work. And, finally, he complained that the Board was too intimate with *The Presbyterian* newspaper. Too many men belonging to that one establishment were in positions of influence in the Board.

Dr. SCHENCK repudiated any wish or intention, on the part of the Board, to practice any concealment. The minutes of the Board and Executive Committee, the vouchers, the accounts, all are here, and a balance-sheet has always been presented to the Assembly. The Board think it would be inexpedient to spread these statements over the whole land; but if the Assembly so direct, it shall be done, notwith-

standing it would place the Board at a business disadvantage, as in competition with our houses in the same trade.

As to the charge of extravagance in the colportage department—to get the forty thousand required much work. It was not a compact capital, all in a lump, and ready to be used, but the *collection*, as well as the *disbursement*, of it demanded labor and expence. A Superintendent of Colportage was necessary, and also a Corresponding Secretary, and the two offices could not be united in one man. A book-keeper was, also, indispensable, and his pay moderate. And, then, as the Treasurer had to give bonds, it was necessary to pay him, also, a salary.

A MEMBER asked what was the amount of capital of this Board?

Dr. SCHENCK replied that the papers, balance-sheet, and all the details were here, on the table, and could be read or examined at pleasure. He could not, without referring to them, state with accuracy. He then denied, explicitly, the charge of the Board's being tied to one printing establishment. The printing was given out by contract, and to those who would do the best job. As to the charge of intimacy with *The Presbyterian*, it was an extraordinary charge, and he knew not how to meet it. When the Board was established, that paper was here, and had always been the friend of the Board. The intimacy complained of was very natural and proper and profitable. It was, however, only official, and he had never known that any advantage to themselves was sought or obtained from it by those gentlemen, and he was sure no such thing had occurred.

Dr. MUSGRAVE claimed it as his right to demand, for the information of the Assembly, what the capital of this Board was. Without this, no man could judge intelligently of the economy practiced. He was surprised that the Secretary had not promptly answered the questions asked on this point. He could conceive of the propriety of their withholding many details, but not the amount of their capital. The General Assembly had authorized them to add six per cent. annually to the capital. He wanted to know how much the increase now amounted to. When he was Secretary, he estimated their net profits at \$10,000 annually. He supposed their capital might soon be a quarter of a million. He thought it was not safe for so few men to control so large a capital.

As to the economy exhibited by the Board, Dr. Musgrave remarked that the entire sales of the Board, for the last year, were about ninety-one thousand dollars, and the expenses of conducting this business about seventeen thousand dollars—more than nineteen per cent—and that exclusive of rent, which was worth four or five thousand dollars more. He trusted his remarks would not be considered personal. Alas! that it should be so. But has it come to this, that a man may not call in question the propriety of any action of any of our Boards, without having his motives suspected, and being considered personal? He then proceeded to object to the salary of the Corresponding Secretary (\$2,500), as being too high; to the Treasurer's office, as a mere

sinicure; to the price paid for the printing, as higher than other printing establishments would ask; and to the undue connection between *The Presbyterian* and the Board. It was a nice little family affair. Two editors of that paper, the brother of one of them recently removed by death, and a brother-in-law, also, all were in the Committee. Why should such a nice little family circle object to any bills that might be handed in for printing at the office of *The Presbyterian*? He would advise those gentlemen to retire from the Board and the Committee, that confidence might be restored to its management. He doubted not that some fifteen cents a token could be saved in the printing. Another subject he would just hint at. If men do not agree with that paper's views of ecclesiastical management, their opinions are misrepresented, their motives are assailed, and they are held up as hostile to the Boards of the Church. No man could have fair play who dissented from the positions of *The Presbyterian*.

Dr. LEYBURN, (Stated Clerk, and editor of *The Presbyterian*, here interposed, although not entitled to the floor,) Moderator, such assaults ought not to be made upon an officer of this Assembly, without an opportunity to defend himself.

Dr. MUSGRAVE called the Clerk to order. He proceeded to the subject of colportage. Would any other publishing house give salaries to agents to sell books, and allow a per centage, too? It was argued that these men were missionaries, but he doubted whether, as a general thing, they did any thing but sell books. It was folly to employ book agents on such principles. Human nature is human nature. The Board should conduct their business on the business principles usually recognized amongst business men.

Mr. T. C. HENRY (Ruling Elder) moved to refer this matter to the Committee, and that Dr. Musgrave and Dr. Edwards be directed to appear before that Committee and substantiate these charges. It was easy to bring indefinite charges.

Dr. EDWARDS was surprised at Mr. Henry's motion. A member rises in his place and asks for explanation, and up gets another member and moves that the inquirer be required to go before a Committee and substantiate charges!

Dr. MCPHAIL (Chairman of the Committee on the Publication Board's Report) said the work proposed in the motion to recommit would require eight or ten days to perform it. Such an investigation could not be had in less time. Besides, is this the business of a Standing Committee? If so, is not the Board itself a farce? In regard to the charge that the Board is a family affair, he saw no justice in it.

Dr. SCHENCK, being again allowed the floor, said he regretted to be called upon to meet the venerable father who had made this assault. An assault of the Secretary of one Board upon another Board, he hardly knew how to meet. From one who had been for one year a Secretary of this very Board; who had often made earnest appeals for it, from the pulpit and with the pen; and who, in one of his own an-

nual reports, written as Secretary, had contradicted the very statements which he had himself made here to-day—from such an one he was surprised to hear what had now been uttered.

The history of the capital stock was as follows: It was first gathered by collections which the Assembly had ordered, during the period from 1839 to 1842, and thus rose to about \$43,000. It was ordered then by the Assembly that the profits, at the rate of six per cent., be added to the capital. It now amounts to about \$242,000. As for the house in Chestnut street, it is now worth no such sum to us as \$75,000. The house cost \$37,000. It gives us shelter for our business. He denied that books of the Board cost more than those of other publishers, and he presented various specimens to prove what he said. He insisted that the per centage of expenses in the Board was only 12 $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. instead of 19 per cent. He compared the per centage of his Board with that of other like establishments, which were in one case 27 per cent., and in another case 28 per cent.; upon salaries alone the per centage in one of them was 10 $\frac{3}{8}$ , and another 14, while in the Board of Publication it was only 11 per cent. In regard to that nice little family circle, it is indeed a nice and orderly circle. True, that venerable father can not, perhaps, appreciate the family circle as well as if he sustained certain relations in life; but more is the pity. If he was more familiar with such family scenes he would, perhaps, not envy us our great enjoyment. But he is mistaken in supposing that there are in that family circle any collusions to the injury of this Board. Dr Engles and Dr. Leyburn are as often on opposite sides as any other members, and if Dr. Musgrave would insinuate that private ends are subserved by our counsels, the imputation is unworthy.

This debate, so little creditable to the Presbyterians of the North and North-West, occurred on the fifth day of the Assembly. On the sixth day, the Report of the Committee on the Board of Domestic Missions came before the body. The chief item was the Committee's recommendation that the office of Coördinate Secretary be discontinued, and that in filling the office of the one Secretary, both the present incumbents be passed by, and some new man appointed.

There was a minority report, proposing to employ one Secretary only, but leaving the Board free to choose whom they would.

Dr. KENNEDY, for the minority, urged that the Assembly had given to the Board the power of filling these offices, and could not take it back, without violating the compact it had made with the



Board. This Board was composed of the best men in the Presbyterian Church. To resume the powers once delegated, seems a bold and a far stretch of power on the part of the Assembly. The members of the Board, if they had any self-respect, would no longer serve in a Board whose powers were thus trifled with.

The proposal to remove both Secretaries really had reference to but one. The Senior Secretary had resigned—the Junior only was to be the victim. And who was this Junior Secretary? A man who has been serving for seventeen years, and never accepted a cent of his salary whilst a single missionary was lacking his—a man who has given his time, his toil, his property, to this Church and this Board.

Dr. DONALDSON, for the majority, urged that the Assembly had never created these offices, and had as much right to abolish a Secretary as a Secretaryship. It was a mistake, that one man only was affected; for, although the Senior Secretary had proposed to resign, his resignation had not yet been accepted. But neither of the two could secure the coöperation of the whole Church, and he would not sacrifice the great interests of this Board to the official claims of any one or two men.

THE MODERATOR then observed that it was usual to hear the Secretaries of the Board after receiving the report of the Committee. The Senior Secretary, Dr MUSGRAVE, then came forward and expressed embarrassment, after having on another subject occupied so much time. His brother (Dr. Schenck) had applied rather a venerable title to him—"venerable father"—and seemed to think him disqualified for appreciating the amenities of social life. The charge fell with a bad grace from one who had continued so long a *widower*, whilst the speaker was only a *bachelor*; still, he thought neither of them disqualified thereby for their duties to their respective Boards. He had been himself a friend to all these Boards—not of that youthful class of friends who did not know Joseph. He was an old soldier in the service. An effort had been made to institute, by *inuen*do, a comparison between him and another officer. But he would publicly ask the other Secretary if he had not received his salary up to the 1st March, and whether there was not due to the missionaries unpaid salaries to the amount of seven thousand five hundred dollars? He proceeded to charge the present embarrassments of the Board for money on their rash and undue expansion the preceding year. It was not due to the political difficulties and pecuniary crisis, for this Board was insolvent in August last; whereas, the election that produced the crisis did not take place till November. For this rash expansion he was not responsible. He warred against it. He had always favored a large working balance, so as to be prepared for such evils and revulsions as have now occurred. He then recounted the history of the abolition of the Associate Secretary's office (Dr. Happersett's), with which he declared he had nothing to do, and then the reëlection of Dr. Happersett, with himself, as two Coördinate Secretaries, which had caused him to tender his own resignation, though he

afterwards withdrew it, and also that decapitation of the heads of old and tried members of the Board, and the other particulars of *the revolution in the Board*, which had resulted in the establishment of the more liberal policy, with all its consequent present embarrassments. Three years ago he thought the then expenses (nine thousand dollars) too much, now they are fourteen thousand. The aggregate for salaries of Secretaries and Superintendents alone (including those at Louisville) are now nine thousand four hundred dollars. He urged that one Secretary was sufficient, for the Clerk had kept count of the letters each Secretary wrote, and he had himself, in 1859, written one hundred and nine more than his colleague. And how many do you suppose we each write in one day, leaving out Sabbaths? How many a day do you suppose?—a little less than ONE! Only one thing more would he revert to, and that by the order of his Presbytery. It was to the proscription in the membership of the Board of all who had voted to abolish the office of Associate Secretary. Almost every such man has been guillotined as his term of office expired—dropped from this Board and this Committee. Must matters in the Church be managed as they sometimes are in the State? If this thing goes on, your Boards will become corrupt.

Dr. HAPPERT (the Junior Secretary) would not speak two and a half hours. He had an instinctive horror of controversy—would rather suffer persecution. He complained that the Committee was composed of five out of seven who had prejudged the case, yet he knew the Moderator had no blame in the matter. He said a previous General Assembly itself had expressly ordained the establishment of the two Coördinate Secretaryships, and so they were not the creation of the Board. He met the statement that the Board was insolvent by referring to the balance then in the Treasury of three thousand dollars. He utterly denied that his own salary had been paid when the missionaries were lying out of their money. He had given his own note into bank, and had the missionaries all paid, before setting out for Louisville on the business of the Board, previous to the 4th of March. But he alleged that the Treasurer had been ordered by the other Secretary to pay no more missionaries until money enough had accumulated to pay his (Dr. Musgrave's) salary, which was paid on the 25th, five days before it was due. He himself had not received any of his salary this year. He detailed certain statements, showing that the more liberal policy of the Board had worked well. He explained why the Assembly at Indianapolis changed the *personnel* of the Board. It was because of a falling off that year both in missionaries and funds, and that was a year of great general prosperity. The missionaries were stinted in their salary while yet there was a balance lying in the Treasury of twenty-four thousand dollars. Was it any wonder that the Assembly should revolutionize the Board? He reviewed the history of the Associate Secretaryship and its abolition, and then the reaction which ensued, and he replied to the charges of proscription. As to the Senior Secretary's one letter a day, the fact is, that the Clerk

wrote the most of them, as the book itself shows, where they are signed G. W. Musgrave, per W. DeArmand, Clerk. But you will not be surprised that he wrote no more letters, when I tell you that I have kept a little book with a record of the precise time the gentleman has been in the office during the year. The average is but *fifty-five minutes a day*. The-e things I never would have mentioned, but for the extraordinary attacks upon myself. Dr. Happersett concluded by averring that he had simply defended himself, and that most reluctantly, against unfounded charges. He was now ready to retire, and to serve God in some other department, wherever Providence might call him.

After this discussion between the two Secretaries, a few of the other members of the Assembly expressed their views, chiefly to the effect that the harmony of the Church required that both these Secretaries be passed over. The previous question was called for, and the majority report adopted, which instructed the Board, in view, most especially, of the "severe pecuniary pressure of the times," to elect but one Secretary, and he a new man.

On the next day, the seventh, the discussion on the Board of Publication was resumed, and Mr. WALLER argued that the cost of managing the business was disproportionate to the amount of the business done. In the department of colportage alone, there was expended the sum of thirteen thousand dollars, in managing a business of twenty-eight thousand.

The discussion was interrupted at this point, and down to the night of the tenth day it was not resumed. Beyond the night session of that day, we have no particular accounts of the proceedings which refer at all to this matter.

Our readers are aware that we are not of those who have approved the principle of the Church's delegating her work to these Boards. We will not, however, charge the disgrace of the recent discussion, with its disagreeable and unbecoming personalities, to the principle or to the system of Boards. Were the system in the hands of *gentlemen* all round—that is, of none but refined, and fair and honorable men—such shameful results might never be brought

forth. But every Presbyterian Minister or Elder is not a refined and honorable man; and one coarse, selfish, imperious Secretary can run even a good piece of machinery into the ground. We are more than ever satisfied, however, from this very debate, that the machinery itself is liable to great objections, and must, in the long run, work evil to the Church, even in the best of hands. Look, for example, at what has now, we believe, for the first time, come to the knowledge of the Church generally, that the Board of Publication has a capital which, in twenty years, has grown from forty-three thousand to very nearly one-quarter of a million of dollars, and which is constantly increasing at the rate of six per cent. per annum. And recall the fact, which was alleged, and not contradicted, that, a good many years ago, the net annual profits of this Board were ten thousand dollars! Well might Dr. Musgrave say, (although it was, for him, of all men, a most inconsistent declaration,) that it was not safe for a few men to control so mighty an agency. And the remarkable part of the case is, that it has been generally supposed that the Board of Publication was an institution struggling hard to keep its head above the water. A few shrewd men have insisted that they ought to be able to make money out of the vast patronage which, as a publishing house, they get from the great Presbyterian Church, instead of needing collections all the time for their Colporteurs, etc. But still, the general impression has been that the institution needed help, or it could not stand.

Now human nature, even in the best of men, being what it is, who will deny that it is a dangerous thing to lodge so much influence with one of these organizations, outside of the regular Church courts? Does not the struggle for power in the other Board, which was so clearly brought to light in the late debate—does not that struggle show how much of chicanery and management may be covered up in

one of these societies which our Presbyterian Church has had fastened to her free-born limbs?

Or, look at the report, this year, of the Domestic Missionary Board. It has had seven hundred and seven Missionaries in commission. And all these Missionaries are beholden to Dr. Happersett for his kindness in putting his note into bank that they may get their salaries paid. Is this not a large body of Presbyterian Ministers to be dependent upon the kindness of one man, or even two men? This whole difficulty, which so disgraced the late Assembly's proceedings, has arisen out of an effort by the Church to obviate to herself the objection which she felt to suffering so large a one-man power as this. And now the Assembly, finding that the two men could not agree, has gone back to the former plan of intrusting it all to one individual. The difficulty is inherent. All these Boards are great centres of power. If we must have them, let us submit to the evils which they necessarily bring with them. But if Domestic Missions can be as well or better carried on directly by the Presbyteries, let us operate in that way.

The objections hitherto made to the system of the Boards have, for the most part, always come from a portion of the Southern Commissioners. But never did any part of the South urge any such assault as has been witnessed this year. Our objections have been to the principles, not to the men. It has not been the South that has ever arraigned the Boards before the Assembly upon charges of incompetency, maladministration, or unfaithfulness—such charges have always come from the North, and have also most signally marked and disgraced the very year which witnessed the gathering of an almost exclusively Northern Assembly. Even the charge of an extravagant *per-centage* of administrative expense is not a charge which we of the South have urged—that, also, is a Northern censure. We have always been aware that great enterprises must, in the nature of things, require great expenditures of money. Competent

salaries to competent officers the South has not objected to, nor to any amount of necessary outlay, if we could only get the great work efficiently done. We have had no sympathy with the trick of adding together several salaries of officers, or other like items of necessary expense, and holding up the sum they make to frighten the Church from a steadfast pursuit of her great ends. But, on the other hand, we have equally detested the narrow spirit which delighted to figure up the comparatively insignificant doings of the Church in any one of these great departments, and because the sum they constitute would be a large amount for one man to give away, or even to possess, therefore to represent it as a large sum for the whole Church to contribute. We have ever maintained that our Church operations of all kinds were really on a very inadequate scale, and that there was nothing done worthy of the annual huzzas which Red Tape had moved the Assembly to utter. Yet we always granted that, considering the kind of expedients adopted to draw out the Church's resources, what was done was as much as could, perhaps, be expected; and that, no doubt, the men appointed by the Church to employ these human expedients were as faithful and as successful as could any where be found. The argument of the Southern Commissioners, so far as concerns the point of efficiency, has always been to this effect: Take away all your inventions of men—your Yankee notions in Church machinery—your rags and tatters of Congregationalism, and give us the natural and simple operation of the ordinances of Christ. Let your Churches be taught the doctrine of the grace of giving by her pastors; and let your Church courts directly oversee the various parts of Christ's work committed to them. Then, by the blessing of her Head, you will see what the Church is both able and willing to do and to give.

It has, indeed, been, for the most part, Southern Commissioners who have gone beyond these views of the dan-

gerousness and the inefficiency of the system, and attacked the very principle of the Boards, as an unwarranted, and unpresbyterian, and unscriptural scheme. But the opponents of the scheme have ever been in the minority. Year after year, when the matter has been discussed, the Boards have been sustained by large majorities. The system has, therefore, been long and fairly tried. It has enjoyed the confidence and support of the large body of our Church for a great length of time. Now, at last, it happens to it to encounter internecine strife and contention. It begins to devour itself. It is one Board, or rather the Secretary of one Board, that leads the attack on another. It is the two Secretaries of another Board that assail each other. It is no other than our old friend, Dr. Musgrave, who now sounds the alarm about too much power in the hands of a few men—it is he that complains that a man may not call in question the policy of one of these institutions, without having his motives impugned—it is he that can not get fair play from *The Presbyterian*—and it is he, on the other hand, who is now accused of making indefinite charges against a Board. Thus does Providence appear to be against the Boards, and the Church is plagued until she will relinquish the use of this Altar of Damascus.

We have dwelt upon this subject at some length, because, of course, the question will come before the Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States, now to be organized, in due time, whether she will employ such outside institutions, or stand simply on the platform of Presbyterianism and the Bible. Will she delegate her powers to any such Societies, or will she do her own work through committees, directly responsible to her? Will she undertake to do the Ministerial Education work, or the Domestic Missionary work, of every particular settled Presbytery, through any agency of the General Assembly, or will she devolve both these works immediately upon the several Presbyteries themselves? Would she think it desirable, if it could possibly

be done, to transport Philadelphia southward? Or, this being, alas! impossible, will she try and make a copy—a *fac-simile*—as near as possible, of the comely original? Can she hope and expect to live and grow and thrive without the help of any such ecclesiastical metropolis, any such centre of Church power, and parties, and squabbles?

DR. SPRING'S RESOLUTIONS.

At first Dr. Spring's was but one resolution, to the effect that a committee be appointed to inquire whether it was wise and expedient for the Assembly to make any expression of attachment to the American Union, and to the Constitution and Government; and, if so, what expression should be given. This business came up on the third day of the meeting. It was discussed from time to time, and decided on the twelfth day.

When first proposed, Dr. Spring's resolution was laid on the table, upon the motion of Rev. Mr. Hoyte, of Nashville, Tennessee, by a vote of one hundred and twenty-two to one hundred and two. Dr. Spring called for the ayes and noes; but some maintained, rather strangely, that they could not be had if demanded, after a vote was actually taken. Then it was moved to take up the motion just laid on the table; but it was then rather strangely insisted, and that by Dr. Hodge, that to lay on the table was a final disposition of any subject. The rules generally followed clearly provide that it may be taken up whenever two-thirds of those present at the time consent. Even when indefinitely postponed, a subject may be called back again before the house, by consent of three-fourths of the members present at the time. But in either case, the motion to reconsider must be made and seconded by persons of the majority. This point caused a good deal of discussion, and the appeal was made to the generosity of some two of the majority, to move the reconsideration, but there was no response. It would thus seem that at that time a



majority of the body were for silence in the premises. It will be interesting to trace the causes and progress of the change wrought in their views.

The subject did not come up again until the sixth day. Dr. Spring then said: "The influence of the action of last week upon both the friends of revolt throughout the country, and the friends of the Government, was of the most unhappy kind, as he was well informed by advices received both from the North and the West." What the effects of the Assembly's action was in the North and the West, of course we can not judge. But as to the South, which is the seat of the "revolt," and where the greater part of "the friends of revolt throughout the country" are to be found, it is very certain that it has had no appreciable effect whatsoever. Dr. Spring shows old age. Last year, we remember that he deplored the discussion in the Assembly about Boards, for it endangered the Union, of which these were so many bonds! This year, he fancies that an accomplished revolution would go backwards or forwards, according as the Assembly should judge respecting its merits! In view, therefore, of the unhappy effects of what the Assembly had done, Dr. Spring offered for adoption the following preamble and resolutions:

Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God toward this favored land, and also recognizing our obligations to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopt the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, 1. That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, the fourth day of July next be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds, and that on this day ministers and people are called on humbly to confess and bewail our national sins; to offer our thanks to the Father of Lights for His abundant and undeserved goodness towards us as a nation; to seek His guidance and blessing upon our rulers and their counsels, as well as the then assembled Congress of the United States; and to implore Him, in the name of Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Christian profession, to turn away His anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of a safe and honorable peace.

*Resolved*, 2. That in the judgment of this Assembly, it is the duty of ministers and churches under its care to do all in their power to

promote and perpetuate the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government.

Afterwards, the fourth day of July was substituted by the first, and the second resolution was altered by Dr. Spring himself, with others, so as to read thus :

*Resolved, 2.* That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, as far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution, and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty. And to avoid all misconception, the Assembly declares that by the term "Federal Government," as here used, is not meant any particular Administration, or the peculiar opinions of any political party, but that central Administration, which, being at any time appointed and inaugurated according to the terms prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, is the visible representative of our national existence.

There was some promiscuous conversation now had, and several motions were made, none of which appeared to be seconded. Dr. Hodge then moved that this subject be made the first order of the day for Friday morning, the eighth day of the Assembly.

On Friday the discussion was opened by Dr. THOMAS, of the Presbytery of Miami. He urged the right of free discussion against those who wished to shut his mouth. And he advocated the right of the Assembly to testify on behalf of the civil authority, when it was in extreme danger. The old Synod of New York and Philadelphia, then the supreme judicature of the Church, repeatedly did this during the old French war, and the pre-revolutionary difficulties, and also after Independence was declared. And the Synod of South Carolina had recently taken the initiative in the matter, and were committed thoroughly to the position that the Church ought in such cases to speak. If the Presbyterian Church *dare* to shrink from her duty in this crisis, she will be blown away like the foam from the crest of the billow by the tornado. Shall we *dare* to falter when our army and our Government need our encouragement? Are we Secessionists? Are we traitors? Have we forgotten our loyalty? Then, what right have we to sit here as a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of these United States?

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Tennessee, contended that the Church courts were not the proper place to express loyalty. He loved loyalty to government, and would express it at the proper place—at the ballot-box, or in the battle-field, but not in the Church court nor the pulpit. He would give his life to restore the country and the Union to what it was, but even for this he would not divide the Church.

Dr. HODGE differed not with brother Thomas in regard to the duty of the Church to testify on proper occasions. But he objected to the resolutions on other grounds.

1st. Because this action is unnecessary. Our people do not need to be roused. We can not, indeed, hold them back. So sublime, grand, wide-spread and irrepressible a rising was never heard of before. Who doubts the loyalty of Presbyterians?

2d. Such a pronouncement will be highly injurious to the Union, and the objects of the Federal Government. The Administration does not ask our interference—does not need it. It will do them harm, instead of good. A distinguished member of the Cabinet has said he wished the General Assembly would aim to preserve the unity of the Church, as a means of preserving the union of the country.

Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, here interposed, to state that the other members of the Cabinet had been telegraphed, to know if they desired the Assembly to take no action, and here is the answer, assuring us that they wish us to do nothing.

Dr. HODGE, resuming, urged that these resolutions tend to sever, rather than preserve, the Union. The best service we can render to Government is, to preserve the kind feeling of the Union-loving men of the South, so that when the time comes for them to assert their loyalty, they will be encouraged to do it. Our Church is the last link that holds this Union together.

A third objection to this paper is, that the Assembly is designed to represent the whole country. Had the Assembly met this year in a Southern city, and been composed chiefly of Southern men, would it have seemed to you fair and honorable for them to vote similar resolutions in favor of their Confederacy?

4th. The great consideration is, we are bound by our ordination vows to study the *unity of the Presbyterian Church*. What right have we to take a course that will drive away from us one-third of the General Assembly, and one-third of our Churches? The Church is the most influential and conservative agency for the preservation of our Union. He closed by begging not to be misunderstood—he was not pleading against the Government—but he was pleading for the preservation of the Church. He then moved the adoption of the following paper, as a substitute for Dr. Spring's:

“The unhappy contest in which the country is now involved has brought both the Church and the State face to face with questions of patriotism and of morals, which are without a parallel in this or any other land. True to their hereditary principles, the Ministers and Elders present in the Assembly have met the emergency by the most

decisive proof, in their respective social and civil relations, of their firm devotion to the Constitution and laws under which we live; and they are ready at all suitable times, and at whatever personal sacrifice, to testify their loyalty to that Constitution under which 'this goodly vine has sent out her boughs into the sea, and her branches into the river.'

"For the following reasons, the Assembly deem it impossible to put forth, at the present time, a more extended and emphatic deliverance upon the subject, to wit:

"1. The General Assembly is neither a Northern nor a Southern body; it comprehends the entire Presbyterian Church, irrespective of geographical lines or political opinions, and had it met this year, as it does with marked uniformity one-half of the time, in some Southern city, no one, he believed, would have presumed to ask of it a fuller declaration of its views upon this subject, than it has embodied in this minute.

"2. Owing to providential hindrances, nearly one-third of our Presbyteries are not represented at our present meeting; they feel that not only Christian courtesy, but common justice, requires that we should refrain, except in the presence of some stringent necessity, from adopting measures to bind the consciences of our brethren who are absent, most of them, we believe, by no fault of their own.

"3. Such has been the course of events, that all the other evangelical denominations have been rent asunder. We alone retain, this day, the proportions of a national Church. We are, happily, united among ourselves in all questions of doctrine and discipline. The dismemberment of our Church, while fraught with disaster to all our spiritual interests, could not fail to envenom the political animosities of the country, and to augment the sorrows which already oppress us. We are not willing to sever this last bond which holds the North and South together in the fellowship of the Gospel. Should an all-wise Providence hereafter exact this sacrifice, we shall be resigned to it. But for the present, both religion and patriotism require us to cherish a Union which, by God's blessing, may be the means of reuniting our land."

Dr. ANDERSON, of California, said there was danger of other losses than of the South. There are threats of disunion of the Church from the West, which have come since last week. You have to choose where the Unity is to be preserved. He replied to the argument that this action is unnecessary. The subject is before us, and it must be met. Many had kindred in arms—he himself had many dear friends—he wanted to encourage them. It was useless to try and drown the Assembly with such milk-and-water sophistry as that of the substitute. It was entirely too weak—one gallon of milk to about five barrels of water. (Great laughter, and applause in the galleries.) He heard much talk about the Unity of the Church—it was like tying two Mississippi steamboats together with a piece of silk thread, and bidding them not break apart when starting in different

directions. How long would the Church remain one, if we have two confederacies? Not a moment, although Dr. Hodge endeavored to make us believe the contrary, in the last number of the *Princeton Review*.

Dr. SPRING said the paper he had presented was not in the course he had originally proposed. It might have led to some such document as the substitute now offered. But it had been treated with discourtesy, and unceremoniously laid on the table. He believed the measure now proposed by him was right. Talk about the Unity of the Church! It is broken. Like the *debris* of the rock, it is crumbling, and no timid measures could prevent it. The only present hope of unity was on this side of the line. As for the voice from Washington, he would like to know by what measures it had been *procured*—he would like to see it, and find out what more it contained than had been quoted here. And for whom is your sympathy now evoked? For REBELS. Pass Dr. Hodge's substitute, and he would not like to say how many of the Synod of New York would again meet with the General Assembly. He wanted his last utterance to be for that glorious Union, for which his father had fought, and for which he had never ceased, and never should cease, while alive, to labor and to pray.

Judge RYERSON, of New Jersey, proceeded to recite the evidence, which convinced him that it had long been the design of South Carolina to break up this Union. He did not consider the usurpation of the South entitled to any respect. It had none of the claims of a Government. It was a sheer conspiracy, and a wanton and inexcusable rebellion. Was it possible to preserve the unity of the Church after the nation is rent in fragments? Is it supposed that we will consent to attend the General Assembly, when we can travel to it only under a system of passports? It was folly to think of it. Americans would never submit to it.

Mr. GILLESPIE, interposing, asked if China, India, and Africa were not now represented on our floor, and what was to hinder the South from coming in as they?

Judge RYERSON. The only way to keep the Church one, is to keep the country one. We have the constitutional right to make the deliverance proposed in Dr. Spring's paper—let us not be afraid to do it.

The Rev. Mr. HASTINGS spoke of the sudden birth of an intense spirit of patriotism, and of the danger of resisting that giant. He spoke of a letter he had received at noon, and which he held up in his hand, in which a very prominent citizen expressed astonishment that the Assembly should have laid Dr. Spring's first paper on the table.

Rev. Mr. HOYTE (of Tennessee) urged that the Assembly had no right to make the deliverance proposed. It was unconstitutional, for the Assembly could interfere with such matters only by humble petition, or when invited thereto by the civil authorities. The action proposed would divide us. It was also unfair to take such action in the absence

of so many of the Southern Commissioners. Why should you take advantage of our feebleness amongst you to force us into circumstances of distress and danger? Who asks you to touch this thing? Not the Cabinet—not the officers of your army—not the men who take broadest views of the interests of the nation—not the Union men of the South. The Government at Washington would not thank you for any such deliverance; and, while it can not increase the unanimity which appears to prevail at the North, its effect at the South would be to drive to despair those who had done nothing to bring about this deplorable state of things, and who had done what they could to avert it.

Dr. MUSGRAVE denounced secession as a monstrous immorality. The Assembly ought to say so, and encourage their public men in crushing out at once and for ever this ruinous error. We ought to aid in sweeping it from the country and from the earth. He would do it for our own sakes—he would do it for the encouragement of all loyal hearts in the South. He pointed to Maryland and Baltimore, as now rejoicing in the protection of the General Government, and he hoped that other States would soon receive the same protection. He hoped the paper of Dr. Spring would pass, not only by an overwhelming majority, but by an unanimous vote.

On the next day, the Rev. Dr. Wines, of St. Louis, informed the Assembly that he was in a sense the representative of the Hon. Edward Bates, the distinguished member of the Cabinet referred to yesterday. Whereupon, he read the telegraphic correspondence which had passed between them, and then proceeded to define his own position, and to offer a substitute for both the papers before the house. He was for no action—for it might be that the mission of our Church in this solemn crisis is to assist in the readjustment of our relations to the seceded States.

Rev. Dr. MATHEWS, of Kentucky, said his affections and interests were on both sides—North and South. The State from which he came, he was happy to announce, had unfurled and kept waving the banner of the stars and stripes. (Applause, with a few *cat-calls*, both which the Moderator checked.) Dr. Mathews expressed regret that he had said any thing to elicit such an expression. He had only said so to show that what he had to say he said as a Union man. He went on to deplore the straits into which the proposed action of the Assembly was about to bring the Union men of the South. Two things he wished to add before he sat down. 1st. There are brethren in the South who wished to secede—a minority, he believed—but they want a pretext. O! give them no such pretext. 2d. There are men in the South who labor night and day to heal these divisions. Let those men be cherished and upheld. The last thing he had to say was, let this Assembly legislate in the spirit of great charity. What if there has been wrong at the South? What if on the records of the Synod of South Carolina there are things we regret? Ought we not to exercise charity in judgments? What did the Master say to her

who stood accused before Him? "Go, sin no more: neither do I condemn you."

The Rev. Mr. WALLER urged the adoption of Dr. Spring's paper, because of the very conviction Southern Christian men were said to have, that it was wrong to obey the Government at Washington. For this very reason we ought to pronounce, and do it distinctly. Such a conviction he considered in decided opposition to the Bible and our Confession. It was such a conviction as this that ruined our race, and blighted Paradise. It was an allurements to withdraw her allegiance from the rightful government under which she was placed, that was the temptation of our first mother. It was a withdrawal of their loyalty from their lawful sovereign and His government, that constituted the sin, and produced the ruin, of our first parents. They claimed the right to do it, but had no right. A similar temptation had beset our brethren, and we should warn them of it.

On Monday morning, Mr. Waller still having the floor, Dr. WINES, by his leave, offered a modification of his paper.

Dr. SPRING presented a modification of his second resolution.

Dr. BERGEN offered a substitute of his own.

Dr. STOCKTON proposed a substitute for Dr. Spring's second resolution.

Judge RYERSON offered a paper, proposing a committee of nine, with Dr. Spring as chairman.

Dr. MCPHAIL offered a substitute for all.

Mr. MILLER (Ruling Elder), of New York, offered sundry preambles and resolutions.

Dr. MONFORT also offered a paper.

Rev. Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, offered a paper.

Rev. Mr. STRYKER presented one.

Rev. Mr. REASER asked if this thing was not becoming ridiculous.

The MODERATOR answered that it was not.

Rev. Mr. MURPHY also offered a paper.

Mr. WALLER confessed bewilderment amongst all these papers. He feared the very delay occasioned was breeding timidity. He feared the disposition to stand still would do mischief. He felt inclined to stick to the boat in which he had first embarked, viz: Dr. Spring's paper. He deprecated a false issue—that we were to save the Church

from division. Territorial division did not necessarily involve spiritual division. Separation in form may exist, and be compatible with spiritual union. He denied that we were making a new term of communion. He quoted the prophet Samuel: "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft," which latter crime was punishable with death, and therefore the former was likewise. If we had any doubt about the legitimacy of our Government, or the application of these Scriptures, then we might hesitate. But nobody doubted this, and nothing but an "obfuscation" of interests could admit such a doubt. Moreover, our brethren of the South have not set an example of hesitation and forbearance. He read from the Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina to show this. These resolutions of the Synod of South Carolina, urging secession, were passed before the State had seceded. Here was a Southern Synod urging rebellion against lawful authority in advance, and promising in advance to bless it with the prayers of the Church. Surely, these men can not complain if we lift our voice on the side of God and the country.

Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, urged the inexpediency of the proposed action. The administration wished the Church to hold together. On the other hand, the disunionists will hail the proposed action with joy. But it is said other bodies have spoken out, and so should we. If others have acted, impulsively yielding to the tide of the times, let us all the more move cautiously, and with our pristine, far-reaching wisdom and tide-resisting firmness.

Dr. YEOMANS was sorry a judicious committee had not been agreed to, that they might have embodied in a harmonious minute what might command the suffrages of a majority of both sides. He regretted extremely that such an opportunity had been lost by the tabling of Judge Ryerson's resolution. It was a solemn moment in the history of our Church. We stand on the brink of division. And there seems to have been a real preparation of mind for division. We have had an apology for it here this morning. From the beginning, it did seem that there were some who had ends to reach at this terrible sacrifice. Is it not time for us to pause and ponder our way? Moderator, if I could utter one word to delay this dreadful result—if I could make one utterance that might recall my brethren to a sober consideration of the real issue before us, it would be the sweetest word of my life, and one which, to my dying day, it would be most pleasant to remember. It is admitted that a division is likely, if this vote is pressed. Is there any good to be gained by this sad sacrifice? Can we afford the sacrifice? Can this Church's mission be accomplished if she be divided? He urged particularly the advantages the Church must lose for doing good to the slaves of the South.

It is one of the pretexts for this action (he used the word not in an invidious sense) that we are to uphold the Government. Is there a call for this? We have individually, and in various and decided ways, expressed our patriotism. Is it necessary that the same class of men repeat, in every possible relation they fill, their devotion to the



country? We have proof that the Government itself does not want, but rather deprecates, this support from us. We are asked to do over again, as a Church court, what we have already done as citizens. We are doing it at the sacrifice of the integrity of our Church organization. We not only do it, but we *understand* that we do it. But is it wise and right? He deprecated the inevitable consequences, and could see no compensating advantages. We defeat our Church enterprises—we defeat the very purpose of the action itself. We cut the last, strongest, tenderest bond that holds our country together. O! sir, let us hold on to our Southern brethren—they will do good and great service in times and efforts that yet belong to the future. One brother had reminded us that there is a North-West. Why, sir! that is the very thing that ought to be forgotten. Now is the time to ignore sections. O! sir, let us not destroy the conservative position of our Church in regard to the great question that is agitating the civilized world—the question of most difficult solution in our own beloved land. Let us not descend from our vantage ground. Let us not let go the cable that holds us, and us only, in available position for good in relation to that subject. It is small matter to speak of patriotism. It is cheap to do as he did the last Sabbath before he left home, viz: to tell his people that we were engaged in a great struggle, that must be fought through, once for all. He had urged them to do their duty to their country in this, the hour of their peril. This was a cheap utterance for us in the North to make. He appealed to the kind feelings of the body for the Southern members, in view of the sacrifices they had made to come to the Assembly. He hoped naught would be done to increase their difficulty and distress. He earnestly begged that the Southern men who had not spoken might be heard. He had heard of one of them who had stood face to face with the bold front of secession—with a mob of six hundred excited people—pleading for the Union, and who would like to do it here. Another, from the most distant seceded State, would be willing to say a few words. He hoped the house would be willing to hear them, and others, and give them a fair and candid hearing, and would gravely ponder what they had to say.

Dr. WILLIS LORD, of Chicago, eulogized the Government, to support which it was proposed to pledge ourselves. He spoke of its protection of us and of the Church, and of its beneficent influence on our country and the world. He urged the entire *constitutionality* of the action proposed, viz: the adopting of Dr. Spring's paper. This new doctrine of the unconstitutionality of Church utterances on such subjects, which has been much mooted for a few years, came from the same source from which our other troubles came. Its origin is identical with that of nullification and secession. It is designed to estop the Church from meeting her responsibilities and performing her full mission. He also urged the *expediency* of the course. You might as well give up your Missionary work in the great West if you falter on this subject. His third reason for this action was, its *necessity*. In

no other way can we show that we have been and are loyal. We must pass these resolutions, to meet the sad fact that one Synod had avowed disloyalty already. They had penned such action and sent it to the General Assembly. Some of the Ministers of that Synod were actually in the army of the rebels. His fourth reason was, that the course proposed was *right*. It had been said it was unfair to pass these resolutions in the absence of the Southern brethren. Why unfair? Is it right to presume, in their absence, that they would not approve of a measure so right and expedient in itself? He honored those Southern brethren who had come to the Assembly. He wished all the Southern Commissioners had been present. But why are they not? He had a letter from a distinguished source in the South, in which he was informed that some of the Presbyteries would not appoint Commissioners—and why? Because of the difficulty of travel? No; but because of their sympathy with the rebellion.

Here (says *The Presbyterian*) Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. BAKER besought Dr. Lord not to make the impression that such was the general state of things. That letter was a misrepresentation of the Southern Presbyteries generally, if true of any; and one of the gentlemen (the reporter could not see which) deprecated the *harshness* of the term “rebellion.”

Dr. Lord urged that our charter, and the protection of our Church property, was from the Government which we proposed to encourage. We owe it much. We ought to sustain it, for it has done much for us and for our Church. Our dearest interests are at stake, and if this United States Government is prostrated, every thing will be in jeopardy. He loved the Church—Christ’s cross and crown were above every thing, but his country next. And, in conclusion, he could not help saying:

“The star-spangled banner, O! long may it wave,  
O’er the land of the free, and the home of the brave.”

Rev. W. M. BAKER, of Texas, said he feared he might say some thing unpleasant to his brethren, whom he shrank from offending. He feared he might not do justice to the cause in which he felt constrained to speak. Born in Washington, raised there, educated in reverence for the Government, he still loved it, and loved the whole country. The present state of things is one of the greatest griefs of his whole life. He was going to speak plainly, and say things which might endanger his life, both at the North and at the South. He was opposed to the proposed deliverance, which was neither a Christian nor a religious movement; for, 1st. It was by a *sudden* impulse of the venerable father who introduced it; 2d. It was military, it smelt of war. You are making a Church utterance under a military impulse. We from the South opposed secession, but were borne before the torrent. Now we find a thundergust raging at the North, and upon its wild and raging bosom is our Church to be borne away? Dr. Lord had shewed a profound ignorance of the South. Grant that you have

to choose between the going off of the North-West and that of the South. If the Church must divide, let it not divide along that accursed, fatal line—Mason's and Dixon's. He was against secession—but what can man do against the tide? When overpowered, what can we do but submit? And was it generous or just for this Assembly to put us in a position where we must either separate from our homes and fields of labor, or from this beloved Church of our fathers? If you pass this resolution, we must either leave our all, give up our charges to destitution, and leave our fields of labor, or separate from you. For, is it not duty to submit to the powers that be? Can we rightfully resist it where there is none other there for us to obey? We are told the popular excitement is such that the Assembly dare not be silent. It is just as impossible to resist the excitement there as here. He was Daniel Baker's son, and was glad that holy man was not alive to witness these troubles. Brethren say the Southern Confederacy is a usurpation. If you pass these resolutions, you compel us to be loyal to that Confederacy or leave it. You run up the secession flag over our heads. You can not do more to help Mr. Davis' Government than just to compel the Southern portion of the Church to take the position into which this action will force them. Your silence will send a thrill of joy to Washington. Your speaking will send it to Montgomery.

It was not because of secession that the Commissioners from the South were not here. He felt ashamed to tell the real truth; yet why should he? Crops had failed in many portions of the South, and many Presbyteries could not raise the means to send their Commissioners. We were in many instances too poor to come, and shall we be reproached with disloyalty, because we yield to providential necessity? Shall I tell you a secret? Do not any of this vast audience repeat it, for it might not do to tell every where. But he would tell it, and was consoled in venturing in the same way a member of a legislature was, in making a speech that he was afraid would displease his constituents—"Don't report that speech," said he, "but if you do, I don't care, for none of my constituents can read." He (Mr. Baker) could not just say that, for his constituents could read; but still, he would be safe, for the *mails were stopped*. He would tell the secret. He then, with a good deal of dramatic manner, described the way in which those who still loved the Union at the South spoke to each other in whispers; described the way in which he had been approached, with extreme caution, and inquiries made of his intention of coming to the Assembly; of his opinion of what would likely be done; and of the wishes of the Union men at the South that nothing might be done that might render adherence to the Assembly, on the part of the South, impossible.

Such is the report of Mr. Baker's speech in *The Presbyterian*. In other papers he is reported as saying that he

“hated secession ;” that he had “never made a prayer for the President of the Confederate States in his pulpit ;” also, as “eulogizing the patriotic uprising in the North.” At the same time, we find him represented in the *Cincinnati Weekly Gazette* as saying that “if the Southern Commissioners in the Assembly were to be cast off, they would return to their beautiful and glorious South, their fortunes linked with it, and their lives given to its defence.”

At the close of Mr. Baker’s speech, Dr. Hodge moved to lay the whole subject on the table. The yeas and nays were called for. There were seventy-four yeas to one hundred and thirty-nine nays. So the Assembly refused to lay the whole subject on the table.

On Tuesday, the eleventh day of the proceedings, absentees were allowed to record their votes on the question of laying on the table, so that the vote stood eighty-one yeas to one hundred and forty-six nays. The first order of the day was judicial case number two, but a motion was made to postpone it, so as to take up the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH, of Ohio, was ready to vote on the loyalty resolutions now.

Dr. MUSGRAVE was, also, now ready to vote for Dr. Spring’s resolutions. He would vote for no resolutions that did not express those sentiments.

Dr. HALL, of Rochester, then said he wanted a special committee, so that he could offer the following resolution :

*Resolved*, That there is a voluntary rebellion in certain States against the constituted authorities of our Government, and that rebellion is a sin of such magnitude among members of the Presbyterian Church as to make them fit subjects for excommunication.

It was then decided, by a vote of one hundred and thirty to eighty-three, to appoint a committee to consider all the papers before the house on this subject. A committee of nine was appointed, viz: Drs. Musgrave, Hodge, Anderson, Wines, and Yeomans, and Judges Ryerson, Semple,

White, and Clark. In the afternoon, they brought in a report, by a majority of the committee (eight out of nine), endorsing the Government, yet softening the language of Dr. Spring's paper. Dr. Anderson read his report, as the minority of the committee, recommending the adoption of Dr. Spring's paper, as modified by the author himself and others, only making the first of July the day of prayer, instead of the fourth. He said, in his speech, that the report of the majority was intended to shirk the crisis and its responsibilities. Its aim was to prevent the Assembly from showing its hand, and coming manfully forward to the support of the country. It was full of weakness and prevarication. There was once a man tried for stealing a sheep. The defence set up was, that he had been an industrious laborer, and was good to his wife—but it said nothing about the sheep. So with the majority's report. They talked of functions, constitutions, etc., etc., but said nothing of the crisis, and its demands upon the Church and the ministry.

On Wednesday, the twelfth day, Dr. Yeomans supported the majority report, and moved that the vote be taken at twelve o'clock.

Rev. Mr. McINNIS, of New Orleans, said the Synod of Mississippi, had been striving to get the floor for the last four days. He gave notice, that if the motion to end the debate should pass, he would protest against the action of the Assembly, and withdraw from the body.

A MEMBER here said that the speaker had himself voted to lay the whole subject on the table. Mr. McInnis replied, that he was not there to give an account of his vote. Continuing, he said that his section of the country had been misrepresented, and would not submit to be gagged.

It was then voted to take the question at 6 o'clock, P. M.

Mr. McINNIS, of New Orleans, again took the platform. He said the Assembly had made up its mind, and that his words would not alter it; but, for all that, he had to make a statement, showing the position and opinions of the Church at the South. No statement from any seceded State had, so far, given the true idea of affairs in that region. The Southern Churches are, as he knew, being a native of the South, perfectly loyal to the Presbyterian Church, and they are loyal to Government. They have in the South a Government which

they are as much bound to obey as you in the North are bound to obey your Government. If Dr. Spring's resolutions are passed, they place us in rebellion to the Government *de facto* at home. The attempt thus to bind our consciences will sever the Presbyterian Church. It was not the province of this Assembly to break our allegiance. They could not say to which Government its members should be loyal. In the support of their Government, the people of the South are both *united* and *determined*. The conduct of the South had been compared to the sin of witchcraft—the same charge might have been made against our revolutionary fathers, contending for their rights. The speaker asked for neither pity nor sympathy for the South, but for her inherent constitutional rights. The speaker was opposed to both of the reports of the Committee. If you are going to force political views upon us, give us a creed that there can be no mistake about.

The speaker thought that the history of the Church and its constitution proved that it was always unsafe to legislate on such subjects. The Assembly is not a legislative body, and its decisions are not law. It is entirely a judicial body. The speaker here read from the "Form of Government" a section which he thought decided that the Assembly had no right to take any political action, except in the way of petition. In this latter form of action the speaker would join; he would sign a petition for peace, for a just and honorable settlement of this whole national difficulty. But if you place me at the mercy of a mere majority of this Assembly, then I say "Farewell!" to all that constitutes Presbyterianism. Is there no limit to the power of this Assembly? Have we no constitution?

Mr. McInnis here read further extracts from the "Form of Government," to show that the power of the Assembly was confined to matters of doctrine, of appeal, and of a judicial character. Errors of doctrine (not political, but theological,) and immorality in practice, can also be dealt with by the Assembly; but no power exists by which it can make a political deliverance. No right exists to force a political vote from a member.

The speaker asked if any Presbytery had sent up an overture on this question? On the contrary, the Presbyteries have ordered us to say nothing on this unhappy subject. At the opening of this Assembly, the body decided to say nothing on the question, and the speaker thought they were no better prepared to speak now. If you could hear the vote of all the Church, you would feel that they desire no utterance. It can not come before us constitutionally. The country does not desire any deliverance from us, nor would it justly appreciate the meaning of our words. Any deliverance we might make to-day we might be ashamed of in a week. Even the Southern Secessionists desire no deliverance from us.

The orator earnestly repeated that any action on this subject by the Assembly would drive off the South and close it for ever against the influence of our Church. The South needs the restraining influence of the North, and the North needs the South; but if we separate, there

can be no reconstruction of the Presbyterian Church, The speaker protested against the division in the name of the Saviour, in the name of the Church, and in the name of the country.

Mr. HARBESON, an Elder from Kentucky, arose about the conclusion of Rev. Mr. McInnis' remarks, and said he fully concurred in all of the speaker's views.

Rev. Mr. OGDEN, of Mississippi, stated that he was a native of New Jersey, a graduate of Princeton, but the last thirty-four years had given his life to the religious education of the slave. He was opposed to the Constitutional views of the previous speaker; but, like him, was opposed to both the majority and minority reports; yet, if compelled, would vote for the majority report. He was opposed to the minority report, because it committed the Church to the Administration of Abraham Lincoln, William H. Seward, and Salmon P. Chase. It perils the union of the Presbyterian Church, and consummates the disunion of these States. If passed, it will gratify every Abolitionist in the country—William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and the like.

He would not accuse Dr. Thomas and others of being Abolitionists, yet he would say, that if they were, they could not have done any thing better to serve the views of Abolitionists than by bringing in these resolutions. The resolutions finding favor with Northern members will commit all the Union men of the South to the Secessionists.

The Rev. Mr. FRAZER, of Kentucky, opened his argument historically, referring to the Church of Scotland, and its connection with the State; he then referred to the Missionary Churches of this body, and asked whether we required them to be loyal to the "United States?" He thought we could not decide the question whether "we have a Government" in this body. The Church could not decide it, but she could take a higher position, and act in her appropriate sphere. There is a sphere found for the civil power to legislate in for the Church, and limits in which the Church can legislate for the State. Neither of these authorities can legislate for each other.

From the days of Constantine, the State had nearly always preserved the unity of the Church. Now, is the Presbyterian Church going to act the tyrant to preserve the unity of the State? Such action would resemble the action of the Roman Catholic Church, which had made kings and emperors bow to it.

If Dr. Spring's resolutions were passed, every loyal Presbyterian in the South would be a traitor to the *de facto* Government, and would be hung on the nearest tree. He was very severe on the conduct of the North-Western brethren, who wish to make the Southern Presbyterians traitors, and earnestly maintained that the Assembly had no right to fix and pronounce upon any man's political allegiance.

Rev. Mr. MUTCHMORE, of Missouri, said it was a sad day for the Church of Jesus, when the Gospel herald must hoist the stars and stripes to be heard at all. The Church in the South, and four-fifths of its Ministers, had been true to the Union.

The Rev. Dr. Breckinridge, and the Rev. John Knox, and others, were cited by the speaker, to show that the Church was in a quandary, at one time, as to whether King James or his rival should be served. So with members of the Assembly now living in the South. The speaker proceeded, in strong terms, to *argue the right of revolution*. The Assembly, in his mind, had no business to take a stand for the constituted authorities, because revolution might be right, if not now, at some time to come.

The speaker was here interrupted by a gentleman, who stated that he would not remain in the Church to hear "treason" preached. The speaker had no right to argue the right of revolution, which was obnoxious to the loyal people of the Assembly and audience.

There were two means of revolution, the ballot-box and the sword. If the second resolution of Dr. Spring was passed, either the Church must be disobeyed, or half his congregation and Presbytery must be dismissed. A member of the speaker's Church might conscientiously oppose the Government, thinking it an engine of tyranny? Should he be dismissed for acting conscientiously? If the General Assembly took Dr. Spring's stand, he should endeavor to obey, but it would require revolvers to carry out the law.

In his State the Governor was a traitor, and a military bill had been passed, requiring the people of Missouri to take oath to support the laws of the State, as expounded by the Jackson Administration.

It were better that Forts Sumter, Pickens, Monroe, and all the rest, should fall, than that the Spring Union resolutions should be passed. In Missouri, the Methodists were the strongest Secessionists, because they had been long embittered with the radicals of the North. Controversy which would ensue upon the Spring resolutions would make the Presbyterians of the South the rankest Secessionists.

Dr. EDWARDS, of Philadelphia, said the Church could not stay its hand in this matter, even if it would. It must deliver an official and authoritative idea of its position. The Reverend Secessionists of South Carolina and Georgia had departed, in the first place, from spiritual discussion; yet, their political friends now raised the argument of non-interference. A missionary of the Old School Assembly was a Chaplain in the Secession ranks; eight Old School preachers were enrolling men, and thousands of Presbyters and members were in the ranks of treason.

In reference to the members of the Assembly present from India, etc., he would say, that the presence of such was no evidence of a world-broad Presbyterianism, for the native delegates of such missions would probably never be present. The Church must be geographically divided, and if so, the North and the North-West could not be lost. If the South must go, so let it be. (Applause in the galleries.)



When the armies of the North had achieved the integrity of the Union anew, the Church would be again reunited.

Dr. Edwards held in his hand a letter from a Philadelphia clergyman to Secretary Chase, asking him if the passage of the Union resolutions would do harm to the Union, even if some of the representatives in the Assembly should withdraw. The following reply was received from Secretary Chase :

*"Can not properly advise, but see no valid objection to unequivocal expressions in favor of the Constitution, Union, and freedom.*

"S. P. CHASE."

(Loud applause.)

Dr. DICKSON then took the floor, and made a statement relative to Judge Bates, reading a letter from that official.

He hoped, afterward, that three minutes would be allowed for meditation and silent prayer before voting.

Much confusion here ensued, as the hour for voting had arrived. Motions and counter-motions were made on every hand, and an effort was made upon the part of each wing to bring their respective report before the Assembly prior to the other.

An appeal from the decision of the Chair, to put the minority report first, with amendments, was lost. Efforts were made to adjourn until this morning, and avoid a vote. Loud cries of "vote," "vote," were made, and there was great confusion. The Assembly refused to adjourn.

The vote was then taken, first on the majority report, which was rejected; and then on the minority report, which was adopted, by a vote of one hundred and fifty-four to sixty-six. To this, Dr. Hodge and forty-five others offered the following protest :

We, the undersigned, respectfully protest against the action of the General Assembly, in adopting the minority report of the Committee on the State of the Country. We make this protest, not because we do not acknowledge loyalty to our country to be a moral and religious duty, according to the Word of God, which requires every one to be subject to the powers that be, nor because we deny the right of the Assembly to enjoy that and all other like duties on the Ministers and Churches under its care; but because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what Government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due, and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our Church. That the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, in our judgment, is undeniable. It not only asserts the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises, in the name of all the Churches and Ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to strengthen, uphold and encourage

the Federal Government. It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our Ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens of this country is primarily due to the States to which they respectively belong; and, therefore, that when any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance to the Constitution, the citizens of that State are bound, by the laws of God, to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizens is due to the United States, any thing in the Constitution, ordinances or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding. It is not the loyalty of the members constituting this Assembly, nor of our Churches and Ministers, in any one portion of our country, that is thus asserted, but the loyalty of the whole Presbyterian Church, North, South, East, West. Allegiance to the Federal Government is recognized or declared to be the duty of all the Churches and Ministers represented in this body. In adopting this paper, therefore, the Assembly does decide the great political question which agitates and divides the country—the question, whether is the allegiance of our citizens due primarily to the State or to the Union? However our own convictions of the correctness of this decision may be, or however deeply we may be impressed with its importance, yet it is not a question which this Assembly has the right to decide. A man may conscientiously believe that he owes allegiance to one Government or another, and yet possess all the qualifications which the Word of God or the standards of the Church authorize us to demand in our members or Ministers. As this General Assembly represents the whole Church, the acts and declarations of the Assembly become the acts and declarations of the Church. It is this consideration that gives to the action in this case all its importance, either in our own view or in the views of others. It is the allegiance of the Old School Presbyterian Church to the Constitution and the Federal Government, which this paper is intended to profess and proclaim. It does, therefore, of necessity, decide the political question which agitates the country. This is a matter clearly beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

That the action of the Assembly in the premises does not only decide the political question referred to, but makes that decision a term of membership in our Church, is no less clear. It is not analogous to the recommendation of a religious or benevolent institution, which our members may regard or not at pleasure, but it puts into the mouths of all represented in this body a declaration of loyalty and allegiance to the Union and to the Federal Government; but such declarations, made by the members of our Church residing in what is called the seceding States, is treasonable.

Presbyterians under the jurisdiction of those States, therefore, can not make that declaration. They are, consequently, forced to choose between allegiance to their State and allegiance to the Church.

The General Assembly, in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of membership of the Church, has, in our judgment, violated the constitution of the Church, and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master.

We protest, secondly, against this action of the Assembly, because it is a departure from all its previous action. The General Assembly has always acted on the principle that the Church has no right to make any thing a condition of Christian or ministerial fellowship which is not enjoined or required in the Scriptures and the standards of the Church. We have, at one time, resisted the popular demand to make total abstinence from intoxicating liquors a term of membership; at another time, the holding of slaves. In firmly resisting these unscriptural demands, we have preserved the integrity and unity of the Church, and made it the great conservator of truth, moderation, and liberty of conscience in our country. The Assembly have now descended from this high position, in making a political opinion, a particular theory of the Constitution, however correct and important that theory may be, the condition of membership in our body, and thus, we fear, have endangered the unity of the Church.

In the third place, we protest, because we regard the action of the Assembly uncalled for. It was required neither to instruct nor to excite our brethren in the Northern States. It was not needed as a vindication of the loyalty of the North.

Old School Presbyterians every where, out of the so-called seceding States, have openly avowed, and most conspicuously displayed, their allegiance to the Constitution and the Government; and that, in many cases, at great cost and peril. Nor was such action required by our duty to our country. We are fully persuaded that we best promote the interest of the country by preserving the integrity and union of the Church. We regard this action of the Assembly, therefore, as a great national calamity, as well as the most disastrous to the interest of the Church, which has marked its history.

We protest, fourthly, because we regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren. It was, in our judgment, unfair to entertain and decide such a momentous question, when the great majority of our Southern Presbyteries were, from necessity, unrepresented in this body; and it is, in our judgment, a violation of the law of love to adopt an act which would expose most of our Southern brethren, should they remain connected with our Church, to suspicion, to the loss of property, to personal dangers, which tends to destroy their usefulness in their appointed fields of labor.

And, finally, we protest, because we believe the action of the Assembly will not only diminish the resources of the Church, but greatly weaken its power for good, and expose it to the danger of being carried away more and more from its true principles, by a wordly or fanatical spirit.

We have patiently labored through this long and absurd debate (most of which was as wicked as absurd), that we might here put on record the names of all these speakers, and the sentiments uttered by them. As reported by the weekly journals alone, the whole might possibly have perished, and been forgotten. We have probably secured for it immortality. In our pages it will no doubt live, in at least some few *bound up* copies, and descend to generations following, for their instruction and warning. The future Church historian will note the principles asserted by this body of Presbyterian Ministers and Ruling Elders—principles which are in violation of the constitution of the Church, and destructive of the crown-rights of the Church's Head. It will be seen hereafter, by the student of these times, how a new term of communion was invented and imposed. It will be seen how a majority sought to impose on a minority the necessity of committing treason, on pain of being cut off from Church privileges. It will be seen how the encouragement and support of a human government, and that an unrighteous one, was made the altar on which the unity and peace of the Church, which we have all sworn to study and to seek, was sacrificed. Presbyterian Assemblies have sometimes, before now, been servile in their adulation of royal persons—but hitherto, in this country, Presbyterian Assemblies have always sympathized with the defenders of regulated freedom. Our fathers of the old Synod, whenever it became necessary to speak about the duties of the citizen, always spoke for the country, and against the tyrant. Their patriotism was an intelligent thing; and they held it a sacred duty of British subjects to defend their rights as Britons. They believed that a free people might not justly nor legitimately be forced to submit to rulers not of their own choosing; and that the free sons of free sires were under a religious obligation to transmit, if possible, to their children, their sacred inheritance of constitutional liberty. But here sat an Assembly,

which made its chief business the passage of "the *loyalty resolutions*"—as if in this Republic loyalty were a thing due from the people to the officers of Government, and not, rather, from the officers of Government, high and low, military and civil, to the people and their Constitution. Alas! for the noble Church that has fallen the victim of an insidious, as well as cruel, fanaticism. Dr. Spring, in that body, was really the cat's-paw of Dr. McMaster. He it was, who, though not a member, yet, through Drs. Thomas and Monfort, and a few other Abolitionists, made himself the master-spirit of that feeble Assembly. The hitherto insignificant elements of positive Abolitionism amongst us rose to the agitated surface of things in that sycophantic body, and, with the hue and cry of patriotism on its lips, and with bitter malice against the South in its heart, triumphed over the timid, uncertain, demoralized opposition that encountered it. Where was Dr. Hodge? He was there, but he was not there as a leader any more. He was there, to be ridiculed, and opposed, and *snubbed*, and put down. Coolly did Dr. Monfort tell him (as we were privately informed) that the election of Professor Moffat to Princeton Seminary, over Mr. Shields (Dr. Hodge's candidate), was the punishment of his opposing the "loyalty resolutions," and was also to teach him that there is a North-West, which will drive him, next year, out of Princeton Seminary! Yes! Dr. Hodge was there, to have his protest answered by no other pen than that of Dr. Thomas, of Ohio—this Old School Presbyterian Assembly actually appointing such a man as that to represent her against Charles Hodge! He was there; but the South, against whose sacred cause he had so lately used all his influence, and upon whose devoted head he had helped to launch the terrors of this atrocious war, was not there, as always hitherto, to sustain him and the other conservatives, against the pressure that was upon

them, and so he and they, and the Old School Presbyterian Church of the North, went down together.

The debate on the state of the country was divided between three different classes of speakers. There was, first, the class led by Dr. Thomas—the man who *dared* the Assembly to shrink in this crisis, and “be blown away like the foam from the crest of the billow.” He was supported by Dr. Anderson, the man who had “dear friends in the army, and wanted to encourage them.” He it was who ridiculed Dr. Hodge’s paper as “milk-and-water sophistry.” Dr. Thomas was supported, also, by Judge Ryerson, who had long been aware of the wicked designs of little South Carolina upon the mighty Union, and who had no respect at all for the “sheer conspiracy” which Southern men call their Government. Then there was Mr. Hastings, who scared the Assembly with the danger of resisting the intense and giant patriotism that had been awakened. It was he that shook in their pale faces the letter “received at noon from a very prominent citizen.” There was, also, Dr. Musgrave, who saw in secession “a monstrous immorality—a ruinous error, that ought to be crushed out, at once and for ever—that ought to be swept from the face, not only of this country, but of the earth;” which terrible words he spoke for the “encouragement of all loyal hearts in the South.” His tongue was loud and smooth on the subject of the Government’s gracious protection of Maryland, which he hoped “would soon be extended to some other States.” There was, also, Mr. Waller, drawing out the comparison in full, of secession from Mr. Lincoln’s Government with the apostacy of our first parents from God. He was the man to denounce, on Scripture authority, this “rebellion,” as being “like witchcraft, worthy of death;” and yet the confession came out of him, that, after all, the justice of the death he would inflict depended on the legitimacy of the Government, and that that legitimacy did admit of being doubted. And, finally, there was Dr. Lord, with like ser-

vile adulation of the Government, urging on the Assembly how much the Church owed to it, and how every interest of the Church was in jeopardy if the United States Government were prostrated! Well might he close his speech with an apostrophe to the star-spangled banner, under whose folds he had just put the Church! That eloquent apostrophe, so suitable to the time and the place, lacked only one additional touch, to have made the effect of it perfectly irresistible. Dr. Lord should have *sung the whole song from the platform*, and the Assembly should have joined in it, as we are informed has come to be a common practice in the Northern Churches. Alas! for the Church, when the banner of the Cross is thus displaced, and her Head and Saviour has His honor given to Cæsar! Along with all these speeches of flattery to the Government, put the fact that, once and again, the Cabinet must be asked, by telegrams, to direct the course of this Assembly, and that their wishes are referred to, over and over again, as authority for the action taken. It was a just remark of a writer in the *North Carolina Presbyterian*, that, toward the Government of the United States, the tone of this free-born General Assembly was as abject as that of the most servile English Parliament towards the fiercest of the Tudors, or that of the Roman Senate, in the worst days of imperial despotism, toward the most sanguinary of the Cæsars.

The second class of speakers in the Assembly was composed of Drs. Hodge, Yeomans, Backus, and, perhaps, one or two others. These were the only representatives of the conservative North. In our judgment, the ablest speech of the Assembly, from amongst the men of the North, was that of Dr. Yeomans, and that, we are sorry to add, since we respect Dr. Yeomans so highly, is not saying much. Dr. Hodge's speech had its strong points, too, and they were well put, but it was chiefly a mere appeal to considerations of expediency. Both Dr. Hodge and Dr. Yeomans acknowledged in full the righteousness of the war, and there

was, therefore, no power in them to withstand the demand for an expression of sympathy with the Government. The fierce and savage uprising of the North, to wage a war of invasion and of every horror against the South, simply because these free Southern States have claimed their independence, Dr. Hodge said, is more "sublime and grand than was ever heard of before." And Dr. Yeomans told his people, just before leaving them, that it is a great "struggle which must be fought through, once for all." With such utterances on their lips, how could they expect to keep back the Assembly from declaring *its* sympathy, also, with this "grand and sublime struggle?" Both of them were willing to make the unity of the Church subsidiary to the Union of the States, and Dr. Hodge, especially, urged the continuance of the former chiefly on that ground; thus making Christ's kingdom to be *of this world*; and yet, they both sanctioned the war which renders disunion, both in Church and in State, as permanent as complete.

The third class of speakers in the Assembly, was the small class of Southern Commissioners. We do not desire to intensify at all the feelings of disapprobation with which it is becoming evident that Southern Presbyterians have regarded the course of these brethren generally. We would treat them with all possible forbearance, on the ground of its not being at all certain that they have been justly represented by the reporters. One thing, however, we think is very certain. They put themselves into a false position by appearing at all in the Assembly. Previous to the opening of the Assembly, the war had commenced. Southern men, therefore, had no business at the North, nor in that house. To go to an enemy's country, and to stay there, and to meet in counsel with those enemies, and to take part in their debates—this was, all, or any part of it, bad enough. But to take such a part in these debates as has been ascribed to most of the Southern speakers, is worse than we can well express. We will not attempt to express it. We would



not say too much, lest we should be unjust to them; we would not say too little, lest we should be unjust to that dear and sacred cause which they appear to us to have so much damaged.

We have dwelt upon the sycophantic adulation of the Government by the Assembly; of the voting at the outset to meet next year at Springfield, Illinois, where Mr. Lincoln comes from, and at Washington, where he holds his court; and of the telegrams asking the Administration to direct the proceedings of the body. The reader also remembers how one great Doctor of Divinity held himself forth as the “*representative*” of Mr. Secretary Bates, and as the man who had actually held the correspondence, by telegraph, with that distinguished functionary. Before passing away to another topic, let us just allude to a significant little circumstance mentioned by the *Cincinnati Weekly Gazette*, in its account of the proceedings. It was, indeed, a *little* thing, every way, but it shows the character of the body. It evinces the calibre and the tone of the men who were so loud in hounding on the dogs of war upon the South. It declares how incapable was that Assembly of rising to the seriousness of the occasion and the case before them—how little in earnest they were—though met together in such sad and earnest times. The *Gazette* is speaking of the very afternoon when Dr. Spring’s resolutions were adopted. It says:

Prior to the commencement of the afternoon session, when the house was moderately filled, an artist photographed the scene, the prominent or forward members of the body taking standing positions in the pulpit. The scene may yet become historical with the Presbyterian Church.

With regard to the question of the right and duty of the General Assembly, or of the Synod, or of the Minister in his pulpit, to enjoin upon the people their duty to Government, we have no doubts whatever. We think in nothing was the weakness of the Southern Commissioners more

manifest than in their constant, but vain, efforts to disprove this right and duty. None have been more hostile than we to "political parsons," or to untimely intermeddling with civil affairs by bodies of Ministers. But there are, without doubt, *morals in politics*, which sometimes demand a testimony. There is duty to God in respect to country and to rulers, to ancestors and to posterity; and there is duty, also, directly to all these last. The second table of the law must be preached, as well as the first. And not only may a Church court, as we conceive, testify to the citizens, individually and separately, respecting their civil duties, but that court may sometimes be required to testify to the nation itself. The nation is a moral person. It can sin, and it will be punished if it do not repent. Wisdom, of course, is profitable to direct, when the occasion has come which demands the instruction of the Ministry and the testimony of the Church court respecting the affairs and the duties of the nation. But it does seem to us, that, if there ever was an occasion when Church teachers might legitimately have spoken, and were under obligations to speak, to the Church and to the country, about duty and about sin, that occasion was when the last Assembly met. Just think of the ground which those must take who deny the Assembly's right to speak: Here was, on the theory of the North, a sinful rebellion against the Government, gotten up in certain States where the Assembly had many Ministers and Churches; while, on the theory of the South, here was a wicked war of invasion waging by the Federal Government against free and sovereign States—that Federal Government being the agent of the North, where, also, the Assembly had many Ministers and Churches. The consequences of this struggle were to be dreadful in the highest degree and on the largest scale. Thousands of men were likely to be slaughtered at a time. Widows and orphans were to fill the land. Every species of wickedness was to increase and multiply in the train of the war, and,

in a word, inexpressible misery as well as guilt was involved on the one side, or on the other, or on both. Yet, while the moral sense of all the world is shocked at the idea of such a fratricidal war and its consequences, the General Assembly were to have no moral sense whatever on the subject! The very spectacle of it, the confused noise in their ears of the battle itself, and the warrior's garments rolled in blood before their very eyes, is not to call off their attention for a moment from their more important affairs of routine and red-tape! It seems to us to be the absurdest possible notion of our Church Government, that the Confession of Faith forbids the Church court from speaking out for justice, and right, and peace, in such a case as this. The very idea casts *ridicule*, yes, *reproach*, upon the Assembly, as a body of reverend recluses in white cravats and black coats, too sanctimoniously busy with their own holy or unholy pursuits—too much engrossed with the pious squabbles of the body—to turn an ear for one moment to the cry of a bleeding country. This preposterous conception of the Church's duty arises from simply failing to draw the very obvious distinction between mere politics and a great religious question. If a whole congregation were going out, immediately after service, to a murderous assault upon their innocent neighbors; or if, on the other hand, they were going out to rebel against lawful authority, and if their pastor knew it, ought he to preach not a word of warning against their sin? If the members of all our Churches were joining in this war, on the one side or on the other, and if the Assembly believed that one side was wicked aggression, and the other side rightful resistance, could they, ought they, to be silent, and not testify upon this moral and religious question? We know that an Assembly constituted like ours could hardly have one opinion on such a question, and that whatever it might say must be condemned either at the North or at the South. That only shows how impossible it would be for a body so con-

stituted to hold together in such circumstances—it does not disprove their duty to testify to whatever might seem to them to be right in the premises.

What, therefore, as it seems to us, the Southern Commissioners ought to have attacked, was not the Assembly's undertaking to enjoin the duty due to the Government, but the way in which they performed their undertaking. It ought to have been demonstrated that the Assembly was giving the wrong kind of testimony. There ought to have come forth from amongst the Southern Commissioners some adequate exhibition of the rights of the country from which they came—a country of eleven sovereign States—which had renounced the unfaithful and usurping central agency they joined in creating, and had set up a new Confederacy. What a glorious opportunity it was for some man in the Assembly, whether from the South or from the North, whether from the East or from the West, to have spoken strongly, clearly, fully, adequately, on behalf of the rights of these States; on behalf of regulated liberty—that precious gift of God to so few of the nations, but inherited, through His favor, by Britons, and still more fully by Americans; on behalf of the Constitution—that compact violated on one side, and, therefore, on all sides; on behalf of truth, and justice, and honesty, and fairness, and peace, between all the equal parties to that national compact. If there had been some Dr. Witherspoon there, how he would have stood up for the States against Abraham I., as he stood up for the Colonies against George III. Had the General Assembly but risen to the sublimity of the occasion, and, laying Dr. Spring's resolutions—not on the table, but under it—had they testified, before God, to their people that this is a wicked war which Mr. Lincoln is, without color of constitutional authority, waging against the Confederate States; and had they called on their people to exert themselves on behalf of justice and peace towards their brethren, who desire nothing from the North which

belongs to the North, asking only for their plain right to govern themselves; if the Assembly had spoken in some such sense as this, how becoming had been their action, and how beneficent their influence. We shall be told, of course, by the Southern Commissioners, that it had been altogether in vain for them to have attempted any such full and complete testimony as that, for it would not only not have had any good effect, but it would not have been listened to—that the Assembly would have silenced any such thorough and full defence of the South as treason. Then we say, this only shows that Southern men had no business to be in any such Assembly.

All that we have now said is quite in harmony with the views which we and others of the South have hitherto asserted, and which prevailed in the Assembly of 1860, respecting the unlawfulness of interference by the Assembly with *secular* affairs. This matter was *ecclesiastical*, and that in the highest sense, and for the strongest reasons. And the Assembly could not have innocently omitted to notice it. Their misfortune was, that they did not view it in the only right way—that they did not rebuke the unjust—yea, murderous spirit of Northern Ministers, and Churches, and people. We do not see how any gathering of Ministers and Christian men, in any part of the country, can neglect to speak, loudly and distinctly, their views of this war. It is their own responsibility if they speak on the wrong side. Speak they must, for it is the grandest drama of wickedness, on the one side or on the other, that the respective parties ever were engaged in. And let all sections of what was once the American people be aware of this. Let them look to the stand they are occupying, for it is full of responsibility. Let them do all things in this case in God's name, and in God's fear, for to Him, as Judge amongst the nations, they must give account.

The action of the Synod of South Carolina at its last meeting, often referred to in the Assembly, is altogether in

harmony with what we have always maintained, as well as with what we are now maintaining. It was moved in that Synod that we immediately separate from the Old School Presbyterian Church, because of the Act of 1818, which, with other circumstances, evinced her to be hostile to the South. The ground upon which this course was urged was, that fidelity to the South required it of the Synod. The motion was laid upon the table, by a vote of seventy-seven to twenty-one. A minute explaining this very significant disposal of a motion which had appealed, but in vain, to such a sacred principle, was then adopted, with but one dissenting voice. That minute declared truly that the General Assembly, in its annual meetings, had always accorded both justice and courtesy to the Southern members; and that the Act of 1818 had been adopted by the South of that day, as well as by the North, and virtually had been rescinded in the action of 1845. As to separation, it was said the Synod could not inaugurate it, because that was not the time for such a step, nor was the Synod the proper body to initiate such a movement. It was not for the Church to anticipate the State in dividing from the North; and it was not for the Synod, but for the Sessions and Presbyteries, to take the first steps, whenever the time should come. Then the Synod proceeded to say it was not for her to instruct the citizens in their ordinary political duties; but that the great and solemn question before the State, whether she would give up her inheritance of freedom, and her very being and life, had a religious bearing, and involved duty to God; to ancestors; to posterity; to our very slaves. The Synod doubted not that the State ought to make a stand for the precious rights which were the correlative of all these solemn duties. And she exhorted our Churches and people to go forward in the solemn path of their duty, putting their trust in God, and, also, assured them of her benediction and her prayers.

Of course, the so nearly unanimous adoption of that minute implied plainly that the members of the Synod had studied the question of the rights involved in the controversy between the South and the North—had studied the Constitution of the United States and of their own State, and were convinced that there was involved a precious and sacred inheritance of rights, which could not be surrendered without sin against God. And well had it been for the Assembly, in Philadelphia, had they, also, understood the question at issue, and been prepared to take a proper view of the relative rights and duties of the belligerents in this case. We cheerfully commit the action of the Synod of South Carolina, in comparison with that of the Assembly, to the judgment of impartial posterity.

The Presbyterian Church, Old School, is, therefore, of course, soon to be formally divided. It is now, in one sense, divided already, for there is no more union of feeling between the two parts. The Northern majority have so legislated against us, as to show that in their hearts they are not at one with us; and so legislated against us, as that we certainly can not be at one with them. Now, the question arises, what is it that both *will* soon, and *ought* soon, to divide this Church? Is it these mutual feelings of alienation? Do they, can they, justify actual separation, and the setting up of a new and distinct Presbyterian Church organization? We have no hesitation in answering, No! Such feelings as produce unjust and unkind legislation, and such feelings, too, as it produces, ought to be controlled and corrected. They form no justification of schism.

Is it, then, that the late Assembly has made a term of Church membership which we can not agree to? In ordinary circumstances, we would answer, with equal readiness, No! If the new term they have made were not so peculiar in its nature and bearing, that would undoubtedly be our answer. To make a new term of membership is extra-Constitutional action, and simply null and void. The Gen-

eral Assembly has no power or authority to do any such thing. It has only a judicial power of interpreting and declaring the laws of Christ. But whenever it gives a wrong interpretation of them, no man's conscience is bound thereby. Were it not, therefore, that the "loyalty resolutions" of the Assembly must necessarily affect our position towards our own Government, we would say, unhesitatingly, that they do not render necessary any division of the Church. And, notwithstanding this bearing of the Assembly's action, we are much inclined to the belief that those resolutions do not, of themselves, constitute any necessary or justifying ground of a separation. We might repudiate the resolutions—we might defy the Assembly, as violating the Constitution thereby—and we might still continue in the Church of our fathers. If there were no other and better reason for division, we conceive that this unconstitutional action would neither compel nor justify it. This is not the ground on which, of itself, we, for one, are willing to put our departure. Nor would the additional circumstance suffice, that the Assembly have really reënacted the Act of 1818. That, also, is simply the judgment of a fallible court, which judgment ought to be, and might be, subsequently reversed. All such offences by the Assembly against truth and right, as we have now been considering, do but require the Presbyteries to appear in the next Assembly, and, with the help of the conservative men of the North, if any there now be, endeavor to rectify all these errors. And, if defeated, then it would be our duty to renew the conflict, and hope for some future vindication of the truth to be successful. Just as, if the Assembly were to enact any other heresy, we would not think of therefore giving up our birthright and retiring, until, at least, we had fought some good fighting in its defence. We are satisfied of the entire justice of this position. If the Church had been at liberty to divide whenever any Council or Synod made any unjust or erroneous decree,



she would just have been dividing all the time, from the beginning until now. Synods and Councils have been prone to err. What is a General Assembly, but two or three hundred fallible men, acting for a constituency which may at any time reverse their decisions? Dr. Breckinridge once said, with characteristic point, that God had ordained that the General Assembly should every now and then decree itself *an ass*.

What is it, then, that *must*, and *ought* to divide the Presbyterian Church, Old School? It is the division of the country into two separate nations. No external Church organization of a spiritual Church can properly perform its spiritual functions within the limits of two distinct nations. And the more hostile they become, the more impossible will it be for one Church to work in the bounds of both. There is no need to spend much time in arguing this point. All Church history illustrates the truth of what we say. The Romish Church is no exception, because, in point of fact, she, also, is divided into many distinct national organizations, which are but indirectly connected together through the Pope. The Gallic Church, for example, never has been in any other but this indirect way connected with the Church in Spain or Italy. Each one is fully organized within, by a separate and independent organization, only they are all subject to the same Pope—except when it happens that there are two or three of these. We suppose, in the present case, the Romish dioceses of the North and those of the South will be organized into separate Archbishopsrics. But, whether they shall be so organized or not, the Romish Church is no exception to what we said above, because that Church can not be considered, in the full and high sense of that term, a *spiritual* Church. With her, on the contrary, all is material, mechanical, external. She is a purely visible society, having a visible head on the earth. The union between the members of that Church, the world over, is not spiritual, but external. It does not depend on

the bond of any internal, religious, or moral character. It depends simply on the profession of the same creed, the use of the same sacraments, and the acknowledgment of the same Pope. Within these few and wide limits, therefore, no obstacles to their unity arise from differences of ideas or opinions. The sphere of their Church is not the sphere of the life, or of thought or feeling. Every kind of moral notion may prevail amongst them, even the most opposite ones, and their outward Church union is not thereby disturbed. Quite different is the case with every spiritual Church, where each member is to be united to every other, as well as to an invisible Head, by a faith which appeals to the intellect and to the heart, and which always affects the character. Here there must be identity, in some good degree, of moral judgments, feelings, and sympathies, or the unity is broken. For here opinions are free. Here there is discussion, and here, owing to weakness on one or both sides, there arise prejudices, and these are obstacles to union, and to the accomplishment together of the Church's work. In the case of every such free Church, therefore, having the domain of the intellect and the heart for its sphere of operation and influence, the separation of national interests becomes an obstacle to union, which can not be disregarded. Differences of political organization, therefore, must divide such Churches. There were, in the beginning, the different Churches of Rome, Corinth, Galatia, and Ephesus, etc., etc. No one Church organization can operate successfully under two Governments. The necessity for separation is absolute. But the real unity of the Spirit is no more sacrificed in this case, than when the separation is produced by language, or by race, or by the ocean, or by the ages.

So, also, the case of our own Missionary Synods in India forms no exception. They are but exotics, submitting, of course, necessarily, for a time, to many untoward circumstances and influences. Wait till they take root in the soil,

and we shall see them organize the Presbyterian Church of the Indies.

But we have taken root already, and are no exotics. Our case is that of a Church extending into all parts of this broad land, and the country suddenly disrupted politically. And how can the old organization successfully operate in these two separate Confederacies? This question was settled for the Church, in our apprehension, on the same day which settled it for the country. And, just as it was the earnest wish of the Southern States, in their separation from the North, to take a peaceable departure from their late sisters, and to maintain with them always the most friendly relations, so did we fondly hope that the inevitable separation thus to be brought upon the Church would be a peaceable separation, and no schism. That pleasant dream of a secession for the States which should be peaceable, we confess that we ourselves did dream, and long did we refuse to be waked up from it. We can hardly yet believe that we are awake, and that we find war between the North and South an actual reality. Just so in reference to our dream for the Church. We have been waked up from it, to find ourselves virtually *cut off*, and practically *turned out*. We are in the condition of the Apostles when cast out of the Synagogue. Well, it is not the first exodus God's people ever made. Israel made an exodus from Egypt. It is not the first *Presbyterian exodus*, either. The Free Church of Scotland made an exodus from their National Church, Erastianized. And accepting, as, *in view of our divided nationality*, we all certainly shall accept, that exodus which many Southern Presbyterians consider to be, even otherwise, forced upon us by the Erastianized Church of the North, our humble, but earnest, hearty, and cheerful hope is, that, disowned by the servants, we are acknowledged by the Son and the Lord and Master. This is enough for us. We do not doubt that He has a work for us to do, and that He will enable us to perform it. Our hearts bound forward in the pathway of

this new Presbyterian exodus. We hasten to meet the new and glorious future which seems to rise up before us, and to beckon us onwards.

Our own impressions were, at first, favorable to no immediate action towards the formal separation. We preferred to have the Presbyteries take the needful action at their regular Fall meetings. But we are now convinced that the general and the clamorous call, from so many parts of the South, for a Convention to assemble, without unnecessary delay, and take the necessary steps for organizing a separate Southern Church, is the voice of God on the subject. It is the instinctive demand of the Church's feelings. And the instincts of Zion's heart are apt to be right. It does appear to us, that, having been put into a false position, both by the Assembly and by our own Commissioners, we must not delay at all to set ourselves right. We owe this to our Northern brethren, in so far as it may be possible to reach them by any declarations of ours. We owe it still more to our country—our country, the Confederate States. We must have opportunity to declare, immediately and loudly, with how much indignation we repel the attempt to coerce us to be traitors to her. And still more, if possible, do we owe it to ourselves—to our own convictions and our own feelings, which will not let us rest as the thing now stands—to repudiate, in the most formal and solemn manner possible, and as soon as possible, the attitude which they would have compelled us to assume.

It is a sad thing to have had such an end made of "the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." We think impartial history will testify that the South, in this case, as in the civil disruption, has not been the aggressor. We humbly trust such will be the Master's judgment, also. He is a gracious Lord. We are complete in Him. We again declare our confidence that He will not forsake nor disown us. He will condescend to use us and our poor labors. We have a glorious work to do in these

Confederate States, and in our share of the Foreign Missionary field. Let us gird up our loins for the vigorous discharge of these sacred and delightful obligations!

P. S.—Since the above was sent to press, accounts have reached us of the further and final proceedings of the Assembly.

#### REMOVAL OF BOARDS FROM PHILADELPHIA.

Dr. DICKSON moved to remove the Board of Education to Baltimore. The Corresponding Secretary was in favor of it.

Mr. WALLER moved to refer the subject to the next Assembly.

Mr. ROBERTSON moved a Committee to consider the propriety of removing the Boards of Education and of Domestic Missions to Pittsburgh, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, or other cities, and to report necessary changes.

After some discussion, in view of the lateness of the day, the whole subject was indefinitely postponed.

#### REPORT OF BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

Mr. WALLER continued his speech, on the want of economy and the expensiveness of the whole arrangements.

Dr. EDWARDS said, if the Boards had had trouble, they had brought it on themselves. There must be a clear showing; nothing kept under the hand.

Dr. SCHENCK replied, that nothing was hidden in the reports of the Board, save the capital, and this had not been called for in the Assembly till now.

Various efforts to procure a vote of some kind of censure of the Board, were then made by Drs. Edwards and Musgrave, but all failed, and a very favorable report was adopted.

#### MINUTES OF SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

The exceptions reported by the Committee were taken up *seriatim*.

The first was that "the book has not been sent up for three years."

Agreed to.

The second was "against the statement, by the Synod, that the act of 1818 had been virtually repealed." After some discussion, agreed to.

The third exception was "against the solemn counselling of a popular movement against the Government of the United States."

Dr. HALL moved to add to the exception the words: "Inasmuch as it is inexpedient for the judicatures of our Church to give political deliverances."

Mr. VAILL said he would propose, as an addition to that, these words: "Except in the case of the General Assembly."

Dr. HODGE moved, as a substitute for the third exception, as reported, the following: "In approving these minutes the Assembly is not to be understood as endorsing the action of the Synod in reference to the political course of the State of South Carolina." Adopted.

REVISED BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

Mr. CLARK offered a resolution, directing the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Discipline to meet in Pittsburg, on Tuesday, August 13, at 7, P. M., and that the members present be a quorum.

This resolution seems to have been adopted. It is a virtual displacing of all the Southern members of the Committee, the Chairman, Dr. Thornwell, included.

The following is the letter of Dr. Thornwell, as Chairman of the Committee, read to the Assembly. It is said to have produced very general indications of mingled surprise and derision in the Assembly, many of the members repeating over and over to themselves, in a whisper, its closing expression, "your country and mine."

DEAR BRETHREN: It becomes my duty, as Chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Discipline, to state the reasons why the orders of the last Assembly have not been complied with. The Committee have been able to have no meeting at all. During the whole of last summer I was absent from the country, and did not return until some time in October. I left immediately after the dissolution of the Assembly.

I intended to call the Committee together about Christmas, but the political troubles, which at that time began to thicken upon us, rendered it inexpedient, if not impracticable. At no time since has it been possible to have a meeting; and, even if the condition of the country had allowed, my health, since the middle of January, has been so poor that I have attempted no public duty of any kind.

I am persuaded, however, that the Church is put to no real inconvenience by not having a report from the Committee of Revision. The Assembly could not consider it. Other issues, much more pressing, and much more solemn, are upon us. This whole subject will have to lie over until more quiet times. Brethren, I invoke upon your deliberations the blessings of the Most High.

I sincerely pray that He may guide you, by the inspiration of His Spirit, into wise and holy measures; that He may save the Church

from every false step; that He may make her a messenger of peace in these troublous times; and that He may restore harmony and good will between your country and mine.

Most truly, yours,

J. H. THORNWELL.

---

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Biblical Commentary on the Epistles of St. John, in Continuation of the Work of Olshausen. With an Appendix on the Catholic Epistles, and an Introductory Essay on the Life and Writings of St. John.* By Dr. JOHN H. A. EBRARD. Translated by Rev. W. B. POPE, Manchester. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1860; pp. 416, 8vo.

Dr. Ebrard is one of the most learned, earnest and zealous divines of Germany. A Bavarian by birth and education, and a Huguenot by descent, he unites to the impulsive energy of the French, the minute learning of the Germans. He is one of the leading advocates of the Reformed Church in his own country, adopting, as our own standards do, the Calvinistic view of the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament, but approaching more nearly the Melancthonian than the higher Calvinistic type in his theology. Though in the prime of life, his works have already become numerous. Among the most considerable are his *Critical History of the Life of Christ*; his *Dogmatic Theology*; his *History of the Lord's Supper, from the Apostles down*; his *Collection of the Reformed Liturgies*; his *Lectures on Practical Theology*; his *Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on the Apocalypse*. Besides these, he has been a frequent contributor to the *Studien und Kritiken*, and to Herzog's *Encyclopedia*.