

ARTICLE VIII.

THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC AND THE DEBS
INSURRECTION.

BY MR. Z. SWIFT HOLBROOK.

THE American Republic is the fruitage of a religious inspiration. Our democratic institutions, our notions of liberty and equality, had their origin with men who practised every form of self-denial, that they might be free from hierarchical authority and worship God according to the dictates of conscience. They were not men, like the colony that landed at Jamestown in 1607, moved by the spirit of adventure or by the desire to acquire,—both worthy and useful passions when subordinated to higher ends,—but they came to an unknown land, braving the perils of the sea and enduring the privations incident to such a perilous journey, that they might have freedom to worship God.

To what extent these men had caught the inspiration of Luther and had given it a new interpretation, need not here be traced; but the age was one of discovery, of heroism, of adventure, of awakened intellect,—giving the world the revival of faith, hope, and learning. It was the Elizabethan Age in literature. It was the period of the centuries when, freed from the bonds of ecclesiastical authority, individualism burst the barriers which had restrained it, and men took on new conceptions of liberty and of individual worth. Man as an individual, a unit, free and independent in his relations to the unseen, and bound by social compacts only because thus his individualism found higher freedom and fuller development,—this was the conception that inspired

the men who founded this Republic, and was enunciated by those choicest minds and spirits of the seventeenth century.

It was not a mere intellectual conception; it was a spiritual experience, involving the conscience, and having practical relations with life, liberty, property, and reputation. For these very reasons it led the Pilgrims and the Puritans across the sea.

When man has tasted the sweets of liberty, persecution augments, but it cannot destroy, its growth. Wyclif caught the idea one hundred and forty years before Luther, and taught that the New Testament is a sufficient guide in church government. The growth of that idea and its final permanency in men's minds, before the assent of king and priest, cost many lives and untold suffering. Henry VIII., Edward VI., Bloody Mary, and Queen Elizabeth found people who, with Peter, said, It is right to obey God rather than men. That class sought to purify the church,—its clergy, its membership, its forms of worship, and its ordinances. They were known as Puritans. It was a common thing for them to resist unto the death any attempt of human authority to take the place of Christ over the conscience.

While democratic and social equality were terms that in 1631 had no meaning, for no one could have a voice in town affairs unless he had been elected a freeman by the Court, and, after May 31, 1631, unless he was a church member, yet Robert Browne, the founder of the first Congregational church in Norwich, England, in 1580,

"clearly stated and defended the theory that every man had a right to choose and practice such religion as his conscience approved; and that the king, hierarchy or magistrate had no right to meddle in any way with his liberty of conscience. . . . This defense of absolute toleration by Browne is a whole generation before the writers whom the Baptist historians claim to be the originators and two generations before Roger Williams."¹

No student of history in the historical development of

¹ William Frederick Poole, in *Dial*, August, 1880.

modern free thought can ignore the origin, growth, and development of Congregationalism.

"New England was settled under this polity, and its influence was dominant for two centuries in moulding New England institutions."¹

As the individual was the unit of power in church and state, it was essential that all the citizens should be educated; hence colleges and free schools were established at the outset.

"This zeal for education prompted the people of Massachusetts to found a college before they were yet free from the perils of starvation, and to establish a complete system of free schools before the first generation born in their new home had passed the age of childhood."¹

Thus the Pilgrims of 1620 from Holland and the Puritans from England (of whom some 22,000 came over between 1630 and 1640) laid those solid foundation-stones—religion, morality, knowledge—which have ever been the basis of our institutions. It was a most felicitous and providential union, that—the Pilgrim a Separatist and the Puritan an Independent; for it combined the intense religious zeal and other-worldliness of the one, tuned to so high a pitch, with the healthy regard for this world and the practical affairs of life so characteristic of the other. The Pilgrim was earnest to secure a mansion in the skies; while the Puritan, none the less zealous for that heavenly home, kept his economic eye on a corner lot on earth. The Massachusetts Colony soon learned to know cod no less than religion; and they mixed in delightful proportions a zeal for fishery and whaling with that for religious discussions and protracted meetings; they compounded in an ingenious manner a love for New England rum with a clear conscience toward God; "pine-tree shillings and piety"; a love for heaven and a perfect willingness to remain on earth.

But the Puritans, under Governor Winthrop, were moulded in their religious and intellectual life by the Pilgrims. The

¹ William Frederick Poole, in *Dial*, 1880.

Puritans had attempted in England to purify and reform the church through the State; but when on American soil they soon saw that the

"best service the State can render to religion is to leave it free to live and act according to its own nature, in obedience to its own laws, prompted by its own impulses, guided by its own spirit and judgment."¹

The Cambridge Platform of 1648 has been the authoritative manual of the church for two centuries, and a comparison of it with the Declaration of the National Council of 1871 will reveal how clearly and uniformly Congregationalism has moved along a definite line of thought in its polity.

The compact in the Mayflower was a covenant binding the Pilgrims to all due submission and obedience unto such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and officers from time to time as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the community; and they clearly stated that they combined into a civil body-politic for their better ordering and preservation. And the motive asserted was the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith. As De Tocqueville well says,

"A democracy more perfect than any which antiquity had dreamed of started in full size and panoply from the midst of an ancient feudal society."²

The divine and natural order for the development of society are all on the Mayflower in the germ. Religion seeking divine assistance, and wisdom, with good-will toward one another, which is its natural fruitage; or, in other words, morality; and evincing itself in the loftiest notions of liberty and equality. This is the true historical and scientific development; for, as De Tocqueville says,

"Liberty cannot be established without morality, nor morality without faith."³

As has been said: "Here was the spirit of religion and

¹ Encyclopædia Britannica, "Independent."

² Democracy in America, p. 35. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

the spirit of liberty, which so often were in open conflict," happily combined and united to accomplish a result. And what was that result? Congregationalism in religious affairs and democracy in civil affairs, for democracy implies equality, —one being the same as another in law.

As to the notions of liberty which prevailed among the Puritans who came over with Governor Winthrop in June, 1630, hear what he says:—

"Nor would I have you to mistake in the point of your own liberty. There is a liberty of corrupt nature which is affected both by men and beasts to do what they list; and this liberty is inconsistent with authority, impatient of all restraint; by this liberty, '*sumus omnes deteriores*': 'tis the grand enemy of truth and peace, and all the ordinances of God are bent against it. But there is a civil, a moral, a federal liberty which is the proper end and object of authority; it is a liberty for that only which is just and good: for this liberty you are to stand with the hazard of your very lives, and whatsoever crosses it, is not authority but a distemper thereof. This liberty is maintained in a way of subjection to authority; and the authority set over you will, in all administrations for your good, be quietly submitted unto by all but such as have a disposition to shake off the yoke and lose their true liberty, by their murmuring at the honour and power of authority."¹

This whole conception of liberty is biblical, and founded on Christ's definition, that only truth (or law) can set free. This idea of liberty became the sentiment of New England; and Governor John Treadwell, of Connecticut, wrote a letter to Rev. Nathaniel Emmons, July 11, 1800, in which he says:

"Liberty I love; but it is that liberty which results from the most perfect subjugation of every soul to the empire of law, and not that which is sought by illuminers and atheists."²

Weeden says:—

"In 1641 these legislators whether in their political or ecclesiastical capacity never conceived any polity which should grant freedom of action in the modern sense. They did not believe such a society to be possible and they would not have considered it desirable. Freedom and liberty meant the working out of a life soberly restrained according to the will of the majority. This major will was directed divinely through the medium

¹ De Tocqueville, *Democracy*, p. 42.

² *Biography of Emmons*, by Edwards A. Park.

of the Bible interpreted by pastors and elders. This was the mind of Massachusetts and Connecticut."¹

Josiah Quincy said, that liberty of conscience would have produced anarchy in the seventeenth century. This conception of liberty and equality is the gift of Congregationalism to the Republic, and its fruitage is seen in Mr. Lincoln's high thought of obedience to law:—

"Let reverence for law be breathed by every mother to the lisping babe that prattles in her lap; let it be taught in the schools, seminaries and colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling-books and almanacs; let it be preached from pulpits and proclaimed in legislative halls and enforced in courts of justice; in short let it become the political religion of the nation."

The late Dr. William Frederick Poole wrote as follows:—

"The rise and growth of Congregationalism make an important chapter in the historical development of modern free thought. It is in religion what democracy is in the conduct of civil affairs. It inculcates the duty and right of each individual to interpret the Scriptures for himself and vests all ecclesiastical power in the brotherhood of each local church as an independent body. Every other human authority in spiritual affairs, whether it be council, hierarchy or synod, it rejects together with all antiquated symbols, rites, functionaries and other machinery which come between the individual soul and its Maker. It is the exaltation of the individual, and the dethronement of all outside spiritual dictation. . . . It was the polity under which New England was settled, and there it was the dominant influence for two centuries in moulding its institutions. It is not strange that a system so unlike that of England and the other nations of Europe should have wrought out an independent and peculiar people. As the individual was the unit of power in Church and State, it was essential that all the citizens should be educated; and hence colleges and free schools were established at the outset. Such a development of individualism was necessarily the occasion of many internal controversies and disputes; but both State and Church withstood the strain, grew strong under it, and enjoyed a material and social prosperity such as fell to the lot of none of the other early American colonies."²

On September 4, 1633, there arrived in Boston a man of heroic faith and scholarly attainments,—the Rev. Thomas Hooker. His coming was destined to have far-reaching re-

¹ Economic and Social History of New England, Vol. i. p. 179.

² Poole's review of Dexter's Congregationalism, in the Dial, 1880.

sults in its effect on the life and development of the colonies; for he was the one who inspired the Connecticut Constitution, and first stated clearly, not only the right of the people to elect their magistrates, but to limit them in their powers by laws which they must follow. In other words, the absolute sovereignty of the people, or democracy in its modern sense.

Mr. Hooker had been a fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, England, and had been influenced profoundly by the teachings of that most eminent divine, Thomas Cartwright. It is significant that Emmanuel College was regarded as a Puritan institution, and the men it graduated were all of a distinct and pronounced type. Such were Robert Browne, Nathaniel Ward of Ipswich, Thomas Hooker, and John Cotton. For his opinions, Mr. Hooker was persecuted, and cited to appear before the High Commission Court in England, July 10, 1630. He fled to Holland and then to America. His ideas of liberty, equality, and democracy were dearly bought. They were not intellectual discoveries; they were spiritual experiences. Hear his words:—

“We (as it becometh Christians) stand upon the sufficiency of Christ’s institutions, for all kynde of worship; and that exclusively the word and nothing but the word, in matters of Religious worship. . . . Christ we know; and all that cometh from him we are ready to embrace. But these human ceremonies in divine worship we know not, nor can have anything to doe with them.”¹

Hooker was a giant in stature, in faith, and in intellect. After remaining in Massachusetts a few years, he went to Hartford, Conn., in 1636. It is well to remember that the Massachusetts government was not, and was never intended to be, democratic.² Mr. Hooker was exceedingly jealous for popular liberty, and his influence among his early associates in the Massachusetts Colony is revealed by the statement, made by an early chronicler, that,

¹ Walker’s Life of Hooker (Dodd, Mead & Co.), p. 58.

² *Ibid.*, p. 119.

"after Mr. Hooker's coming over, it was observed that many of the free-men grew to be very jealous of their liberties."¹

In the autumn of 1638, Governor Winthrop, who was an aristocrat, and had never divested himself of aristocratic notions, even in government, wrote a letter to Mr. Hooker² expostulating with him about—

"the unwarrantableness and unsafeness of referring matters of counsel or judicature to the body of the people, because the best part is always the least, and of that best part the wiser part is always the lesser."

Mr. Hooker replied that the judges must simply enforce the law, and the general counsel should be chosen by all; and he even goes so far as to say that otherwise it would lead to tyranny and so to confusion. He says, he would choose neither to live nor to leave his property under such a government. He quotes the Scriptures for his authority.³ The late historian of Connecticut, Alexander Johnston, says that this letter to Winthrop might be made the foundation of the claim that Mr. Hooker had supplied the spirit of the Connecticut Constitution.⁴

In Massachusetts, the advice of the ministers of the churches was sought and followed as the practice, and Massachusetts was theocratic and aristocratic, for both John Cotton and Governor Winthrop contended for this; but the first written constitution in human history was that of Connecticut, adopted in 1639, and it was framed clearly on these lines marked out by Mr. Hooker. There was an adjourned session of the General Court in April, 1638. To this Court, says Dr. Trumbull, was intrusted the formation of that Constitution which was formally adopted in January, 1639. On Thursday, May 31, 1638, Mr. Hooker preached a sermon before the General Court, and he held:—

Doctrine. I. That the choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people by God's own allowance.

¹ Hubbard's General History, p. 265. ² Winthrop, ii, 428.

³ Conn. Hist. Soc. Coll., i, 11, 12. ⁴ Johnston's Conn., p. 71.

"II. The privilege of election, which belongs to the people, therefore must not be exercised according to their humors, but according to the blessed will and law of God.

"III. They who have the power to appoint officers and magistrates, it is in their power, also, to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place unto which they call them.

"Reasons. 1. Because the foundation of authority is laid, firstly, in the free consent of the people.

"2. Because, by a free choice, the hearts of the people will be more inclined to the love of the persons [chosen] and more ready to yield [obedience].

"3. Because of that duty and engagement of the people."¹

Dr. Leonard Bacon said:—

"That sermon by Thomas Hooker, from the pulpit of the first church in Hartford, is the earliest known suggestion of a fundamental law, enacted not by royal charter, nor by concession from any previously existing government, but by the people themselves,—a primary and supreme law by which the government is constituted, and which not only provides for the free choice of magistrates by the people, but also sets the bounds and limitations of the power and place to which each magistrate is called."²

Professor Alexander Johnston says:—

"Here is the first practical assertion of the right of the people, not only to choose but to limit the powers of their rulers,—an assertion which lies at the foundation of the American system."³

John Fiske says:—

"The Connecticut Constitution was the first written Constitution known to history that created a government, and it marked the beginnings of American democracy, of which Thomas Hooker deserves more than any other man to be called the father. The government of the United States to-day is in lineal descent more nearly related to that of Connecticut than to that of any other of the thirteen colonies."⁴

In May, 1639, Mr. Hooker and Mr. Haynes went to Massachusetts to renew negotiations about the Confederation which had been unsuccessfully begun two years before. Mr. Hooker preached a sermon of more than two hours in length before the Governor, and we know that the result of

¹ Walker's Life of Hooker, p. 125.

² Centennial Conf. Address, pp. 152, 153.

³ Conn., p. 72. ⁴ Beginnings of New England, pp. 127, 128.

this visit was an agreement of the Commissioners of the various Colonies in twelve articles, which constituted in effect, for certain matters of common interest, a federal government under the title of the "United Colonies of New England."¹ This Federal Constitution prepared the way for that of 1787.

We now turn to another step in the development of our national political life, and again we find the moving spirit was a Congregational clergyman. We refer to the famous "Body of Liberties," which Massachusetts Bay adopted in 1641, and which was mainly the work of the Rev. Nathaniel Ward, of Ipswich, who graduated at Emmanuel College in 1603, one year before Thomas Hooker entered. This "Body of Liberties" formed the basis of the law and civil government of the Massachusetts Colony.

"In one hundred sections it lays down the substantial principles securing life, liberty, property, etc., and the methods of civil administration adapted to the time. It was fully studied and amended in the towns, and was adopted in the most deliberate way."²

Nathaniel Ward had studied law in England, and he was of course most intimate with Thomas Hooker; for, not only as graduates of the same college, but in their weekly ministers' meetings, they must have met often and compared views. This is significant, for both Nathan Dane and Rev. Manasseh Cutler, who wrote the Ordinance of 1787, came from the same town as Ward,—Ipswich.³ The laws and customs of New England were enforced by the magistrates in the spirit of a "sacred trust," for they were not accustomed to use office for personal ends.

We now pass to the most important of all legislative en-

¹ Winthrop, ii. 121, 127. ² Weeden, Vol. i. p. 77.

³ So far as we know, the significant fact has not heretofore been noticed that, whoever wrote the Ordinance of 1787, whether Nathan Dane, as stated by Daniel Webster, or Dr. Manasseh Cutler, as stated by Dr. Poole, it emanated from Ipswich, Mass., the home of Nathaniel Ward, the author of the *Body of Liberties*.

actments that Congress ever passed with regard to the public domain,—the Ordinance of 1787.

Mr. Shosuke Sato,¹ after reviewing carefully the claims of different men to the authorship of the Ordinance, says:—

“Mr. Poole's article remains the masterpiece on the subject of the Ordinance of 1787.”

This article of Dr. Poole² says:—

“On the 13th of July, 1787, the Congress of the old Confederation, sitting in New York, passed an ‘Ordinance for the Government of the Territory Northwest of the River Ohio,’ which has passed into history as the ‘Ordinance of 1787.’

“The territory embraced what is now the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Its provisions have since been applied to all the Territories of the United States lying north of latitude 36° 40’, which now comprises the States of Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Oregon. August 7, 1789, the Constitution of the United States, having then been adopted, Congress among its earliest acts passed one recognizing the binding force of the Ordinance of 1787, and adapting its provisions to the Federal Constitution.

“The Ordinance, in the breadth of its conceptions, its details, and its results, has been perhaps the most notable instance of legislation that was ever enacted by the representatives of the American people. It fixed forever the character of the immigration, and of the social, political, and educational institutions of the people who were to inhabit this imperial territory,—then a wilderness, but now covered by five great States, and teeming with more than ten million persons, or one-fourth of the entire population of the United States. It forever prohibited slavery and involuntary servitude,—that pestilent element of discord and tyranny in our American system, which then existed in all the States except Massachusetts, where it had come to an end by a decision of its Supreme Court only four years before. It declared that ‘religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall always be encouraged.’ It prohibited the feudal law of primogeniture, and provided that the property of a parent dying intestate should be divided equally among his children or next of kin; that no person demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or religious sentiments; that the inhabitants shall always be entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, of trial by jury, of a proportional representation in the legislature, and of judicial proceedings ac-

¹ Land Question in the United States.

² North American Review, April, 1876.

ording to the course of the common law; that all persons shall be bailable unless for capital offences, when the proof shall be evident, or the presumption great; that all fines shall be moderate, and no cruel and unusual punishment shall be inflicted; that no man shall be deprived of his liberty or property but by the judgment of his peers, or the law of the land; and should the public exigencies make it necessary to take any man's property, or to demand his particular services, full compensation shall be made for the same; and in the just preservation of his rights and property, it is understood and declared that no law ought ever to be made or have force in said territory that shall in any manner whatever interfere with or affect private contracts or engagements *bona fide* and without fraud previously made.

"This was the first embodiment in written constitutional law of a provision maintaining the obligation of contracts. Six weeks later it was, on motion of Mr. King, of Massachusetts, incorporated in the draft of the Constitution of the United States."

". . . Every square mile of territory that was covered by the Ordinance of 1787 was patriotic, and gave its men and its means for the support of the Union."

"Dr. Manasseh Cutler, of *Ipswich, Mass.*, arrived July 5th.

"In April, 1788, the Ohio Company made the first English settlement of the Northwest Territory at Marietta, Ohio, at the mouth of the Muskingum, on the land which Dr. Cutler had bought on this occasion. General Washington,¹ writing from Mount Vernon, two months later, said: 'No colony in America was ever settled under such favorable auspices as that which has just commenced at the Muskingum. Information, property, and strength will be its characteristics. I know many of the settlers personally, and there never were men better calculated to promote the welfare of such a community. If I were a young man, just preparing to begin the world, or, if advanced in life and had a family to make provision for, I know of no country where I should rather fix my habitation than in some part of that region.'

"Massachusetts had in 1780 abolished slavery, established public schools for general education, and framed the most advanced code of laws concerning the liberties and natural rights of man, civil jurisprudence, and public polity, which the world had then seen.

"The Ordinance of 1787 is a condensed abstract of the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780. Every principle contained in the former, either in a germinal or developed form, except that relating to the obligation of contracts, and some temporary provisions relating to the organization of the territorial government, is found in the latter, and often in the same phraseology."

In 1830 Daniel Webster, in his answer to Hayne, as-

¹ Sparks' edition of Washington's Writings, Vol. ix. p. 385.

cribed the authorship to Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts. Mr. Benton, of Missouri, said it was not the work of Nathan Dane, but of Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia. Hon. Edward Coles, Governor of Illinois (1822-26), in January, 1856, claimed the honor for Jefferson. Dr. Poole clearly proved that it could not have been the work of Jefferson.

Of the Ordinance, Daniel Webster said:—

“We are accustomed to praise the lawgivers of antiquity; we help to perpetuate the fame of Solon and Lycurgus; but I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked and lasting character than the Ordinance of 1787. We see its consequences at this moment, and we shall never cease to see them perhaps while the Ohio shall flow.”¹

Judge Story said:—

“The Ordinance is remarkable for the brevity and exactness of its text and for its masterly display of the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty.”²

Judge Timothy Walker said:—

“Upon the surpassing excellence of the Ordinance no language of panegyric would be extravagant. The Romans would have imagined some divine Egeria for its author. It approaches as nearly to absolute perfection as anything to be found in the legislation of mankind; for after the experience of fifty years it would perhaps be impossible to alter a word without marring it. In short, it is one of those matchless specimens of sagacious forecast which even the reckless spirit of innovation would not venture to assail.”³

Dr. Poole clearly showed that this Ordinance was the work of the Rev. Manasseh Cutler, of Ipswich. He admits that it was in the handwriting of Dane, whom Webster credited with being its author, but both Dane and Cutler came from Ipswich,—Dane being the member from the Essex district. Ipswich was the home of Nathaniel Ward, the author of the “Body of Liberties,” and he was the great friend of Thomas Hooker. It must be that Congregationalism in Ipswich was thoroughly imbued with sound piety and polit-

¹ Daniel Webster, *Work*, iii. 263.

² Story's *Commentaries*, iii. 187.

³ Quoted by Poole, *No. Am. Rev.*, April, 1876.

ical sagacity, and we imagine we know its origin. It was Rev. Nathaniel Ward, who was trained to the law and practised it in England.

Let us examine one more political document, famous as a title-deed to liberty,—the Emancipation Proclamation.

In the early part of the century a Congregational home missionary settled upon this Western Reserve, at Tallmadge, Ohio, and afterward moved to Detroit, Mich., when a son was born to him. This boy became one of the heroic, distinguished, and useful men in the denomination. His name was Leonard Bacon. He wrote a tract on Slavery which fell into the hands of another Western boy,—Abraham Lincoln. When the Emancipation Proclamation became famous, and was recognized as worthy to be ranked with the Magna Charta and the Declaration of Independence, as one of the world's three title-deeds to liberty, Lincoln was asked as to the source of his inspiration, and he gave full credit to that tract of Dr. Bacon's for its influence upon him in his earlier years.¹

It makes little difference, therefore, at what point we analyze the waters of that stream called "American History." The simple elements are ever the same. The Congregational idea is clearly revealed. At whatever point of vision we view the past four centuries, the same rugged truths stand out in bold relief against the sky. They are the basal ideas of Congregationalism on their religious side, and American democracy on their civil side. They are religion, morality, knowledge; liberty, equality, democracy. Individualism and true socialism; egoism and Christian altruism; liberty by bondage to truth. We find these truths in the Connecticut Constitution of 1639, in the Body of Liberties of 1641, in Federal Compact of 1643, the Declaration of Independence, the Ordinance of 1787, the Constitution of 1789, and the

¹ Lincoln's Declaration to Dr. Jos. P. Thompson, *Century Magazine*, Vol. xxv. p. 658.

Emancipation Proclamation of 1863. The Thirteenth Amendment, prohibiting slavery, is identical with the sixth clause in the Ordinance of 1787. All of these documents are the result largely of the influence and teaching of Congregational clergymen at periods in the nation's history most pivotal and critical. As a spiritual force and polity the Congregational idea has been a powerful magnet, giving direction to all the religious, civil, and political forces in America. Thus the founders of this nation were men of faith and wisdom. They went upon the mountain, and Christ was transfigured before them. They worshipped him. When they came down they built three tabernacles,—one to religion, one to morality, and one to knowledge.

It has been said they were narrow. So is electricity, but it is concentrated. Sometimes it is narrow; sometimes it is broad. Strange such narrow men should have been such powerful metaphysicians and theologians as Edwards, Taylor, Emmons, Hopkins, Stuart, Finney; and should be succeeded by such men of breadth as Mark Hopkins, Noah Porter, Hickok, and President Fairchild. True, they were Calvinists, and split hairs into sixteenths over such subjects as the freedom of the will, the state of the mind a minute before conversion; the doctrine of election, of foreordination. But they had a sense of the immanence and sovereignty of God, and of man's accountability to him, that would put the amiable doctrines of this age to shame. Where are the men to-day preaching the doctrine of sin and the persistence of force in character? Where is the heroic truth that has moral fibre and tissue; that has will for the basis of character instead of sentimentalism or emotion? And yet these fathers, while so severe with themselves, were tender and beautiful in their lives, gentle in manner, and lovely in character. This age needs to learn that love is made of sterner stuff than sentiment; that it seeks the good of all, and is not cultivated for subjective purposes. It can shoot Indians, throw

tea overboard, and make quick work with disturbers of the public peace. They had virtue, moral dignity, moral character, because they had freedom which, as they had learned from Christ, came from bondage to truth or law. They defined all of life in terms of faith and duty, and not in terms of expediency or sentiment.

Strange, is it not, that where Scotch piety prevails in its sternest type, Scotch bankers are the most reliable; where parents are most honored, that nation has outlived all others; and where stern sense of duty prevailed, the most beneficent economic conditions flourished.

The founders of America went to the heart of things, and psychology, no less than moral philosophy, as it is taught in our universities to-day, is the gift of Congregational clergymen to this age. But some say they had no religious toleration except in theory. This is the charge of the youngest scion of the Adams family against his own ancestors and the founders of the Massachusetts Colony. Neither had our fathers Winchester rifles to shoot Indians with; nor could Paul Revere telephone the news of the arrival of the British; nor did they come over the ocean on the White Star Line, or bring stem-winding watches with them. These, all, were the fruit of a later age. So was religious toleration. One age must not judge another by its own standards. Brooks Adams has judged by the standards of to-day the men who founded Harvard College, and, as Dr. Poole well says in his review of the book,¹ it bears evidences throughout of the work of a callow dude.

But the Puritans sang psalm tunes through their noses; they wore wigs and enjoyed long sermons; they went to bed early to save candles. Do we not wish that our slums could be induced to do the same? They suffered slavery to exist. Emmons, Edwards, Hopkins, were hostile to involuntary servitude, and all preached against it. Emmons did so when it was sanctioned by his own State. Kidd says:—

¹ Emancipation of Man.

"The two doctrines which contributed most to producing the extinction of slavery were the doctrine of salvation and the doctrine of the equality of all men before the Deity."¹

These two doctrines are the key-notes of Congregationalism. Massachusetts abolished slavery in 1780 in her Constitution. Pennsylvania and Connecticut made a partial abolition in 1784. De Tocqueville prophesied that slavery could not long exist in America in contact with American thought, and it did not. Judge Samuel Sewall, in 1700, printed a tract against slavery. He said:—

"These Ethiopians, as black as they are, seeing that they are the sons and daughters of the first Adam, the brethren and sisters of the last Adam, and the offspring of God, they ought to be treated with a respect agreeable."

The family which did the most in America towards creating public opinion against slavery was the Beecher family, —Congregationalists. "Uncle Tom's Cabin," one of the greatest novels of history, was on every tongue, and Plymouth pulpit was protected by the police. Phillips Brooks was asked to name the three greatest Americans, and he said: Daniel Webster, Henry Ward Beecher, and Abraham Lincoln. They were all great and famous, because they were wedded to those Congregational ideas, liberty and equality. Dean Stanley and Canon Farrar both admitted that the church polity which the apostles acted upon was the Congregational.

The founders of American institutions believed in that orderly development of national life, evolution and not revolution, except as the latter was necessary to right wrongs which could be righted in no other way. First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. First the individual, then the family, then the church, then the state, and finally a nation. The doctrine of the sovereignty of the people thus unfolded. It was nurtured in the township, it then took possession of the state, and finally of the nation. They never dreamed of a democratic Republic as being free, desirable, or

¹ Social Evolution, p. 168.

safe except as it was founded on religion, morality, and education; and except as the right of franchise was in the hands of integral units who were themselves lovers of God and man. Person and property were to them safe so far as they were held to be sacred.

And when it came to the individual, they had scientific notions of his orderly development. They believed that religion strengthened the will, clarified the intellect, and softened the sensibilities. It was not simply the "sweetness and light" of an æsthetic dreamer nor an emotion; but it was *will* renewed, strengthened, and healed from the impotency caused by sin; it was conscience awakened, educated, and ever operative, giving the only true conception of good-will; it was thought, broad in its sweep and comprehensive in its grasp, but none the less synthetic and analytic. It gave generalizations from an absolute knowledge of detail.

As Dr. Poole said:—

"From that prolific stock has sprung a race of men and women, who, by character, energy, and ideas, have largely controlled the tier of Northern States from the Atlantic to the Pacific."¹

Since these men landed on American shores, great advancement has been made in notions of religious toleration, of democracy, and of political liberty; but a loftier faith and heroism; a greater fortitude and self-denial; a keener insight into principles giving wisdom and political sagacity will never be found in the American people than that which characterized the Founders of this Republic.

¹ Dial, Jan. 1891.

[*To be Concluded.*]