

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVIII—NO. I.

JULY, MDCCCLXVII.

## ARTICLE I.

### OUR ECCLESIASTICAL RELATIONS TO FREEDMEN.

The history of the following document is this: The General Assembly which sat at Macon, in 1865, appointed a Committee to take into consideration the relations of our Church to the Freedmen, and to report to the next Assembly. Upon corresponding with the Committee, the chairman discovered that it would be impossible to secure a meeting. He then wrote to each of the members, discussing the question in all its aspects as they occurred to his own mind, intimating his own opinions, and inviting from the Committee an expression of their views. Upon the reception of their replies, he found so great a diversity of opinion existing between the members of the Committee as to make it impracticable to frame a report which would embody the views of the majority. Ascertaining that some of the Committee would be present at the Assembly at Memphis, and being hindered from going himself, he drew up the paper which is subjoined, and sent it to those brethren in the hope that they might adopt it, for substance at least, as their report, and present it to the Assembly. This they did not do; but having kindly informed the Assembly that this paper was in their hands, it pleased that body to permit it to be read, and subsequently to order that it be offered to the Editors of this REVIEW for publication.

The Committee to whom was referred the subject of our relations and duties, as a Church, to the Freed People in their present altered condition, beg leave to present the following report:

They confess that they have been greatly embarrassed by the extreme difficulty of the questions which have encountered them,

VOL. XVIII, NO. 1.—1.

and which, in the opinion of some, are incapable of solution under existing circumstances. They trust that they will be justified by the importance of the subject in laying before the Assembly the whole case as it occurred to their minds, and in exhibiting and comparing the different supposable schemes in accordance with which our policy towards the freed people may be framed. They hope that, by pursuing this course, they will, if they accomplish nothing more positive, at least open the way for an intelligent and thorough-going discussion of the whole matter. There are several great considerations which, at the outset, deserve our attention.

1. In the first place, we have always acknowledged, and now hold the scriptural doctrine of the specific unity of the human race. We believe that all mankind sprang from one original pair, are involved in the consequences of Adam's fall, and depend for their recovery solely upon the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ. God "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." As, therefore, the sons of Ham share with us the ruin of a common fall, they are interested alike with us in the glorious hopes of a common redemption. As sinners, equally dependent upon the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, we and they have the same gospel, the same Saviour, the same Spirit, the same Church on earth, and the hope of attaining through mercy the same heavenly home.

2. In the second place, we have always fully recognised, and we fully recognise now, the unity and brotherhood of all believers in Christ Jesus—a unity and brotherhood which is not affected by distinctions of race, nationality, sex, culture, or civil status. It is not affected by differences of race or nationality, for the apostle Paul distinctly asserts that, in the new man "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision." It is not impaired by difference of sex, for in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female. It is not destroyed by difference of culture, for in Christ there is neither wise nor unwise. It is not

subverted by difference of civil status, for in Christ there is neither bond nor free. At the same time, we hold this unity of believers to be spiritual. It is one which exists in Christ Jesus, and is predicated of men only as they are characterised by a common relation to him within the spiritual sphere of his Church. All believers, as such, constitute one body, the members of which are indeed distinguished by a diversity of spiritual gifts, but which as a whole is united to Christ as its Head, and derives from his Spirit, as its informing life, a unity which is organic. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." As, therefore, the unity of believers is spiritual, it does not conflict with the civil differences, as such, which exist between men, and which are the result of providential ordination. It is a unity which may coexist with political, civil, and social distinctions. There is no necessary inference, in the present condition of things in this world, of a political, civil, or social equality from the spiritual oneness of believers in Christ. We are justified, however, in endeavoring to realise an outward expression of this unity of believers so far as we can do so without doing unwarrantable violence to those distinctions in human society in the midst of which the Church finds herself to be placed.

3. In the third place, our Church is confronted by an order of things, which, so far as civil relations are concerned, is, in some important respects, entirely new, and which may be regarded as the result of providential appointment. That portion of the population in our bounds, which formerly existed in the condition of slavery, have, by governmental act, been emancipated from that condition. Their civil status is changed. Whether their political status will also be essentially altered, is still a question *sub lite*, the decision of which the future alone can develop. We have now to deal with these people as civilly free. It therefore deserves to be considered by us whether we ought not to adopt such measures as will, at least to some extent, conform our relations to them to the existing order of things. The eccle-

siastical disabilities which attached to them, growing out of the state of slavery, are no longer in existence. Whatever may be our opinions in regard to their moral preparation for the great change which they have experienced, it must be admitted that, technically speaking, their minority in the Church has been removed. The question is therefore a serious one, whether they are not entitled to greater privileges and powers than they previously had a right to expect; and we are met by the fact, which we ought not to ignore, that they are now, either of their own motion, or under the promptings of others, actually demanding them.

4. In the fourth place, we are encountered by *social* differences which we are obliged to take into consideration. The question is not whether these differences ought to continue or not. They exist, and will probably continue to exist; and the question is, What, in view of them as an existing fact, is the course which, as a Church acting wisely and prudently, we ought to pursue? They constitute difficulties, which, for some time at least, must continue to meet us. They naturally spring from the indestructible distinction of color, and are enhanced by the memory of relations but recently destroyed, and destroyed in opposition to the views and desires of the white people of the South. The force of this difficulty does not lie in the fact that our people are in any degree indisposed to worship together with the colored people. That they have always done. They have been accustomed to sit with them in the same buildings, and at the same communion tables. But in the past there was no tendency either to social equality, or to an equal participation of the blacks with the whites in the government and discipline of the Church. The case is now changed. The elevation of the colored people to *civil* equality with the whites, tends to produce in them a desire for *social* and *ecclesiastical* equality. This the whites will not be willing to concede. A separation of the two classes would seem to be the natural consequence. The freed people will go to themselves in order to attain that independence of white control which, possessed of civilly, they will also desire to have ecclesiastically.

Here, then, we have several great considerations in the light of which our course is to be determined. We have the natural unity of the races; we have the spiritual oneness of believers in Christ; we have the civil equality of the colored people with the whites; and we have difficulties arising from social differences which invincibly oppose the realisation of this spiritual unity and civil equality in an outward and formal ecclesiastical shape. Now, looking with an eye of kindness and Christian love upon the freed people, and sincerely desirous of securing their spiritual welfare by the best means, we are led to inquire, What is the policy which ought to be adopted by us ?

The first question, evidently, which requires to be settled is, Whether we shall, without an effort on our part to prevent such a result, permit them to withdraw from us into separate organizations? Or shall we endeavor to retain them in ecclesiastical connexion with us, so that we may exert upon them that direct influence for good which we were enabled to exercise in the past? To the adoption of the latter alternative we are urged by several weighty reasons.

1. These people, though no longer our slaves, and, as such, immediately dependent on us for religious instruction, are among the poor in our communities, and we are only their *neighbors*, when, in accordance with the great principle inculcated by our Saviour, we go to their assistance in their need, and give them, as far as in us lies, the gospel of our salvation. We cannot discharge our consciences of this obligation. If they are willing to receive the gospel at our hands, we cannot refrain from giving it to them to the extent of our ability. Now, as ever, their spiritual necessities appeal irresistibly to us for help, and may the compassionate Redeemer give us grace to answer the call, and hasten to their succor.

2. We have been prepared, by long experience in the work of instructing them, to go forward still in the discharge of the same beneficent office. We shall sacrifice all the results of that experience if we now withdraw ourselves from them, or which is the same thing, permit them to withdraw from us without an effort on our part to hold them in connexion with us. We are of all

men best prepared by our knowledge of their characteristics and wants to give them the gospel efficiently; and duty to the great Master and to their undying souls impels us to consecrate the fruits of our past training to the promotion of their everlasting good.

3. Whatever may be the condition of the freed people in the future, it is clear that they are not now prepared to organise fully for themselves, to furnish or elect their own spiritual teachers, and to constitute themselves into Presbyteries and Synods.

4. Should they establish separate organisations, it is to be feared that they will be exposed to fanatical, licentious, and superstitious influences which will tend to ruin them, and to injure the interests of society in general. It is now a year and a half since they were emancipated, and their religious history during that period, in cases in which they have set up for themselves, only serves to confirm this apprehension. Did the limits of this report admit it, facts could be presented which would go to show that in many instances they have adopted ideas and practices which suggest the fear that they are rapidly lapsing into a condition of baptized heathenism.

5. It deserves to be considered that the ecclesiastical union of the two races, and their joint participation, as hitherto, in the sweet and charitable offices of religion, will operate to the production of harmony and mutual good will; while, on the other hand, their ecclesiastical separation will sever the most tender tie which binds them together, and tend to promote alienation and estrangement, if not to foster antagonism and hostility between them.

These considerations, drawn mainly from a regard to the interests of the freed people themselves, strongly impel us to the endeavor to retain them in connexion with us, and thus to check the progress of those influences which are threatening to corrupt and destroy them. And it is believed that we but interpret the common sentiment of our people when we express the opinion that our Church has still a great work to do for the salvation of the colored race, and that notwithstanding the discouragements

which may meet her, she will at least make a fair and earnest effort to accomplish it.

On the supposition, then, that we are unwilling to witness an ecclesiastical separation of the two races, and are anxious to retain the colored people in connexion with us, the important and difficult question next presents itself: Upon what plan shall we proceed in adjusting our relations and discharging our duties to them? This question is susceptible of three general answers: First, we may concede to them *a, full* extension of power; secondly, we may concede to them *no* extension of power; thirdly, we may concede to them a *partial* extension of power. Full power, no power, some power—these are the alternatives between which we must elect.

I. The first general plan which has been mentioned involves the organisation of separate colored churches with full powers, and the right to representation in all the upper courts of our Church. The statement of this plan we regard, as its refutation. It would, for reasons which it is not necessary to detail, be, at least for the present, hopelessly impracticable. We are not opposed to the enjoyment by the colored people of all the rights and privileges, the exercise of which would conduce to the glory of God, the good of the Church, and the salvation of their souls. But even were it possible, at present, to have our Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, partly white and partly colored, the people of color are not prepared for the plan under consideration. They have not the men who would be capable of sustaining the weighty responsibilities and discharging the difficult duties of spiritual teachers, or of adequately representing their interests and those of the whole Church on the floor of our higher judicatories. Whatever may be their own tendency to strive after the realisation of such a state of things, we are not ready, with our knowledge of their condition and wants, to yield it our sanction. We are persuaded that it would issue alike in damage to themselves, to the Church, and to society at large. If they are determined to be satisfied with nothing less than the possession of all the rights and powers of perfectly organised churches, all that we can say is, that they will have our best wishes for their

spiritual welfare, but we shall regret their purpose, and shall be constrained to withhold our approval of it, and to suffer them, however reluctantly, to withdraw from us entirely in their attempt to put it into execution. We would still, as ever, be willing to preach to them the gospel of Christ, as opportunity might be presented, but our ecclesiastical relations to them would, by their own agency, be necessarily severed.

II. The second general plan which has been indicated would involve the retention, in an unmodified form, of the system which has always existed. The colored people then would be, as heretofore, either parts of our ordinary pastoral charges under the watch and care of white sessions, or they would constitute simple missionary congregations. This plan is strongly recommended by its simplicity, and by the consideration that it would avoid the risks and dangers which are incident to innovations upon established usages. It deserves to be considered, however, that there are serious difficulties under which it would labor, and which would serve to embarrass its operation. These are mainly two-fold:

1. In the first place, it would take no account of the altered circumstances in which the colored people are now placed. From time immemorial, the Christian Church declined, for obvious reasons, to elevate slaves to office in the house of the Lord. They were regarded as in a condition of perpetual ecclesiastical minority. The colored people, while slaves, were in that condition, and we were justifiable in excluding them from office in the Church. But they have ceased to be slaves, and it is a serious question whether we should endeavor to perpetuate the disabilities which are peculiar to the status of servitude. Their moral and intellectual state may be at present very much what it always has been, and any extension of their powers should be contemplated with that fact in view; but if they are not slaves, their perpetual minority has been removed. It is not clear, therefore, that we would not be doing them injustice by endeavoring to keep them in that condition. It is evident that if they chose to exercise the powers with which they have been invested by their change of circumstances, they could do so. If, for



example, a body of colored Presbyterians should please to organise themselves into a church and elect their own office-bearers, what could hinder them from accomplishing their purpose? May it not be wiser in us to concede them such a limited exercise of power as they may be able to bear, and as may be regulated by the conserving influence of the white man, than, by holding them in complete subordination, to present to them the temptation to break with us, and assert for themselves such power as they are not able to bear, and as may be abused by fanaticism, superstition, and lust?

2. In the second place, it is extremely doubtful whether upon this plan, we can continue to hold them in ecclesiastical relation to us. Their tendency, whenever they are exposed to radical influences, is to a withdrawal from connexion with us, and it is probable that unless we meet that tendency by making to them some concessions involving an extension of their privileges, the masses of them will break with us entirely, and establish their own separate organisations in which they will possess the powers which we refuse to yield them. They will thus not only pass out of ecclesiastical connexion with us, but will be led by their conception of what will appear to them unreasonableness and injustice on our part, to oppose any moral influence in their favor which we would still be prompted by Christian charity to extend. And although it may be possible that some of them would be content to remain with us even though our present system should be unchanged, it is certain that the great majority will be encouraged by representations not wholly emanating from themselves, to sunder a relation by which, it will be urged, their rights are suppressed, and their privileges withheld. Whatever may be our speculative views as to the future of these people, it would seem to be clear that we are called upon to deal with them in the light of existing facts. They have been emancipated; but should the future reduce them to the same condition, substantially if not nominally, in which they formerly were, our measures may hereafter be adapted to the requirements of that condition. What we have to do with is the actual present, not the possible future. If we wish to keep them with us, especially in our cities and towns,

judging from their present disposition, some concessions would appear to be requisite. They will scarcely be satisfied with the old order of things entirely unmodified. Many of them have left us already, and should they become totally separated from us, it is to be feared that our opportunities for doing them good, so far as the masses would be concerned, will forever have departed.

While, however, these considerations have great weight, and claim our earnest attention, it must be admitted that caution and wisdom would be required in making any alterations in the old system, and it may be best to commit the question to the judgment of the Presbyteries who know the situation, character, and exigencies of the congregations under their charge.

III. The third general plan which has been suggested, contemplates a partial and limited extension of the powers and privileges of colored congregations. On the supposition that this plan should be pursued, there are at least three prominent schemes which are conceivable:

1. The first scheme is that of missionary congregations of colored people with the power of electing their own deacons. This scheme would be recommended by the consideration that, on the supposition that an extension of power is afforded to colored congregations, it provides for the most limited exercise of that power. It would "hasten slowly" in the introduction of changes. It would, however, be attended by the following difficulties:

(a.) If these congregations be conceded the power of electing their own deacons, they would not be purely missionary. They would be churches in an imperfect state of organisation. The election of deacons would be a step in the maturing process. It would appear to be a misnomer, therefore, to call them missionary congregations; and yet, if the right to mature be arrested at this point, they would lack the essential feature of Presbyterian churches—the possession of the ruling eldership.

(b.) In the second place, a missionary congregation of slaves could not attain to the perfect organisation of a church. But the case is changed. Constitute a missionary congregation of these people now, and, if they please, they may mature into a

fully organised church. They would then be entitled to representation in the upper courts. The result would be, in that case, that we would ultimately be met by precisely the same difficulties as those which would exist if we should at once organise colored congregations into separate churches with full powers, and the right to colored representation in all the courts of the Church. It strikes us that it would be better, either to treat these congregations as simply missionary, or, if it be deemed expedient to grant them the power of electing deacons, that they should be regarded as branches of existing churches.

2. The second scheme is that of fully organised separate churches, possessing the right of electing their own colored pastors, ruling elders, and deacons, and being under the care of Presbyteries and responsible to them, but without the right of representation in any of the upper courts. This scheme is attended with the advantage of meeting, and perhaps fully meeting, the desires of the colored people themselves, and of checking their tendency to break with us entirely, and form a Presbyterian Church which would be separate from our own. There is no doubt, also, that it tends to promote a kindly relation of the two races to each other, and by removing all cause of discontent from the minds of the colored people, to bind them to the whites by the tie of gratitude and affection. It is encumbered, however, with several difficulties.

(a.) In the first place, it makes no provision at all for the representation of fully organised churches in the courts to which they would be responsible, and by which they would be governed. These churches, therefore, would be destitute even of the representation which missionary congregations enjoy, for they are represented by the missionaries who have charge of them. It would appear that if churches be constituted with full powers, they are entitled to be represented in the higher judicatories.

(b.) In the second place, the colored people have not, at present, the men who are capable of adequately discharging the difficult and responsible functions of ministers of the gospel. There never was a time when they more needed than now, to be taught by wise and judicious men prepared by careful training

for the work of preaching, and fortified against the danger of being infected by radical and fanatical influences. They require in their teachers men who will be able to stand fast against the storm of temptation to which they will surely be subjected. God may please to call men from among them to the ministry, who may in time be qualified for its discharge, but it is improbable that such pastors can now be found among them as their exigencies demand. We should hesitate too, before we depress the requirements for the ministry in order to meet this special case. In lowering to any great extent the standard of ministerial qualification, we would depart from our settled policy in the past, and the ultimate results, in all probability, would evince that the advantages of the change were more apparent than real.

(c.) In the third place, this scheme would cut off the colored people from immediate connexion with white congregations, and deprive them of the salutary and conservative influence of the white race. They would cease to be under the care of white pastors, and the supervision of white sessions. This, we think, is, especially at the present time, to be deprecated. They are passing through a transitional process which is trying, and they need to be steadied by the moderating and supporting influence of their white brethren. It is true that they may reject that influence when proffered them, but what we contend for is, that we should endeavor to keep them under it, for their own sake. Should they persistently refuse it, the responsibility in the case will rest entirely upon themselves.

3. The third scheme, under this general plan, is to treat colored congregations as *branches* of existing white churches, conceding them the power to elect their own deacons, or even their own ruling elders, but retaining them under the care of white pastors. In those cases in which the power to elect their own ruling elders might be granted to a colored congregation, the scheme would involve the following elements:

(a.) The white and the colored congregations to be component parts of the same organisation, the colored congregation being a branch of the white.

(b.) The colored congregation to be served by the white pastor

of the church of which it would be a branch, in those cases—as in many country communities—in which one pastor might meet the demands of both congregations, or in which the services of only one pastor can be secured. In other cases, as in cities, the colored congregation to be served by a white collegiate pastor of the church of which it would be a branch, who would be installed as co-pastor with special relation to the colored congregation.

(c.) The colored congregation to be conceded the power to elect ruling elders from their own number who would have jurisdiction over the colored congregation alone; the unity of the session to be preserved by the appointment on the part of the white elders of one or more of their number as a commission to act with the colored elders in the adjudication of special cases emerging in the government and discipline of the colored congregation; the colored congregation to have, also, the power to elect the pastor or co-pastor, as *their* pastor, upon his nomination by the white elders; and the right to elect the white elders as *their* elders. This would leave the rights of the white congregation entirely unaffected, and at the same time give these colored Presbyterians the power of electing the men by whom they would be taught and governed.

(d.) The representation of the colored congregation in the upper courts to be through the white ruling elders of the church of which it would be a branch.

(e.) In case there should be but one pastor, the colored congregation to have the opportunity of contributing to his support; and in case there should be a co-pastor having special relation to the colored congregation, his support to be furnished by it; the amount so raised, if inadequate, to be supplemented by the contributions of the white congregation with which it would be connected. Assistance, too, might be obtained from benevolent individuals of other congregations, and from missionary sources. This scheme is recommended by the following considerations:

1. It provides white pastors for colored congregations, a measure which, if practicable, would be of immeasurable benefit to them.

2. It would keep colored congregations to a considerable ex-

tent under the controlling influence of white ruling elders, and of the white congregations which they would represent.

3. It gives colored congregations the right to elect their pastors (a right deemed inestimable by Presbyterians,) but under such checks and guards as would render its abuse almost impossible. This would greatly tend to hold them in connexion with us.

4. The concession to the colored people of the right to elect their own ruling elders would powerfully tend to keep them in connexion with us, by meeting one of their most cherished expectations.

5. At the same time it meets the formidable difficulty of representation by providing that the colored congregations should be represented in the upper courts by white delegates. Supposing that the powers of colored congregations be extended at all, no other scheme can be conceived by which their representation can be secured without encountering insuperable obstacles.

6. It provides for the support of pastors of colored congregations.

7. It would effect no violent disturbance of the old relations between the whites and the blacks, but would preserve a close affinity between the two races in church organisation, and in the solemn and tender offices of religion.

This scheme is attended with two serious difficulties which may be regarded as comprehending the principal objections to it.

1. The concession of any rights to the colored people tends to create the desire for greater, and on the principle that it is just or expedient to grant them *any* extension of rights, it is impossible to deny them the *greatest* extension of them. The only answer to this which is possible is, that they are, ecclesiastically speaking, but children still in the condition of growth, as the wisest of them admit, and that, therefore, we must to a great extent do their thinking for them. We may give them what rights we think they can bear. If they demand more, the remedy is always in our hands—we can cut the bond that binds us together. That would settle the difficulty, and settle it effectually.

2. In the second place, the difficulty exists that if colored elders are elected, they would, on this scheme, be debarred their constitutional right to represent their own people in the upper courts, and thus the principle of the parity of the eldership would be sacrificed. This is a serious objection, but the answer that may be given is, that such a limitation upon the representative rights of the colored elder would be justified by the imperative necessities of the case.

Such is a somewhat extended, but, in view of the difficulty and importance of the subject, a concise statement of the different schemes upon which it is conceivable that our relations to the colored people may be constructed. In the present state of the question, it is not likely that any single plan would harmonise the views of the whole Church, and, therefore, the Committee would simply express the hope that it may please the Assembly to give currency to the statement presented in the report, so that it may be brought before the Church at large, and they would decline to urge the recommendation, at present, of any particular scheme. The subject is remitted to the wisdom of the Assembly with the earnest prayer that the great Head of the Church may guide it to wise conclusions.

The following resolutions, appended by the author of this report thereto, were also offered to the Assembly by the Committee:

1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly entertains for the freed people the sincerest sentiments of good will and affection; that it earnestly desires and prays for their salvation, and would encourage the employment of every legitimate means for the promotion of their spiritual good.

2. That it be recommended to all our ministers to exert themselves to the utmost of their ability, to give, as heretofore, the gospel to these people; to church sessions to urge upon parents among them the duty of presenting their children for baptism, and of bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and especially to evangelists and missionaries to devote a portion of their labor to the promotion of the salvation of the freed people.

3. That in the judgment of the Assembly, it is highly inexpedient that there should be an ecclesiastical separation of the white and colored races; that such a measure would threaten evil to

both races, and especially to the colored; and that, therefore, it is desirable that every warrantable effort be made affectionately to dissuade the freed people from severing their connexion with our churches, and to retain them with us, as of old; but that in those cases in which they prefer, though against our judgment, to establish separate organisations, they will carry with them our best wishes for their welfare.

4. That in view of the imperfect development of events growing out of the altered condition of the colored people, and the great difficulty of the questions arising from it, the Assembly does not regard the way as clear for a deliverance as to the plan upon which our ecclesiastical relations to them should be constructed ; but would submit the whole subject to the wisdom and discretion of the presbyteries, leaving it to them to adopt such measures as they may deem best adapted to the circumstances and wants of the colored congregations severally under their care, and urging it upon them, that in case any changes of the existing system be proposed, respect be had to the question of the preparation of the colored congregations for such changes, and great caution and prudence be exercised in their adoption.

5. That it be recommended to the presbyteries in the case of colored persons who may be applicants for introduction into the ministry, to adhere to the course prescribed in the constitution for the examination, license, and ordination of candidates for the sacred office.

6. That the Assembly recommend that whenever it is practicable, Sabbath-schools and mission schools for the benefit of the freed people, especially the young, be established in connexion with our churches, and that the sessions of the churches take these schools into their charge and provide suitable teachers for them.

7. That the Assembly is not prepared to recommend the adoption of any system of secular education for the freed people; but should any of the presbyteries or churches under their care see fit to establish parochial schools for their benefit, the Assembly would extend its approval to such a measure, provided such schools are under the supervision of the presbyteries or the sessions of the churches with which they may be connected, and are furnished with such teachers as they shall endorse and provide. Further, that religious instruction on the basis of our standards be incorporated into such schools as a distinctive element.

8. That the heads of families are exhorted to afford opportunities to the freed people in their households to attend, upon



family and public worship, and that they provide for them, so far as possible, catechetical instruction in the doctrines and duties of the gospel.

9. That masters and employers are exhorted to give to their servants and employés the things which are just and equal; to extend to them every facility for attending upon the means of grace; and to provide, so far as in them lieth, for the salvation of their souls.

10. That the freed people in our communion, who may be servants and employés, are exhorted to render to their masters and employers all proper honor and obedience; not despising them because they are brethren, but rather doing them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit.

#### ARTICLE II.

#### THE TWO TREES IN EDEN.

The brief narrative in the first chapters of Genesis, majestic in its simplicity, has failed to satisfy the minds of men. The origin of the race, the short probation of its federal head and representative, the lapse of the trustee and the consequent lapse of all his posterity, the tremendous interests involved in the trial, are all matters of too great importance to be slightly hinted at and dismissed without comment; too far-reaching in their results to be compressed within these narrow limits. Consequently, the philosophers of earth have not hesitated to emend, modify, and improve the history furnished by Heaven. For many generations this good work has been in progress. The revelation of God has been duly arraigned and tried at the bar of each new science, even while the science was yet in its infancy. But it was reserved for the *savans* of the present day, and mainly for the theologians of New England, to set aside the divine record entirely; to substitute a higher inspiration, and to smile with complacent compassion upon the ignorant credulity that is content with the bare word of God.

VOL. XVIII., NO. 1.—2.

Rev. John L. Girardeau, "Our Ecclesiastical Relations to Freedmen."