

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 10. — OCTOBER, 1889.

I. THE NEGRO IN ECCLESIASTICAL RELATIONS.

THE negro question, as it is called, presents one of the most perplexing problems of our age. Every phase of it, social, political, and ecclesiastical, involves difficulties sufficient to tax the wisdom and philanthropy of the most enlightened. The difficulty is increased by the malign influence of sectionalism. Both sections of our common country essay the attempt, and each embarrasses the other. The North would speedily settle it were it not for the South; and the South would have settled it long ago but for the North. The conscientious convictions of each party stand in the way of the best intentions of the other, so that the well meant efforts of both fail, to the scandal of religion and the sorrow of philanthropy. Two opposing policies are presented by the two sections. This want of harmony was at first explained and excused by the heat of passion lingering like smoke around the recent battle fields, and there was confident prophecy of its speedy disappearance. The passions of war, however, have long since subsided, and the hostiles have "shaken hands across the bloody chasm," and the lines of opposition, like those of breastwork and battle-field, have been long ago obliterated, while this conflict still rages. These policies have confronted each other now for a quarter of a century, and they are as unreconciled if not as irreconcilable in 1889 as in 1865. There is something very significant in this.

Moreover, whatever suggestion is offered by either fails of influence on the other, each being discounted—the South by the North upon the allegation of prejudice, the North by the South upon that of ignorance.

The foregoing circumstances heighten the difficulty well nigh to the insuperable. Though we are of decidedly optimistic temperament, and greatly disposed to hope for the best in most troubles, yet we feel constrained to confess that increasing acquaintance with the various elements and circumstances of this question has but served to emphasize its difficulty and enhance its darkness.

We think it inevitable that people, however wise and good, who essay the solution of a practical problem from a distance must be liable to mistake; nothing is more unreliable and unsatisfactory than long range theory and speculation anent problems of practical policy; the world universally resists and resents such criticism as unjust and unfair; alien interference and dictation in matters of this sort can never be helpful, and therefore never wise or welcome. It is no imputation on the intelligence or virtue of the North to assert this.

The Rev. Dr. Field, the able and accomplished editor of the *Evangelist*, in one of his "Letters from the South," says:

"If the confession of ignorance is the first step in the road to knowledge, I think I am in a way to learn something, though it may leave me in the end both 'a wiser and a sadder man.' When I came South, I thought I knew something of its peculiar social and political questions; but I find I have a great deal to learn, and that, while my sympathy for the colored race remains as before, there are difficulties in the adjustment of its relations to the white race, which could not be seen at a distance, but which on a near approach become distinctly visible."

"It (the North) can help them in the way of education; it can give money for schools and colleges, but it cannot interfere in political and social affairs. That the South would resent, as we should resent any outside interference with the affairs of the City or State of New York. We have many things that are bad enough, such as ballot-box stuffing and false counting of votes; but we do not call on the national government to put them down. That is our business. We believe in home rule, and if that is the law in New York, so it must be in Georgia and Mississippi. As to its internal affairs, the South must work out its own salvation."

The observation of any candid Northern man who has spent several years of *bona fide* residence in the South will corroborate Dr. Field most heartily. Consult a man who, like Dr. Dorland, has had some direct dealing in immediate contact with the negro, and if he speaks without reserve, you will infallibly find that the opinions and views and policy cherished when he came South have been very materially altered by practical personal experience.

As to the allegation of prejudice on our part, of course no mere disclaimer is of any avail; it is barred by the very nature of prejudice. At the same time it is well to remember that prejudice is not necessarily nor altogether a fault of one party only to an issue. It is perfectly possible that there may be prejudice on both sides of the same question. Here is a possibility that seems never to have entered the minds of our brethren of the North; they may be as strongly and as unreasonably prejudiced in their view as we in ours.

Again: granting the existence of it, it is none the less an element in the problem demanding and deserving consideration. In all practical concerns prejudice, if existent, must be taken into account; it cannot be ignored, it cannot be ridiculed or scolded away. This perpetual cry and condemnation does not relieve the difficulty. Twenty-five years insistent assertion of it has brought no benefit; it has neither lessened nor lightened the evil.

Moreover, there is evidence not little nor doubtful of the existence, in the North itself, of the very feeling for which we are so uniformly and unsparingly condemned. There are rumors that even the rare and enlightened atmosphere of New England is not absolutely free from its insidious inroads. Of course there is not so much of it in the North, for exactly the same reason that there is not so much wool on black sheep as on white; the scarcity of the brother in black necessitates a corresponding scarcity of this "wool;" but nevertheless when we go a shearing we do not altogether return with our labor for our pains.

Some readers may remember something of the Glenn Bill introduced into the Georgia Legislature. Referring to this the *Advance* says:

"When, a few months ago, the Glenn Bill, professedly typical of the 'southern civilization,' came so near being enacted into a law in the State of Georgia, for the purpose of making it legal to send to the 'chain-gang' the professors in the Atlanta University if found guilty of allowing their own young children to recite in the same classes with colored youth—where was there a Presbyterian newspaper, or a Presbyterian minister, or a Presbyterian church that ever ventured to utter one word of outright protest against the exhibition of the genuine color-caste spirit so heinous and hateful? 'Comment would the text confound!'"

Now *per contra* read the following from the *New York Nation* upon the same Glenn Bill:

"If the question had come to an issue when it was originally brought up, Republican organs in the North would have been able to make a strong point of the bitterness of race prejudice which it showed to exist in the South. But recent occurrences in the North have effectually spiked their guns. A fierce outburst of race prejudice in the Republican State of Ohio has followed the action of the last Legislature in repealing the 'black laws,' and requiring white and black children to attend school together. Oxford is a town of Butler county, conspicuous for its educational institutions, containing Miami University, Oxford Female College, and the Western Female Seminary. Its colored population is small, the whole number of negroes in Butler county, according to the census of 1880, being only 1,140, against 41,435 whites. In short, it is just the sort of Northern town that has always been filled with indignation over any exhibition of race prejudice in the South. But when the time came for opening the fall term of the public schools, and it was discovered that the colored children were to be seated beside white children in Oxford, the public, without distinction of party, rebelled. A meeting, consisting of about four hundred white men, was held week before last, and by an almost unanimous vote instructed the Board of Education to withdraw the colored children from the building attended by the white children, a leading banker agreeing to stand between the Board and harm in thus violating the law. The Board thereupon held a meeting and unanimously resolved that, 'in compliance with the above request, the superintendent be, and he is hereby instructed, to assign the colored children to the north building to-morrow.'

"On the next Tuesday evening another large public meeting was held to express the popular satisfaction over the action of the Board. The *Commercial Gazette* thus describes the gathering: 'Quite a number of colored men came to the hall, and were greeted with cries of "Rats," "Take him out," etc. One might imagine that, for the nonce, instead of being in free and enlightened Ohio, he was in South Carolina or Mississippi. It was a shameful exhibition of unmanliness and bravado, the strong domineering over the weak. If the steps taken were necessary, they should have been taken in a quiet way, without making such a public and race-prejudice-producing demonstration. To the shame of some of these men, it must be stated that they were Republicans, blinded by a fanaticism that cannot but result in harm to this beautiful little town.' In calling the meeting to order, the chairman 'asked the boys to be as quiet as possible—that while they had cause to feel jubilant, they could at the proper time give vent to their feelings.' The banker who had engaged to defend the School Board made a speech in which he said: 'The colored people have the right of suffrage. More than this they cannot expect. As for their social qualifications, there are few of us here ready for that question.' Another speaker 'expressed himself highly satisfied to know that the children had been driven from the schools.' The *Commercial Gazette's* report concludes as follows: 'Joshua Fry, an ex-banker, responded to calls next. His exact language was this: "I don't want to be called upon, for I have kept out of this whole trouble. If I was to express my opinion, I would say that I wouldn't allow a nigger in the town. I won't harbor them in any form or about my place. I've no use for them." This short speech was cheered and applauded until it seemed

that the house would fall. The meeting then adjourned, after passing a vote of thanks to the Board for its "manliness" in acting as the meeting requested.'

"At the same time comes news of a similar outbreak of race prejudice in another Republican State at the North. Fort Scott is the capital of a Kansas county which cast 2,974 votes for Blaine to 1,671 for Cleveland, and its Board of Education is strongly Republican. The colored children have hitherto been taught in a separate building, but of late they have insisted upon mixed schools, as they have a right to do under the laws of the State. The Board of Education, however, with the exception of one colored member, resisted this legal demand, and instructed the teachers of the different schools to exclude colored children should they attempt to enter. At four school-houses small delegations of colored children were refused admission; at a fifth, a girl with so little negro blood in her veins that the principal did not know she had any, slipped in the first day, but was turned out as soon as the facts were learned; at a sixth, the colored children marched in fifty strong, and took possession, but the teacher refused to instruct them, devoting himself exclusively to the few whites who remained. The matter has been carried into the courts, which appear bound to decide in favor of mixed schools; but it is evident that the great body of the whites will not accept this policy, the opposition being so strong that the local Republican organ protests earnestly against any attempt to enforce it.

"It has been a long time since a more impressive lesson on the necessity of charity has been taught the people of this country, and in no other way could it have been so forcibly taught as by such outbreaks of race prejudice in John Sherman's State and in 'bleeding Kansas.'"

We remember to have read of a similar scene at Felicity, Ohio.

An editorial brief in the *Interior* relates the following:

"Our colored waiter at a dinner *café*, Johnny, is about to be married. Johnny is of a clear yellow complexion, tidy, agreeable, saving. We happened to ask him why he did not take unto himself a wife. That brought out the pleasant secret at a glance, and he owned up. 'Hope you are getting a good wife, John.' 'Thank you, sir, very much, and I know I am. She is industrious and has no vanity about her.' The establishment of confidential relations between ourselves and John was followed by the request on his part that we should help him to get a decent house in a decent quarter of the town, at the rental charged to white people—and we did some real estate interviewing on his behalf. Though success finally attended our joint enterprise, the fact came out clearly that a negro cannot, without special favor, get a respectable place to live in Chicago without paying at least double what would be charged to a very mean sort of a white man. The demand for caterers, in so large a city, gives good-paying employment to a great many colored men. But they are quietly ruled out of most of the avenues of wage-earning, nearly as rigidly as they are in South Carolina. They do not have here, as there, a monopoly of carriage and cab driving. Probably no one has seen a negro coachman on our streets. True, there are not a large proportion of them here, relative to population, but it is true that they have no equality with white men in the struggle for daily bread."

The Rev. William V. Tunnell, a colored minister of Brooklyn, has evidently felt the iron enter his soul, and he utters his protest in a letter to the *Independent*. After speaking of "what are commonly understood as civil rights," he goes on:

"But when these are granted his advantages practically end. If he is allowed to spend his money on an equality with the white man, he is not permitted to make it on an equality with him. He is debarred from pursuits which are remunerative or which promise ultimately to be. Colored boys are not admitted to learn trades in Northern workshops; colored mechanics or skilled laborers who may migrate from other parts hither can find no employment, not because there is none to be had, but because 'no colored need apply.' The principle that there will be a 'strike' if colored men are admitted to work at the same bench or on the same material with white laborers is so universally conceded by employers, that on the one hand it results in making them, however well disposed to colored people, or however philosophical in their views of labor as a commodity regardless of the color of the laborer, mere machines in the hands of their employees; and, on the other hand, it deprives a respectable quota of our citizens not only of a legitimate and helpful sphere of aspiration, but in most cases of an adequate and self-respecting means of a livelihood. In this respect the Northern colored man is far worse off than his Southern brother. Slavery taught the social heresy that labor is a disgrace, and so, becoming the badge of inferiority, it became odious in the eyes of the white man. The poor white would, therefore, rather loaf or steal than labor. This resulted in placing the handicrafts in the hands of the colored people, so that they became carpenters, masons, blacksmiths, men skilled in the various manual arts, to whom was confined almost exclusively the exercise of them. Not so, however, is it with the Northern colored man. The opportunity for the acquirement of any skilled mechanical pursuit is very rare, and Southern and West Indian skilled laborers who immigrate here, with the greatest difficulty, if at all, can find sphere for the exercise of their trades.

"Almost invariably it has proved futile, and in many cases disastrous, for colored men to undertake business enterprises because of the pecuniary outlay necessary, and the risk and the harrowing uncertainty of patronage. Occasionally a bold little bark launches out upon that stormy sea, only in five cases out of six to be engulfed in the cruel waves of financial embarrassment—not in every case because of incapacity or inattention to business, but because, by the logic of events, they were not patronized by the general public, and so expired from atrophy. The most successful, indeed, preëminently the only successful colored merchant in New York is a retail druggist, and the condition which has made his business prosperous and his wealth possible is that where he is located there is no sharp competition, and thus an unwilling patronage has been forced in his way. Had there been the usual competition it is doubtful if this gentleman could have achieved the success and amassed the wealth he has—not because of any lack of business capacity and devotion on his part, but of the lack of business patronage. As a result, the negro appears to be hopelessly doomed to servile and unremunerative occupations—the men to waiting, coaching, bootblacking, erranding; the women to washing, scrubbing, cooking, etc. No one ever thinks of giving a colored lady an oppor-

tunity to exercise her brain and fingers at a telegraphic machine or type-writer, and an application from one such would be deemed an impertinence. And it has come to pass that occupations wherein the negro was the acknowledged lord and monopolist are being handed over to the more prosperous white artisan. White-washing, carpet-beating, barbering, catering, for example, have been almost entirely diverted from him, and if he does anything of the kind he is required to do it at a reduced price. The colored man, seeing the door to legitimate aspiration and advancement fast barred against him, is under a sore temptation to become discouraged, fall into a state of utter indifference, and at last into positive inertia.

“But there is another phase, and that not the least important, which makes the lot of the Northern negro one of extreme trial, and which already is operating to drive him to despair of his lot and his future. It is the impossibility for even respectable colored people to rent suitable houses in reputable neighborhoods. It is notorious that colored people in Brooklyn and New York have to live in the vilest neighborhoods, in ‘mud’ and ‘duck’ alleys, in ‘bedbug row,’ in any purlieu or hole where prejudiced or grasping landlords may allow them to find shelter. Whenever a particular neighborhood has degenerated and is in ill-repute, and the landlords see it is to their interest to raise its moral tone so that their property may not depreciate, it is an open secret that they sow in a colony of colored people to redeem in a measure the reputation of the locality. If the houses are good, colored people are invariably glad to get them, but it is always at an advanced rent. As a class they receive the lowest wages of any wage-earners in the community; they are compelled to pay the highest rents for the shabbiest houses in the most undesirable neighborhoods. The writer has himself felt this even enter his own soul. Renting of necessity a floor in the immediate rear of which are four large boarding stables, the odor and the flies in hot weather were intolerable. Next door is a large wholesale milk dairy, where from midnight till late morning heavy trucks come trundling in. The noise incident to the unloading of the larger and the loading of the smaller wagons, hitching up and unhitching of horses, profanity, etc., of course defies the somnolent powers of a Rip Van Winkle, and much more the reduced nervous energy of a young city missionary. We have walked ourselves footsore in search of a desirable house in some pleasant locality, but we are invariably told of apartments in some alley, or that ‘people will object to your color.’ This objection to color is so persistent that cases are numerous in which light-complexioned colored people, hiring a house without proclaiming their slight mixed blood, have had, on discovery, their rent refunded and a peremptory notice to move. Said a brother clergyman engaged in the real estate business (who knew I was laboring among colored people, but who was unaware of the presence in me of a little mixed blood), after telling me he had nothing on his list to suit me, ‘advertise,’ he said, [here he gave the form of the advertisement, price, etc.,] ‘and perhaps somebody will make it an object to secure such as you.’ ‘But,’ rejoined I, ‘you know people don’t want colored people about them.’

“‘That’s true,’ he said; ‘you will not be able to meet your parishioners at your house, so you will have to appoint office hours and meet them at your church.’

“‘We have no church building. The congregation worships in a hall at present,’ I said,

“‘Then,’ concluded he, ‘you will have to meet them there, for people won’t

have them around!' If all colored people were scavengers, or low, ignorant brutes, such a repugnance might have a show of desert.

"Right in the North, therefore, are abundant opportunities for the exercise of practical sympathy and fair play. The enterprising and philanthropic, who are ever devising plans for the comfort, health, and moral well-being of our foreign population, would deserve and receive the gratitude and the earnings of our colored citizens if they would stretch forth a helping hand to relieve a situation which daily seems to be growing more and more hopeless."

And here is another item indicative of the same general feeling:

"A dispatch from Marion, Illinois, says: 'What threatens to prove a serious race war has broken out in this city. A few weeks ago the firm of F. M. Westbrook & Sons, tobacco packers, imported a number of colored men to work in their factory, claiming that there are no white men here capable of performing the work of stemming and stripping. This action on the part of the company greatly enraged a number of the white workmen, and they sent notices to the colored men warning them to leave town within ten days or receive summary punishment. Threats were also made to burn the factory and the homes of the imported laborers. But little attention was paid to the threats, and Saturday night a lot of men went to the home of Logan Collins, a colored boss, and fired five shots into the house. Collins procured a revolver and returned the fire, but no one was hurt on either side. The factory owners say they will not discharge the new men, and an outbreak is believed to be imminent.'"

These extracts are all taken from prominent papers of the North; if they tell the truth about their own section, our Northern brethren ought to be more tolerant, certainly less abusive, of "Southern prejudice," inasmuch as they are not perhaps in the most advantageous position possible for casting the first stone.¹ Even admitting their charge of "caste feeling so heinous and hateful," there seems to be place for the proverb teaching that a certain very attractive grace begins at home. A more candid and Christian proposition, from their view-point, would be that we both walk backward over these years of recrimination and strife, and

¹ Since the above extracts were set up by the compositor, we have read the following in a religious paper: "An exchange furnishes this: The Rev. J. Francis Robinson, a Baptist preacher of good character, has been visiting in the city of Auburn, N. Y. The day after his arrival he wished to get shaved, and went to a barber-shop, but was refused attention. He went in succession to several other barber-shops, but received the same treatment at each house. The trouble was, that the Rev. Mr. Robinson has a black skin, and, as one of the barbers said, 'I refused to shave him, because it is against the rules of the trade to shave a colored man.'"

cast the mantle of a mutual charity over the shame of a common sin.

While our past observation and experience give little hope of a candid hearing, if any at all, at the hands of these brethren, we propose to submit our views of one phase of this negro question, limiting our paper at this time to the proposed commingling of black and white in the Presbyterian Church in the South. This is the distinctively Northern policy as opposed to the Southern plan of grouping the churches of this race wherever possible into presbyteries and synods of their own; it stands at the threshold of every proposition for reunion; this appears with increasing clearness upon every occasion that brings reunion tangibly to the front.

On January 16, 1888, the able and influential Presbytery of Cincinnati adopted by an almost unanimous vote the following resolution:

“*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this presbytery, the General Assembly, which is over all sessions, presbyteries and synods, and where all are represented, should have the liberty, on petition of a sufficient number on the ground, to organize or continue presbyteries or synods on the same territory of white and colored churches, with their pastors, and such other ministers as are laboring with or for them, or might be received by them.”

Here we have a very cautious and guarded proposition, not in favor of an independent African church, mark it, for this policy was expressly condemned in the preamble, but in favor of allowing, upon petition of those concerned, the organization or continuance in the South of separate presbyteries and synods. Upon this proposition the *Africo-American Presbyterian* (which owes its very existence to the color-line, and lives, moves and has its being in the color line) thus delivers itself:

“Doubtless it will carry in the Presbytery of Cincinnati, where this non-presbyterial, ecclesiastico-color-line, religio-caste and unchristian theory had its origin. Should it become possible for the Presbyterian Church to commit the supreme folly of adopting this third article in order to open a front door for the entrance of the Southern Church, it will by the same act open a back door for the exit of the colored Presbyterians. What, then, of union? A union that produces divisions, and leaves the last state worse than the first! For there will be apparent unto all that the Presbyterian churches of the country are divided only by the color-line formally established.”

And the *Philadelphia Presbyterian*, while insinuating a mild rebuke of the colored brother's rant, substantially endorses his position.

Moreover, the colored Presbytery of Catawba, in Western North Carolina, adopted the following:

"Resolved, That the Presbytery of Catawba is in favor of such a change of the Form of Government as will admit of the establishment of more than one presbytery within the same territory."

This presbytery is in Western North Carolina, and is composed chiefly of colored ministers.

This, too, the *Philadelphia Presbyterian* opposes in an elaborate editorial leader.

The position of these two papers has since been endorsed by the decisive action of the Northern General Assembly, on the report of the Committee on Coöperation.

So that not only is the Northern Presbyterian Church opposed to an independent African organization; not only is it opposed to the policy of setting the negroes into separate presbyteries and synods, with representatives in the General Assembly; but it is opposed to allowing the negroes at their own option to set themselves off; even though the colored Presbytery of Catawba should vote, nay, has voted, to retain its autonomy in a reunited church, it is not to be allowed to do so. Whether the white Presbyterians of the South wish it or not, whether the colored Presbyterians of the South wish it or not, nay, even though both agree in wishing it otherwise, yet, nevertheless, *nolens volens*, whites and black *shall be mixed in the South*. This is the unequivocal and inexorable demand of our Northern brethren. The issue is joined, and the Northern Presbyterian Church stands squarely on that platform, with both feet fixed and rooted; there is to be no more distinction of race or color in ecclesiastical relations than there is in political; the fifteenth amendment is to run right through the constitution and government of the Presbyterian Church, just as it does through those of the United States: with this difference, that in political and civil matters the negro is left to his own option as to the exercise of his rights and privileges of equality,—he may claim them if he chooses,—whereas in the ecclesiastical sphere he *must*, whether he chooses or not.

This then is the settled, avowed, distinctive policy of the North; submission to this demand is the condition of the approval and goodwill of our brethren. Such is the situation.

In our discussion of this demand we remark, *first*, that it looks as if the North in making it were discriminating against the South. In the interests of fraternity or fusion, or of peace and harmony, there have been in history instances of what are called "elective affinity presbyteries" organized upon the very plan we have proposed as the best solution of this negro question. This same plan has been worked in the North. Commenting on the Cincinnati resolution the Rev. Dr. Montfort writes:

"There are many instances where presbyteries and synods cover the territory of other presbyteries and synods in whole or in part. There are three white churches and two white ministers within the bounds of Catawba (colored) Presbytery and Synod that have been attached to Holston Presbytery and Synod of Tennessee. Another case is found in an act by the Assembly, at the request of the parties concerned, allowing the Georgia missionaries and Indian preachers and churches to unite with Union Presbytery, though within the limits of another presbytery. The Second Presbytery of Philadelphia (1832-'34) approved by one Assembly and disapproved by another, was on the same ground with the First Presbytery. The ground of objection was that the line of separation was doctrinal. The Synods of Missouri and of Indian Territory have churches in the same territory. There are many precedents, and in every case a reason existed to justify, and this should always be required. . . . It is not necessary to enact a law. All that is needful is to act upon the doctrine that there may be such presbyteries, and create them as occasion may require, as has been done in the past, beginning in 1822 with the Second Presbytery of New York."

Now there is at least an apparent inconsistency here. This pepper and salt doctrine seems adapted to Southern soil only; the warmth of this fraternal feeling for the brother in black seems limited to our latitude, a strange sort of force that increases directly with the distance. There are thousands of negroes in some populous centres of the North, and no one has yet arisen to point a moral or adorn a tale by citing a single instance in which the pepper and salt doctrine receives a practical endorsement on its native heath. During the discussion of the Cincinnati resolution this challenge was thrown out again and again; it remained unanswered, and will continue so because there is no answer to it. It has been repeatedly asserted in leading papers of the North that there is no place in the United States where the color line is

not drawn, and drawn in the churches. We have already quoted somewhat liberally, but as we wish to establish our position firmly, readers will bear with us in this particular. They will notice that all our extracts are from Northern papers; the South is so "prejudiced" on the subject that we are driven to the North for unbiassed, trustworthy evidence. As it is so good and reliable, we propose to furnish it *ex abundantia*. Let us, then, hear the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*; in its issue of 26th May, 1889, it says:

"The color line is everywhere. It is in the Northern Presbyterian Church. It is in every Northern church. It is in society. It is in politics. And there is no class that knows this better than the colored people.

"However it may be in politics, we are sure the colored people desire their own churches. They may be Methodists, or Episcopalians, or Baptists, or Presbyterians, but they prefer their own organizations. There may be a sentiment in favor of wiping out the color line, but it is not honest.

"There is nothing in our history that does not afford evidence of this. From the beginning to the end it has been so. In politics all men are equal before the law. In church courts all men are equal. Nobody denies this in politics. Nobody denies it in the church, but in spite of all this the color line exists. And what are we going to do about it? There is a sentiment in the Northern church against the color line, but it is only a sentiment. In the Southern church there is an honest view. In the Northern church the view is not an honest one. The color line is in the pews and it is in the pulpit. To settle this the only way is the honest way; and this should be especially pursued in the church. This is the way the Assembly at New York, in the face of all its talk, all its resolutions, all its protests, and all its professions, adopted. There can be no mingling of the races in the church any more than there is in society. In politics it is different. There should be no color line there, as there is no social line.

"These are the points to be considered, and they have nothing to do with the color line in heaven. The best way to settle the matter is to be honest about it. . . .

"Where is the Northern church in which the color line is not drawn? Is there one in Cincinnati in any denomination? We do not know it. Does anybody know it? Is there one in any city or anywhere?"

It would not be seemly in us to use such language as this, but we may note an appearance of inconsistency in our brethren. If it is thus at the North, where the negro is scarcely an appreciable proportion of the population, how much more is it to be expected in our country, in many portions of which they are numerically equal to the whites, in some sections of which they largely outnumber them. It looks as if our Northern friends were prescrib-

ing for us a rule by which they themselves, under infinitely more favorable auspices, are not willing to be guided.

Again, it seems inconsistent to make the African in the South an exception to their approved race policy. The only other race they deal with in numbers sufficient for an analogy is the Indian. Do they ignore the line here and require an absolute, imperative commingling of the white and Indian races? We are told upon unimpeachable authority that there is in the Northern Presbyterian Church an Indian Presbytery coterminous with five white presbyteries. The very "primary principles of Presbyterianism" would be violated and the spirit of Christ outraged by allowing the colored Presbytery of Catawba, even at its own request, to continue coterminous with Concord and Mecklenburg Presbyteries, but the Indians may be segregated into the Presbytery of Dakota, though it spread over the territory of *five* white presbyteries.

Still further and more decisively, their policy in dealing with the negro is inconsistent with its very self. They protest vigorously against any color-line in the South as something un-Presbyterian, sinful and intolerable in general; and yet their whole negro work draws the color-line distinctly and sharply, in that it is prosecuted from beginning to end by separate agencies; it is all distinct from the white; they have separate boards, separate academies and schools, separate theological seminaries, separate collections; the very money that pays for the work is kept in a separate purse. This fact is emphasized in the controversy occasionally sprung between our Northern brethren; when *they* fall out then *we* get our dues. Here is an illustration in two little "spats" of *The Interior*; first, with the *Evangelist* (Presbyterian); and, second, with the *Advantage* (Congregational):

"The New York *Evangelist*, in a somewhat offensive manner, says that *The Interior* knows that there is no colored presbytery or synod to be found anywhere between Florida and Mississippi. Such a contradiction is mere foolishness. No distinction is as yet made in name by the Assembly, except by approving the report of the Board of Missions for Freedmen, in which report the distinction does appear; but the distinction *in fact* is as broad and as impossible of concealment as the continent. We have had some commingling of white and colored churches in the same presbyteries in the South, but they soon separate, as naturally, and we may say, comparatively speaking, as promptly as oil and water. *They will not stay together.* That fact has already been demonstrated.

"This setting up of the Congregational churches as differing from the Presbyterians on this subject is the uttermost and nethermost humbug. There is not a mixed white and black Congregational Church in the world, and there never will be, unless amalgamation comes to be regarded as desirable. We said in our note to the *Advance* :

"Let me call your attention to the fact that the "color-line" is as sharply drawn in your church as in ours, and in both it is as sharply drawn as it ever will be. The color-line in the churches is fundamental, and it cannot be confused by any means short of the marital commingling of the two races. The colored people are not found in any of your white Congregational churches in Chicago. Why? You are most kindly disposed toward them. The reason is that people, white or black, will not attend a church in which all the possibilities of social life are not open to them. You may have an exceptional old uncle or aunty in some of your churches, as we do, but you cannot hold a single family of young people. Your church neither has nor can do this thing anywhere, North or South, unless by compulsion, as possibly among the students of Berea or Oberlin."

"To this the *Advance* replies :

"As to Dr. Gray's assertion that Congregationalists, even in the North, do the same thing as is proposed and implied in this scheme of reunion, it is simply not true to the facts. Nowhere, North or South, does the Congregational fellowship of churches sanction in any way this caste-spirit."

"Our contemporary says this with the facts under its nose, that the churches in Georgia, organized by the Congregational Home Missionary Society (white), and those organized by the American Missionary Association (black) have pulled apart into separate white and black associations. Our contemporary runs the color-line from top to bottom."

We may be furnishing only another instance and evidence of that silly and sinful prejudice that darkens the mind and hardens the heart of the Southern Presbyterian, but we must confess that the position of our brethren with reference to the negro looks, in the several particulars we have mentioned, a little inconsistent. It certainly seems to justify our *first* point, that the North in its policy appears to discriminate against the South.

Our *second* point is this pregnant fact, that no church has been able to work this pepper-and-salt policy in the South.

The Methodist and Baptist churches have fortunately never attempted it. In these two churches the color-line was drawn long ago, with the largest prosperity to both white and black; at least nineteen-twentieths of Africo-American Christendom is in these two flourishing independent colored churches.

The Congregationalists of Georgia, after actual experiment, have felt forced to divide on the color-line, and reunion now hangs fire even under the whip of the power of the purse and the

unequivocal threat of non-recognition at the hands of the National Association. The exigency that can nerve a missionary body to resist such potent persuasion must be little short of the danger of extinction.

There has been a painful dissension in the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of South Carolina on this negro question, and a lamentable schism has been prevented only, if at all, by a compromise, allowing the one colored member to remain but denying admittance to all others. Concerning which compromise the conservative, and usually dignified, *Philadelphia Presbyterian* has this to say:

“A moral question has been settled in the Episcopal Church in South Carolina, under the canon defining a clerical delegate as a Christian minister in holy orders, by a straddling compromise on the color line which weakens both parties, and which is at variance with the Scriptures and the primary principles of church purpose and life. It is a sacrifice to race prejudices and race oppressions, and will never avail until the question is settled on the basis of the divine authority of ordained men to call to all men to be saved. Some seceders announced their willingness to return to the fold if there could be a complete separation of the races, so that the respectable white Christians would be by themselves and the negroes somewhere outside in a missionary section. The canon laws were then amended so as to exclude negro clergymen who may hereafter apply for admission. This was a compromise which ought to have satisfied the seceders, since it conceded to them the principle of excluding black men; but they bitterly resented the neglect of the Convention to eject the one colored minister who had already got in under the old canon, now so old and rusty that it will not go off any more. The old canon and the black Episcopalians will be sent out of the lines. Peace is now expected to be as a river, and righteousness to flow as the waves of the sea. An absurd procession of the Southern Episcopal Church of white sheep and the black goat browsing at the rear is thus given as a spectacle to men and angels. As these white Christians could not get into the world without the negro, for many of them drew life from black breasts, they cannot get on to heaven without one black face following after.”

This editorial paragraph may be taken as a specimen of the spirit in which our Northern friends deal with this question. This is a criticism upon a body of intelligent Christian people seriously transacting their own church business. While there may perhaps be some difference of opinion as to the good taste of such a paragraph in such a paper, there will be doubtless general unanimity as to its *force*. It hails from a section that bewails Southern prejudice on the subject.

A recent news item gives the Virginia Diocese's solution of the same question :

"The Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Virginia has decided, by a vote of one hundred and twenty-four to sixty-three, to retain the word 'white' in the qualifications for delegates to the council."

Here is another verdict in the case:

"At the recent session of the North Carolina Lutheran Synod, in St. John's Church, Cabarrus county, a number of measures were adopted of considerable importance to the church. Among them was the organization of the colored Lutheran ministers of the State into the Alpha Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Freedmen in America. There are four colored Lutheran ministers in the State. Rev. D. J. Koontz, of Concord, was elected President of the Alpha Synod, and Rev. W. P. Phifer, of Charlotte, Secretary."

Here, then, we have the experience of the Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists and Lutherans, all endorsing the position of the Southern Presbyterian Church. This is experience against theory. In view of such facts, it seems strange that any reflecting man should fail to recognize the propriety of reconsidering his views, and asking himself if there be not something worthy of weight in a unanimous verdict rendered by the Christian heart and conscience of so many different but concurrent bodies of believers.

There are few topics upon which there has been written or spoken so much that is irrelevant or sophistical. There is no argument in the allegation of prejudice upon which the changes have been rung with such monotonous melody; and moreover, whatever force such writing might otherwise have in the line of hortation is much weakened by the conspicuous difference between the preaching and the practice of our brethren.

All appeal to the analogy of politics is pointless. The North has had some success in carrying politics into their religion, but they will have to carry a good deal more religion into their politics before the latter can be held up as stimulus and example to ecclesiastical reform. Political equality is no reason under heaven for ecclesiastical equality; it does not rise even to the height of a presumption. Discussion along this line is waste of breath. Contrasts, therefore, drawn between state and church will have no

weight with any thinking persons. Such campaign material as editorial leaders in religious papers ending with the statement that "the state is more Christian than the church" (*i. e.*, the Southern church, of course), may be quietly relegated to the limbo of the *ad captandum vulgus*.

Again: when the most prominent Presbyterian paper of the North in a long editorial advances the idea that the politics of the South is really the opposing spirit in the church, and concludes with saying:

"Unless there is a radical change in the politics, and new and diverting questions withdraw the public mind from its present drift, there will be no organic union. It is not church antagonism, doctrines, policies or faith that hinders—it is politics steadily holding back those who would, if only ecclesiastical issues were at stake, unite like a well-set fracture on first intention."

—when we meet a few columns of this kind of politico-religious philosophy, there is no need of committing it to memory; it would be a comparative waste of time.

Appeals based on the propriety of "accepting the situation," are equally irrelevant. Our brethren sometimes declare, with great seeming surprise, that the South is as reconstructed as ever, that we have not accepted the situation, that the leaders of our church seem not aware that the war is over, etc., etc. Now all this stuff is either greatly insincere or grossly absurd.

To say that we have not submitted to the arbitrament of the sword would be palpably false; moreover, our brethren repeatedly use this very submission as ground for the acceptance of their ecclesiastical policy also. By "accepting the situation" they can mean only such change of our views as would imply a recognition of error in the principles for which we contended. If this is their meaning, then of course we have not accepted the situation, nor will we ever. The surrender at Appomattox did not decide a single ethical principle, nor did it reverse a single moral judgment, nor did it alter a single conviction we before entertained. From the nature of the case it could not. Our brethren seem sometimes to proceed from the assumption that when the South was overpowered, every position maintained by the North was thereby established as proven correct! Such assumption lies at the basis of

all this talk about not "accepting the situation." As we stated, this is either greatly insincere or grossly absurd.

Lastly on this line: It is often stated that in the South a black skin is an insuperable bar, an invariable disqualification, etc., etc. All this emphasis laid upon "the black skin" is an appeal to prejudice entirely unworthy of those who stoop to it. The implication invariably is that in all other respects the negro is equal to any privilege claimed for him; that the only difference between the two races is the color of their skin.

Alas! the negro-ness of the Negro is a great deal darker and deeper than his skin. None are more radically convinced of this fact than Northern residents in the South; you will never find such persons indulging in this line of remark. There is greater and more radical difference between the whites and the blacks than there is between our Northern friends and the Chinese, towards whom they evince a loving toleration so general and remarkable as to be proverbial.

We do not think we are wrong in saying that nine-tenths of Northern discussion of this question is made up of just such points as we have here passed in review, and therefore just about that proportion of it we must consider irrelevant. The only thing that approximates an argument in favor of the position of the Northern Presbyterian Church is the use made of the Scriptures in Gal. iii. 28: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." This text is the standing resort of those who deem it worth while to use discourse of reason on this subject. It has appeared again and again in print, and has been made more than once to do duty on the floor of church courts; but none of the users thereof have seen fit to pause and establish his interpretation of the text or justify its application to this subject. It is quoted as if the interpretation was one only and unquestioned, thus furnishing unequivocal Scripture authority for the position it is cited to establish, and should be consequently an end of all controversy.

Such interpretation and application we are most decidedly disposed to dispute. The context in its integrity reads thus: "For

ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

The whole intent and application of the passage is evidently to be determined and limited by the words "in Christ Jesus," used as equivalent to the preceding phrases "baptized into Christ" and "have put on Christ." The words "in Christ Jesus" are constantly quoted in this discussion as synonymous with "in the church;" all the force of their application, all their pertinence, depends upon the equivalence of the two phrases.

Now we maintain that such an interpretation is utterly unsound, and is a palpable perversion of the passage. The phrase "in Christ" has in the Scriptures a definite, fixed meaning and a uniform usage; we are not aware of a single instance in which it has the significance assumed or assigned in the current application of it to this argument. The words are used regularly to signify that union legal, personal, vital with Christ which constitutes one a child of God, as the same apostle says elsewhere, "If any man be *in Christ*, he is a new creature." The passage in Gal. iii. 26-28, therefore, teaches the blessed doctrine that the salvation of God's grace is not circumscribed by any earthly line of race, nation, sex or condition, nor limited by any worldly circumstance whatever, "for there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." (Rom. x. 12, 13.)

With this interpretation and reference agree also the other parallel passages: "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink unto one Spirit." (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13.) "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircum-

cision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free ; but Christ is all and in all." (Col. iii. 10, 11.)

These passages are all collated from the same writer, and they all clearly treat of one and the same subject. Is there a doubt in the mind of any candid reader as to their meaning and application? It is something new under the sun for Presbyterian preachers to be found basing an argument upon such an interpretation of these passages as compels their reference to the visible church! One may judge of the exigencies of our brethren's position, when they are driven to such straits to maintain it. According to our interpretation, and heretofore the general, if not universal, one among Presbyterians, of these passages, every believer, every regenerated soul, of whatever country, clime, race or color; with whatever denomination of Christians associated; whether white, yellow, red or black; whether Romanist, Episcopal, Lutheran, Disciple, Methodist, Baptist, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, or what not; every such believing, regenerated soul is by virtue of his union with Christ a member of this "one body" independent of any and of all church ties. This is a doctrine that, so far as we are familiar with discussion, has never in Presbyterian circles been denied, disputed or doubted.

Perhaps a respondent rejoins, "True; but if a member of the invisible church, why not *a fortiori* a member of the church visible? Does not membership in Christ involve the right to membership in the Presbyterian Church?"

We note now that this is a total change of base; this is not Scripture argument we deal with here. We claim to have estopped the appeal to the Scriptures; at this point we are discussing an inference only. With this reminder, we answer, No; membership in Christ does not necessarily involve the right to membership in the Presbyterian Church, nor in any particular branch of the visible church. This statement may sound a little startling to some persons, but reflection will establish its correctness. Every church claims and exercises the right to prescribe terms of fellowship. The Baptists admit the Christianity of the Pedo-Baptists, but deny fellowship; the Episcopalians acknowledge the Christianity of the Presbyterians, but decline fellowship; a Presbyterian

session would be strictly within the exercise of its rights and of its duty in denying membership to one, however godly he might be, who avowed his disbelief of infant membership and declared his purpose to disregard the practice and injunction of our church there-anent. Nay, more; our respondents themselves furnish us with a historic answer to their own rejoinder, in an authoritative deliverance of their highest court:

“Church sessions are also ordered to examine all applicants for church membership by persons from the Southern States, or who have been living in the South since the rebellion, concerning their conduct and principles on the points above specified; and if it be found that, of their own free will, they have taken up arms against the United States, or that they hold slavery to be an ordinance of God, as above stated, such persons shall not be admitted to the communion of the church till they give evidence of repentance for their sin, and renounce their error.” (Minutes of General Assembly, 1865, pp. 562-’3.)

Now, unless our respondents are prepared to deny membership in Christ to every Southern Christian, they must admit that such membership does not necessarily involve the right to membership in their own church; and this inference, therefore, falls to the ground.

But the text is not advanced to justify the membership simply of the African in a white church. Against this there is neither law nor usage. We are not in this article contending against the membership of a negro in a white church; for though the Southern Presbyterian Church, or any church, has undoubted right to exclude them, if such exclusion is necessary for the peace, harmony and prosperity of the church, and advise them to seek connection with congregations of their own color; though any church has this right, yet as a matter of fact the Southern Presbyterian Church has always welcomed the negro to her fellowship. We doubt if a negro has ever been refused membership on account of his race. During the short experience¹ of the writer, he has always had negroes under his pastoral care; has received them into the communion of the church; has visited and prayed with them in sickness, and has buried them when dead. Moreover, this was uniformly true of the South until the close of the war; so much

¹ This remark applies to the town of Washington, N. C., in which, up to the time of the writing of the article, had been the writer's only pastorate.

so that it was rare to find a Southern Presbyterian church without its quota of colored communicants, and in some there was a large membership of them. This fact is so notorious that it is difficult to understand the language attributed to Rev. Dr. Stryker on the floor of the latest General Assembly :

“Rev. Dr. Stryker, of Chicago, said that he would vote for no report that asked one Christian to stand aside at the communion table in favor of another.”

The truth is—and how the eminent speaker could be ignorant of it is a mystery—that the Southern Presbyterian Church has never asked the negro to “stand aside at the communion table.” *If such had been the case, there would be now no negro question in the Presbyterian Church.* A large majority of our negro membership was after the war transferred bodily and irregularly to the Northern church; and all the zeal and liberality exhibited in twenty years’ work have added a very meagre percentage to the fruits of our work which they reaped, and for which they now claim credit.

Oh! no; the Southern Presbyterian Church did not ask the negro to stand aside from the communion table; if it had done so, the roll of the Northern church would be now shorter by about six presbyteries.

But we return from this digression to repeat that it is not a question of membership merely that is under discussion. The pepper and salt policy advances a doctrine distinctly different. We wish to make this patent, and we wish to make it prominent. The policy we oppose is a demand for the negro of equality of rule; and this, mark it, not in negro churches, for such right of rule is undisputed. The *presbytery* is to be pepper and salt; these six negro presbyteries are to be blended with the present coterminous white presbyteries, and the new bodies, thus resultant, are to be composed of white and colored preachers and white and colored elders, representatives of white and colored churches, all upon the same footing in the administration of the government of the now united Presbyterian Church; and in any question that concerns the government of the First Church of Wilmington or Charlotte, the First Church of Atlanta or Charleston, the negro ruling elder is to have equal voice and vote with the white elder. *The demand*

is that the negro shall have equality of rule over white churches. It is just this and nothing less. This is the intent and effect of all the argument on the Northern side of this question. *There is nothing else at issue between the North and South on this negro question.* As we said before, it is just simply and solely the fifteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States run right through the Presbyterian Church.

Now this doctrine is sought to be sustained by an appeal to Gal. iii. 28; this stock text is cited really to establish for the negro equality of rule over white churches. Is such doctrine deducible from it?

We have claimed already an estoppel of argument from this text on this subject; if it does not involve equality in rights of membership, *a fortiori* it cannot justify equality in right of rule; but waiving this, and granting, for the sake of argument, that the text does teach equality in church membership, does it therefore involve equality in the right of office? Or to put exactly the same question in a different shape, Is every church member eligible to office? To this we answer unhesitatingly, No. We argue a distinction here, one made most evidently by all Presbyterians North and South; nay, more, made by this very apostle himself; for though he says "there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus," at the same time he denies to the female the function of rule in the church, thus disqualifying at one sweep more than half the membership, and the most pious part at that! He mentions, moreover, certain circumstances that bar and limit this privilege even in the male membership; but it is needless to quote these other disqualifications. This one instance of sex as a bar is sufficient to destroy the whole argument.

Do our brethren hold that every male member of the church has a right to office? Do not our common standards designate certain definite qualifications as requisite for office-bearing? What proportion of the male membership of any well-ordered or wisely-officered church is considered eligible for the eldership? To say that every man has such privilege is absurd.

Our position on this question is a very simple one; it is just this, that the negro has not the proper qualifications for the func-

tion of rule over white Southern Presbyterians. If the North considers him qualified to rule over them, we shall not question their judgment; they have a right to it, and we wish them the freest exercise of it; but we do not think him fit to rule over us; his character, ignorance, prejudice, habits, and associations all disqualify him; he would be merely and only a stumbling block and an offence in such a position. There is no law of God or man, no principle or practice of the Presbyterian Church North or South, that justifies this ruinous policy to which our brethren stand committed.

If this right be claimed for the negro, it must be claimed simply because he is a negro, for certainly no white man of his grade of character and intelligence could be permitted to exercise the functions of the eldership in the Southern Church, and we have yet to see any one advance the negro-ness of the negro as a positive qualification for office in the church.

In this discussion we have been studious to avoid thus far all reference and appeal to the distinctively social features and political influences that are indissolubly blended with the question, and enter therefore inevitably into it. We have done this in order, as far as possible, to place our argument upon grounds that might appeal to any reader, regardless of locality or latitude. But we are unwilling to allow any to suppose that we do not recognize the existence or force of such elements.

The influence of politics enters the question in the fact that the negroes almost *en masse* are opposed to the whites; they were unfortunately the willing tool and cat's paw of that horde of fortune-seekers who introduced the carnival of corruption which did all that was possible to make a hell of our home in the period that will ever be shame and reproach to our great nation. They did all that they could to perpetuate it, and they stand ever ready to reproduce it. It is the goal of their hopes and efforts still. They are solidly and persistently hostile to us. This is true of them as a race, and they are invariably united against us. They would be the same in any question of church policy. They would vote as solidly in this sphere as in the political. They themselves draw the color line distinctly in politics, and they maltreat any colored

man who votes otherwise. They would do the same in ecclesiastical matters. Of course any attempt to unite two such hostile elements in one church fellowship would be sheer folly. The influence of politics is very indirect, but nevertheless it is a real element in the question, to the extent that we have noted.

The social feature is of much more direct and potent influence. Our Northern friends seem disposed to pooh-pooh any objection based on this feature as purely imaginary; but we know the negro a great deal better than they do. This fact Dr. Field recognized in the extract we quoted from him some pages back. He seems also to have gained some inkling of the negro's disposition, judging from the following bit of advice:

"If I might, without being obtrusive, say a word to my colored brethren, it would be this: You too must work out your own salvation! That which is the law in entering the kingdom of God, is the law in all great moral undertakings: it is the law for every man, and you are no exception.

"Above all, don't try to be what God never made you to be, and what you cannot be, however much you try. The great trouble with the colored people of the South, is that they want to be white folks. But can the Ethiopian change his skin? In this foolish desire to be what they can *not* be, they lose the opportunity to be what they *can* be: to take a position of their own, in which they can keep their independence and their self-respect.

"Can anything be more childish than to complain that we are not treated with proper consideration? I sometimes hear a good honest colored man say 'white folks don't treat him 'spectful,' by which he means that they won't have anything to do with him socially. Well then, my good fellow, if I were in your place, I wouldn't have anything to do with them. They like to be by themselves, and so do you, for you feel a great deal more free, and enjoy yourself better; and if I were in your place, when I wanted to have a good time, I wouldn't have any white folks around!"

This disposition of the negro that Dr. Field criticises would surely lead to social complications. And we would interject here that the patent panacea for all negro defects, education, does not mend matters in the least; an "educated" negro is just as much negro as before, just the same raw hide volume with the incongruous addition of a gilt edge; he is only a little more aggressively offensive than his less ornate brother. Social complications are not at all lessened by education, nor mitigated by "light complexions" either.

Not very long ago, at a meeting of the Convention of the

Episcopal Diocese of N. C., in Raleigh, the bishop gave a reception to his clergy, and there was a very near approach to a disturbance growing out of just such a social complication.

While the majority of Northern writers agree in ridiculing this difficulty, some of them seem to appreciate it. We quote here from a letter by the Rev. George Miller, of Missouri:

“There seems to be but one of two possible issues to this vexed problem—either an exterminating race war, or amalgamation. And while the nation at large might find serious the task of preventing the one, the nation at large could not enforce the other. Appalling alternatives! . . . We of the North cannot reasonably blame our Southern brethren for declining to accept any basis of union, the trend of which is toward amalgamation. We would just as strongly revolt at doing so for ourselves, if it were with us a practical home question, as it is to-day with them. It may be wrong for them to demand an entirely separate church organism for the freedmen; but it is clearly both reasonable and just on their part to demand separate congregations, if not even separate presbyteries and synods. We of the North ought to place ourselves where our Southern brethren find themselves to-day; and we ought not, in Christian charity, to try to force on them possibilities against which we ourselves would indignantly revolt.

“Let us suppose a case. Here is a congregation made up of white and colored members. The colored people being more numerous will soon have a large majority. A pastor is to be called, and they vote in a colored brother. He is your pastor, your wife's, your daughter's pastor. He is, therefore, your equal socially; his children the peers of your children. His son calls on your daughter! Here comes the crisis; and how would you meet it? Are you ready to encourage amalgamation in your own home? No. You would do just as Abraham did (Gen. xxiv. 1-4), and feel as Rebekah felt (Gen. xxvii. 46). Until we are ready to invite such an event to our own homes can we insist upon forcing it upon others?

“Of course, in the case of mixed presbyteries and synods, the trouble is largely modified; and yet the tendency remains in sufficient strength to divest them of the character of a *sine qua non* to union.”

To sum it all up, we believe that every consideration of propriety, expediency, justice and right, justifies the position of the Southern church on this question. The dictates of reason and common sense, and the results of observation and experience, all agree in the support of our policy.

We have one remark to make in conclusion. It is frequently represented in the North that the Southern Presbyterian Church is held reluctantly in abeyance by the dominating influence of a few leaders whose age and prejudice and war memories embitter and blind them; that the body of the membership and the younger ministers feel very differently on all questions at issue between the two churches.

Now, we wish to say that we have grown to man's estate since the war, and its memories are mainly a tradition to us; moreover, our bitterest enemy could not accuse us of being a "leader in the Southern Presbyterian Church." Our views are generally our own, and they are eminently so in this instance; but we believe they are shared by our church with as absolute and hearty a unanimity as ever gave force and value to the convictions of an intelligent Christian people.

Columbia, South Carolina.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.