

REPORT

ON

FRATERNAL RELATIONS,

PRESENTED TO

THE PRESBYTERY OF MECKLENBURGH,

e AT

MALLARD CREEK CHURCH,

MAY 4, 1883.

BY

THE REV. A. W. MILLER, D. D.,

CHARLOTTE, N. C.:
Journal-Observer Steam Job Presses.
1883.

REPORT

—ON—

FRATERNAL RELATIONS.

The Committee respectfully recommend to the Presbytery of Mecklenburgh disapproval of the action of Atlanta Assembly, touching Fraternal Relations with the Northern Church, on the following grounds :

1. Because of its unauthorized, arbitrary reversal of the settled position of the Church ; taking into its own hands, and summarily disposing of a matter so grave in its character, and so far reaching in its consequences, without giving the Church, thro' the Presbyteries, opportunity to carefully consider the proposed change, and express its mind in relation thereto.

2. Because of the humiliating attitude in which it placed the Southern Church. The Northern Assembly having repeatedly refused to retract its slanderous charges against the Southern Church, then, for a Southern Assembly suddenly to abandon the only position consistent with self-respect, maintained for 17 years, and to take the initiative, and supplicate the Northern Assembly for a re-traxit, and even go so far as to draw up the form of it for them, and invite them to sign it, and offer as an inducement that they, the Southern Assembly, would sign it too, *mutatis mutandis* ; was a crouching posture of self-degradation, worthy of a spaniel but disgusting and disgraceful in a man, in a Christian, and much more so, in a Court of Jesus Christ.

3. For the Southern Assembly, in the so-called "concurrent

P18006

resolution," to confess, hypothetically, a sin, viz., libeling the Northern Church, which that Assembly knew had never been committed, was a hypocritical trick, worthy of a Jesuit. The framer of that resolution, himself, affirmed, that our charges against the Northern Church were not slanderous, but true, and he quoted the declaration of one of its leaders, (Dr. Humphrey,) that the Southern Assembly, had never slandered his Assembly, and that the former had nothing to regret or withdraw. It is idle for our Assembly to seek refuge from the charge of dissimulation, under the words: "*provided, or if* we have defamed the Northern Church," when our Assembly well knew there was no ground whatever for that "*provided,*" for that "*if.*"

4. Acquiescence by the Atlanta Assembly in the offensive and insulting action of the Springfield Assembly, in regard to the "concurrent resolution," has fixed a stigma upon the Southern Church.

We quote from the Northern Assembly's Record, and from the Northern Assembly's Minutes.

"Dr. Herrick Johnson on the floor: 'I want to call the attention of the Assembly to the possible significance of this action, to the inevitable inference that will be drawn from it, on the part of a great many of the loyal men in this country,—to what I believe is the natural inference and the irresistible inference, if the record be once considered. What do we declare in the resolution now before us that we regret? "While receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for, and withdrawal of, all expressions of our Assembly, which may be regarded as a reflection upon and offensive to the General Assembly, &c." Now, what words are they to which reference is made by the Southern Assembly, and by ourselves? You say by your action, "All words of either General Assembly, that have been offensive to the South we withdraw and regret?" Do you know what that means, when you cover the ground of the Old School and New School Assembly? Let me read some of the words: "Resolved, that inasmuch as the Presbyterian Church, in her past history, has frequently lifted up,

her voice against abuses, and has shown herself a champion of civil liberty, as against the despotism and anarchy of the civilized world, we should be recreant to our high trust, were we to withhold our earnest protest against all such unlawful and treasonable acts. Resolved, that inasmuch as we believe, according to our Form of Government, that God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under Him, over the people, for His own glory and the public good, and, to this end, hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defence and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evil doers. There is, in the judgment of this Assembly, no blood or treasure too precious to be devoted to the defence and perpetuity of the Government in all its constitutional authority." "Those are two resolutions passed in 1861; both of them were exceedingly offensive to our Southern brethren. We here, by this resolution, declare our regret for, and our withdrawal of these resolutions. (Cries of, "NEVER! NEVER!") He reads again: "Resolved, that the rebellion against such a Government as ours, and especially by those who have enjoyed their full share of its protection, honors, and rich blessings of every name, can have no excuse or palliation, and can be inspired by no other motives than those of ambition and avarice, and can find no parallel except in the past two great rebellions,—that which assailed the throne of Heaven directly, and that which filled our world with miserable apostates; "That was exceedingly offensive to our Southern brethren. And now the action of the Old School Assembly: "The Church of Christ has no authority from Him to make rebellion, or to counsel treason, or to favor anarchy in any case whatever. On the contrary, every follower of Christ has the personal liberty bestowed on him by Christ to submit for the sake of Christ, according to his own conscientious sense of duty, to whatever government, however bad, under which his lot may be cast. If in any case, treason, rebellion and anarchy can possibly be sinful, they are so in the case now desolating large portions of this nation, and laying waste great numbers of Christian congregations, and fatally obscuring every good word and work in those regions."

"These resolutions are on record, recognizing the duty of the people to sustain the Government, and endorsing the war as against rebellion and treason, and these resolutions, we all know, were offensive to the Southern brethren. Now does this action mean, that we are ready to express our regret for, and our withdrawal of, these resolutions? (Fervent voices, "No!") If "No," and this Assembly will say "No," then I will vote for the majority report without amendment. If the Assembly says, "Yes" then I must oppose until I die." (Great Applause.) "I ask a suspension of the rule that we may adopt the following resolution: "Resolved, that in the action now to be taken, we disclaim any reference to the action of preceding Assemblies concerning loyalty and rebellion but we refer only to the action concerning schism, heresy and blasphemy,"

Rev. Mr. Tully, of Florida, inquired, if this resolution was to accompany the reply to the South.

Dr. Johnson. It is no part of our action in reference to the Church, South.

The rules were suspended, and the resolution adopted.

Rev. Mr. Lawrence, of Biddle Institute: This is not to be embodied in the returned answer?

Dr. Johnson. No, sir.

Mr. Lawrence thought the matter had been ingeniously handled by the Moderator.

The resolution was passed unanimously, with hearty applause, and Dr. Johnson led the Assembly in the Doxology.

"The Report of the Committee was then adopted, and is as follows: The Moderator is instructed to telegraph to the Moderator of the General Assembly in session at Atlanta, Ga., that his telegram is received with warm enthusiasm by this Assembly, and in order to remove all difficulties in the way of that full and formal fraternal correspondence between the two Assemblies which we are on our part prepared to accept, we adopt the following, to wit: While receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly, which may be regarded as reflecting upon and offensive to the General Assem-

bly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and we re-
new the expression of our warm fraternal regard for all who com-
pose its communion, and our readiness to exchange delegates forth-
with." This report was adopted with great heartiness, only two
or three dissenting.

Dr. Phraner of Sing Sing said, "this report could never have
been adopted by such a vote as it was but for the preceding action"
(the Herrick Johnson resolution.) It is almost certain, that the
"concurrent resolution" would not have been adopted, had not the
Johnson resolution been previously adopted. But the Johnson
resolution was not intended by Springfield Assembly for the Atlanta
Assembly. Their Moderator told his body : "It is no part of our
action in reference to the Church, South. And so is not to be em-
bodied in the returned answer". Had it been formally embodied,
of course, it would have imperilled, if not killed outright, frater-
nity ! And if not *virtually* embodied, they would have imperilled,
if not killed themselves ! for they would be subjected to a consum-
ing fire, originated by, (to quote their language,) "the inevitable,
the irresistible inference that will be drawn from the concurrent
resolution, on the part a of great many of the loyal men in this
country."

But the presiding genius was equal to the emergency. A Janus
faced Paper, the first part looking to the North, the second to the
South solved the difficulty. But the first part "was not intended
for the Church, South." It must not come officially from Spring-
field to Atlanta. The former Assembly must not send it to the lat-
ter. The second part only, must be sent officially, that the bargain
may be complete. Still, in order that the bargain may not subse-
quently be renounced, by the discovery, sooner or later, of the
trick of withholding the first part, it was necessary it should be
brought, somehow, to the notice of the Southern body. And so,
after the second, or "concurrent" part had come first from Spring-
field, and Atlanta had sung the Doxology over the concluded bar-
gain, there came a private telegram from Dr. Johnson to Dr.
Smoot, as follows : "As matter of information, and in justice to
all parties I would say, that our Assembly's action on your basis

for fraternal relation was taken *mutatis mutandis*, with great heartiness, only two or three dissenting. Pending our action, the following resolution was passed: 'Resolved, that in the action now to be taken, we disclaim any reference to the action of preceding Assemblies concerning loyalty and rebellion, but we refer only to the action concerning schism, heresy and blasphemy.' We were led in prayer after final action, and sang the doxology amidst grateful and profound feeling. We shall welcome word from your Assembly concerning delegates." Dr. Johnson, as Moderator, told his Assembly, "this resolution is no part of our action in reference to the Church, South." Dr. Johnson, privately, tells Dr. Smoot, that "*in justice to all parties*" he acquaints him with the resolution. If "justice" to the South required this, it required it, officially, "as a part of the Northern Assembly's action in reference to the Church, South." The consistency between these two Johnson declarations has not been made to appear in his many "Attempts to make it plain."

This unofficial telegram staggered the Atlanta Assembly, at first as well it might, and, with any other than a deluded Body, would have instantly terminated all correspondence. But the old saying was verified in this case: *Quem Deus vult perdere prius de mentat*. The Southern Assembly notifies the Northern, that if this action does not modify the concurrent resolution they are prepared to send delegates forthwith. The response comes from Springfield: "The action referred to does not modify, but it explains the concurrent resolution, and the explanation is on the face of the action. There is nothing behind it or between the lines."

Some excellent brethren affirm that this is a misstatement, and others that it is a direct falsehood. We do not agree with them. We hold that the Northern Assembly's representation is exactly true. The Johnson resolution does not modify but explains the Concurrent Resolution. Bear in mind, that the former was adopted first, and by an unanimous vote, and, without which, the latter would not have been adopted at all. The former, in their estimation, far exceeds in importance the latter. And the latter must

not be allowed to qualify in the least the former ; but the former must interpret the latter. Now, the former retracts offensive expressions, touching schism, heresy, blasphemy, but refuses to retract the charges of treason and rebellion. And, therefore, when they in the Concurrent Resolution state that they "declare their regret for and withdrawal of all expressions regarded as reflecting upon or offensive to, the Southern Church," this is, by the Johnson resolution, necessarily restricted to expressions touching schism, heresy and blasphemy. For it says so in so many words. Evidently again, for when the Moderator called upon them to say whether they were willing to declare their regret for, and withdrawal of, the confessedly offensive resolutions of 1861, the Assembly cried out: "NEVER! NEVER!" The Johnson resolution then does not modify, but simply explains the other resolution, and the explanation is, as they say, on the face of it ; and there is nothing behind it, or between the lines. It means just what it says. Put the two in one, and it reads thus: "Whilst we refuse to retract anything relating to treason and rebellion, we do retract any expressions reflecting on, or offensive to, the Southern Church, relating to schism, heresy and blasphemy."

The duplicity and falsehood consisted in their designing to deceive and mislead the Atlanta Assembly. They believed that that Assembly would put a construction upon their language, different from their own, and they intended that they should. And so it turned out. The serpent beguiled them, and they did eat. They hypocritically affirm, that it is their desire "to remove all difficulties in the way of a full and formal fraternal correspondence," after declaring that they would never withdraw the charges of treason and rebellion, and "that they would be recreant to their high trust, were they to withdraw their protest against all such unlawful and treasonable acts!" This is what they call a "Concurrent Resolution:" This is their way of "removing difficulties!" These are "Fraternal Relations," with a vengeance!

Verily, "the matter was *ingeniously* handled by the Moderator." Much more "*ingeniously*," than *ingenuously*,—no mean specimen of Yankee diplomacy and duplicity. "After final action they sang

the Doxology amidst grateful and profound feelings !!!

The response of Atlanta was as follows: "*Resolved*, 1st, That this Assembly does hereby declare its entire satisfaction with the full and explicit terms in which the Gen. Ass. of the Pres. Ch. in U. S. A., has expressed its "reciprocal concurrence" in the paper transmitted to said Assembly on fraternal correspondence.

Resolved, 2d. That we do unfeignedly rejoice and render thanksgiving to God in an event suited to take away the reproach of alienation between bodies holding the same standards of faith, and tending to bring peace to our borders."

The mockery and insults shown to the Atlanta Assembly were acquiesced in; delegates appointed; and a Southern Assembly put thereby a stigma upon the Southern Church, exposing it to the contempt of the world.

5. "*Receding from no principle*;" thus begins the Concurrent Resolution adopted by both Assemblies, and involves the whole in a contradiction. "Receding from no principle," should, consistently, forbid all that follows, and forbid any so-called "Concurrent Resolution." Emphasis should be laid upon these words: "Receding from no principle." But they have not been marked as they deserve to be. This is the heart of the whole subject. "Receding from no principle" is the porch that prevents the erection of the "Fraternal" House—or, if erected, dissolves it into air. The Paper gives us a Porch, with an Air-Castle joining it!

What, then, are the *principles* of the Northern Church? We have already given the action of 1861, as quoted and re-affirmed by the Springfield Assembly, declaring that the Southern "Rebellion" can only be paralleled by the rebellion of the Devil in Heaven, and of Adam in Paradise. The O. S. Assembly of 1862, declared it to be "the clear and solemn duty of the National Government to preserve at whatever cost, the National Union and Constitution, to maintain the laws in their supremacy, to crush force by force, &c., &c." In 1863, it said: "No causes now exist to vindicate the disloyalty of American citizens towards the U. S. Government." In 1864, it said: "Under the influence of the most *incomprehensible infatuation of wickedness*, those who were most interested

in the perpetuation of slavery have *taken away every motive for further toleration.*" In 1865, it said: "This Assembly regards the Civil Rebellion for the perpetuation of negro-slavery as a great crime, both against our National Government, and against God, and the secession of those Presbyteries and Synods from the Presbyterian Church, in such circumstances, and for such reasons, as unwarranted, schismatical and unconstitutional.—This Assembly will recognize loyal persons as constituting the Churches, Presbyteries and Synods, in all the bounds of the schism, and will use earnest endeavors to restore and revive all such churches and church courts.—Where any three ministers, who entertain the views above mentioned, belong to the same Presbytery, such ministers are hereby authorized and directed to continue their organization as a Presbytery." In reply to the protest of Dr. Sam'l R. Wilson, that this action is "calculated to promote strife and discord among the brethren in the South themselves, and to widen and perpetuate the breach already existing to so sad an extent between the Northern and Southern portions of the Presbyterian Church," the Assembly said: "They recognize the fact that the directions given by them will involve much personal affliction, and perhaps, in some instances, temporary hardships. But for this they are not responsible. Those who have sown the wind must expect to reap the whirlwind. Duty to the Great Head of the Church forbids that the Assembly should compromise with heresy and sin; nor can they walk in any way as 'more excellent', because apparently more peaceful, which involves such compromise. They know no scriptural way by which those who have gone out from us, proclaiming heresy, can be restored to the bosom of the church, until after recantation, or those who have fallen into the grievous sin of treason, but upon confession and repentance." (Minutes, 1865.)

The Assembly of 1866 ordered, that every Minister from the South, applying for admission into a Northern Presbytery, who "was concerned at any time in aiding or countenancing the rebellion and the war which had been waged against the U. S., be required to confess and forsake his sin in this regard before he shall be received. And if it be found, that he holds either of these doc-

trines, viz: that the system of negro slavery in the South is a Divine institution, and that it is 'the peculiar mission of the Southern Church to conserve the institution of slavery as there maintained,' he be not received without renouncing and forsaking these errors."

The Assembly of 1866 also said: "It appears that six General Assemblies in succession, including the present, have with remarkable unanimity, maintained the same position concerning the rebellion, and concerning those engaged in it. After carefully reviewing the whole course of these years of strife and alienation, we find nothing to recall or modify in the deliverances which have been made."

The New School Assembly of 1863 said: "Since the existing rebellion finds no justification in the facts of the case, or the Constitution of the U. S., in any law, human or divine, the Assembly can regard it only as treason against the Nation, and a most offensive sin in the sight of God, justly exposing its authors to the retributive vengeance of earth and heaven. This rebellion in its origin, history and measures, has been distinguished by those qualities which most sadly evince the depravity of our nature, especially in seeking to establish a new nationality on this continent, based on the perpetual enslavement and oppression of a weak and long-injured race." In 1865, that Assembly said: "Regarding the forcible secession of the Southern Aristocracy as treason against a most beneficent Government, and as treason rendered peculiarly malignant and wicked by the fact that it was committed with the avowed purpose of sustaining and perpetuating the system of Slavery,—a system in direct opposition to the Gospel and the principles of religious liberty—the Assembly condemned it in the name of God, and pledged to the Government a hearty support in the effort to crush it. Each succeeding Assembly reiterated this action. Our churches with entire unanimity responded by word and deed, to these sentiments. Our record as a church we commit to the calm judgment of posterity, in the full assurance that there is neither a line nor a word the Christian patriotism of the future will desire to erase; not a single sentiment befitting our

relation with this great conflict it will find unexpressed."

In 1865, that Assembly directed its Presbyteries not to receive Southern Ministers, unless they give satisfactory evidence of sincere repentance of the sin of rebellion.

In 1865, it used these words: "Let it not be said that, as a Church, we have nothing to do with civil legislation. The day has gone by, when an intelligent christian will affirm the doctrine that what is wrong in religion is right in politics. — — — We desire to pledge to Andrew Johnson, as our constitutional Chief Magistrate, our confidence and support in his efforts to vindicate the majesty of law; maintain the National Government in its just supremacy; destroy the spirit and counteract the workings of the evil system that created this war; inspire a just appreciation of the crime of treason, and a true loyalty to the Government in the breasts of the masses of the white population of the South, and extend to the colored citizens of that section the practical enjoyment of those personal and political rights announced in the Declaration of Independence, but denied them by a despotic aristocracy."

Here then are the *principles* of the Northern Church, from which they declared in 1882, they do not recede. Tho' from the existence of the U. S. Government, two opposing theories respecting its nature and powers, have existed, dividing the country, the one held by the North, the other by the South, yet an ecclesiastical Assembly assumes to decide between them, and determine what is political orthodoxy, and what political heterodoxy, and to prescribe the former, and forbid the latter to its members, enjoining the one as a duty, condemning the other as a sin, an offence to be visited with ecclesiastical penalties. The Southern Assembly, on the contrary, carries out the teachings of the Confession of Faith. "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical, and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary." The Northern Assembly eschews this principle, proclaims itself the "champion of civil liberty," to use its own language, and declares that they "would be recreant

to their high trust were they to withhold their earnest protest against all unlawful and treasonable acts." They offer themselves as allies to the government in crushing secession and slavery. The Assembly proved itself to be a *Political Propaganda*; and as their ablest Divine, Dr. Chas. Hodge, declared, "*they violated the Constitution of the Church and usurped the prerogative of the Divine Master.*"

They were indeed guilty of this, and as they reaffirmed, in 1882, the action of past Assemblies, they are still guilty of this.

Here there is an "irrepressible conflict" between two principles, as represented by two Churches. If we "do not recede from our principles" we are bound to testify to the spirituality of the Church, and to testify against those who sacrifice that spirituality, and to do this in plain, unmistakable terms, of condemnation, and which expressions, therefore, *our principles* forbid us to retract, which if we do, it would be false to say, we "recede from no principle." But this is what we did do. The Atlanta Assembly suggested to the Springfield Assembly its own terms of reciprocity: "receding from no principle." And this was the very reason why the Southern Church separated from the Northern, because of its unscriptural principles, from which it would not recede; and its condemnation of which the Southern Church was, and is, solemnly bound plainly to express!

The Northern Assembly also declare that they "recede from no principle." Then, as their *principles* led them to condemn us for schism, heresy, and blasphemy, as well as treason and rebellion, it is evident that, tried by their standard, we are still guilty of the former, as well as the latter; and if so, what great objection could there be to their continuing to say so? *Our* guilt is *implied* by *their* principles, whether expressed or not. Why should the expressions be withdrawn if the guilt continues? If they withdraw the expressions, is it true then, that they "recede from no principle," when their principles require them to condemn, and to express their condemnation, of schism, heresy, blasphemy, as well as treason and rebellion? What are principles worth without expression? It is certain that the Southern Church has not repented

of the "sin of slavery," and does not expect to, and that it does not believe it to be a sin at all. Yet the Northern Assembly of 1882, whilst withdrawing offensive expressions—"heresy," "blasphemy"—characterizing thus the Southern view of slavery—at the same time endorses and re-affirms the offensive action of 1861, which condemned and stigmatized both secession and slavery! THEIR PRINCIPLES ARE VASTLY MORE OFFENSIVE THAN THEIR EXPRESSIONS. Apart from the former, we forgive the latter, when retracted. Their insulting, offensive principles, if not abandoned, it is our duty never to forgive. If one man says to another, in substance if not in so many words: "Whilst not receding from my principles, which still constrain me to regard you as a rascal and a criminal, yet my former denunciation of you as such, I regret and withdraw"; would the other be constrained to express "his entire satisfaction with the full and explicit" retraxit, and upon the resumption of "fraternal relations" would he "unfeignedly rejoice" and sing the doxology?

The charges against us of treason and rebellion have never been withdrawn, but are still preferred; and the charges of schism, heresy, and blasphemy are still implied, for our slanderers declare that they do not recede from their principles—shewing thus how groundless is the assertion that "the Springfield Assembly came up to the Baltimore platform," improperly lowered though that was. "Are we willing," as has been well said, "to taint with this infamy the memory of our dead martyrs, to wear this livery of shame ourselves, and then transmit it as an heirloom to our children?"

Touching the principles of the Northern Church in regard to slavery, our General Assembly of 1865 spake the words of truth and wisdom: "While the existence of slavery may, in its civil aspects, be regarded as a settled question, an issue now gone, yet the lawfulness of the relation as a question of social morality and scriptural truth, has lost nothing of its importance. When we solemnly declare to you, brethren, that the dogma which asserts the inherent sinfulness of this relation is unscriptural and fanati-

cal; that it is condemned not only by the Word of God, but by the voice of the Church in all ages; *that it is one of the most pernicious heresies of modern times; that its countenance by any Church is a just cause of separation from it,* (1 Tim. 6: 1-5,) we have surely said enough to warn you away from this insidious error, as from a fatal shore."

The doctrine of Abolitionists is here truly described as "one of the most pernicious heresies of modern times, and its countenance by any Church is a just cause of separation from it," and the Scripture quoted, in proof, is 1 Tim. 6: 1-5, which reads thus: "Let as many servants (*douloi, slaves,* and so admitted by Dr. Hodge,) as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." Calvin's comment is this: "Slaves who have unbelieving masters are ready enough with the objection that it is unreasonable that they who serve the devil should have dominion over the children of God. But Paul throws back the argument to the opposite side, that they ought to obey unbelieving masters, in order that the name of God and the Gospel may not be evil spoken of; *as if God, whom we worship, incites us to rebellion, and as if the Gospel rendered obstinate and disobedient those who ought to be subject to others!*"

"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort."

"These things teach and exhort." "He means," says Calvin, "that these are matters on the teaching of which he ought to dwell largely, and wishes that doctrine should be accompanied by exhortations. It is as if he had said that this kind of instruction ought to be daily repeated, and that men need not only to be taught, but likewise to be roused and urged by frequent exhortations."

"If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, *even to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness,* he is proud, knowing nothing,

but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strifes, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; *from such withdraw thyself,*" or *draw off*, or *away from*, *have no intercourse with*, as the word signifies (*Aphistaso apo*).

Calvin remarks: "Paul forbids the servants of Christ to have any intercourse with such persons. He not only warns Timothy not to resemble them, but exhorts him to avoid them as dangerous plagues; for although they do not openly resist the gospel, but, on the contrary, make a false profession of adhering to it, yet their society is infectious. Besides, if the multitude see that we are on friendly terms with those men, the danger is, lest they insinuate themselves under the guise of our friendship. We should therefore labor to the utmost that all may know, that so far are we from being agreed with them, *that they have no communication with us.*" Here, then, is solid Bible ground on which to stand—*have no intercourse with those* whose doctrine as to slavery, as well as other points, differs from that of the Apostle here, and is condemned by him. This forbids not only organic union with Abolitionists, *but also Fraternal Relations with them.* With Ministers and members of the Northern Church, who are in her but not of her, who are not representatives of that communion and have no sympathy with its heresies, but condemn them, we may, of course, fraternize consistently. But with a Church condemned here by the Apostle as heretical, we may not, as such, affiliate. The command is, "*have no intercourse with them.*" Had our Church planted herself firmly on this Bible-ground, and maintained her position, she would have saved herself a world of trouble, and at least have commanded the respect of her enemies. But what has she gained by a compromising, half-way, Laodicean policy? Only the contempt and insults of her foes. It was said at the close of the war, *that to pursue the narrow path of rigid principle "would leave her out in the cold, forsaken by the world."* But light and heat come from the sun, not from the world. Had she followed Christ, her Sun, content with His smiles, and regardless of a frowning world, He would not have suffered her to lack light and heat. She would

have walked in His light and been warmed by His love. The Pillar of Cloud by Day and of Fire by Night would have afforded her both guidance and protection against all her foes. The Holy Spirit would have made the Crown of Thorns upon her head, a Crown of Glory, a Diadem of Beauty, and clothed her testimony with such power as all her adversaries would be unable to gain-say and resist. But she evaded her Cross and lost her Crown.

6. The doctrinal character of the Northern Church forbids any fraternal relations with her. By reason of the union of Old and New School without any change on the part of the latter, the present Northern Church is, of course, the representative of all the heresies of the New School. Dr. Hodge declared that "by this union, the Old School Church *was dead*, and, said he, if truth be lost, all is lost." The New School is the predominant power in the Northern Church. The controversies between the Old and New School that are now, in their Presbyterian Quarterly Review, the organ of both parties, agitating the Northern Church, threaten to rend it at no distant day. Broadchurchism, or skepticism, assailing the inspiration of the Scriptures, is rearing its impudent front, defiantly, in that communion, and alarming and vexing the souls of the righteous within her, who fear the Lord and shrink from laying an unhallowed hand upon His Word. The heretical element in her, now predominant, will not "consent to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness." And are we to affiliate with this? "*From such withdraw thyself,*" *have no intercourse with them*—is the decisive injunction of the Head of the Church, which will be obeyed by all who fear the Lord.

7. When a separation between Churches is caused by opposing principles, no such relations can be allowed, which may destroy or weaken the testimony which truth requires should be maintained against error. The Louisville Assembly of 1870 justly observed: "It may seem to some that any hesitancy on our part to enter into correspondence with any Church, is out of accord with the spirit of the times, which finds expression in formal protestations of amity and unity between all evangelical Christians. But a

little reflection will make it manifest that this want of accord is only apparent, not real, so far as relates to any unity which is founded on a common reverence for the truth of Christ. For, in every case of separation between brethren of the same Church, on account of errors held, or supposed to be held, on the one side; and the purpose to testify against the same on the other, a formal recognition of each other may be incompatible with the very end held in view in the separation. It may involve an utter obscuration of the testimony of the witnesses. Thus it will be remembered there was no official correspondence between the two bodies into which our Church divided in 1837-38 for the space of twenty-five years, though each held official correspondence with other bodies even less near to them in doctrine and order. Nor, indeed, was such correspondence even proposed until it was suggested as a preliminary to organic re-union. The Christian instincts of both bodies suggested that such correspondence must involve the inconsistency, on the part of each, of standing apart from the other, while under not only the same articles of faith, but the same constitution—each bearing witness against the other while affecting relations of unity.”

If the essentially different character of the opposing principles of the Northern and Southern Churches constitutes no valid barrier against fraternal relations, then neither against organic union. If two Churches, so opposite, should fraternize, they should also unite. If the separating principles are sacrificed on one side, what is there to prevent union? If they should not unite, they should not fraternize, especially where, as in this case, the fraternizing is avowedly designed by the one Church to prepare the way for, and terminate in, organic union.

The following plain utterance of the *Presbyterian Journal* expresses the mind of the entire Northern Church: “We do not hesitate to say that it is only as a step towards re-union that we care for this Fraternal Relation movement.” And yet such an admission will have no effect whatever in opening the eyes of those who are voluntarily blind to the dangers which beset us. It

is very evident that the work of disintegration has begun among us. A member of the Atlanta Assembly was not ashamed to disclose the mercenary motive which influenced him and many others: "We need," said he, "the *material aid* which fraternity"—(and of course, union,)—"would bring us. Asking for favors on the one hand, and refusing fellowship on the other, is about the most inconsistent thing we can do, *and that we are doing every day.*" Another Southern minister writes to the *N. Y. Observer*: "*A few hundred dollars, sent in a quiet way, to relieve and encourage our poor churches, almost disorganized and ruined by the war, would accomplish the happiest results.*"

A few hundred dollars, sent in a quiet way!!

The Philadelphia *Presbyterian* parades the following: "A minister in the far South, writing to a friend in Philadelphia, says: 'Dr. Dabney will make as egregious a failure as he did in the Park case. He cannot controul the Southern Church. It is folly for him to try. Dr. Smith, of the *S. W. Presbyterian*, cannot controul us. I tell you, we are *coming*; we are in dead earnest.'"

Yes! they *are* in "dead earnest." Their policy is settled. Their course is Northward. "We are coming," is the cry. And through the open door of "Fraternal Relations" will they, and a multitude more, enter the Northern Church. The only question is, How many, or how few, will be left behind? for re-union is now only a question of time, and it is useless to shut our eyes to inevitable destiny; for where a road is continuously travelled, the end must be reached sooner or later. The Southern Church, as a whole, it is now impossible to save. There is not virtue enough left in her to save her. Decisive action only can save a remnant. The longer that is deferred, the smaller this will be. The establishment of Fraternal Relations means Union, and Union means *Death*. We may say, with Dr. Hodge, "by this union, the Old School Southern Church is dead. If truth be lost, all is lost." Fraternal Relations being established, prompt Secession on the part of Presbyteries that continue loyal to Christ alone can save them. And this Confederacy of Presbyteries, reduced to a handful, it may be

like Gideon's Band, yet, like Gideon's Band, marshalled under a Divine Leader, shall go forth, in unbroken phalanx, to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and afford, another proof, that "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts," do the soldiers of Christ "subdue kingdoms, stop the mouths of lions, quench the violence of fire, out of weakness are made strong, wax valiant in fight, and turn to flight the armies of the aliens" !

"Strong in the strength which God supplies,
Thro' His eternal Son,
Strong in the Lord of Hosts,
And in His mighty power,
Who in the strength of Jesus trusts
Is more than conqueror."

The Committee recommend the adoption of the following Resolution:

Resolved, That the Presbytery of Mecklenburg disapproves of the action of Atlanta Assembly, 1882, concerning Fraternal Relations with the Northern church.

Respectfully submitted,

A. W. MILLER, *Chairman of Committee.*

MALLARD CREEK CHURCH,

Mecklenburg County, N. C., May 4, 1883.

The above resolution was adopted almost unanimously, only two dissenting.

APPENDIX.

The remaining history of "Fraternal Relations" shows the measure of our humiliation to be complete. The Northern Delegates appeared before the Lexington Assembly and entertained that body with a profusion of *studied gush*; one speaker comparing the two churches to two belligerent clouds, dreadfully charged with electricity, approaching each other, intent on war and ruin, but having prudently relieved themselves of their excess of "brimstone" by "much agitation, thundering and lightning, as with the voice of great guns, until the electrical condition of both was equalized, and then the clouds uniting and blending into one in the blessed wedlock of the skies, sailed majestically on, pouring out of their united fulness a baptism of life upon the thirsty fields."

Alas, for "the thirsty fields"! They will be thirstier than ever. No "baptism of life," no refreshing rains can they receive, *for there's nothing but wind in those clouds.*

Before the Saratoga Assembly appeared two delegates, who dishonoured and disgraced the Southern Church. The one a dotard, who professed to have so "fallen in love with the Northern Moderator, that he proposed to capture him and make him the Moderator of the Southern Assembly at Vicksburg." The other, a traitor, who, not only "overleaped the past," *but overleaped the Southern into the Northern Church*, at the very time he professed to represent the former, having, according to the Saratoga correspondent of the Boston *Congregationalist*, already accepted an invitation to Detroit.

The pressure for an explanation of the Herrick Johnson Springfield Resolution being felt in the Saratoga Assembly, Dr. Crosby offered the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, some differences of opinion have been manifested concerning the true import of the Resolution adopted in May, 1882, by the two General Assemblies, sitting respectively in Atlanta, Ga., and Springfield, Ill.

Resolved, That this General Assembly understands that Resolution to declare the steadfast adherence of each of those General Assemblies to *all the principles* which its predecessors had affirmed upon the question on which the two Assemblies had held opposite convictions; while each Assembly avowed its regret for and withdrawal of all aspersions, which either may have been understood

to cast on the christian character of ministers, or constituents of the other Assembly; and in this sense this Assembly cordially affirms that Resolution."

But even this was too much for the irrepressible Dr. Herrick Johnson, who immediately rose, objected to the resolution and moved its reference to a committee—of which he was made a member. The following is their report:

"The committee to whom was referred the resolution regarding the bearing of the deliverance of last year's Assembly in behalf of fraternal relations with the Southern Church, respectfully report, That fraternal relations having been happily established between the two Assemblies on the basis of the withdrawal of all imputations that may have been officially made from either side against the Christian character of the other, no further action of this Assembly is necessary."

Here is a contemptuous refusal to give the desired explanation! Fraternal Relations were "established" at Atlanta, and the Northern Assembly has nothing more to say! And so, Dr. Nicolls stated to the Lexington Assembly: "There has been some unfavourable criticism upon the terms on which this fraternal correspondence has been established; and more especially on the explanatory resolution in the action of the Assembly which we represent. *Our mission to you is not one of apology, explanation, or confession. The time for that is past.*"

The time for that is past! Saratoga declares, that fraternal relations were established on the preceding year's basis of withdrawal of all imputations. What the "Springfield withdrawal" amounts to, we have seen. And no further explanation of the unsatisfactory "explanation" is to be given. *The time for that is past!* The matter is closed. "*No further action of this Assembly is necessary,*" says Saratoga. The Southern Church asks for an explanation, and a slap in the face is the only response. And, as they "recede from no principle," there could be no other response. Thus writes a Presbyterian from Saratoga to the Boston Congregationalist: "*I find that there is a large, though quiet, element, which is not going to unmake history by going back upon the glorious national history of the past 21 years.*"

Dr. Herrick Johnson, in supporting his resolution, said: "I trust that, with this, all rancour, and bitterness, and alienation, and suspicion, and necessity of explanation, will go down to the fathomless sea of oblivion forever, and that henceforth whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, we will think on these things."

We challenge an instance that equals this for shameless decep-

tion, astounding hypocrisy, and audacious assumption of incompetency on the part of the Southern Church to see through it all ! If his resolutions contained "things that are true," "just," "honest," "lovely and of good report," we would love to find them, and, with complacency and delight, would "think on these things." But instead of this, we find things that are *false, tricky, dishonest, scandalous*; and as the Master bids us "be wise as serpents," we intend to be ever on our guard, and ever to *think on these things*; and the "ingenious handling" of Dr. Herriek Johnson.

The Saratoga correspondent of the *Congregationalist* adds these words of comfort for the sycophantick South :

"Many Northern men feel that organick union is to be deprecated rather than sought. *The Southern Church is as poor as it is proud, and would simply enlarge the Home Missions field of the Assembly, which has already more work upon its hands in the West than it can do.*"

If one drop makes a cup overflow, we would suppose that *this drop* would suffice not only to make the Southern cup of "Fraternal relations" overflow, but utterly to empty it!

Is this one kick enough to arouse us, or, lost to all Christian manhood, will the Southern spaniel continue to crouch at the Northern Master's feet?

Those only who are asleep, may be aroused. But the great majority are not asleep. Not stupor, but apostasy, characterizes their state. Words of warning have not a feather's weight with them. It is impossible to save the Southern Church. It is hastening to, and soon to be engulfed in, the Northern Maelstrom. Only a remnant can be saved. And only prompt, decisive action can save that. The critical time has come.

It is now, *or never*.

A. W. M.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.