

S. M. Casey
1871
Berkeley

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 1.—JULY, 1887.

I. BERKELEY'S IDEALISM.

A splendid edition of Bishop Berkeley's works was issued, in 1871, by Professor Alexander Campbell Fraser, the incumbent of the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh—the chair once illuminated by the genius of the illustrious Sir William Hamilton. The elaborate dissertations in which the accomplished Editor expounds the Bishop's idealistic system, and the fact that they have emanated from one who has succeeded the great exponent and defender of Natural Realism, have had the effect of calling attention afresh to the principles of Berkeley's philosophy. In proceeding to discuss them we deem it important to furnish a brief preliminary statement of the main features of Berkeley's system :

1. The Denial of Abstract Ideas.
2. The Denial of the Existence of Matter as Substance. There is no such thing as material substance.
3. The Denial of even the Phenomenal Existence of Matter, separate from and independent of spirit: denial of Natural Realism. Material things have no reality in themselves. Whatever reality or *casuality* material things possess, is dependent and relative.
4. *Esse est percipi*: the so-called material world depends for existence upon the perception of spirit. A thing exists only as it is sensibly perceived.

225038

VI. NOTES.

I. THE SOUTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States met on the 19th of May, 1887, in the Grand Avenue Presbyterian Church, St. Louis. About one hundred and fifty commissioners were in attendance. It was opened in the usual manner by a sermon from the retiring Moderator, Dr. Bryson, of Alabama, and was organized by the election of Dr. Strickler, of Georgia, as Moderator, and Rev. Messrs. I. P. Smith, of Virginia, and G. T. Storey, of Mississippi, as Temporary Clerks. The business proceeded with promptitude and dispatch. The discussions were marked by great courtesy and good feeling, even when the leading subject evoked marked differences of judgment and convictions, upon one side at least, of the most decided character. The conclusions reached on the bulk of the subjects disposed of appeared to be received as satisfactory, although on one or two of the issues determined, they were only satisfactory to the majorities which secured them. The importance of one of these issues, that of organic union with the Presbyterian Church of the North, and the possible importance of the policy adopted in reference to it, will confer an importance upon the Assembly of St. Louis itself, which can only be appreciated in years to come. Circumstances prevent such an exposition of the action of this body on more than one grand matter as would be adequate in thoroughness; we can only sketch hastily the leading features of the work accomplished, leaving to the future a more complete analysis of the course pursued and the consequences which are likely to follow. We may state briefly touching the surroundings of this meeting that in everything they were up to the highest water-mark of comfort and convenience. The Grand Avenue Church in which the Assembly met is a noble building of stone, richly ornamented and furnished with all the modern conveniences for the various branches of Church work. It has only the one defect, that its acoustic properties are not good. The arrangements for the convenience of the Assembly were well-nigh per-

fect, and the entertainment in the homes of the citizens of St. Louis gave the highest impressions of the cordial and elegant hospitality of the great Western Metropolis. On the second day, the Standing Committees were appointed, the Reports of the Executive agents were received and suitably referred, and the Assembly drifted steadily into the work before it. A Special Committee of twenty-six, one minister and one elder from each of the thirteen Synods of the Assembly, was appointed on what was felt to be the great matter on which action of some sort must be taken. A painful anxiety, which seriously marred the enjoyment usual in the sessions of the highest of our courts, was created by the serious issue placed in the hands of this Committee to be shaped for trial. As we do not propose to attempt to follow strictly the order of events in the Assembly, owing to some defect in the documentary record of them in our hands, and to our unwillingness to trust to memory, we shall group the transactions which we do propose to notice under distinct heads, without special reference to the order of their occurrence.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Standing Committee of Foreign Missions reported substantially as follows through their Chairman, Dr. Palmer :

The Standing Committee of Foreign Missions reported substantially, through their Chairman, Dr. Palmer :

1. Recommending in answer to overtures the enlargement of the Missionary, and authorizing the increase of the price to correspond.

2. Recommending the postponement for the present of the transfer of the Indian Missions from the Foreign to the Home department.

3. Recommending the formation of a Synod in Brazil composed of the Presbyteries of Campinas and Western Minas recently formed under the auspices of our Church, and the Presbytery of Rio Janeiro belonging to the Northern Presbyterian Church ; this Synod to be entirely independent, free from foreign control.

4. Recommending the continued support of the Mission in Northern Brazil in spite of the discouragements arising from the brutal opposition of the Roman Catholic Church in that region.

5. Recommending in answer to the overtures of the East Hanover Presbytery that the transfer of a Missionary to a Foreign

Presbytery be decided as the constitutional severance of his connection with the Presbytery at home.

6. Recommending the commendation of the diligence and fidelity of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, and in view of the superior openings in some parts of the Foreign field, that the distribution of funds be left to the discretion of the Committee.

7. Recommending in answer to renewed overtures touching the Foreign Evangelists, that in view of the wide differences of judgment upon the principles involved and the failure to harmonize upon any settled view, none of the proposed amendments be sent down to the Presbyteries. The solution of the difficulties in the Foreign field sought to be reached by the powers of the Evangelist will come with the progress of the work, and the establishment of a self-governing Church in the field.

8. All the members of the Executive Committee were renominated, including the four who had sent in their resignations, with the addition of three new members.

This report was adopted. As the Report of the Executive Committee will soon be in the hands of all, we only extract from it the financial statement of its work, which makes an encouraging exhibit. The receipt from all sources amount to \$84,072 65. This is \$10,902 38 more than the receipts of any previous. The contributing Churches were 465 more than of the year before. The number of Ladies Societies contributing increased by 70, of Sunday-Schools by 82. These figures show marked progress in the Foreign Missionary work.

HOME MISSIONS.

The Standing Committee's Report on Home Missions was received, amended and adopted. It recommends,

1. That the Committee's diligence be commended and the First and Central Churches of Atlanta be cordially thanked for their generous action in defraying all the expenses of the removal of the Committee from Baltimore to Atlanta.

2. That the overture of the Presbytery of Eastern Texas in reference to the Committee's aid in the erection of churches by *loans* as well as by donations, be answered by reference to the action of the Assembly of 1885, and to the action of the Committee in giving such assistance.

3. That no change in the amount of the Treasurer's bond be allowed.

4. That inasmuch as the contributions to Sustentation fell short last year, and the sum of \$10,000 in addition to all that the Committee has a right to expect previous to the January collection, is necessary to prevent debt at the close of the year, the Committee is authorized to apportion this amount among the Presbyteries, and invite special attention to it at their fall meetings. The Presbyteries are also requested to use efforts to secure from all the churches a collection on the first of January.

5. That the Executive Committee be authorized and directed to encourage the formation of Home Mission Societies in Congregations and Sabbath schools.

6. That in view of the necessities of the Evangelistic branch of the Home Mission work, the Presbyteries which are doing their own evangelistic work, be urged with great earnestness to adhere to the plan of co-operation outlined in the Manual of Home Missions, and to secure *one* annual collection from all their churches for the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is authorized to appropriate funds thus contributed to the several causes under their care, as necessity may require. It is also authorized to divide legacies in the same way.

7. The Invalid Fund is again recommended for a liberal support.

8. The Colored Evangelistic Fund is recommended to liberal support in view of the existing need, and in order to extend the work. This fund supports the Tuscaloosa Institute and evangelistic work by both white and colored ministers among the Negro Population.

9. The Assembly repeats its interest in the work among seamen, and recommends it to the sympathy, prayers and support of Christian people.

10. The great need of this great Home Mission enterprise is *money*. The way to secure it is by cultivating the grace of giving. The principle of recognizing the regular officers of the Church as the agents for securing funds ought to be recognized.

11. In view of the great need of money, the Executive Committee are enjoined to economy in the administration of its sacred trust.

12. The officers and members of the Committee, with thanks for their past zeal and fidelity, were re-appointed.

The Report of the Executive Committee will soon place the

figures of their work in the hands of the Church. The grants to Sustentation and Evangelistic work were *less* than for last year. The grants for Invalid Fund were considerably more. The funds for the Colored Evangelistic work were sufficient for its demands.

PUBLICATION.

The Report of the Standing Committee of Publication is not accessible to us, owing to the defect in the documentary records to which we alluded in the outset. No one could have heard the Report of the Executive Committee of Publication without being struck with the results achieved under the administration of the modest and most efficient Secretary, Dr. Hazen. Taking charge of this work in a time of eminent peril, finding it overwhelmed with debt and heavily handicapped with something more dangerous than debt, the want of confidence in the Church—with assets amounting to only a little over \$20,000—the new Secretary has had to provide for the payment of over \$108,000, principal and interest. This enormous liability has been met, until only \$5,650 remain unpaid, and for the payment of this balance the funds are in sight. In the meantime the work of the Committee has gone steadily forward, improving from year to year. The excess of the assets over the liabilities of this Committee are now over \$64,000. This splendid result calls for the gratitude of the Church to God and to her efficient servants, and in simple justice demands the restoration of the full confidence of all our people. The Publication work of the Church is one of inestimable importance and capable of indefinite extension. It places that wonderful instrument, the press, in the hands of the Church to forward its great enterprise. It will be a source of incalculable disaster not to turn it to full account. Let the Church restore its confidence and give a just and generous support to our efficient Committee.

EDUCATION.

The Standing Committee of Education reported:

1. That the entire debt of this Committee to the full amount of \$3,447.15 had been paid off, and all its obligations to candidates had been met.

2. That the result had been accomplished by the special collection in June, 1886, by a special legacy, by a small increase in its regular revenues, and by reducing the appropriations to candidates.

3. That the management of the Committee be commended.
4. That in view of the fact that these happy results were the fruit of special circumstances—not of the regular development of the revenues of the Committee—in view, also, of the increase of candidates and the necessities of the beneficiaries of the Committee, it be recommended to the Assembly to modify the time allotted to the collections for all our various enterprises so as to conform more fully to the great principle that giving is an ordinance of the regular public worship of the Church.
5. That the change of the schedule of time be made so as to substitute *months* for *days*, and so to arrange these months as to cover the whole year. *
6. That the Assembly *enjoin* upon the Presbyteries to see that the vacant churches be required to worship God in the use of all the ordinances available to them.
7. That the Presbyteries be urged to raise \$25,000 for this cause, and the Committee be authorized to apportion this sum among the Presbyteries, and the Presbyteries be requested to apportion this allotment among their churches.
8. That the overture of the Presbytery of Missouri in reference to the expenditure of candidates be answered in the negative.

This report was adopted with the exception of the 5th recommendation in relation to the change of *certain days to certain months*. This Report of the Standing Committee of Education was considered, by agreement, along with the Report on Systematic Benificence, and the schedule of time recommended by that Committee was adopted in place of the change recommended by the Standing Committee of Education. That schedule is the same, or substantially the same so far as the *time* allotted is concerned with the schedule in use for several years past. It really nullified the 4th recommendation of the Committee of Education which was adopted by the Assembly. The very point of that recommendation was a change of time to conform more fully to the principle that giving is an ordinance of worship in the *regular* worship of the Church from Sabbath to Sabbath. It was designed to break down the dangerous policy of *conditioning* the revenue of the Kingdom of Christ on the incidents of a single day, and to condition on the *time* allotted to the regular worship of God, whatever that might be. This we are required to do by the principle that giving is an ordinance of regular worship. No other insti-

tute on earth conditions revenue on the incidents of *one day* in the year. The whole purpose of the recommendation was to bring the Church to make *its principle the guide of its policy*. When this is done and the revenue law of the Kingdom is fully carried out, there will be no more trouble about deficient funds. The substitution of the schedule of time recommended by the Committee of Systematic Beneficence really stultified the recommendations of the Committee of Education. But it is a step forward that the Assembly adopted the recommendations of the committee, though it failed to see the practical adaptation of them to the schedule of time. That will come hereafter. It is a *seed*, though, which is bound to germinate; it is the thought of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures; and it will be a happy day for the revenues and the work of the Church when it is practically applied.

SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE.

The Committee on Systematic Beneficence reports :

1. That 57 Presbyteries out of 69 report showing that out of upwards of 2,100 churches 1,153 have contributed to Sustentation; 1,136 to Evangelistic Fund; 1,121 to Foreign Missions; 1,062 to Education; 913 to Invalid Fund; 851 to Publication; 575 to Tuscaloosa Institute.

2. They recommend that the authorization of the last Assembly of free-will offerings to supplement the funds of the Committee of Foreign Missions, be renewed and that Committee be permitted to appeal for free-will offerings in October and February.

3. That a similar privilege be granted to Education, to be made in April, to the Evangelistic work in June, and to Sustentation in August.

4. That the distinction between the free-will offerings and the regular stated collections be clearly maintained by setting forth again the schedule of time in use for years past.

5. That the Assembly further explain touching the free-will offering, that these offerings are not enjoined as a supplementary collection, but as really what they claim to be, *free-will* offerings.

This Report was adopted. We call deliberate and thoughtful attention to this system rather timidly put forward to meet the necessities of our work, as compared with the suggestions of the Standing Committee of Education. Let the Church boldly obey the law of the Kingdom, and trust in the love and obedience of

the King's children; then she will be under the wisest guidance and she will have no more trouble. Her revenues will grow with the spirit of worship. The King's legislation can be also fully trusted to secure the revenues of the Kingdom.

We must condense more rapidly the Reports of other Committees in order to preserve space for the question of organic union.

The Committee on the Centennial Celebration reported on various points connected with the subject. The invitation of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and of the Second Church of that city, to the Assembly to hold its next stated meeting within their bounds was declined with hearty recognition of the courtesy and kindness displayed in the proposal. Baltimore and the Church on Franklin Street were selected, upon invitation, as the place of the next Assembly. It was provided that the business of the court be suspended on Memorial Day to allow visitors to go to Philadelphia to witness and take part in the ceremonies. Speakers were appointed and subjects assigned to them, to represent the Southern Assembly and Church on the occasion. A Local Committee to fill vacancies and attend to all details of preparation necessary was appointed. All necessary steps, so far as the Assembly could make them, were taken to secure the creditable participation of our Church in the celebration of the centennial of the Church of Presbyterians in the United States.

The Committee on the Sabbath reported the progress of its work encouraging on the whole, yet developing enough of the stubborn difficulties in the way to show the need of a sustained effort to secure the observance of the day reserved to sacred uses by the Divine Law. Adopted.

The Committee on Foreign Correspondence reported:

1. A letter of fraternal salutation to the General Assembly of the Northern Church, giving a brief account of our affairs and expressing an interest in their own.
2. A recommendation of continued interest in the Pan-Presbyterian alliance, and appointing the usual number of delegates.
3. A response to the Declaration and Resolutions of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, expressing hearty sympathy in the hope of Christian unity, but suspending all definite response to the proposal of specific unity, on the basis of the historical Episcopate, until formulated by the Episcopal Convention in 1889.

4. A letter in the usual form of hearty Christian sympathy, addressed to Rev. Henry M. Cox, representative of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America. Adopted.

The Special Committee to examine and report on the report and recommendations of the *Ad Interim* Committee to bring the Book of Order into consistency with the lately recognized right of the Ruling Elder to hold the Moderatorship of any Church Court, reported, recommending that the suggestions of the Committee be not sent down to the Presbyteries. This report was referred, and the suggestions of the Committee ordered sent down.

Several overtures were sent up asking that the tenure of office by the Clerks of all the Courts of the Church be changed from the tenure *quamdiu bene gesserint* to a specific term of years. The motion to answer in the affirmative was lost by a single vote.

A single judicial case, that of Rev. D. P. Robinson, suspended from the ministry for disobedience to the mandate of a civil court, came up on appeal from the Synod of North Carolina. It was referred to a Commission. The Commission finally reported to sustain the appeal: 10 to sustain, 4 to sustain in part, and 9 not to sustain. The finding was confirmed, and a protest admitted to record, which ended the matter.

ORGANIC UNION.

As soon as the Assembly was organized, Dr. Smoot took steps to take hold at once on the issue which dominated every other in interest which could come before the body. He moved promptly for the appointment of the Special Committee heretofore named, to which all overtures or other papers concerning organic union with the Northern Church should be referred, with instructions to report to the Assembly as soon as practicable. This Committee was announced with suitable dispatch by the Moderator, with Dr. Smoot as its chairman.

It appeared that overtures from three Synods, those of Alabama, Missouri and Arkansas, and from some ten or twelve Presbyteries, had been sent up requesting the Assembly to take measures looking to some form of *closer relations* with the Northern Church. Some favored organic union, some a co-operative union, and all some form of closer relations than now existed. It soon appeared in the deliberations of the Committee that a wide difference of opinion prevailed. A few among the party favoring a move

towards closer relations, were in favor of organic union, but not unconditionally—not, as some of them afterwards expressed it, at the expense of the Southern Church. A number of others—it was difficult to tell exactly how many—preferred merely a co-operative union. Yet another section were in favor of a conference on the subject with a representative Committee of the Northern Church—as due to the Courts of the Southern Church which had sent up the overtures before the Committee—as demanded by the public sentiment of the Christian world—but not as committing us to any irrevocable step. On the other hand, a compact section of the Committee were opposed to any step whatever in the direction indicated by the bulk of the overtures, and favored compliance with the overtures from three of the Virginia Presbyteries to refuse all compliance whatever with the suggestions made. Among this section of the Committee some held that a Committee of Conference was an irrevocable and dangerous step, whose consequences could not be resisted. Others, believing that all tentatives after closer relations whatever, meant ultimate organic union, and that organic union could not be gained without the abandonment of the principles and autonomy of the Southern Church, and consequently that organic union was not an open question at all, felt that candor forbade the treatment of it as a question apparently open. Consequently, when the Committee, unable to agree, divided into two sections, each retired to itself in order to prepare separate reports to the Assembly.

The majority report, concurred in by sixteen of the Committee, recommended a Committee of Conference to meet a similar Committee to be appointed by the Northern Assembly, to confer upon the subject of organic union, co-operative union, or any other modification of closer relations. The minority report, made by ten members, recommended that inasmuch as any form of closer relations than those now existing was unadvisable, the Assembly should decline taking any step whatever to modify the existing relations between the two Churches. The exact issue made was on the appointment or non-appointment of a Committee to confer. Upon this the conflict was fought.

The debate was opened by Dr Smoot in an address of admirable vigor. He is a smooth, rapid talker, thoroughly self-possessed, quick, bright and ready, using little or no action, but holding attention by the steady, unfailling stream of clear and dis-

criminating thought, poured out in sentences as complete as if written for the press. His strong and striking arguments lay along the line of the constitutional and legal principles involved in the history and in the merits of the question. We regret extremely that the defect in the documentary records of the debate includes an absolute loss of Dr. Smoot's able argument. We cannot rely upon memory to restore it, and must refer our readers to the pages of the Assembly Reporter, of Farris, Smith & Co., 999 Olive street, St. Louis.

Dr. Smoot was followed by Col. Livingston, an Elder representing the Presbytery of Atlanta. Col. Livingston is a man of strong native mind, accustomed to the transaction of business in popular assemblies, and was put forward by his party in the majority of sixteen as one of the most reliable champions of organic union. The first part of his address is unfortunately not before us. We are compelled to confine our brief analysis of his argument to the latter part of his speech. Col. Livingston made the point that the purpose of the majority report was misunderstood, even by members of the majority which introduced it. It was supposed to concern organic union; but it is nothing of the kind. It proposes simply the *appointment of a Committee to confer*. It does not force organic union upon the Church; it is not an irrevocable step. He then alluded to the assertion that the Northern Assembly as the larger body ought to have taken the initiative. In ordinary circumstances, he would have approved this objection; but the overtures from so many of our Church courts, coupled with the action of the Omaha Assembly in approving and adopting the action of the Missouri Synod, compels us to action.

He referred to the cause of separation in 1861, the passage of the Spring resolutions. Those resolutions settled for us that the United States was entitled to our allegiance. He quoted Dr. Thornwell as saying that this, in itself, was no sufficient cause of separation. Col. Livingston justified it on the ground that separation was necessary under the *de facto* government of the Confederacy. But the objection was now removed, because the Omaha Assembly had repudiated the anti-spiritual character of the Church and we were bound to rely upon their honesty, and that the action set at rest the doubt at the South whether the Northern Church was not as much a political as an ecclesiastical body.

He argued for a conference as due to the overtures of the Synods of Alabama, Missouri and Arkansas, and from the superior ability of the Northern Church to push its way into our territory. Our Church was beginning to disintegrate under this influence: churches unable to support themselves were going over to them. This process would go on with all classes of our churches until four-fifths of all our Synods and Presbyteries would go from us, and leave us unable to make terms, when the remnant will have to go. It was wise to yield in time, as Gen. Lee would have been wise to have yielded before he did.

He argued that the majority report recommending a conference was right because only by a conference we could understand the differences between us and the Northern Church. This Committee was for peace. Another advantage of the proposition is that it is a slow process and will give time to make enquiries and form conclusions.

He then proceeded to attack the minority report. It was all in a tangle. How did the minority find out the differences between the two Churches were numerous and not to be overcome? Another objection to it was its assertion that no suggestion had been made or could be made to remove these difficulties. What right had the minority to make such an assertion? The minority report charges an attempt to compromise fundamental differences. They assert this conclusion as based on a careful examination of the whole question. How could they make such an examination without a conference? Another objection to the minority report was the assertion that the further agitation of this question would hinder the progress and endanger the unity of our own Church. Yet we have learned from her representations on this floor that Florida is trembling like an aspen leaf under the terror of disintegration, and if we refuse to confer, the Synod of Missouri will proceed to take care of her own interest on an independent line.

Col. Livingston was followed by Rev. W. H. Parks, of the Synod of Missouri, in opposition to the project of organic union. He opposed it because there was no suitability in the parties proposing this union. No stress had been laid by the preceding speaker upon any *principles* involved—his main appeal was to the fear of disintegration. The Northern Church had pronounced their work in the South to be *war*: they intended to carry it into Africa: they did not intend to give up the Southern territory to the Southern

Church. This war was inaugurated at once and carried on around our feeble churches with a long purse. But the speaker remembered when Gideon won a great victory over enormous odds by a very small force. He did not fear for our cause in spite of disintegration, superior numbers, wealth and national prestige.

Dr. J. M. P. Otts, of Alabama, then took the floor. He is a man of ability, heavily built, a very fair speaker, aguing his points with a good deal of tact, ready in reply, enlivening his discussion with wit and humor, and animated with a good spirit in his advocacy of this question. He is a native of South Carolina, a graduate of Columbia Seminary, served ten years in the Southern Church, removed North and served eleven years in the Northern Church and returned a few years ago to Alabama. Dr. Otts occupied more time than any speaker on either side, his address covering thirty-four columns of the Assembly Reporter. The first part of his address was adjusted as a reply to some positions of Dr. Smoot. We pass over this, as our space only admits of a brief analysis of his argument in favor of organic union. He presented two propositions under the form of a question: First, "Is the reunion of the Churches *desirable*;" and Second, "Can their *reunion* in any way by their closer relations be now effected on terms and conditions alike safe and honorable to both sides?" He affirmed both.

1. The reunion was desirable because on general terms the unity of the Church was expedient and required as far as possible. The only reason that justifies the separate organization of churches of the same faith and order was to be found in the limitations of human governments and the differences of race and language. Under the Confederate States government the Southern Church had a right to a separate existence; but when she was brought under the government of the United States she ought to become "the Church of the United States." The causes that threw us apart were differences in opinions and sentiments that came into existence during the period of great political strife, known in our history as "the war period." Dr. Otts emphatically repeated this assertion "because some deny it." The "war period" covered twenty years of strife preceding the four years of bloodshed and the twenty years of strife that followed them. Our political, commercial and social relations have been restored. The Church of God alone is unreconciled. Some parts of the Church have come

together: the Episcopal Church has been reunited and the Baptist Churches as far as their system admits of it. The Methodists and Presbyterians alone stand apart. The origin of our differences was political and the tap-root of our existing divisions strikes into a political soil. The words North and South are no longer descriptive of geographical but political distinctions. These political differences ought to give way to union between the Churches because they are effective in controlling the immigration which comes into the South from the North. The South is filling with people from the North and West. Many of them are Presbyterians; but very few will join the Southern Church, because they do not wish to be connected with a sectional Church—sectional in its boundaries and supposed to be sectional in its sympathies. Many go into the Methodist and Episcopal Churches in preference. On the contrary, Southern Presbyterians, going North, find no difficulty in entering Northern Presbyterian churches. This is the line along which things are working; and the result will be—if we do not enter into closer relations, organic or co-operative union—the final, and not far off, result will be the ultimate absorption of the Southern Church into the Northern Assembly. The disintegration has begun. The growth of the Southern Church is small at best, as proved by a paper of our Stated Clerk, Dr. Wilson. On the contrary, the growth of the Northern Church in the South is wonderful, their Synod of Atlantic numbering 13,159 communicants; their Synods of Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, and the Presbyteries of Baltimore and Washington City give over 100,000 communicants. We are also losing ground before the new element of Congregationalism recently introduced into the South.

2. Can reunion be effected now on safe and honorable terms? Dr. Otts thinks so, but does not know, and wants this Committee of Conference to find out. The paper of the minority says the obstacles are so serious they cannot be removed. How do the signers of that paper know? I do not know whether a solution can be found. I think so, but do not know. The difficulties have been widely discussed. *First*: The changes which have been made in the Book of Church Order and Form of Government have been construed as an obstacle. This might be met by both parties going back to the Book as it was in 1860, qualified by such changes as have been made in common by both Churches. *Second*:

It has been suggested that the numbers of the Northern Church are so overwhelmingly superior to our own, it would not be safe to trust matters vital to us to their control. To this it may be replied, no important change has ever been made in that Assembly by a unanimous vote, and the Southern element in the reunited Church would hold the balance of power. *Third*: The political deliverances of the Northern Assembly are objected. I do not say that enough has been done in reference to these. They are acknowledged to have been made in the heat and passion of the war. Let us appoint a Committee and see if what was done at Omaha the other day was sufficient. I do not take the ground that the differences have been removed so far as to justify organic union. *Fourth*: Another difficulty is found in the presence of the brother in black. He is our brother man: the law of nature has settled that. He is our fellow-citizen: the law of the land has settled that. He is our brother in faith and in Christian rights: the law of Christ and the law of our Southern Assembly settles that. But no equality before the law in Church or State can bring about social equality. That is an impossibility—recognized in Boston and Chicago, as well as Richmond or Charleston. In my opinion, the quickest way to force the negroes into an independent organization would be to put them into mixed Presbyteries where whites and blacks would be about equal. Even if the blacks were seventy-five to twenty-five, they would go to the wall. They would be always as they are now. If it were *possible* it would not be *wise* to organize the whites and blacks in the same churches. *Fifth*: The woman question is objected. In my eleven years' stay in a Northern connection, I never heard of a woman preaching, and I do know the General Assembly of that Church has four or five times condemned woman preaching.

In conclusion Dr. Otts asked permission to define his position. "I do not want re-union until the churches want it, and by the churches I mean the people as well as the ministry: I mean the majority and I mean a fair majority: and I believe it will come."

Dr. C. R. Vaughan of Virginia.—The first reason why I am in favor of the minority report is that the Church at large is not ready for so significant a step as the appointment of a Committee to confer. This grave question has been suddenly sprung; no one was looking for it; the Church has had no time to investigate it with the thoroughness indispensably necessary in such an issue;

and I am not prepared to move in advance. It is all important that in the first place we go slow, and in the second place, from the lights before me now, it is probable we ought not to go at all. I oppose this Committee because it is altogether premature—a step too far in advance of the intelligent public sentiment of the Church at large. A few Synods and Presbyteries have no claim to compromise the vast majority of our courts and people.

2. I oppose this appointment because there are grave and radical difficulties, religious and ecclesiastical, in the way—difficulties which are in my judgment unremovable. Yet we are accused of being actuated in our opposition by political feeling. I was surprised in listening to the speech of Dr. Otts to hear him assert, what is often asserted on the street corners and in other places of popular resort, that we Southern Presbyterians are actuated by political partisanship. He joined in the common reproach that while business men and politicians have affiliated, Christians are the last to be reconciled. But why is there more slowness on the part of the Church? It is simply because business men are not under the requirements of any positive law, but the Church is under law. When questions like the present are raised between Churches, they are bound to inquire how the issues proposed square with the law of their King. I deny that the root of opposition to this fusion with the Northern Church is in political prejudice. I deny it for myself and for my brethren. Yet Dr. Otts seemed to present a view of the essential relations between the Church and the State, which brings us, in spite of our personal resistance to the imputation of political disloyalty, into the position of positive rebellion against the State. If I understood him aright he stated that the Church stands in such a relation to the State, that its *lawful* and *right* existence was somehow defined by its relation to the government. Our Church had a lawful existence under the Confederate government; but as soon as that government broke down, and the United States government took its place, we then became dependent on that government for a lawful existence, and when we refuse to become the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, we are placed in the attitude of rebellion. Is it true that there is such a relation between the Church of Christ and the human government under which it lives, that the lawful existence of the Church is controlled by the government? As a Church we stand in no special relation to human gov-

ernments, much less in such a relation as that our lawful existence as a Church depends upon it. In the Church we know no master but Christ: He is our King. Why should any difference in religious opinion affect the question of our loyalty to government? The Methodist Church at the North, and the Presbyterian Church at the North stand on religious grounds opposed to each other; but that religious difference is not supposed to affect the loyalty of either of them to the government. If then we differ from both of these Churches, how does that possibly affect our standing as obedient citizens and servants of the United States government? This issue is not based upon political grounds at all. It rests upon four grounds, each of which is exclusively religious and ecclesiastical. It rests upon differences in *creed principle*, in *doctrine*, in *morals*, and in *many points of pure ecclesiastical administration and policy*. Under this classification of differences in policy and usage are found, *first*, the issue of a *mixed Church*; *second*, the recognized relations of women to the public work of the Church; *third*, the issue as between Boards and Committees; and *fourth*, as to the use of wine in the Sacrament of the Supper. These are only a part. In regard to the latter item, we cannot and will not tolerate the bitter reflection implied on the character of our Lord. In regard to the distinction between Boards and Committees, I recall to mind, that while our brother Otts made small of that distinction, such men as Thornwell, Stuart Robinson, and Robert Breckinridge, regarded it as of high importance. In regard to the relation of *woman* to the public work of the Church, it is beyond question a matter of fact that women, however prohibited from preaching, are admitted to relations to the public work of the Church which we do not approve. But I pre-termit any formal discussion of these to lay emphasis on *three* points only.

1. Dr. Vaughan prefaced his remarks on the issue of doctrines by reading the list of the sixteen errors formulated by the Convention of May 11th, 1837, and adopted by the Assembly a few days afterward. This statement is probably new to many of our younger ministers and elders. It is a fearful arraignment. It is asserted to us by Dr. George Baxter, Robert Breckinridge, Archibald Green and the whole Old School Church. Yet it was formally denied by the New School, and from the time of the disruption their denials were wrapped up in orthodox phraseology

even down to the period of the reunion negotiations. The protest of Dr. E. P. Humphrey, Robert Breckinridge, Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander Hodge, and upwards of fifty Old School men in the Assembly of 1869 reads like a duplicate of the Memorial of May, 1837. Now, we are invited to join a body against the formation of which such a protest was offered by such men as these. Does it not become us to go slow in view of such a past? Ought we not to make diligent and deliberate inquiry if we wish to avoid a betrayal of our covenanted doctrine? No doubt these men were honest on both sides; who was *right*? We do not impeach their integrity, but we do impeach the correctness of the N. S. interpretation of the Standards, their agreement with us in doctrine, and the soundness of the principle on which the O. S. Church consented to a fusion with the N. S. in 1869.

2. On the question of a mixed Church of whites and blacks, we are in absolute and unalterable opposition to the Northern Church. This doctrine, in the words of the *Herald and Presbyter* is, "an independent African church is not proposed." Our doctrine, in full accord with the views of colored brethren themselves, is, "an independent African Church." Colored ministers are now received into our Presbyteries *provisionally*, waiting for the independent organization in due time. Colored ministers are in full and permanent union with the Northern Church courts. Now this question can never be any menace to the peace, or property, or social life of the Northern people, because the negro is not a factor of any importance in Northern society. With us it is different. The numbers of the colored race in the *South* will often give them the constitutional control of the property and the constitutional government of the Church, if organized on the principle of a mixed Church. There will be no possible avoidance of this result. It will also be followed by a certain amount of social mixture, which, in the lapse of time, will be followed by a mixture of blood, with all its degrading and disastrous consequences. It is absolutely inadmissible to place our relations to the negro race in the hands of a Northern body, as organic union will do. The necessity is so imperious that we cannot even discuss it so long as their principle of a mixed church is maintained. The pretext on which that principle is asserted will not bear investigation. It is not required by the unity of the Church of Christ. The unity of the Christian Kingdom is precisely conditioned on the same thing

with the unity of any other kingdom. The principle of unity in every kingdom *is submission to the Crown*. The Roman Church conditions unity on a single official under the crown. The Episcopal Church conditions it on an order of officials under the crown. These theories are as absurd as it would be to condition the unity of the British Empire on the Prime Minister or the clerks in the War Office. The unity of the Kingdom of Christ is in the crown of her King, and not in any form of organization of its human subjects. If this be so, then the organization of human beings into a part of the Kingdom preserves its unity untouched by means of its adherence to the crown, and the method of the organization is a matter merely of expediency, not of essential principle. No Christian ought to allow his conscience to be disturbed by the thought that he violates the unity of the Church by insisting on an independent organization for the colored race. The distinctions of race are drawn by God himself, for reasons not known to us, but worthy of His wisdom. His reasons for fixing them are better than any reasons man can have for breaking them down, and any design or policy which leads, however remotely, to destroy them, is both foolish and wicked. He has enforced them by consequences which no wise man can disregard, and by personal antipathies which can never safely be denied.

3. The difference on the moral element in slavery is also an absolute bar to organic union, unless we are prepared to abandon the testimony of our Church and refuse any longer to obey the voice of the Holy Ghost in I Tim. 6:1-5. Slavery as a civil institution has perished; it is as dead as Julius Cæsar. I have in my place in this court no word of approval or disapproval of the State policy which destroyed it. But the moral element in it remains the same. The Scripture teachings on it are not changed. The paragraph in Timothy still commands: "These things teach and exhort"—still commands "if any man teach otherwise," "from such withdraw thyself." The Old School Church of the North stood with us on this testimony in 1845. The New School always refused to do this and drove out the United Synod for their faithful adherence to the teachings of Scripture. Will either party agree now to "teach and exhort" with us on this subject? It is our duty to abide by our testimony on this subject. That testimony always embraced the statement that slavery was a part of the curse upon humanity, as well as that it was a lawful relation.

There is no inconsistency in the two Bible declarations—the curse upon Ham and the lawfulness of the relation in which it placed him. The Scriptures discriminate clearly between a condition of servitude which it pronounces to be a curse, and the relation it creates. There are many examples of it. War is a part of the curse; but the relations of soldier and diplomat are right. Disease and death are parts of the curse; but the relations they create—those of physician and nurse—are right. Civil government itself is another example. The condition of servitude is a part of the curse, but the relation it creates—the relation of slave and the relation of hired servant—are right. The differences of view among Christian people on the subject are due to one class of them looking only to the character of servitude as part of the curse and failing to discriminate between it and the relation it creates.

It is certain the Northern Church will not concur in our testimony on this subject; but that testimony we must bear or rebel against the command in Timothy. It is useless and misleading to appoint a Committee to inquire about it. In closing, let me say to all, go slow; the New and Old School took years to come together. There is no use in our getting into a hand-gallop. Let us stop and think.

Rev. Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans—Mr. Moderator: I may truly say I never rose to discuss a question with a deeper sense of responsibility than now. The fate of this Southern Church in the hands of this Assembly. As I look round me and see the apparent state of feeling the gloom thickens. It is said the only issue before us is the appointment of a Committee of conference; but organic union is the ultimate outcome of all the movements proposed, whether of closer relations, or co-operative union, or of a Committee to confer. We must put these issues together and discuss them as a whole.

1. The first objection I make to any closer relations with the Northern Assembly, of any sort, is that the old issue of 1861 is the issue of today, and we cannot approach that without involving certain of the principles which, as a church, we have maintained for six and twenty years.

In 1861 the General Assembly passed what are known as the Spring Resolutions. These resolutions undertook to decide a political question—a political question which involved all other political questions—a political question so difficult it had been

left undetermined by the framers of the Constitution in 1787. These resolutions decided it with a sharpness which could not be exceeded by a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States. They determined where the paramount sovereignty lodged; whether allegiance is first due to the State or to the General government. They enjoined it as the decision rendered by the highest court of the Church, upon the consciences of all the members of the Church, North or South. Under the circumstances it was simply a writ of ejection of the whole Southern part of the Church. All the Presbyterians of eleven Synods were compelled to withdraw and integrate themselves into the Assembly of which this is the lineal successor. Now, the point I make is this: that decision of 1861 is the law in the Northern Church to-day. It is claimed by them as a decision righteously rendered, in discharge of duty. Now, recall certain facts. After the failure to bring back the Church of the South by the dragooning policy pursued from 1866 to 1869, they came to us in 1870 with overtures of reconciliation. But the first words uttered by their delegates, through the lips of Dr. Van Dyke, were: "We are not here to say *peccavi*. We cancel nothing: we withdraw nothing." Consequently no reconciliation was effected.

Immediately after this was the famous Baltimore Convention. During that Conference every effort was made to adjust this very question. Every effort failed. Things dragged along until the Atlanta Assembly made the effort by a hypothetical crimination of themselves to induce the Northern Assembly to confess their fault in the same terms. But the proposition, as forwarded by us, was not put to the vote until a rider was placed upon it which held fast to certain deliverances. They withdrew the insulting imputations of blasphemy, heresy and schism, but said distinctly they withdrew no other deliverances and no other expressions concerning the rebellion and the war. From that time until now those deliverances have been treasured as precious testimonies which are never to be touched. The *right* in the Church to decide the political allegiance of its members is still asserted as the law of the Church. Our testimony that the Kingdom of our Lord is not of this world, as He himself hath said, has been held up before the world in opposition to this asserted claim. To go into a union with the Northern Church while that law remains upon their statute book is to surrender this testimony. Is it necessary to

appoint a Committee to find out whether the Northern Church has changed its mind, and is ready to surrender this unlawful claim? Is it necessary to appoint a Committee to inquire whether the Roman Catholic Church has changed its doctrines? Are not the deliverances of the Church testimony enough? I hold it to be imbecility in us to ask such a question. If they have changed, it is their part to approach us with the statement of the change. It is not ours to ask by a Committee whether they have changed or not.

But, it is said, telegrams have come from the Omaha Assembly stating that they have approved and adopted the action of the Missouri Synod last Fall. Why, Moderator, I say it in no disrespect, that the deliverance which comes from Omaha is not worth the paper it is written upon, so far as qualifying this question is concerned. The paper of the Missouri Synod simply quotes the paragraphs in the Confession asserting the spiritual character of the Church. Yet Christian men of the highest intelligence for twenty-five years have asserted their right to pass the Spring resolutions, though bound by the paragraphs quoted by the Synod of Missouri. How could they do it? Simply because they held the paragraphs consistent with the right to pass the resolutions. It is mere folly to quote the paragraphs as sufficient to repudiate the resolutions. No *in thesi* deliverance can have more authority or extend farther than the Confession itself, and if they construe the Confession as consistent with the right to determine a political question, they will feel at liberty to construe an *in thesi* deliverance in a similar way whenever it suits them. The principal claim of the Northern Church is that when politics rise into the sphere of morals they have a right to take the matter in hand. The moral distinction may attach to every possible matter about which human energies are concerned, because whatever man does he must do either in a right or wrong way. Their claim abolishes all limitation upon Church power, and renders the spirituality of Christ's Kingdom a dead letter. If we go into organic union we surrender all our testimonies for the last five and twenty years.

2. My second objection to treating organic union as an open question is, that we have entered into a covenant obligation with a constituent portion of our existing Church. The Synod of Kentucky came to us holding in their ungloved hand their "Declaration and Testimony." They submitted it to our body, and in the

letter in which the conveyance was made, they asked a guarantee from this Church into which they proposed to enter, that they would be sustained and upheld, and never betrayed in reference to these matters. The General Assembly passed a minute in which they declared their entire sympathy and concurrence with the principles of that Declaration and Testimony, and gave in express terms to the Synod of Kentucky just the guarantee that they desired. I do not know the opinion of the Synod of Kentucky on the issue of organic union, but it would be a painful issue for this Assembly to have the Synod of Kentucky hold up this document, saying, "you entered into a solemn covenant with us in reference to this matter." The Northern Assembly still stands on the same issues as in 1861, and I enforce my argument by pointing to our solemn covenant with the Synod of Kentucky.

3. The third objection to any kind of union with the Northern Assembly is that by the terms of reunion between the two branches of the Church in 1869, all the testimonies of the great controversy of 1837 and 1838 were destroyed. The great issue then was a *strict* or a *lax subscription* to the symbols of the Church. That point divided them then and was surrendered by the Old School in 1869. They tried for two years to find the sense of the symbols; they failed to come to a common construction; and finally came together simply upon the Standards, leaving to both bodies to put what construction they pleased upon them. No rule formerly of authority in either body was to be of authority in the united body unless re-enacted. The *index expurgatorius* cut all the the testimony of 1837 and 1838 from the history and law of the Church. Now, this Committee of Conference is said to be a measure of peace. As you listened to that heavy indictment of doctrinal error tabled by the Old School against the New School in 1837, as read by Dr. Vaughan, did you think of the danger of reopening all the issues of that tremendous controversy by raising this issue of organic union? Did any one remember the *ipso facto* struggle over that most iniquitous piece of legislation that ever went upon an ecclesiastical record? Did you think what would become of peace, if both of these controversies are reopened by this negotiation about union? Our good brother, Dr. Otts, was so inadvertent as to say, if we go into that body we shall probably hold the balance of power. In the very act of the fraternal embrace we are to be an element of disturbance. Is that for peace? Moderator,

the burden of years is upon me, and I cannot allow my declining life to be spent in contention and strife. The only home I have known for the last five and twenty years is the Church of God: it will be a sad day to be banished from it. But there can be no peace if this measure is pressed. Not only this Church, but the Northern Church will be precipitated upon stubborn controversies which will last for five and twenty years, unless Christian men can learn to swallow their convictions. The meetings of the Assembly before the rupture were stripped of all pleasure, by the taunts and revilings in open Assembly of the partisans of abolition. It was bad enough to endure through all these years.

4. This thought brings me to the *fourth* objection to this movement towards organic union. The Negro is in position to-day to be far more an element of strife and contention than he was then. Enfranchised, equal with us before the law, animated by an aggressive spirit, in all matters it is impossible for our relations with him to be determined for us by the Northern Church, without endangering the whole social structure, throughout the whole Southern land. You cannot put men side by side, equal Presbyters in courts, and equal teachers in pulpits, without involving social relations. So long as only two or three are there it makes no difference; but as soon as the thing enlarges its proportions, ecclesiastical relations draw after them social relations and social equality. The color line is distinctly drawn by Jehovah himself; it is drawn in nature and in history in such a form as to make it a sin and a crime to undertake to obliterate it. Before the flood, when there was but one family, wickedness rose to such heights it could only be purged by universal destruction. After that judgment, it was necessary to restrain sin within tolerable bounds. This was done by the confusion of languages. Race distinctions were probably developed at the same time, and for the same purpose. The attempt to obliterate the color line by amalgamation of the white with the Negro or Mongolian or Malay race is a crime against the wise orderings of God. The very moment it is advertised through the country that this organic union is accomplished and the power is placed in the hands of a Northern body to control our relations to the Negro race, you will endanger the very existence of the Southern Church. We cannot confide in the Northern people on this subject. As some of their ecclesiastical leaders have expressed it, "Do not press us on this

point and on that, for we have an unmanageable constituency." We cannot trust that unmanageable constituency. The moment it is even seriously threatened, you will find your people not yielding to the threatened absorption into the Northern Church, but bolting bodily into the Methodist and Episcopal Churches. We trust they will not be precipitate. The Southern Presbyterian Church is going to be continued, if it is reduced to a single Presbytery and a bare quorum. We shall be able to stand alone as the Wisemans and the Fishers did in the Old Scotch Church, and planted in their weakness and isolation the seed of a true and strong Church in the future. We shall be able to raise our testimony to the last for Christ's Kingdom and for Christ's Crown.

It will be impossible to report the discussion in full. Dr. Bryson spoke in favor of the Committee, without committing himself to any relations whatever to the Northern Church, other than those now existing. His argument lay chiefly along the legislative and administrative line of discussion. He was succeeded by Dr. Thos. L. Preston, of Virginia. Dr. Preston is one of the most ready and adroit debaters in the Church. His able and effective address told weightily. His argument rested on the great essential considerations involved in the issue. Rev. Mr. Luckett made a temperate and judicious speech in favor of the Committee, but held himself uncommitted on the remoter issue of organic union. Dr. King, of Texas, made a strong and decisive speech against the whole issue. Rev. T. M. Lowry, of Georgia, explained his views very much to the same purport with Mr. Luckett. Rev. G. W. Firley, of Virginia, opposed the whole issue decisively, in accordance alike with his own views, and the settled convictions of his Presbytery. Dr. John S. Moore, of Texas, favored it. Rev. Mr. Caldwell, of Memphis Presbytery, and A. M. McPheeters, of North Carolina, a ruling elder, favored it. Rev. P. H. Hoge, of the Synod of North Carolina, then offered a paper as a substitute for both reports of the Special Committee on organic union. This paper provided for a Committee of Inquiry in place of a Committee of Conference. It was accepted as relieving the policy of sending a Committee at all of that character of an irrevocable step which had been so formidable to many. It was adopted first over the Minority report, and then over the Majority report, by a vote of yeas 80, nays 57.

The attitude in which the St. Louis Assembly left the question

of closer relations to the Northern Church is substantially this: A Committee of Inquiry was appointed to seek information from a Committee of Conference appointed by the Northern Assembly on all matters of difficulty in the way of closer relations. The effect of the revelations made in the debates upon the question was marked. New light on the grave obstacles in the way of union was thrown on the minds of many. The notion that nothing but prejudice stood in the way, was effectually disposed of by the strong array of matters of principle and religious fidelity to creed and testimony against the project. The ruinous consequences of fusion were clearly brought out. The good spirit prevailing on both sides was eminently happy in its effects. On the whole, the deep anxieties of the opposers of the union in the beginning gave way, at last, to the strong hope that the independence of the Church could be saved without division or serious loss.

C. R. V.

II. THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly at Omaha consisted of nearly five hundred members, and represented a Church composed of about seven thousand ministers, twenty-five thousand ruling elders and three-quarters of a million communicants. That it met so far west is a sign of the large dimensions of the Church, which is a great body, with a vast work, and which is growing with prodigious rapidity. Its activity is admirable in all the departments of its labors. Its Boards of Home and Foreign Missions, of Education and Publication, of Aid for Colleges, and of Ministerial Relief, and others, display marvellous skill and energy.

There was apparent in this Assembly a curious combination, often noticed in other Assemblies, of practical good sense and even shrewdness, with an almost fanatical enthusiasm. The former qualities were conspicuous in the affairs of the Boards. On the other hand, the action on Temperance was the fruit, not of the best judgment of the Church, but of a wild excitement, similar to that which carried the Spring Resolutions of 1861, against the protest of Dr. Chas. Hodge and many other thoughtful men.

The action of the Assembly on Temperance was three-fold. First, it refused to discharge the Standing Committee on Temper-