

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVII.—NO. 1.

---

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXVI.

---

ARTICLE I.

## PRELACY A BLUNDER.

Two theories of Christianity prevail in Christendom, which are in fact essentially opposite. If one is the gospel of God, then the other cannot be. To him who heartily holds the one, the assertor of the other must be as one who "brings another gospel," and who ought to "be Anathema Maran-atha." That the advocates of these incompatible schemes should co-exist, and should have co-existed for three hundred years, in the bosom of the same communion, can only be accounted for by the stringency of the political influences which originally dictated the unnatural union, and by the absurdity of that theory of the Church which requires its tolerance. The hatred of Queen Elizabeth for the gospel, with what she regarded as her diplomatic and secular interests, prompted her to coerce the two religions into cohabitation in the State Church, by the despotic hand of persecution. The blunder of making a visible unity an essential attribute of the Church, where Christ required only a spiritual unity, has betrayed both parties into a dread of "the sin of schism," which holds them to the hollow mockery of union.

The one of these plans of salvation may be described, with sufficient accuracy, as the high-Prelatic, held by Rome, the Greek Church, and the Episcopalian Ritualists. It is often called the theory of "sacramental grace;" not because the other party deny

clear on this point. On p. 140, it is argued that God may "suspend or reverse" any law; not by "a new force," but through "other laws." The meaning seems to be, that God may answer prayer without working a miracle. But in the account the author gives, on pp. 137-139, of the miracles of Scripture, we understand him to analyse them into the same kind of operations with ordinary, so far as physical laws are concerned. Either, then, there is no such thing as a miracle, or it is still to be shown that all prayer does not demand the miraculous. The next chapter is on the notorious "Prayer-Test," which the lecturer shows up very cleverly and successfully. He is, however, too mild. There was room for more of virtuous wrath. The grand reply is omitted, viz., that such a test involves the sin of the arch-tempter on the mountain-top. The fifth lecture discusses the point, does God answer prayer, or prayer and miracle.

The thought in this book is better than the language, which, though commonly good, is often diffuse. We challenge the word "reliable." The book abounds in apt illustrations.

*Memoirs of General W. T. Sherman: Written by Himself.*  
D. Appleton & Co. 2 vols. 8vo. Pp. 405, 409.

Darwinians say that the first of a new *genus* is created by its "environment." No other environment than that of Yankee "civilisation" could have rendered possible such a book as this from a man holding such a position. Its author is a distinguished member of an educated profession, and commander-in-chief of the armies of this Empire. His book may be briefly described as lively, perspicuous, egotistical, reckless, slashing, with a spice of profanity, a large infusion of slang, and a general complexion of vulgarity. Military and political criticisms are out of the sphere of this Review; and, for literary criticism, the work does not present a subject matter at all. Our only object in noticing it, is to remark upon its code of official ethics.

Gen. Sherman here not only avows, but glories in his ravages of the South. During his career, his usual answer to remonstrance was: "You Southern people chose war; and war is war."

Mankind will yet decide that, while Gen. Lee's career in Pennsylvania *was war*, Gen. Sherman's, in Georgia and Carolina, *was brigandage*. It is a duty which every civilised and Christian person owes to his kind, to insist on this verdict. *Grotius*, whose international code was the harsh one of the ancients and of the middle ages, declares, (*De Jure Belli et Pacis. Liber III., Chap. VI., §27*):

“But this external right to acquire possessions captured in war, is so restricted to formal wars arising out of the law of nations, that in other wars it has no place; for, in wars between foreigners, the property is not acquired by virtue of force of arms, but for compensation of dues which could not be otherwise obtained. *But in wars between citizens*, whether they be small or large, *no transfer of ownership takes place, except by authority of a judge.*” The doctrine is, that, in no war, does mere superior force create any just title to the spoils obtained; brute force decides no right. Hence, when at the end of a war between foreigners, the conqueror retains his spoils, it is not on the ground of superior force; but on the ground that, where there is no common arbiter, these spoils of war are his only means of getting just indemnity; and the strong hand, the only process. But civil wars, between citizens of the same nation, are waged for the avowed purpose of reducing opponents under the regular jurisdiction of the laws and magistracy. In this the combatants have a common umpire when peace returns. It is the judicial decision of law which confers a just right of property, not brute force; and hence *civil war confers no right of spoil.*

Says Vattell, Bk. III., Chap. 9: “It is lawful to take away *the property of an unjust enemy* in order to weaken him.” But . . . . “only with moderation, and according to the exigencies of the case.” “If an enemy of superior strength treats in this manner a province which he might easily keep in his possession, he is universally accused of making war like a furious barbarian.” “The pillage and destruction of towns, the devastation of the open country, the ravaging and setting fire to houses . . . . are measures odious and detestable, on every occasion when they are evidently put in practice without absolute necessity.”

Gen. Sherman claims a belligerent right to take or destroy everything, which if left might have enabled the South for farther resistance—even including, according to that practical explanation of his code given in Georgia and Carolina, plate, watches, jewelry, spoons, pianos, harps, pictures, statues, churches, libraries, sacred vessels of the sacraments, clothing of females and infants, bedding, and dwellings; as much as iron-foundries and powder-mills. Why did he not apply his doctrine also to murder the children, because they might speedily grow up into soldiers; and to murder the women, because they might breed soldiers? This would have been just as consistent.

Gen. Sherman's crowning exploit, as is well known, was the sack and burning of the city of Columbia, the capital of South Carolina, peacefully and formally surrendered to him by its civic authorities, upon his express guarantee of its protection. This beautiful town, then containing twenty thousand people, was systematically sacked during the day, and at night fired with equal system in various places, and the larger portion of it burned to the ground. We will not attempt to detail the complicated horrors and crimes of that night; but will present Gen. Sherman's own version of their cause. Vol. II., p. 287, he says:

“Many of the people thought that this fire was deliberately planned and executed. This is not true. It was accidental, and, in my judgment, began with the cotton which General Hampton's men had set fire to on leaving the city, (whether by his orders or not is not material,) which fire was partially subdued early in the day by our men; but when night came, the high wind fanned it again into full blaze, carried it against the frame-houses, which caught like tinder, and soon spread beyond our control.”

Every intelligent person in Columbia believed that Gen. Sherman, probably without formally ordering it, designed and managed this burning. In their eyes, this method of procuring the crime only added to its meanness, without diminishing anything of its atrocity. The impartial reader may, perhaps, determine where the truth lies, from the following facts:

Gen. Sherman, on the same page which has just been quoted, adds: “In my official report of this conflagration, I distinctly

charged it to Gen. Wade Hampton, and confess I did so pointedly, to shake the faith of his people in him, for he was in my opinion a braggart, and professed to be the special champion of South Carolina." Above, he confesses that he had not sufficient evidence to show whether Gen. Hampton was responsible for the fire or not, this point not being "material." Here, he avows, that in a formal, official report, he "distinctly and pointedly" charged Gen. Hampton with the act, for the purpose of defaming him with his own people! The curious reader will perhaps be embarrassed in deciding how much (or little) weight may be attached to any averment of one whose views of the obligation of veracity are so peculiar.

Next, let it be added, that according to express testimony of eye-witnesses, this cotton, placed in a very wide open street, was not fired at all by Gen. Hampton, or by any Confederate agency; but by the pipes, cigars, and matches of Sherman's soldiers lounging upon it; and that this fire was not "partially," but utterly extinguished by a fire company of the city, who saturated and drenched the whole mass with water; and that the same wind was blowing then and afterwards. Let it also be considered, that threats were notoriously uttered by officers and men of Sherman's army, reflecting his own vindictive temper, before it crossed the Savannah river, against Columbia, as the capital of the State which was first to secede, the place of refuge for the people and the wealth of hated Charleston, and the seat of important Confederate works and stores. The broad track of ruin left through the State shows of what this General and his army were capable. Who so likely to have burned the city, as they who avowedly burned the whole country over which they marched? We remind the reader again, that a multitude of soldiers and officers, some of considerable rank, declared that the city was to be burned at night. Accordingly, the work was begun at an appointed time, by a preconcerted signal, (the rise of sundry rockets,) and by large bands of soldiers deliberately prepared with combustibles, and acting with perfect deliberation and method. To show that it was a purposed crime, we need only add, that when the fire companies of the

city endeavored to arrest the flames, they were driven off, their hose cut, and their fire-engines disabled. Will it be said, that all this was done by the army without the consent and approbation of its commander? Then let the following facts be noted: That from 10 o'clock a. m., Gen. Sherman was, according to his own statement, riding or walking about the town nearly during the whole day (as during the subsequent night); while his people were openly engaged in the pleasant pastimes of robbing stores and dwellings, murdering blacks, committing rape on their women, stealing watches off the persons of ladies, and tearing rings from their fingers; that he had his whole army otherwise under rigid and perfect discipline; and that, accordingly, when the work of destruction had reached a certain point, a single bugle call from headquarters sufficed to arrest it, and at the first bidding of authority, the tumult subsided, the hordes of drunken soldiers vanished, and order was at once restored. Why was not this authority exerted at 8 o'clock p. m., instead of 5 o'clock a. m.? It was only because the designed work was unfinished.

Gen. Sherman recites his amiable charities to those whom he had ruined, with a refreshing simplicity. He gave a parcel of bacon and half a tierce of rice to each of two widows. But the provisions were stolen from their fellow-citizens. He left with the Mayor five hundred cattle. But these were driven from the farms, and were famished, unable to travel, and dying a score a day of exhaustion!

When any attempt was made to shame the incendiaries, they usually replied, that on their return home they should glory in the act, and that nothing would be so grateful as their vengeance to the people of the North. Did they estimate their country aright? The city of Chicago rung joy-bells at the news; and the chief actor has since been rewarded for it by "a grateful country" with the highest military honors in her gift.

Recent journals have told us, that when a representative of Great Britain lately met the Spanish General, *Burriel*, in his own country, he refused him all recognition, because this officer had ordered the execution of the "Virginus prisoners," whom, from his point of view, he regarded as caught in the act of piracy.

Gen. Sherman's little finger has been thicker than Gen. *Burriel's* loins. But the journey of the former through Europe was almost an ovation! Why this? Because it happened that Gen. Sherman's victims were the protectors of those poor Africans, whom the slave-trade, fostered by Europe and New England, had torn from their homes! Well; we presume that the people who could calmly look up to the righteous heavens amidst the horrors of that *pandemonium* which reigned in Columbia the 17th of February, 1865, will survive this injustice also, with an equanimity only disturbed by a quiet contempt.

There are two disclosures in Gen. Sherman's memoirs which have some value to the South. The Convention made with Gen. Jos. E. Johnston at Raleigh, in April, 1865, promised to the Confederate people restoration of all their constitutional rights and franchises, on condition of their submission to the Washington Government. How came Gen. Sherman to promise terms so much more just than those actually granted by that Government? Not, certainly, because of any special mercifulness or justice in the man; as the fate of Carolina clearly showed. The solution obviously is, that the blunt soldier, zealously engrossed with his war, in a region remote from the capital, had not kept pace with the developments of faithlessness in the ruling minds there. He had not comprehended, that all the solemn pledges made to the country and the world, of waging the war to uphold the constitution and laws, meant that, so soon as the South was helpless, the war was to be used to destroy them. It should be added, however, for Gen. Sherman's credit, that as soon as he was corrected, he hastened to amend this little error.

The other item is contained on p. 373 of Vol. II. We are there informed that Mr. Chase (doubtless the Ahitophel of the conclave) demanded of the President, so early as April 12, 1865, suffrage for the negroes; and that the reason which was assigned for this insane and criminal measure, was simply the desire to strengthen the radical faction in the Government after the restoration of a nominal peace. Thus the sagacity of Mr. Calhoun is verified, who had long before predicted that this dishonest motive would make negro suffrage the sequel of abolition; and the flimsy pretence of justice to the negro is dropped.