

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

HOME MISSIONS—HOW SHALL THEY BE CONDUCTED?

It is generally agreed among our Christian people that the work of Foreign Missions ought to be conducted under the direction and superintendence of the General Assembly. Presbyteries and Synods are fully competent to carry on the work, if they had the means and facilities, and could do it as effectually and economically in their separate character as in combination with other Presbyteries. But as Presbyteries, with few exceptions, perhaps, have not the means of themselves, and as separate action would involve a great increase of machinery as well as of expense, the work, by common consent, is committed to the General Assembly, the proper representative of the whole body. Presbyteries, in accordance with our Book of Order, in ordaining men to the work of foreign evangelisation, have agreed to transfer them to the control of the Assembly, so far as their general work is concerned, but without abdicating their right of control, so far as the moral and ministerial character of these brethren is concerned. In this view of the matter, our Church, so far as is known, is very nearly a unit.

In relation to the Home work, however, as also of Education, there is some diversity of views as to the mode in which it should be carried on. The great mass of our people hold that so far as

all business" (Printed Minutes, p. 196), although not only the conclusive force of the divine ordination of a Presbytery, composed not of one but of two classes of presbyters, is directly against this decision, but the explicit doctrine of the Church is that the quorum of a Presbytery is not "any three ministers," but "any three ministers, AND as many elders as may be present," etc. (*Idem*, ch. x., sec. 7): Now, this Synod believing the principle here involved to be practically the question between an aristocratical hierarchy and a free Christian commonwealth, and judging the word of God and the Constitution of the Church to be against the former and for the latter, we do, therefore, according to the power inherent in this Synod, and so declared to be in our Form of Government (ch. xi. sec. 4), "propose to the General Assembly," by way of overture, the repeal of Overture No. 20, adopted on the 30th of May, 1843, by yeas and nays 83 to 35, in the last Assembly, as being in its doctrine contrary to Scripture and to the standards of the Church, and in its effects subversive of the office of ruling elder, and of the rights and liberties of the Christian people; and the adoption, in its stead, of a declarative overture, to the effect that, by the Constitution of the Church, no assembly of the Church, whether it be congregational, classical, or synodical, can be regularly, legally, or completely constituted without the presence of ruling elders as members thereof.

ARTICLE IV.

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE CONFEDERATE
GOVERNMENT.

The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government. By JEFFERSON DAVIS. *Prosperum et felix seelus virtus vocatur.* D. Appleton & Co., New York: 2 Vols., 8vo. Pp. 707 and 808.

The natural theologian observes that God, in his providence, governs men on a vicarious principle analogous to that on which he redeems them. He who would deliver his fellows, or bestow on them any succor under their dangers and miseries, must usually do it by enduring for them the burden of those evils. The loftier the sphere of effort to which the leader or philanthropist is called, the more awful does he find this law in its demands upon his heart. The President of the fallen Confederacy has been required, doubtless, to meet this solemn law, in the full force of its bitterness. In addition to the anxieties and fears of the indi-

vidual citizen, and father, and patriot, he was required to bear, during the pendency of the great struggle, the vicarious cares and troubles of the whole people whom he represented. He was obnoxious to his individual portion of the animosities and reproaches of the enemies of his people, and to a large share of the passions directed against them. When his people were overpowered, the malice they had provoked pursued his person, while they received their amnesty. During the long years of oppression and obloquy, the anguish of every patriot has come into his soul, multiplied by the sense of his high responsibility. The bitterest part of this pain has doubtless been from that tendency, so natural to men defeated, and yet so cowardly and unjust, to cast the blame of their calamity on their leader. This long agony Mr. Davis has borne with a dignity, calmness, and courage, which must, in every fair mind, reinforce that respectful sympathy which is felt for him. Now, after years of reflection and careful study, he presents his people and the world, in this history, an account of his stewardship. On every principle of justice, he has a right to be heard by all the civilised world, but especially by the sons of those for whose liberation he toiled and suffered so manfully, if vainly. As head of the Confederate movement, and a head so active, devoted, and influential as to be better informed of the whole struggle than any one else, he is entitled to speak for his cause at the bar of history. The overthrow of that cause will unquestionably be judged in future in its effects on human destiny, as the most momentous secular event in Christendom, since the fall of the first Napoleon in 1815. To every educated man in the world, then, ignorance or misjudgment of this grand catastrophe would be an opprobrium. To the sons of Confederate sires, it would be a shameful disgrace. Their duty to themselves, as well as to the memories of their country, requires them to possess themselves of this plea for the Confederacy, by this farther reason, that the enemies of the cause are so diligent in misrepresenting. The claim which Mr. Davis lifts up, *Audi alteram partem*, amidst this huge torrent and flood of slander and falsehood, by which truth and our fathers' honor are

sought to be drowned, comes, therefore, to the people of the South with a high and sacred right.

He has been fitted to make this plea for his "lost cause," not only by statesmanship, wide knowledge, and eloquence, but by his providential position. He has stood absolutely aloof from *post bellum* politics. He has known, all along, that for him this arena was forever closed. Hence he has been able to tell the story of Southern rights with unfettered candor and boldness. Other great leaders in the Confederacy, who have resumed their careers and hopes as politicians, find the jealousy of that divinity, the "majority," in whose hand is the breath of the American public man, an inconvenient obstruction. It is but natural for them, therefore, to speak for their former cause "with bated breath." Mr. Davis has finally removed his plea from the lower tribunal of the populace to that of the future of history, and of God. Hence, there is no restraint upon his assertion of all those facts and principles, in their full breadth and authenticity, which once all manly Southerners were wont to assert with him. The other providence seems no less remarkable: that the ennobling poverty to which he was so honorably reduced by his sacrifices for his country, was relieved so unexpectedly, when it threatened to obstruct his task; and that, by the thoughtful generosity of a Southern lady. But this pleasing fact coheres with the whole tenor of our struggle, in which the women of the South ever proved themselves the truest and bravest. It is with eminent fitness that Mr. Davis dedicates his history to them. Doubtless he had in his mind another reason: that amidst all degrading and debauching influences of subjugation, the best hope for the propagating of truth and manly sentiments in the future is in the inculcations of the mothers of the land. He would provide the topics and the evidences for this fireside instruction.

When we thus claim a hearing for him by the right of his position, we by no means imply that he is not able to support this title by the merits of his own statesmanship and authorship. These are of a high rank. The great mass of his materials is digested into lucid order with a masterly hand. His narrative is eloquent, animated, and perspicuous. His forbearance towards

those with whom he had to differ is dignified; his only heat is against the assailants and traducers of his country. His argument is weighty and intelligent. And while he stands before the world as the impersonation of the "lost cause," there are few in the South clearer of the blame of its loss than Mr. Davis. While others were precipitating collision, he was conscientiously striving to postpone it. But when it came, none met it more promptly, wisely, or courageously. He would doubtless be the first to acknowledge that his plans were not infallible. But so much may be claimed for his administration, that had others high in office, had the Confederate Congresses, had the States, had the soldiers and the people, all done their parts as wisely and well as Mr. Davis did his, the Confederacy would be now free. The energy and skill with which he created the resources of war out of nothing, and organised victory, were the wonder of the world. And there is this striking attestation to his part of the struggle, that to the day the Southern people wearied of fighting, he had left no lack of weapons and ammunition with which to fight.

Mr Davis candidly declares that it is not his design to write a detailed military narrative. Of the events of the war a clear and judicious outline is given; but the main design pursued is to present in a just light the constitutional claims and the diplomatic history of the Confederacy. With full resources of statesmanship and historical knowledge, he asserts the rights which the Southern States attempted to defend, in a logic which we here only recite, without asserting it. The positions which are argued and implied are such as these:

That throughout the controversy, the Southern States were not factious, or sectional, but stood upon the defensive, only claiming in the federal association such rights as were equal, and the demission of which would have relegated them to the place of conquered provinces.

That when this equality was refused them, peaceable secession was the unquestionable right of the States, and their most moderate remedy; conceded by all the fathers of the Constitution; expressly left to the States by that instrument itself; never dis-

puted by any respectable authority or great party; asserted in theory from time to time by all parties and by nearly every State, North as well as South; conceded even by the assailants of the South, up to the very verge of hostilities, and then only impugned by the after-thought of an unblushing and inconsistent passion. A powerful presumption is raised in advance for this truth by the extreme unlikelihood that our revolutionary fathers should or could have been so unwise as to submit their rights, just so hardly bought with blood, to another consolidated and irresponsible power. They had just before found themselves compelled, in order to escape political slavery, to grasp deliverance by the perilous means of *revolution*; becoming rebels in order to be free, and contending for their natural rights with halters over their heads. This right of revolution had always been the recognised resort of the oppressed; but a resort only accessible through fearful difficulty and peril, and at the dear cost of civil war. Is it credible that these clear heads, just escaped from British halters, designed to bind their children so soon under another centralised government, from whose future usurpations the only deliverance would be by the bitter throes of other revolutions? Did these sagacious men imagine that the tendency and likelihood of power to usurp further prerogatives, and reënslave the people, could be sufficiently restrained by mere paper bands? Every argument and every enactment show that they did not. Did they construct a free Federal Government on principles new to the whole world, with the intention of securing for liberty no advancement; of providing for invaded rights no defence cheaper, readier, more beneficent, than the old one of bloody revolution? This is incredible. No; they thought they were providing, instead of the fearful ordeal of force, the appeal to free consent. They thought they were securing for the liberties they had bought so dear, the prompt and easy defence of a reserved sovereignty, the re-assumption of which, when liberty was imperilled, should peaceably take the place of revolution, and so open an easy and bloodless way for checking usurpation and rearranging powers found too liable to abuse. To suppose that they voluntarily merged their States into a Union, from which, however fatal to their

rights, there could be no egress except through the blood of other revolutions, is to suppose that they deliberately threw away for their children the very prize they had won for themselves.

Accordingly, Mr. Davis argues, every fact and every stipulation shows that they did not design to construct such a consolidated and irrevocable union. The thirteen States had compelled the recognition of their separate and individual independence by the mother country. Beyond all doubt they stood at the end of the war thirteen sovereignties—thirteen little nations, allied together. In making their amended Union, they exercised the right of seceding, of their own movement, from the previous one. They expunged from the new Constitution the pledge of perpetuity expressed in the old one. They expressly refused to the central government the power to coerce the continued adhesion of any State. They did nothing more than invite the voluntary accession of States. Three States, in acceding, expressly stipulated the right to secede, and there was no demur. The first act of the common government was to accept a solemn amendment, in which the States reserve to themselves and to their people every power not expressly granted to the general union.

Mr. Davis argues, again, that all publicists and lawyers, of all parties, including such New Englanders as John Quincy Adams and Webster, confessed—what cannot be denied, without moral obliquity—that a compact, such as that which grounded the General Government, if broken on one side, was broken on both sides ; so that the aggrieved parties to it were fully released from its obligations. But Mr. Davis holds that the enactments passed by the most of the Northern States, repudiating the fugitive slave law, and the election of a sectional President pledged to an immediate assault on that equality in the federal family of States guaranteed us in the Constitution, and pledged, only a little more remotely, to an assault on our lawful property, were a clear violation and repudiation of that federal compact. But the grounds on which the South claimed the right of peaceable withdrawal have been so ably argued in a recent number of this journal, that a recital here is needless.

Mr. Davis also contests the truth and justice of every one of

those sophistical "catchwords," which, taken as arguments, did so much to inflame the passionate minds of his adversaries. In every case, he shows, that the popular cry was the opposite of the reality. Thus: the secession of the South did not "threaten the life of the nation;" first, because *there was no nation* to have such a life, as is clear from the act of the Constitutional Convention, erasing the words "nation," and "national," wherever they had been proposed by its committee; and second, because the Confederacy gave, from the first, every proof of a pacific desire to let their late partners be a "nation" if it suited them, and "live" any way they pleased, uninjured and unmolested in every just right.

That the story, perpetually repeated to this day, that the Southern people were inveigled into disunion by a few ambitious leaders, was and is a sheer falsehood. For the leaders, like Mr. Davis, were behind their own people in the movement. The secession was wrought by the clear good sense, and honest, manly spirit of the masses at home, against the dissuasions of their leaders, and far in advance of their expectations. This all well informed men here know to be the truth.

That it was the North, and not the South, which really "appealed from the ballot to the bullet." For when the Confederate States withdrew from the Union by a peaceable "ballot," in the very same form in which they had "balloted" themselves into this Union, it was the North that flew to arms in order to obstruct the ballot.

That Mr. Lincoln's prettexts for beginning war, for the professed objects of "repossessing" Federal property of which the laws made him guardian, and of dispersing insurgent assemblages of individuals resisting the laws, were as obviously false, as truculent; because there stood the Commissioners of the Confederacy offering to pay for every penny's worth of the property belonging to the United States; which would have met Mr. Lincoln's pretended object without the cost of a drop of blood. And he knew that the bodies he stigmatised as insurrectionary assemblages of individuals, were, in fact, sovereign States, performing the acts in question, with every feature and form of Statehood, and

sovereignty, and validity, by which they had at first become members of the general government.

That the South did not "begin the war" and "fire on the flag." But while she was anxiously offering peace, the flag fired on her, by arming fortresses, and sending a fleet and army within her borders, to which her resistance was purely defensive.

That it was a mere sophism to argue there was no tyranny in coercion, "because the North only required us to live under the same laws under which they lived themselves." Practically and virtually, their requirement was, that the minority should obey, in points vital to their rights and even existence, laws made by a majority who had no concern at all in those points. Should the pastoral dwellers on the mountains say: "We do not go to sea in ships: therefore the maritime dwellers on the coast shall not go to sea in ships;" we should have just a parallel mockery of "equal laws."

That slavery was not the cause of secession or war on the Southern side, but only the occasion. That the choice of Northern fanaticism and usurpation was to attack slavery as our vulnerable point, which circumstance rendered it the occasion of strife. But the end pursued by the South in her secession was to preserve her citizens from political slavery, and not to perpetuate the domestic slavery of the Africans; a point with which the Confederate Government had no concern whatever, either way, as that of the United States rightfully had none.

That had Southern slavery been anything more than a pretext of Northern greed, for sectional strife; had it been a real cause; all sectionalism would have ceased when the South absolutely and finally surrendered slavery. But sectionalism, instead of ceasing, is now more embittered than ever, on the part of the North.

That the South did not "go to war for the extension of slavery." For, properly speaking, she did not "go" to war, at all, but was driven into it, against her choice, by the North. And that the policy claimed by the South would never, if conceded, have really "extended slavery," by the addition of a single bondsman, inasmuch as the South forbade the only mode of its further extension, by

the importation of additional Africans, even more stringently than the United States had done.

That every charge of "treason" and "rebellion" on Confederates, was insolent nonsense. For the sovereignty of the States being the original one, and that of the general government being only derived from, and deputed by, the States, the rebellion of a State was as impossible as that of a father against his own child.

That the only "treasons" and "rebellions" perpetrated within the Confederate States were those to which the United States incited the so-called "Union men" in them, in levying war against the sovereignties to whom their allegiance lawfully belonged. The establishment of the so-called State of West Virginia, for instance, by force of arms, was a literal rebellion and treason against the State of Virginia and against the Constitution of the United States expressly forbidding such formation without Virginia's consent. For, that the pretended assent to the partition, wrung from the "Peirpoint government," was a contemptible farce, is plain from the total lack of the attributes of a State in that petty imposture, and from the further fact that the general government soon after set aside that pretended State government as invalid, by its own act.

That the plea of "necessity" for assuming, in consequence of a state of war, powers not conferred on the general government, was, as usual, "the tyrant's plea." That a government founded on and created by a constitutional compact, and only possessing such powers as this conferred, should usurp other powers under the pretext of *upholding the Constitution*, and especially, should usurp these powers against States its own constituents, is simply monstrous. This is simply that the constable should go a-stealing, to execute the law against theft. The Constitution gave a certain war-power to the general government; thus teaching it what, and how much war-power, it was intended it should exercise. If this measure of war-power was found insufficient for the successful prosecution of a war against States, then the only possible inference was, that the government had no power to make such war on States; for the Constitution had said, that every power

not granted was thereby reserved to the States or their people. He must be blind indeed, who does not see, that if a state of war is to justify the usurpation of unconstitutional powers, the people have, in a Constitution, no guarantee for their liberties ; because a state of war may at any time be brought about by action which the people do not wish, and cannot prevent. Such a people must ask their enemies' leave to remain free.

That the Washington government was responsible for the horrible and multiplied barbarities of the war ; because they were, in most cases, either commanded by that government, or the perpetrators of uncommanded crimes against the laws of war were usually applauded and rewarded for them by the government.

That the whole responsibility of the sufferings and death of prisoners, on both sides, lay upon the Washington government ; because the Confederacy always fed its prisoners of war as well as its own soldiers ; and in every case, the breaches of the cartels for exchange came from the North. The Confederacy treated Federal prisoners with far more humanity than the Washington government ; because, notwithstanding the cruel scarcity at the South, the blockading of medicines, and the more sultry climate unfriendly to men in confinement, the Confederacy only let less than nine per cent. of the Northern prisoners die ; while the Washington government let more than twelve per cent. of the Confederate prisoners die. Its motive for letting its own soldiers thus perish in a confinement imposed solely by itself, was, to keep Confederate veterans from returning to their own ranks. This was confessed by Gen. Grant at the close of the war. But, in order to infuriate the Northern people, every false pretext, and every measure contrary to the laws of civilised war, were coolly employed, in order to make the apparent blame of arresting exchanges rest on the South.

That the European powers, and especially England, while pretending neutrality in the struggle, construed every important question with a shabby unfairness, in favor of the aggressor. Under the pretence of not undertaking to decide between the right of secession on the one side, and of coercion on the other, she practically and efficiently sanctioned coercion. She had laid down for

herself, and all other nations, the rule that a blockade should not exclude the ships of neutrals, unless efficient. Yet, just when the decision was most injurious to the Confederates, she recognised a paper-blockade. She had invited the United States, in 1856, to join her in delegalsing privateering, hitherto employed as a legitimate means of war. This invitation the United States had expressly rejected; thus retaining the use of, but also making herself liable to, privateering, in future wars. England accepted this as the result of this refusal; yet she effectually shielded the United States from this, her own elected mode of warfare, by excluding Confederate privateers from British ports and maritime tribunals; under the illogical pretext that Britain had disclaimed privateering for herself.

Mr. Davis also argues, that the pretended legislations of the Washington government, in organising spurious State governments, contrary to the Constitution, within the territories of Confederate States and without their consent, out of pitiful minorities of Tories or rebels against their own States, were all illegal and void *ab initio*. But these *simulacra* of States, and that too, under duress, were the bodies which nominally abolished slavery in the States, and nominally ratified the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments. Hence, to this day, there has never been a legal and valid emancipation of the Africans, or enactment of these articles. They rest, to this day, on no better basis than the right of conquest. But this is a ground which cannot be righteous or valid for a power which solemnly declares that "all just government rests upon the consent of the governed."

He concludes, finally, that the real overthrow, which the Northern people, in their lust of aggrandisement and fury, inflicted by force of arms, was not only of the Confederacy, but of the whole liberties of themselves and their children. That the equitable, constitutional, and federal government, created by the Fathers, has been annihilated, and is replaced by a consolidated democracy, which, under the name of a "Republic" is in fact a virtual oligarchy of demagogues and capitalists.

He shows that the so-called "reconstruction measures" were the crowning and most violent usurpations of all. For the

Washington government had declared all along, that there was no way under heaven by which a State could cease to be a member of the Union; that the States called Confederate had been in and under the Union during the whole time of their attempted secession, and at and after the end of the war. The presence of the States in the Union had been recognised in every way, and the forms of their State governments were those imposed on them by the United States. But these State governments, declared indestructible, and this membership in the Union, declared inalienable, were annihilated by the United States Congress two years after, without any crime or offence of the States, or of a single person in them. While there was not a hand lifted against the United States, but the conquered populations were submissively obeying all even of the illegal laws, the States were thrust out of the Union, every magistrate and citizen in them was disfranchised without trial, or even indictment; and all were stripped of the inalienable rights of trial by jury and *habeas corpus*, and thrust under bayonet government. No invasion of human right, so monstrous and sweeping, over so many millions of human beings, was ever before perpetrated, in time of peace, by any usurper, military emperor, or arbitrary conqueror. This crime, committed by a democracy, under universal suffrage, proves that this government of a popular majority now dominant in place of the Constitution and the States, is capable of just as enormous outrages as any other despot, and as much needs the restraints of distributed powers and restricted construction. For the usurpation was not wrought to enforce submission to any existing law, even of the latest innovation, nor to abolition, nor coercion, nor any other professed claim, even of the conquerors; the whole population thus disfranchised being perfectly quiet and docile at the time, and ever since their surrender, to all these claims. But the crime against human rights was done simply to perpetuate the partisan grasp on power of the most disreputable faction ever known in American politics. And the cost at which this end was gained was the permanent fastening on the South of State institutions utterly opposed to the will of its people, alien to their history, and almost ruinous to the public morality and prosperity.

Of course every clear mind sees, that if these views of President Davis are just, the current boasts as to the results of the war are precisely the reverse of truth. "That the war has forever settled the question of unity," etc. Rather has the war forever unsettled the unity of the country, as well as every other institution. For, just as soon as any section feels again the pressure of a grievance and consciousness of any power to escape it, that section will of course pronounce—what everybody knows to be true in fact—that the war of 1861–5, substituted a government of brute force for one of right and popular consent; that force, as everybody but robbers confesses, settles no question of morals, and grounds no claim of right; and that the domination of the Washington government has therefore always been illegal and invalid ever since the fraudulent "reconstruction;" whence any section has a right to reject it, whenever strong enough to do so. This unanswerable argument is not heard, indeed, just now; because the country is now arranged into only two sections: the one, recently conquered, exhausted, and helpless, and the other, still enjoying the triumphs and spoils of conquest. But this arrangement will in due time be changed by the movements of population and business. And he is a very short-sighted man indeed, who does not see that the inference above stated will certainly be resorted to, just as soon as the occasion exists. Mr. Davis closes his narrative with the pious prayer for the Union, *Esto perpetua*. If his doctrine be true, this petition must be, like that of the martyr Stephen, rather the expression of his Christian charity, than of his hope.

Such are the claims he makes, as to the rights of the Confederate States he governed, and such the logical inferences from them. To assert or deny their correctness may not be the proper function of this REVIEW, which seeks not to propagate a school of politics, but to chronicle and to estimate the literary movements of the country. It is useless to conceal the fact, that these positions and conclusions of Mr. Davis together form a tremendous indictment against the conquerors of his country. But they of course profess to regard the whole as a heap of absurdities and extravagances. For the very deeds which Mr. Davis attempts to

prove enormous crimes, they are in the habit of arrogating to themselves great merit. It was, on the one hand, inevitable that so utter a difference of claims and doctrines should result in such a war as Mr Davis describes. But it is equally clear to the discriminating mind, that the holding, however blindly, of two creeds of right so opposite, involved great criminality on the one side or the other. As it is obvious that whichever side was wrong was enormously guilty in fighting for its wrong instead of repenting and forsaking it, so it must be inferred that, since the fighting for its creed was the natural result of the passionate holding of it, the first crime was in having adopted it. The wicked theory was wicked, because the natural mother of a multitudinous progeny of crimes. The issue to be tried before the tribunal of history is, on which side the initial crime lay. Mr. Davis claims to have cleared his side by arguing that the theory of the Constitution on which his side acted was the one held by the makers of the Constitution, claimed in turn by nearly every State, and by all leading parties, admitted *in thesi* by all, contested by no decent authority even up to 1860, and admitted even by those who so soon after, by an inconsistent revulsion, became its assailants.

Foreign notices of Mr. Davis's great work, from the most competent sources, admit the power of his plea. It is evident that it is destined to carry great weight with future history. This impression cannot but be deepened, when such observers note the contrast between the ponderous historical facts and arguments of this book, and the replies of its American critics. The staple of them is chiefly the tossing of abusive names, and the favorite remark that Mr. Davis is a "Bourbon who learns nothing, and forgets nothing." Now, of course, the very nervous desire of oblivion, implied in the frequency of this complaint, that the ex-Confederates "forget nothing," is very natural for men who are conscious of having done so many things the memory of which will be infamy. But we presume Mr. Davis will deem it a natural reply, that *he is writing history*; and the very business of history is to remember and record; and that while the rights and institutions which he describes are "things of the past," the gigantic consequences,

and the solemn retributions are still to come. And these will be much! Impartial readers cannot fail, again, to remark further, that the logic of Mr. Davis's opponents, abating a few hackneyed sophisms and oft-exploded historical falsehoods, resolves itself, when rendered into plain English, only into a disdainful rejection of the idea, that a great people should be expected to keep faith and respect their own covenants, at the expense of their own convenience and interests. This, indeed, is Mr. Davis's unpardonable insolence, that he should, at this time of day, urge so antiquated a claim—a claim as old-fashioned as the Bible. - This, of course, makes him a Bourbon indeed!

But they ask: Does Mr. Davis design, by reasserting at this time the claims of the dead Confederacy, to revive them? Does he seek to incite the Southern mind to a second secession, and a new attack on the power of the conquerors? We presume that nothing is farther from his thought than to seek to disturb the North in its victory: he only aims to do justice to the memory and principles of the departed; a duty in his eyes as substantial and sacred, as it is idle and useless to others. While he does not think that brute force reverses truth and right, he doubtless sees a solid security for the triumph of the conquerors, in a far deeper cause. The Northern people resolved that the differences of the Southern civilisation and social life from theirs, should not be tolerated, although conservative, beneficent, and complementary to their own, instead of hostile. They resolved that we should be like themselves. They have made us like themselves. And therein is their security against another secession. While men are men and live on different soils and under different skies, they will always have differences of sectional interests. But in the future prosecution of our sectional interests and rights, the South will never again use the measures of the Confederates; rather those taught by her masters. The conquerors may be absolutely secure that there will be no more Southern slave-holding, States' rights, secession. Our demagogues will have learned from theirs the wondrous advantages—to the demagogue—of corrupt and ignorant suffrage. They will find it much more to their interest to have the many negroes for voters than the few for servants.

They will find that it is a much easier way to utilise federal institutions for the oppression of others, than to disclaim them when perverted to their own oppression. Probably it will be found that the happy assimilation of the sections has already gone so far, that Mr. Davis's assertion of our fathers' principles seems as importunate and untimely to many of us as to the Northern people; we do not wish to have our politicating and money-getting, under the reconstruction, jostled for any such shadowy objects as the substantiating of historical truth, the assertion of right principles, or the clearing of our own fathers', mothers', and brothers' memory from the amiable charges of "barbarism," "rebellion," "man-stealing," and "treason." Surely this should comfort our conquerors!

No; the last resort to Confederate principles has doubtless been made by the South, and future rivalries will be pursued only in that way which the North prefers. The "New South," taught by her, will hereafter prosecute, not constitutional *rights*, but *interests*. It has been taught by its fathers' defeat, and will not be so foolish again as to rely on righteousness and constitutional covenants, but on material strength, numbers and money. And these it means to have, and will have. The land echoes with the cry: "These be thy gods, O Israel," and not the departed gods of our fathers. The grand cry is: "Develop, develop." The old North has had its development, and that of the Northwest is pressing fast upon the snows and the deserts. The South, say they, "is undeveloped;" and here the future growth will be. While the "Empire State," replete with human life, is at a standstill, the "Empire State of the South" will grow to her five millions. Old Virginia will become a Pennsylvania; Tennessee an Illinois. The Mississippi, cleared of its obstructions, will again be the highway of the continent, and its great city the vast *emporium*. The great Delta, from Cairo to the Gulf, will be drained, and yield more than the wealth of the Euphrates and Nile to a multitude outnumbering that of Egypt and Assyria. That titanic Southern energy and resource which extemporised the means of a gigantic war so as to amaze the world; which endured and outlived such plunderings and exhaustion of the war,

and the worse war in peace which followed, as would have sunk any other land into famine and depopulation; which raised the crop of its great staple to seven millions of bales, and at the same time opened a thousand new channels to wealth under the ponderous and polluting *incubus* of "reconstruction;" what will it not effect in the next half-century? And, as it grows rich and strong, how will other sections come bowing to it: the great prairie-States, beholden to it for an outlet and a market; the new States to be in the empire of Texas, and that are to grow on the line of the Southern Pacific Railroad? Thus, the time may come, when the South with its natural allies, and not the North, will be dominant at Washington. Then it will talk no more of States' rights and secession, nor permit the North to talk such "treason." It will practise the lesson learned from its present master, to wrest the common powers of the general government for expoliating the labor of the feebler section for its own aggrandisement, and to punish all evasion from their yoke as "rebellion."

Such is the fertile ingenuity the South has shown under subjugation, that it may be hard to predict the precise forms in which it will apply the principle taught it by the conqueror. Doubtless its expedients will be marvels of "'cuteness." Perhaps tariffs will then be manipulated so as to transfer profits from New England pockets to Georgian, and to ensure the concourse of immigration, capital, and votes in Southern centres. Perhaps the principle of "taxing luxuries" will be applied by an internal revenue law to the fine cutlery, lawns, silks, laces, watches of Northern manufactories; while the plain cottons of Southern looms, and tobaccos of Southern fields, will go free as "necessaries." Then, it may be, instead of a fishing-bounty to fatten New England ports, every cod-fish will be made to pay an internal revenue. Then, the national debt created in crushing the South, and owned in the Northeast, will be held, like the property in the West and South, liable to a heavy taxation. Then, the vast Southern ports will have too much carrying trade to tolerate present navigation-laws; these will be swept away, and the same European competition admitted to the coast-wise com-

merce, which has already swept Northern ships from the ocean. Then the dominant section may demand at least an equal expenditure of national wealth on its highways, and especially its great water way; and as there will be no more public lands to lavish, the hundreds of millions for the future railroad kings must be wrung from the people by taxation. Then, the shrewd sons of the North will desert her inhospitable soil, no longer fertilised with Southern gold, and will flock to the Yankeed South, leaving factories and cities to decay, and New England hills to lapse to their original nakedness.

Does one exclaim: Surely the constitution-asserting South will never have the face to announce so inconsistent a purpose! We reply: Not at all; she will very decently disclaim the purpose, while steadily pursuing its execution, just as her master and teacher did as to her subjugation. But surely these honorable old Confederates, now so influential in the South, will protest against so shameful an inconsistency! Doubtless they will protest; but the North now requires that their principles be decried and their influence destroyed. The North will have been obeyed in this also: the "New South" will whistle them down the wind as "abstractionists," "Bourbons," and "old fogies." The oppressed North will appeal to the Constitution? But, when it was dominant, it had decided, in 1861-5, that *the preference of the majority is the proper Constitution* of America; and the South with its political allies will be that majority. Fifty years before, the North had made *the majority sovereign*, instead of the Constitution and the States; it need expect no sympathy when it begins to whimper under the pressure of its own elected king. "But the vote of our grateful and faithful allies, the freedmen, will defend us," says another. This also will fail: this great and increasing negro-vote, invented by the North to be a marketable commodity, will then have a better market nearer home. The "New South" will have more money to buy with than the old North. And the freedman, the more he is "educated," will but read the more clearly, that political gratitude was a quality so unknown by his liberators, that it would be a mere impertinence for

him to ape it. Would he deem it good manners thus to condemn by his example his liberators of Ohio and Illinois, for instance, who repaid their mother, Virginia, for the free gift of the fat soil on which they fattened, by rending her vitals? No; the proper thing for the freedman will be to imitate his benefactors, and return evil for good.

In a word: the great North, reassured by its complete success in assimilating the South to itself, may calmly tolerate Mr. Davis's reassertion of a dead system. It may be certain, that in all future rivalries, the South will eschew Mr. Davis's remedy, peaceable secession, and will employ only the methods which the North prefers, and which must therefore always be acceptable and grateful to her. As good citizens, and especially as Christian journalists, we feel a justifiable complacency in giving this assurance of the future peace of the country, and, in the very act, contributing our mite to that good end.

A topic still more appropriate for us is presented by the moral and religious aspects of the great struggle Mr. Davis records. Northern Christianity deservedly claims a foremost place among the causes of the war. Religion chiefly animated its abolitionism. Its pulpits hastened to bless and sanctify the invasion of the South, and emitted the most stirring calls to war. Its church-courts set the first example of defining as "treason" that State secession which no great political party or tribunal had before ever dared to call illegal. Its Bible was made to assume a new exposition in order to condemn the South. The war was, therefore, eminently the expression of the Christianity of the North. Now, Southern Christianity did, indeed, behave in exactly the opposite way, in not intruding into politics and secular rights. Yet, as it expressed itself in the convictions and acts of individuals, it distinctly sustained the rights of the South. Every man was devoted to them just in proportion, usually, to the intelligence and sincerity of his religion. The few Southern Tories were found usually among prejudiced aliens, or debauched political hacks, or men of desperate reputations and fortunes. The most venerable of the clergy, the most godly of the citizens, the purest Christian women, were ever found, the strongest in supporting

the rights of their country. Southern Christianity, then, through the legitimate expression of the right of private judgment by individuals, gave as decided a sanction to the Southern cause, as Northern Christianity gave to coercion and subjugation. But between the two lay a great issue, which must involve, for the one or the other, enormous error of judgment, and fearful guilt.

It may not be the proper place to decide here, on which side this guilt falls. But one inference is unavoidable: the Christianity of the South and the North must have been very unlike, even opposite, things. Professed creeds and external forms may have been alike; but they must have been held in widely different spirits. For the working of the two was antagonistic: the one attacking precisely what the other defended; the one glorifying in actions which the other conscientiously abhorred as stupendous iniquities. Another inference is equally clear, that a Christianity boasting so much as the American, so many pulpits and Bibles, such purity of creed, scripturalness of order, and mental culture, ought to have been able to "keep the peace" between the rival sections. The questions in strife were just such as the Bible ought so have settled: Should covenants be kept by the stronger party to them as well as by the weaker? Does God ever allow a Christian man to own the labor of a fellow creature? That this boastful Christianity should have miserably failed, then, to clear these points of Christian ethics for the mind of the country, and even to keep down the hands of brethren seeking each others' throats; that it should, instead, have only inflamed the quarrel, cannot but be a mark of spuriousness upon it. It is hard to conceive how the shortcomings of any of the effete and apostate Churches, recorded in history, could more effectually convict them of hollowness. Must not Churches so branded with impotency be expected to signalise their disease by a regular course of decadence and corruption? On which side should this indictment lie? Shall we wait for the future to decide, watching which of the two religions verifies its title by the blacker career? This test may be wholly inconclusive. For the conquerors assimilate their victims to themselves; and therefore should Southern Christianity become as corrupt as Northern, it will still remain to

decide whether this corruption was not the result of the conquering type they are forced to assume, rather than of the old type they bore when free.

This suggests the other religious and moral aspect of the great struggle. The coercive party loudly claimed to be the "Party of Moral Ideas." Its charge against the South was, that slavery was immoral and demoralising. Its professed mission was, to purge the South, and lift it up to its own moral plane. Well; it has had the most sweeping success imaginable. In the sphere of military operations, its opponent was not only subdued, but destroyed. Every resisting commonwealth was literally annihilated, the human beings who had composed them dissolved into a helpless mass of individual slaves, divested of every right and franchise, at the absolute will of their conquerors; and the new commonwealths were reconstructed absolutely according to the theory and philosophy of the conquerors, with hardly a voice of dissent to "mutter or peep." But more. The ethics and politics of the coercive party are now the professed creed of all parties. The "opposition" headed by Hancock and supported by the "solid South," declare in their platform that they believe in consolidation, that they repudiate secession, that they have done with slaveholding and delight in immediate abolition, that they approve universal negro suffrage, that they are devoted to this Union as now founded on force. Indeed, had this identical Hancock platform been announced to the Lincoln party in 1860, the only objection it would have made would have been that the platform went much too far, and was too radical for the "Party of Moral Ideas." So that, in every way, this great party has had an absolute success in its harsh tuition: it has taught its pupils the whole lesson it professed, and assimilated the "New South" completely to itself.

But is the teacher satisfied? So far from it, the party of moral ideas now brings heavier charges of demoralisation against the South than ever before. It is complained that this miserable and degraded South now defiles itself with kuklux-isms, with persecutions and murders of the freedmen, with fraudulent ballots and counts in elections, with bribery and corruption, with repudiation of

private and public debts; in a word, with every abomination of public and private immorality. This, then, is the strange thing: that the great "party of moral ideas" should have so demoralised its victim, by having precisely its own way with him! Two facts must be placed alongside of each other. One is, that before 1861 the South presented the best moral *status* seen in this sinful earth. Business morals and domestic purity were confessedly equal in it to those of any other section. No Southern State, no representative Southern party, had ever, in the whole history of the country, defaulted to any federal obligation, or attempted to warp any federal action to any unfair sectional advantage, or repudiated any State debt, or constructed any system of electoral fraud, or been convicted of any legislative corruption. We challenge an exception to this glorious record. Such was the South in 1861. The other fact is, that the party of moral ideas now says that, since the war, the South is corrupt and treacherous. Such, according to its own testimony, is the moral effect of the victor's tutelage and principles!

Again we say that it may not be seemly for this journal to affirm or dispute this adverse testimony. It may not become the servant to contradict his master. But if this accusation be true, then the *rationale* of the way the mischief was done is clear. *Everything has been done to the South* which was calculated to ruin the morals of a people. Experience says that few men can pass through a bankruptcy without resistless temptations to tarnish their principles. The North, not only by a war waged in defiance of civilised usages, but by a universal confiscation and ruthless overthrow of our industrial system, has inflicted bankruptcy on nearly every property holder in the South. Every thinking person knows how perilous it is to a man's or a woman's integrity to break down his *point of honor*. The point of honor of the South was studiously prostrated by putting an alien, barbarous, and servile race over us. All the Southern States, cities, and counties, were forced to repudiate the payment of all those debts which, to any but scoundrels, must ever rank as the highest, most binding, and sacred—money borrowed to defend their soil and their hearths from violence, arson, and rape. When the

people have been compelled to embrace the infamy of dishonoring such debts, how natural that they should cease to be scrupulous about loans made for the sordid purposes of business and gain ! Then, the season of universal distress and debt was selected for enacting a bankrupt law, which invited to innumerable frauds. The free can resist intolerable oppressions by manly and open strength ; and in resistance not only be delivered, but ennobled in their virtue. The subjugated, while crushed under unendurable wrongs, have no escape except chicanery. Reconstruction began, as we saw, by making every man a slave ; they must either endure, or resort to the slave's weapons—concealment and deceit. The subjection of the property, intelligence, and virtue of the land to the servile barbarism of the land, stimulated by the greediest and vilest adventurers from the North, was an engine of torment for estate, heart, and body, which inflicted a more chronic agony and ingenious torture than was ever experienced under an inquisition. Was it in human nature to lie and suffer on this rack of torment ? The alternative was, to see the civilisation of the South absolutely perish, or to learn from the conqueror some of those arts of evasion which the free South had disdained. To crown all, the example has been steadily urged on her, of systematic defamations and falsifications of history, in which the teachers of Christianity have been most active ! of usurpations ; of world-wide venality, extending to the highest places ; of a universal "spoils-system," wresting public trusts to purposes of private plunder. Here is a system of instrumentalities, applied to the South by the "party of moral ideas," whose ingenious fitness to debauch the principles of a people could not be surpassed by the inventive malice of Satan. Our conquerors say, that it has had its natural effect. If it does not have that effect, if the conquered people escape the resultant pollution, it must be by reason of two causes : that they entered the ordeal fortified with the strongest *stamina* of moral health and virtue ; and that the salt of Southern Christianity proves the purest and most saving on this sinful earth. If the present charge of our conquerors be true, then in this demoralisation of subjugation they will have inflicted on us an evil, compared with which,

invasion, the slaughter of a quarter of a million of men, and the destruction of billions of wealth, were small. Those miseries afflicted us for the once; the woe of this moral debauchery would repeat and propagate itself in the distant future.

Now, to the religious journalist, the crowning wonder of the history which Mr. Davis records is, that the most eager advocate and patron of this Satanic school for our tuition in degradation has been all along Northern Christianity! These measures of spiritual debauchery, some of them first suggested and urged by Church-courts and pulpits, have all along found their warmest, steadiest support from the Churches. From pulpits, religious journals, and divines, the teachers in the school have always received the loudest applause. It is from the religious opinion of Northern people, that the relaxation of these measures would meet with most opposition.

In view of this fact, is it surprising that all intelligent and faithful Christians in the South, wishing well to their fellow-citizens' souls, should resolutely shun intermixture with such a Christianity?

* * *

ARTICLE V.

THE NEW THEORY OF THE MINISTRY.

A Report, in three sections, to the Synod of South Carolina, with three other papers on the Diaconate, by REV. JNO. I. GIRARDEAU, D. D., Professor of Theology at Columbia Theological Seminary.

“Man’s chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever.” The obligation involved in this statement extends to every act and every power of the human will. But what course of conduct must be adopted in order to promote the divine glory in the highest degree, the great Ruler has, to a very large extent, left to be decided by our own discretion.

This liberty of discretion is the occasion of one of the most