

ST. LUKE’S INN OF COURT

“Law & Religion Forum”

Volume 1, Apostolate Paper #45 (Section Four)

“A History of the Anglican Church—Part XXIX: An Essay on the Role of Christian Lawyers and Judges within the Secular State”©

By

Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D., D.D., J.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Introduction

Summary

**Part XXIX. Anglican Church: “Puritanism, the Family, and Family
Government—Section Four”**

D. Sacred Duties of the Lord’s Day and of Daily Living

- 14. Duty of Holiness on the Lord’s Day**
- 15. Duty of Holy Living Each Day of the Week**
- 16. Duty of Holy Instruction to Servants and Slaves
on the Lord’s Day**

Bibliography

Appendix A: “Puritanism, the Ten Commandments, and Chattel Slavery”

Appendix B: “Dr. Carter G. Woodson, ‘Introduction,’ *The Education of the Negro* (1919)”

Appendix C: “Frederick Douglass’s Sabbath School and Observations of American Slavery”

Appendix D: “William Goodell, *The American Slave Code*, No Right of the Slave to Religion, Conscience, or Religious Liberty”

Appendix E: “Christianity—A Pillar of the HBCU”

The ideas expressed in this Apostolate Paper are wholly those of the author, and subject to modification as a result of on-going research into this subject matter. This paper is currently being revised and edited, but this version is submitted for the purpose of sharing Christian scholarship with clergy, the legal profession, and the general public.

INTRODUCTION (Section Four)¹

In the Puritan theological mindset, the *husband-wife relationship*, *parent-child relationship*, and *master-servant relationship* were very much mediated through “family government” and an on-going process of “family worship,” in conjunction with public worship at church on Sunday (i.e., the “Lord’s Day”); the religious holiday; and a commitment to daily holiness. The most important day of the week was the Sabbath Day, as stated in the Fourth Commandment:

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. **On it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your male servant, or your female servant, or your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates.** For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy. — Exodus 20:8-11

¹ Section Four on “Puritanism and Family Law” is dedicated to the memory of my paternal grandmother Alice Ford (circa 1908- 1998), who truly impressed upon me the importance of keeping the Lord’s Day or the “Sabbath Day” during the Fall of 1984 when I had the privilege then to live with her for several weeks in downtown Live Oak, Florida, in a home that was adjacent to the Ebenezer A.M.E. Church, where my grandfather Sidney Ford had once been a pastor. I marveled at my grandmother’s strict observance of the Sabbath Day and her commitment to keeping that day especially holy. She would not even allow me to wash, dry, and fold clothes on Sunday! Through her example, words, and holy consecration, I learned of the solemnity of keeping the Sabbath Day holy.

Most importantly, within the Christian world, the “Sabbath Day” became known as “the Lord’s Day.” This special day was a day of consecration, holiness, reflection, rest, worship, devotion, and divine education. And in the New World, the Lord’s Day would have a profound influence on the general character of African slavery,² because according to the Church of England and England’s common law, servants and slaves were required to be given rest and religious instruction on the Sabbath Day.

According to Puritan ideals, beliefs, and teaching, the family governor was responsible for enforcing the Fourth Commandment upon the family unit (including servants and slaves), that is to say, to keep the Sabbath Day holy. This was all a part of a process of sanctification of the entire Puritan household. In the Puritan worldview, a truly Christian family must be set apart for service to Christ— i.e., the family must be *sanctified*.³ This idea or process of sanctification was the responsibility of the *family governor*—customarily at common law, and under the “law of Christ,”⁴ this was the father of the household (but the mother could serve as governor in case of the father’s absence or incapacitation).⁵

In addition to the public worship that occurred on the Sabbath Day, the Puritan family was expected to perform some form of “family worship” within the private household every other day of the week besides the Sabbath Day. To that end, the Puritans believed that the family unit was ordained by God, and that “God’s right of government ...[is] a full right of government of families, as families

² See, e.g., Appendix A, “Dr. Carter G. Woodson, ‘Introduction’ *The Education of the Negro* (1919); and Appendix B, “Frederick Douglass’s Sabbath School and Observations on Slavery.”

³ Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory Or, a Sum of Practical Theology, And Cases of Conscience* (Part 2 Christian Economics)(reprinted in Columbia, S.C. on January 18, 2019), p 29. (“the particular family relations are expressly sanctified. The family complete consisteth of three pairs of relations; husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants. Husbands must love their wives with a holy love in the Lord, even as ‘the Lord loved the church, who gave himself for it, to sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church.’ Eph. V. 25-27. ‘Wives must submit themselves to their husbands as unto the Lord; and be subject to them, as the church is to Christ,’ Eph. V. 22-24. ‘Children must obey their parents in the Lord,’ Eph. Vi. 1. ‘Parents must bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,’ Eph. Vi.4.”)

⁴ The “law of Christ is “to love ye one another” (John 15:12); “to do justice and judgment” (Genesis 18:18-19; Proverbs 21:1-3); “to judge not according to appearance but to judge righteous judgments” (John 7:24); and to do “justice, judgment, and equity” (Proverbs 1:2-3).

⁵ “Note therefore, that the governor is an essential part of the family, and so are some of the governed, (viz. that such there be,) but not each member. If therefore twenty children or servants shall worship God without the father, or master of the family, either present himself, or in some representative, it is not a family worship in strict sense. But if the head of the family in himself (or delegate or representative) be present, with any of his children or servants, though all the rest be absent, it is yet a family duty; though the family be incomplete and maimed (and so is the duty therefore, if culpably so performed.” Richard Baxter, p. 25.

[which]... must honour and worship him according to their utmost capacities.”⁶

Thus, in addition to the covenants that were given to individual patriarchs of families, such as Noah and Abraham, were the obligations of sacred and solemn family worship.⁷ “Family prayer and praises,” writes Rev. Richard Baxter, “are a duty ordinarily crowned with admirable, divine, and special blessings: therefore it is of God...”⁸ “Family discipline is part of God’s solemn worship...”⁹ “If [God] have a full right of government of families, as families, then families as families must honour and worship him according to their utmost capacities.”¹⁰ “If households must serve the Lord, then households must pray to him and praise him: but households must serve him...”¹¹ “Family prayer and praises are a duty owned by the teaching and sanctifying work of the Spirit; therefore they are of God.”¹² “Those that are to be chosen deacons or bishops, must be such as rule their own children and their own household well...”¹³

For this reason, special days such as the Sabbath Day (i.e, the Lord’s Day), holidays, and weekly “family worship” helped the family governors instill religious instruction and discipline within an overall structure of Puritan family government. But this was not exclusively the case for the Puritans of colonial New England—for the idea of “family government” had been extracted from a Judea-Christian idea of patriarchy that was widespread throughout European Christendom.

SECTION FOUR

Part XXIX. Anglican Church: “Puritanism, the Family, and Family Government—Section Four”

Prior to the sixteenth century, the “knowledge of God and the Bible” had been vehemently denied to the Roman Catholic laity throughout England and Europe. This led to the Protestant Reformation, to the leadership of men such as Luther and Calvin, and to the radical idea of a “priesthood of all believers.” The translation of the Latin Bible into English, German, and other languages eventually democratized

⁶ Ibid., p. 26.

⁷ “[B]efore the flood in the families of the righteous, and after till the establishment of a priesthood, God was worshipped in families or households: it is a greater doubt whether then he had any other public worship.” Richard Baxter, p. 36.

⁸ Richard Baxter, p. 33.

⁹ Ibid, p. 30.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 26.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 35.

¹² Ibid., p. 33.

¹³ Ibid.

the Roman Catholic Church and launched the spread of independent national churches, including the Church of England.

Within the Church of England, the Puritans fought for further democratization. They promoted education and literacy for the laity in order that the common man might read the Bible for himself and to reach toward life of perfect holiness. All of this democratization originated with the Puritan idea of “family worship” within the home. The father and mothers of the household (i.e., the “family governors”) were responsible for providing religious education to their children and to their household servants, including any slaves that they may have possessed.

This duty of the father and mother of the household to provide religious instruction to their children and servants reflected colonial New England’s common law of master and servant, where the “law of Christ”¹⁴ governed the core of all master-servant relationships. The master could not exploit, brutalize, or treat their servants unjustly, but rather all servants and slaves were treated as members of the family, as expressed in the Old Testament under the Law of Moses. Hence, the *duty of public worship on the Sabbath Day* was a significant component of the Puritan master-servant relationship, and it significantly influenced the Puritan worldview on African slavery and on how slaves were to be regulated.

D. Sacred Duties of the Lord’s Day and of Daily Living

14. Duty of Holiness on the Lord’s Day

The Church of England and its Puritan wing adopted the Roman Catholic theological idea of “the Lord’s Day,” which was consecrated when Jesus of Nazareth rose from the dead on the first day of the week (i.e., on Sunday). The “universal church”¹⁵ and the Church Fathers had ever since that time celebrated the Eucharist and the Lord’s Day (i.e., the “Sabbath Day”) on Sunday¹⁶—not Saturday, as some theologians deemed to have been the original Jewish Sabbath.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory or, A Sum of Practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience* (Reprinted in Columbia, S.C. on Nov. 22, 2019), p. 103.

¹⁶ Ibid. (“The laws of the land where we live [i.e., England] command it, and the king by proclamation urgeth the execution: and the canons, and homilies, and liturgy show that the holy observation of the Lord’s day, is the judgment and will of the governors of the church.”)

The Pentecost was said to also have occurred on a Sunday; here, the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the Saints.¹⁷ And so, from the earliest days of the Christian Church, the “Lord’s Day” was firmly settled as Sunday, or as the first day of the week. Rev. Richard Baxter (1615-1691) writes:

It is confessed by all Christians that Christ rose on the first day of the week, and appeared to his congregated disciples on that day, and poured out the Holy Ghost upon them on that day; and that the apostles appointed, and the Christian churches observed, their assemblies and communion ordinarily on that day; and that these apostles were filled with the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, that they might infallibly acquaint the church with the doctrine and will of Jesus Christ, and leave it on record for succeeding ages.... It is also confessed, that the universal church, from the days of the apostles down till now, hath constantly kept holy the Lord’s day in the memorial of Christ’s resurrection, and that as by the will of Christ delivered to them by or from the apostles....¹⁸

At least one day of the week must be set aside for celebration of Christ’s resurrection and worship; however, the Puritans did not necessarily hold Sunday to be the only day when this worship could occur within the church. Their position was simply that “custom” had established Sunday to be the “Lord’s Day,” but for all practical purposes, and person would very well celebrate the Lord’s Day on Wednesday, Friday, or any other day. It was simply more expedient for the entire body of Christ to establish one set day for this purpose, and Sunday was selected to be the Lord’s Day by the custom and canon law of the Church since the days of the first apostles.

The Lord’s Day, however, was fundamental to the Puritan’s religious system, because they believed that God must be acknowledged and worshipped publically. Without such public acknowledgement and worship, the entire society eventually would collapse eventually through the breach of God’s covenant and it would cease to acknowledge the sovereignty of God over the body politic.

Public acknowledgement of God on the Lord’s Day was therefore critically important to both England and colonial New England. “Common experience telleth

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

us,” writes Rev. Baxter, “that where the Lord’s day is more holily and carefully observed, knowledge and religion prosper best; and that more souls are converted on those days, than on all other days besides; and that the people are accordingly more edified; and that *wherever the Lord’s day is ordinarily neglected or misspent, religion and civility decay*, and there is a visible, lamentable difference between places and families, and the other.”¹⁹

The Puritans thus mandated Sunday public worship, and they lamented a society where people no longer seriously worshiped on the Lord’s Day. Rev. Baxter thus forewarned: “Isa. Iviii. 13, 14, ‘If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord.’”²⁰

The Puritans generally organized two types of religious services or ceremonies:²¹

(1). First, there were basic, introductory ceremonies for lost souls, unbelievers, and newly-converted Christians. These services were designed to train and to teach the basis principles and doctrines of the faith. These services were typically “Sabbath Schools” or “Sunday Schools” and occurred during the early morning hours on Sunday; and,

(2). Second, there were more advanced ceremonies, such as the sacrament of Eucharist, praise and worship, readings of lectures, and sermons for the advanced Christians.

The Puritan attitude towards work and labor on the Sabbath was much more flexible than one might think, since they were knowledgeable of the conflict of Jesus’ conflict with the Pharisees. Jesus healed on the Sabbath Day, and the Pharisees took great offence to these actions. Therefore, the Puritans believed that “works of mercy” were permissible on the Sabbath Day. This means that in there was an emergency on the Sabbath Day, a Christian would forgo going to church

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 105.

²¹ Ibid., p. 104-105.

service to handle the business of that emergency; or if there arose a need to perform some other work or act of mercy on Sunday, the Puritans did not limit or restrict the performance of such acts of mercy.²² On the other hand, the Puritans did not permit such acts as sheer laziness, slothfulness, sleeping in, etc. on Sunday, as excuses for refraining from public worship and church service.

Finally, the Puritans admonished Christians to take the Lord's Day seriously by planning for productive activities for that special day. One should treat the Lord's Day as a very special day of the week, and plan accordingly for church attendance, public worship, acts of mercy, and other acts of benevolent gratitude and fellowship. Families should especially organize their "family worship" around the Lord's Day. For example, families might use Sunday dinners as a special time for "family worship." As Rev. Baxter suggests: "[a]fter dinner call your families together, and sing a psalm of praise, and by examination or repetition, or both, cause them to remember what was publically taught them.... At supper spend the time as is aforesaid (at dinner): always remembering that though it be a duty of thanksgiving, it is not a day of gluttony, and that you must not use too full a diet, lest it make you heavy, and drowsy, and unfit for holy duty.... After supper examine your children and servants what they have learnt all day, and sing a psalm of praise, and conclude with prayer and thanksgiving.... If there be time after, both you and they may in secret review the duties, and mercies, and failings of the day, and recommend yourselves by prayer into the hands of God for the night following; and so betake yourselves to your rest."²³

It should be noted here that the Puritans considered the father to be the head of the household and responsible for this "family worship." See, e.g., Table 1, "Manhood: A Priestly Function in the Church and Home."

Table 1. Manhood: A Priestly Function in the Church and Home

Father (Church)	Father (Home)
Priest	Husband
Church	Home (Wife/ Children/ Servants/ Slaves)

²² Ibid., pp. 105-106.

²³ Ibid., p. 106.

In other words, to the Puritan mindset, the Lord's Day (i.e., Sunday) was a very important day of the week whereby communities would publically worship and acknowledge the sovereignty of God, and whereby families (i.e., the organization of "family government") would instill Christian education, family unity and family discipline.

15. Duty of Holy Living Each Day of the Week

Next, after the Lord's Day, each day of the week must be carefully planned, dedicated, and consecrated toward righteous and holy living. To be sure, there was no wrong way to live the holy life, because each individual's circumstances differed drastically. However, the most important rule of thumb was to apply Christ's "law of Love" to every duty and relationship with others. As Rev. Baxter admonished: "justice and love are graces which you must still exercise towards all that you have to deal with in the world. Love is called the fulfilling of the law, Rom. Xiii. 10; because the love of God and man is the soul of every outward duty, and a cause that will bring forth these as its effects."²⁴

More specifically, holy life required contemplating the special circumstances of a person's life in order to apply Christ's law of Love. "Every day look to the special duties of your several relations," writes Rev. Baxter "whether you are husbands, wives, parents, children, masters, servants, pastors, people, magistrates, subjects, remember that every relation hat its special duty, and its advantage for the doing of some good; and that God requireth your faithfulness in these, as well as in any other duty."²⁵ Rev. Baxter also made such practical recommendations for holy and righteous living, as follows:

- (1). Get good rest at night, but do not oversleep;²⁶

²⁴ Ibid., p. 101.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 101-102.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 99-102.

(2). Every awakening thought should praise God for the previous night's rest; for a new day; and for the day's future work, safety, and productivity;²⁷

(3). Avoid preoccupation with clothing and entire; avoid overly-expensive and flashy dress; dress sensibly and reasonably;²⁸

(4). Read some Bible verses in the morning;²⁹

(5). Engage in Secret Prayer, prior to starting the day's work;³⁰

(6). Organize family prayer, if possible, during breakfast or a morning hour;³¹

(7). Consecrate each day's work and engage in one's daily vocation with earnest work and seriousness, while always discharging the "law of Love";³²

(8). Meditate daily and the work and life of Christ;³³

(9). Always seek to make peace with others; uplift others with positive conversation;³⁴

(10). Manage each day with a schedule; manage time wisely;³⁵

(11). Monitor one's temptations, moral failures, and weaknesses; avoid sin and temptation;³⁶

(12). Eat healthy; avoid overeating and gluttony;³⁷ and,

(13). End each day with bedtime prayer and thanksgiving for the previous day's labour.³⁸

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

The Puritan regimen of daily holiness was a reflection of Calvinist discipline and clearly shows why the Puritans believed that their way of holy living was far superior to the “seven sacraments” system of the Roman Catholics. The Puritans stressed inward conversion and holiness which, in essence, allowed one to have direct access to Christ through the Holy Spirit, without the need of a priest to serve as mediator. This was partly the reason why the Puritans rejected many of the “Romanist” practices of the Church of England; they considered those practices to stress outward religious ritualism rather than inward holiness.

16. Duty of Holy Instruction to Servants and Slaves on the Lord’s Day

When we consider Rev. Baxter’s instructions to American slaveholders, titled “Directions to those Masters in foreign Plantations who have Negroes and other Slaves: being a solution of several cases about them,”³⁹ we must conclude that the Puritan duty of holy living presented a serious contradiction to the practice of slaveholding in colonial New England. For in order to hold a man in a state of chattel slavery, the slave holder must give up the entire idea of the “brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God” and that “from one blood God created all nations”; and then the slave holder must reduce the slave to something far less than human. And Rev. Baxter and the Puritans were clearly unwilling to take any of these steps or to reduce African slaves to the status of animals and brutes. The process of imposing chattel slavery upon innocent Africans thus required violating the laws of reason and the laws of nature. The Puritans simply could not go along with such a draconian programme. Instead, they advocated for the (a) Christian education of the slaves and (b) their manumission from slavery. Otherwise, the Puritan could not sleep or rest without a guilty Puritan conscience.

The Lord’s Day (i.e. the Sabbath Day) and the duty of daily holiness thus significantly and profoundly influenced Puritan culture as well the culture of colonial British North America. For example, this solemn duty to “keep the Sabbath” would eventually lead to the abolition movement in North America, because servants and slaves were required to be given rest and religious instruction on the Sabbath Day. The struggle to enforce this requirement, as reflected in the writings of the Puritan Richard Baxter and the publication of Chief Justice Sewall’s (Massachusetts) *Selling of Joseph* in 1701, eventually led to the abolition movement in New England and in North America.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid, pp. 90-93.

This required duty to teach, to guide, and to instruct slaves and household servants also had long remained a solemn duty of Christian masters throughout England and Europe. And that duty did not disappear in colonial New England, North America, or the western hemisphere.

Inevitably, the following question presented itself to the colonists of British North America: *Can a fellow Christian be enslaved?* And if not, should we teach Christianity to, and baptize, African slaves?⁴⁰ Indeed, under English common law and Anglican ecclesiastical law, the duty to provide religious instruction within the entire family unit included the duty to instruct servants and slaves under the control of the master. For example, Lorenzo J. Greene noted in *The Negro in Colonial New England* that:

Although there was no general movement to educate the Negroes, no statute prohibited their instruction. Furthermore, **the Puritan religion was founded on a personal knowledge of the Bible, and if the souls of slaves were to be saved, the Negroes must be taught to read.** As a result, many masters, either through kindness or self-interest, gave their slaves instruction in reading, writing and the trades. Members of the Congregational clergy, like Cotton Mather and John Eliot, also pioneered the secular instruction of the slaves. Performing a similar service, were such organizations as the Quakers, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Associates of Dr. Bray. The two latter organizations, which were connected with the Anglican Church, not only provided missionaries, books, Bibles, and other materials for the Negroes but also opened schools for them. Education made the slaves more valuable assets to their owners.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Lorenzo J. Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776*, p. 259 (“Conversion of the Negroes was opposed also on religious grounds. The prevailing opinion among English settlers of America in the seventeenth century was that only heathen could be enslaved by Christians, and that once the slaves were Christianized, they automatically became free, for it was held that no Christian might hold another in bondage.... Not only in New England, but especially in those colonies where slaves were numerous, owners feared that to allow conversion would deprive them of their property. Sincere religious masters were in a quandary: to baptize the slave meant that they would lose him; to withhold conversion would retard the spread of Christianity. Facing this dilemma, most masters let material motives outweigh moral and spiritual principles, and sought an expedient to preserve their slave property. To achieve this end some owners went to the extreme of declaring that the Negro was not a man but a beast, and that he had no soul either to save or to lose.”)

⁴¹ Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2017), p. 327.

The duty of religious instruction—extrapolated from the Fourth Commandment’s duty to keep the Sabbath Day— would significantly influence the practice and procedure of the American slave code in North America. The Puritans of colonial New England, the Anglicans of Virginia and the Carolinas, and the Roman Catholics of Canada and Maryland each promoted, to a greater or lesser degree, the religious instruction of servants and slaves as the *sin quo non* for Christian slave ownership.

The Fourth Commandment required masters to commemorate the Sabbath Day together with their servants and slaves. To that end, **Christian slaveholders were reminded that their own original justification and reasons for bringing Africans to the New World was to uplift them through Christian education.** Slaveholders were reminded that they should treat their slaves with justice and fairness, just as they treated any other servant within the household; and that they should therefore provide both rest and religious instruction on the Lord’s Day to their slaves.

As I have previously noted in this series, the Puritans of colonial New England made a valiant effort to live up to this obligation. Just as the Puritan family governors enforced Christian standards and regulations upon their own children, so they also applied the same standards and regulations the lives of the slaves. Lorenzo J. Greene, in *The Negro in Colonial New England* writes:

Religion...played an important role. The fact that the **New Englanders regarded the slaves as persons divinely committed to their stewardship developed a patriarchal conception of slavery....**⁴²

The law, in practice, went far toward bettering the legal position of the New England slave. The slavery of the Old Testament was patriarchal, with two recognizable classes of bondmen. One group of slaves, Jews, commonly referred to a ‘servants,’ were to serve their masters for six years, after which they were to go free, unless they voluntarily chose to remain with their masters. The Jewish slave was in reality ‘a poor brother,’ who had lost his liberty but not his civil rights. In essence the Jewish slave was part of the master’s family.

The second class of slaves were non-Jewish—Gentiles or ‘strangers’—who were sold to the Jews. These were ‘bond-servants’ or slaves for

⁴² Ibid., p. 219.

life. Although their lot was more difficult, **bondservants were protected by the Mosaic Law from extreme mistreatment.** Should their yoke become unbearable, they might run away, and later legislation even forbade the return of the fugitive to his master.

The bondmen were considered members of the master's family and were to be 'brought to God' by their owners. Neither of these forms of bondage was adopted without change by the Puritans. They apparently developed a slave system under which the status of bondman was something between that of the Jewish 'servant' and the Gentile 'slave.' **As such the Negro was considered a part of the Puritan family and, in keeping with the custom of the Hebraic family, was usually referred to as servant, rarely as 'slave.'** In accordance with the Jewish conception of slavery, especially in the seventeenth century, **many slaves were freed after six years of faithful service....**⁴³

The New England slaves...were forced to conform to the domestic institutions of their masters. The New England family was the fundamental unit, economically, spiritually and socially, and its preservation was deemed essential to the perpetuation of the Puritan way of life. Therefore marriage and the family were jealously guarded, and sexual irregularities either before or after marriage were relentlessly hunted down and severely punished. The family, following the Hebraic model, was largely patriarchal and most of the control of the household fell to the father who as head of the family exerted dominion over all who dwelt under his roof. **As part of the household, the slaves were subject to the same community controls governing marriage and the family as were free white persons.** The sexual promiscuity so common among the plantation slaves was not tolerated in New England. Slaves had to marry and their 'intention to marry' or 'banns' had to be publically posted or read before the wedding could take place. Slave marriages were numerous and were duly inscribed upon the records.⁴⁴

As it turned out, *the religious instruction given to slaves led naturally to their thirst for literacy, freedom and to emancipation.* **(For it was the struggle to attain**

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 167-168.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 327.

literacy in order to read the Bible that defined abolitionism in the antebellum South and eventually led to the establishment of schools and colleges for African Americans both before and immediately after the U.S. Civil War (1861-1865). Education for African Americans during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries thus came in stages; first, moral and spiritual elevation through the Gospel taught in Sabbath Schools; second, vocational education in preparation for emancipation and freedom, taught in church-sponsored private schools, grade schools, and vocational schools; and, third, the preparation for training in the professions, the ministry, and higher education in colleges and universities).⁴⁵ The Puritans of colonial New England did not deny or shirk this responsibility to educate and elevate their slaves.⁴⁶ Dr. Carter G. Woodson⁴⁷ tells us:

The first real educators to take up the work of enlightening American Negroes were clergymen interested in the propagation of the gospel among the heathen in the new world. Addressing themselves to this task, the missionaries easily discovered that their first duty was to educate these crude elements to enable them not only to read the truth for themselves, but to appreciate the supremacy of the Christian religion. After some opposition slaves were given the opportunity to take over the Christian civilization largely because of the adverse criticism which the apostles to the lowly heaped upon the planters who neglected the improvement of their Negroes....

Many early advocates of slavery favored the enlightenment of the Africans. That it was an advantage to the Negroes to be brought within the light of the gospel was common argument in favor of the slave trade....

When the German Protestants from Salsburg had scruples about enslaving men, they were assured by a message from home stating that **if they took slaves in faith and with the intention of conducting them to Christ, the action would not be a sin, but might prove a**

⁴⁵ See, e.g., **Appendix D**, Christianity—A Pillar of the HBCU.”

⁴⁶ Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2017), p. 257 (“Secular education was supplemented and strongly influenced by the movement for the religious instruction of the New England slaves. **In view of the Puritans’ contention that slavery was a means of bringing the heathen to Christ, the conversion of the slaves should have been taken for granted, and apparently, the early settlers felt that it was incumbent upon them to carry out this idea.**”)

⁴⁷ Carter G. Woodson, Ph.D. (Harvard ’12), was the second African American to earn the doctor of philosophy degree from Harvard University.

benediction. This was about the attitude of Spain....

In the French settlements of America the instruction of the Negroes did not early become a difficult problem. There were not many Negroes among the French. Their methods of colonization did not require many slaves. Nevertheless, whenever the French missionary came into contact with Negroes he considered it his duty to enlighten the unfortunates and lead them to God....

The education of Negroes was facilitated among the French and Spanish by their liberal attitude toward their slaves. Many of them were respected for their worth and given some of the privileges of freemen.... The Latin custom of miscegenation proved to be a still more important factor in the education of Negroes in the colonies.... The Latins, in contradistinction to the English, generally liberated their mulatto offspring and sometimes recognized them as their equals....

The Spanish and French were doing so much more than the English to enlighten their slaves that certain teachers and missionaries in the British colonies endeavored more than ever to arouse their countrymen to discharge their duty to those they held in bondage. These reformers hoped to do this by holding up to the members of the Anglican Church the praiseworthy example of the Catholics whom the British had for years denounced as enemies of Christ. The criticism had its effect. **But to prosecute this work extensively the English had to overcome the difficulty found in the observance of the unwritten law that no Christian could be held a slave.** Now, if the teaching of slaves enabled them to be converted and their Christianization led to manumission, the colonists had either to let the institution gradually pass away or close all avenues of information to the minds of their Negroes.

The necessity of choosing either of these alternatives was obviated by the enactment of provincial statutes and formal declarations by the Bishop of London to the effect that conversion did not work manumission. After the solution of this problem English missionaries urged more vigorously upon the colonies the duty of instructing the slaves. Among the active churchmen working for this cause were Rev. Morgan Goodwyn and Bishops Fleetwood, Lowth, and Sanderson. Complaints from men of this type led to systematic efforts to enlighten

the blacks. The first successful scheme for this purpose came from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. It was organized by the members of the Established Church in London in 1701....

Not many slaves were found among the Puritans, but the number sufficed to bring the question of their instruction before these colonists almost as prominently as we have observed it was brought in the case of the members of the Established Church of England. Despite the fact that the Puritans developed from the Calvinists, believers in the doctrine of election which swept away all class distinction, this sect did not, like the Quakers, attack slavery as an institution. **Yet if the Quakers were the first of the Protestants to protest against the buying and selling of souls, New England divines were among the first to devote attention to the mental, moral, and spiritual development of Negroes....**

The sentiment of the clergy of this epoch was more directly expressed by **Richard Baxter**, the noted Nonconformist, in his "Directions to Masters in Foreign Plantations," incorporated as rules into the Christian Directory. **Baxter believed in natural liberty and the equality of man, and justified slavery only on grounds of 'necessitated consent' or captivity in lawful war. For these reasons he felt that they that buy slaves and 'use them as Beasts for their meer Commodity, and betray, or destroy or neglect their Souls are fitter to be called incarnate Devils than Christians, though they be no Christians whom they so abuse.'** His aim here, however, is not to abolish the institution of slavery but to enlighten the Africans and bring them into the Church. **Exactly what effect Baxter had on this movement cannot be accurately figured out. The fact, however, that his creed was extensively adhered to by the Protestant colonists among whom his works were widely read, leads us to think that he influenced some masters to change their attitude toward their slaves.**

The next Puritan of prominence who enlisted among the helpers of the African slaves was **Chief Justice Sewall, of Massachusetts. In 1701 he stirred his section by publishing his *Selling of Joseph*, a distinctly anti-slavery pamphlet, based on the natural and inalienable right of every man to be free. The appearance of this publication marked an epoch in the history of the Negroes. It was**

the first direct attack on slavery in New England.

The Puritan clergy had formerly winked at the continuation of the institution, provided the masters were willing to give the slaves religious instruction. In the *Selling of Joseph* Sewall had little to say about their mental and moral improvement, but in the Athenian Oracle, which expressed his sentiments so well that he had it republished in 1705, he met more directly the problem of elevating the Negro race. Taking up this question, Sewall said: 'There's yet less doubt that those who are of Age to answer for themselves would soon learn the Principles of our Faith, and might be taught the Obligation of the Vow they made in Baptism, and there's little Doubt but Abraham instructed his Heathen Servants who were of Age to learn, the Nature of Circumcision before he circumscribed them; nor can we conclude much less from God's own noble Testimony of him, "I know him that he will command his Children and his Household, and they shall keep the Way of the Lord." **Sewall believed that the emancipation of the slaves should be promoted to encourage Negroes to become Christians.** He could not understand how any Christian could hinder or discourage them from learning the principles of the Christian religion and embracing the faith.

This interest shown in the Negro race was in no sense general among the Puritans of that day. Many of their sect could not favor such proselyting, which, according to their system of government, would have meant the extension to the slaves of social and political privileges. It was not until the French provided that masters should take their slaves to church and have them indoctrinated in the Catholic faith, that the proposition was seriously considered by many of the Puritans. They, like the Anglicans, felt sufficient compunction of conscience to take steps to Christianize the slaves, lest the Catholics, whom they had derided as undesirable churchmen, should put the Protestants to shame. The publication of the Code Noir probably influenced the instructions sent out from England to his Majesty's governors requiring them 'with the assistance of our council to find out the best means to facilitate and encourage the conversion of Negroes and Indians to the Christian Religion.'

Everly subsequently mentions in his diary the passing of a resolution by the Council Board at Windsor or Whitehall, recommending that the

blacks in plantations be baptized, and meting out severe censure to those who opposed this policy....⁴⁸

[Cotton Mather] showed his liberality in his professions published in 1693 in a set of Rules for the Society of Negroes, intended to present the claims of the despised race to the benefits of religious instruction. **Mather believed that servants were in a sense like one's children, and that their masters should train and furnish them with Bibles and other religious books for which they should be given time to read.** He maintained that servants should be admitted to the religious exercises of the family and was willing to employ such of them as were cometenent to teach his children lessons of piety. Coming directly to the issue of the day, Mather deplored the fact that the several plantations which lived upon the labor of their Negroes were guilty of the 'prodigious Wickedness of deriding, neglecting, and opposing all due Means of bringing the poor Negroes unto God.' **He hoped that the masters, of whom God would one day require the souls of slaves committed to their care, would see to it that like Abraham they have catechized servants.** They were not to imagine that the 'Almighty God made so many thousands reasonable Creatures for nothing but only to serve the Lusts of Epicures, or the Gains of Mammonists.'⁴⁹

However, the Puritan example of moral uplift and emancipation of African slaves⁵⁰ in North America was rejected in colonial Virginia, Maryland, the Carolinas and Georgia.⁵¹ As late as the 1830s and 40s, for instance, we hear Frederick Douglass's poignant complaints against the denial of literacy, education, and

⁴⁸ Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro* (Published by CreateSpace, 2013), pp. 12-20.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 18-19.

⁵⁰ See, e.g., Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2017), p. 257 ("Secular education was supplemented and strongly influenced by the movement for the religious instruction of the New England slaves. **In view of the Puritans' contention that slavery was a means of bringing the heathen to Christ, the conversion of the slaves should have been taken for granted, and apparently, the early settlers felt that it was incumbent upon them to carry out this idea.**").

⁵¹ See, e.g., Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2017), p. 257-258 ("Baptism particularly was opposed on economic grounds. Many owners feared conversion might lessen the value of their chattels as laborers. Not only would valuable time be lost in instructing them but, once converted, the Negroes would be compelled to attend church on Sunday. **Prohibition of Sunday work by the slaves would increase maintenance costs, for the in the plantation colonies, especially, the slaves raised part of their food on that day. Although this obstacle did not loom so large in the minds of New England masters, where the Calvinistic theocracy forbade even the slaves to work on the Lord's Day, it had much significance in the tobacco and rice colonies where the economy was dependent upon the large numbers of slaves employed.**")

religion to African slaves.⁵² For Douglass, all of this was yet another example of bombastic fraud and hypocrisy against natural law and the natural rights of African Americans.

(It should be noted, here, that English common law did not recognize “chattel slavery” as a justifiable institution under any circumstances.⁵³ However, looking to the Old Testament example of a rather mild form of “bond-servitude,” the Puritans and other earnest Christians reasoned that the Old Testament’s form of slavery or servitude might be justifiable, if and only if it brought the benefit of Christian civilization to the so-called “heathens” of Africa and the Americas. The seventeenth-century New Englanders certainly held to this view, and the Puritans certainly made a valiant effort to put this milder form of Mosaic slavery or bond-servitude into practice. The forms of plantation slavery that developed in the antebellum South of the 19th century, which Frederick Douglass experienced, was not the type of slavery that had been established in seventeenth-century New England).

By 1850, during the height of the American Slave Power in the southern part of the United States, the situation had become far worse, with the Rev. William Goodell’s compiling various customs, rules, and laws on slavery throughout the southern states in *The American Slave Code*, to wit:

CHAPTER VI. EDUCATION PROHIBITED. The Slave, not being regarded as a Member of Society, nor as a Human Being, the Government, instead of providing for his Education, takes care to forbid it, as being inconsistent with the condition of Chattelhood

CHAPTER VII. FREE SOCIAL WORSHIP AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION PROHIBITED. The Government not only allows the Master to forbid the Free Social Worship and Instruction of his Slaves, but it also steps in with direct Prohibitions of its own, which even the Master himself may not relax or abrogate....⁵⁴

⁵² See Appendix B, “**Frederick Douglass’s Sabbath School and Observations of American Slavery**”

⁵³ “The common law of England did not recognize anyone as a slave (although in Scotland, which does not have the common law, bondage still existed until the late eighteenth century, when it was abolished by legislation). Slavery, however, existed in a number of British colonies, principally in the West Indies.” The Anti-slavery Society <http://www.anti-slaverysociety.addr.com/huk-1833act.htm>.

⁵⁴ William Goodell, *The American Slave Code in Theory and Practice* (1853)(republished by Univ. of Michigan Press). See, also, **Appendix C**.

Perhaps the most telling aspect of the denial of “religious rights” to African American slaves during the mid-nineteenth century is the fact that many American slave-holders during that era believed that true knowledge of the Christian faith was inconsistent with the institution of slavery. Literacy, knowledge of the Bible, and an understanding of the true Christian faith were likewise denied to African American slaves.

But the Church of England, as reflected in the English common law⁵⁵, never approved of denying religious freedom or the right to knowledge of the Christian faith to indentured servants or slaves. On the contrary, the Church of England and the British monarchy had promoted the policy that slavery could be tolerated and permitted *only on the grounds that the enslaved Africans were taught and received the blessings of the Christian faith*. Consequently, when the rigorous southern American slave codes of the mid-nineteenth-century clearly operated in violation of the tenets of the Christian faith and the English common law, New England’s Puritan anti-slavery movement, together with England’s Anglican-Evangelical anti-slavery movement, became an international movement for human rights. At the core of this anti-slavery and human rights movement was the “law of Christ”⁵⁶ and the central mandate “to do justice and judgment” within every human relationship and institution, including that of *husband-wife*, *parent-child* and *master-servant*. The Sabbath Day (or the “Lord’s Day”) was a solemn reminder of these sacred duties.

CONCLUSION

Within the Puritan worldview, all masters—whether heads of households, churches, corporations, or governments—had the duty to ensure that every person serving underneath them (i.e., the family or household) were properly supervised, educated, disciplined, and treated equitably. And this ethical system had a great influence on the nature of the master-servant relationship in both England and colonial New England. The “law of Christ” was the supreme ethical standard of Puritanism, and the Golden Rule, in theory and practice, permeated every relationship within Puritan society.

⁵⁵ “The common law of England did not recognize anyone as a slave (although in Scotland, which does not have the common law, bondage still existed until the late eighteenth century, when it was abolished by legislation). Slavery, however, existed in a number of British colonies, principally in the West Indies.” The Anti-slavery Society <http://www.anti-slaverysociety.addr.com/huk-1833act.htm>.

⁵⁶ The “law of Christ” is “to love ye one another” (John 15:12); “to do justice and judgment” (Genesis 18:18-19; Proverbs 21:1-3); “to judge not according to appearance but to judge righteous judgments” (John 7:24); and to do “justice, judgment, and equity” (Proverbs 1:2-3).

The Puritans also believed that the most important component to ensuring that these relationships remained healthy was to acknowledge and keep the “Lord’s Day.” They believed that the Lord’s Day must be publically established and publically worshipped. The public acknowledgement of the sovereignty of God was necessary for a healthy and thriving body politic. The Puritans believed that societies that did not hold the Lord’s Day as a special day of the week were more likely to experience family break-up, social dislocation, civil discord, and incivility.

Significantly, the Lord’s Day had been established, since the days of the first apostles, as the first day of the week, because the Lord had risen from the dead and poured out the Holy Ghost on a Sunday. Although the Lord’s Day could be held on any day of the week, the Puritans adopted the view that the universal church had appropriately established Sunday as the Lord’s Day as a matter of ecclesiastical law.

The Lord’s Day was a very important and special day, because above all else it was a day of spiritual elevation and personal development, community cohesion, and family bonding. The Sabbath school became a very important tool for teaching the unsaved, children, servants, and slaves. The objective of the Sabbath school was to teach a person how to live holy and ethically every day of the week. Hence, a system of Christian education, ethical training and learning developed throughout British North America, and it inevitably had an influence of the character and abolition of American slavery in North America.

THE END

Bibliography:

Barry, John M. *Roger Williams and the Creation of the American Soul: Church, State, and the Birth of Liberty*. New York, N.Y.: Viking Press (2012).

Baxter, Richard, *A Christian Directory or, A Sum of Practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience. Part 2 Christian Economics* (reprinted in Columbia, S.C. on January 18, 2019).

Smith, Goldwin. *A History of England*. New York, N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons (1957).

References:

Aquinas, Thomas (Saint). *Summa Theologica*. New York, NY: The Catholic Primer (2005).

Augustine, Aurelius (Saint). *Confessions*. New York, N.Y.: Barnes & Nobles Classics (2007).

_____. *On Grace and Free Will*. Louisville, KY: GLH Publishing (2017).

_____. *The City of God*. New York, NY: The Modern Library (1950).

Bode, Carl. *The Portable Emerson*. New York, NY: Penguin Books (1981).

Burt, Edwin A. *The English Philosophers From Bacon To Mill*. New York, NY: The Modern Library (1967).

Catechism of the Catholic Church (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997).

Daniell, Timothy Tyndale. *The Lawyers: The Inns of Court: The Home of the Common Law*. New York, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc. (1976).

Doe, Norman. *Christianity and Natural Law*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press. (2017).

Ford, Roderick. *Jesus Master of Law: A Juridical Science of Christianity and the Law of Equity*. Tampa, Fl.: Xlibris Pub. (2015).

Russell, Bertrand. *A History of Western Philosophy*. New York, NY: Touchstone, (2007).

Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York, N.Y.: The Modern Library (1994).

The Federalist Papers. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc. 2014.

Witte, John, Jr. and Frank S. Alexander. *Christianity and Law: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Press, 2008.

Woods, Thomas E. *How The Catholic Church Built Western Civilization*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2005.

APPENDIX A: “Puritanism, the Ten Commandments, and Chattel Slavery” by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

The Puritan theologians especially held firm to the belief that the Bible should strictly govern the institution of slavery, but the type of chattel slavery that had been established in the American South and in the British West Indies violated every tenet of the Bible as well as the laws of nature. The Puritans especially believed that slavery should be humane; that Christian slave owners had an obligation to hold their slaves in trust for the benefit of bringing them to Christ; that the slaves maintained inviolable and inherent human or natural rights; and that chattel slavery and men-stealing violated the laws of God and nature. See, e.g., the following table, “The Decalogue, Natural Law, Slavery and Christian Jurisprudence.” Thus construing the American slave code (i.e., the entire body of judicial opinions, statutes, and customary practices) of the 1700s and 1800s, most Christian Churches condemned the institution of chattel slavery as a gross violation of both the natural law (i.e., the Decalogue) and the Gospel.

Table 1. “The Decalogue, Natural Law, Slavery and Christian Jurisprudence”

<p>TEN COMMANDMENTS (Decalogue)</p>	<p>NATURAL LAW (The Laws of Nature upon which the Secular Civil Government is founded)</p>
<p>FIRST TABLE</p> <p>I am the Lord thy God! Thou shalt have no other Gods but me!</p>	<p>FIRST TABLE (Church)</p> <p>God’s Divine Providence governs the universe; it is superior to human law.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: religious duty, religious liberty, etc. were routinely denied to slaves.)</p>

Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain!	Same as above
Thou shalt make no graven images!	Same as above
Thou shalt keep the Sabbath Day holy!	Many Puritans and other Christians (particularly the Quakers, Catholics, and Anglicans) believed that the objective of slavery should be to elevate the moral standards of slaves and to teach them the Christian faith. Such elevation and training would normally occur on the “Sabbath Day,” a solemn day of rest and religious rites. Some abolitionist also believed that slaves had a complete and absolute right to religious freedom and to liberty of conscience.
Thou shalt honor father and mother!	<p>Same as above; domestic government (i.e., the family) is the foundation of the body politic</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: “Thou shalt honor father and mother!” These institutions removed fathers from families and tore the family structure apart).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SECOND TABLE</p> <p>Thou shalt not kill!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SECOND TABLE (State)</p> <p>Civil government reinforces Church’s moral teachings against murder. The civil government protects citizens against the crime of homicide, murder, and genocide.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: “Thou shalt not kill!”).</p>
Thou shalt not commit adultery!	Civil government must protect the integrity of

	<p>marriage and the family, since domestic government (i.e., the family) is the foundation of the body politic). Adultery should be proscribed and punished.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: “Thou shalt not commit adultery!”).⁵⁷</p>
Thou shalt not steal!	<p>Civil government reinforces Church’s moral teachings against theft. Civil government must protect citizens against fraud, theft, conversion, embezzlement, and like crimes and offenses.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: “Thou shalt not steal!”).</p>
Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor!	<p>Civil government reinforces Church’s moral teachings against lying and bearing false witness. Civil government must protect the integrity of the justice system and protect citizens against injustices established through false swearing and false testimony.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor!”).</p>

⁵⁷ See, e.g., **Dr. Taylor Marshall**, “**The Sexual Motivation for the European—Muslim Slave Trade**,” (“A few days ago I wrote about how Pope Zachary banned the selling of slaves in Rome. The slave trade in Italy was focused on the selling of Europeans to Muslims. People often neglect the fact that this slave trade was sexually and racially motivated. What I am about to write is politically incorrect, but the historical facts bear witness to it: Muslim men wanted to purchase fair skinned, blonde or redheaded European girls as sex slaves.”) <https://taylormarshall.com/2018/01/sexual-motivation-european-muslim-slave-trade.html>.

See, also., **W.E.B. Du Bois**, “**The Souls of Black Folk**,” *Writings* (New York, N.Y.: The Library of America, 1986), p. 368 (“The red stain of bastardy, which two centuries of systematic legal defilement of Negro women had stamped upon his race, meant not only the loss of ancient African chastity, but also the hereditary weight of a mass of corruption from white adulterers, threatening almost the obliteration of the Negro home.”)

<p>Do not let thyself lust after thy neighbor's wife!</p>	<p>Civil government reinforces Church's moral teachings licentiousness and marital infidelity. Civil government must protect the integrity of marriage and the family, since domestic government (i.e., the family) is the foundation of the body politic). Adultery, rape, concubinage, sex slavery, and the like, should be proscribed and punished.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: "Do not let thyself lust after thy neighbor's wife!").⁵⁸</p>
<p>Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his farm, nor his cattle, nor anything that is his!</p>	<p>Civil government reinforces Church's moral teachings marital infidelity and tortious conduct against the integrity of the institution of marriage.</p> <p>Civil government must establish complete justice and equity between parties or citizens within the body politic.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many Puritans and other Christian abolitionists also believed that chattel slavery and the transatlantic slave trade violated this commandment: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his farm, nor his cattle, nor anything that is his!").</p>

⁵⁸ Ibid.

APPENDIX B: Carter G. Woodson, “Introduction” *The Education of the Negro* (1919)⁵⁹ by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

Dr. Woodson teaches us that the “first real educators to take up the work of enlightening American Negroes were clergymen interested in the propagation of the gospel among the heathen in the new world.”⁶⁰

From the period 1619 to 1865, the Christian church was clearly responsible for most of education which African Americans received. During the seventeenth century, the Anglican Church stood between the patriarchal planters of Virginia and the Carolinas to demand the moral elevation of African slaves, as previously promised and promoted when the magistrates, planters, investors and merchants promoted the slave trade as a grand design to bring the Gospel to the heathens in Africa and the Americas.

However, the early American agricultural planters both relented and balked at the idea of converting the slaves to the Christian faith, since under English law no Christian could be made a slave and it had up to that point been unclear as to whether baptism entitled the enslaved person to manumission.

Meanwhile, as Dr. Woodson tells us, the Catholics of Spain and France moved forward swiftly during the seventeenth century with providing a Christian education to both Indians and Africans. The Spanish even encouraged mixed marriages, educated and freed mulattoes, and brought them into the brother of the Catholic faith. In other words, the Roman Catholics throughout the New World, in Canada and in Latin America, were much more inclined to teach the Christian faith to African slaves. For it was this example of the Roman Catholics that eventually placed pressure upon the Church of England and its missionaries to set a better example. See, e.g., Table 1, “A Survey of Christian Education of African Slaves in the New World”

⁵⁹ Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro* (1919) (Re-published by CreateSpace, 2013). (In 1912, Dr. Woodson became only the second African American to earn a doctor of philosophy degree from Harvard University).

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 12.

Table 1, “A Survey of Christian Education of African Slaves in the New Word”

16 th Century	French and Spanish Roman Catholics led the way in educating African slaves	The Englishmen of colonial Virginia, the Carolinas, and New England were still undecided on the question of Christian conversion and education for African slaves. The great concern was that conversion to Christianity might liberate them under English common law. ⁶¹
17 th Century	Church of England; Puritans; and Quakers followed the Roman Catholic example of providing moral, mental, and religious training for African slaves	The Bishop of London authorized the conversion of African slaves to Christianity, without actually freeing them. This compromise first opened the door to Christian education for African slaves in British North America. As a result, the Puritans and the Quakers made Christian education a platform for the Abolition of Slavery altogether
18 th Century- 19 th Century	American Baptists and Methodists begin teaching, training, and establishing Sabbath schools for African American slaves	The Haitian Revolution led to harsh slave laws. Southern slave owners outlawed teaching slaves to read and write.

⁶¹ Lorenzo J. Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776*, p. 259 (“Conversion of the Negroes was opposed also on religious grounds. The prevailing opinion among English settlers of America in the seventeenth century was that only heathen could be enslaved by Christians, and that once the slaves were Christianized, they automatically became free, for it was held that no Christian might hold another in bondage.... Not only in New England, but especially in those colonies where slaves were numerous, owners feared that to allow conversion would deprive them of their property. Sincere religious masters were in a quandary: to baptize the slave meant that they would lose him; to withhold conversion would retard the spread of Christianity. Facing this dilemma, most masters let material motives outweigh moral and spiritual principles, and sought an expedient to preserve their slave property. To achieve this end some owners went to the extreme of declaring that the Negro was not a man but a beast, and that he had no soul either to save or to lose.”)

		<p>The Industrial Revolution and the invention of the cotton gin revolutionized plantation slavery in the American South.</p> <p>American chattel slavery led to become brutal slave laws. Laws were passed prevent slaves to learn how to read and write.</p> <p>But American Baptists and Methodists persisted, and many clergymen defied these harsh slave codes.</p>
--	--	--

The Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church were thus much more inclined to hold slave-holder accountable, and to require them to teach the true Christian faith to their slaves. The French Catholics were much more notable in this regard; for they enacted the **Code Noir** which “**obliged every planter to have his Negroes instructed and baptized. It allowed the slave for instruction, worship, and rest not only every Sunday, but every festival usually observed by the Roman Catholic Church. It did not permit any market to be held on Sundays or holidays. It prohibited under severe penalties, all masters and managers from corrupting their female slaves. It did not allow the Negro husband, wife, or infant children to be sold separately. It forbade them the use of torture, or immoderate and inhuman punishments. It obliged the owners to maintain their old and decrepit slaves. If the Negroes were not fed and clothed as the law prescribed, or if they were in any way cruelly treated, they might apply to the Procureur, who was obliged by his office to protect them.**”⁶²

This 16th- and 17th century French Code Noir was a blatant contrast to nineteenth-century “American Slave Code,” as documented by the Rev. William Goodell. As Table 1, above, reveals, in the United States, the industrial revolution had so changed the nature and character of African slavery, that the Christian faith was placed on the defensive; teaching religion and letters became illegal; and the

⁶² Ibid., pp. 22-23.

African race was systematically placed, through pseudo-scientific dogma, outside the brotherhood of man. By this time, the American Baptists and Methodists had largely taken up the cause of enlightening the African slaves throughout the South, and Dr. Woodson teaches us that many of the Baptist and Methodist clergymen simply defied the new, harsh slave codes that were being enacted during the 19th century.⁶³

At the same time, the Puritans and the Quakers of colonial New England had already used the tenets of the Christian faith to lay the groundwork for educating the African slaves and for the Abolition Movement. The Puritans had begun this work since the late 1690s and early 1700s. As Dr. Woodson teaches us:

Contemporaneous with these early workers of the Establish Church of England were the liberal Puritans, who directed their attention to the conversion of the slaves long before this sect advocated abolition. Many of this connection justified slavery as established by the precedent of the Hebrews, but they **felt that persons held to service should be instructed as were the servants of the household of Abraham.**⁶⁴

Similarly, Lorenzo J. Greene noted in *The Negro in Colonial New England* that:

Although there was no general movement to educate the Negroes, no statute prohibited their instruction. Furthermore, **the Puritan religion was founded on a personal knowledge of the Bible, and if the souls of slaves were to be saved, the Negroes must be taught to read.** As a result, many masters, either through kindness or self-interest, gave their slaves instruction in reading, writing and the trades. Members of the Congregational clergy, like Cotton Mather and John Eliot, also pioneered the secular instruction of the slaves. Performing a similar service, were such organizations as the Quakers, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Associates of Dr. Bray. The two latter organizations, which were connected with the Anglican Church, not only provided missionaries, books, Bibles, and other materials for

⁶³ Ibid., p. 8 ("Ashamed to play the role of a Christian clergy guarding silence on the indispensable duty of saving the souls of the colored people, certain of the most influential southern ministers hit upon the scheme of teaching illiterate Negroes the principles of Christianity by memory training or the teaching of religion without letters.")

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 6.

the Negroes but also opened schools for them. Education made the slaves more valuable assets to their owners.⁶⁵

And, likewise, the Quakers during the same period advocated for “the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God” and “taught the colored people to read their own ‘instruction in the book of the law that they might be wise unto salvation.’”⁶⁶ The Puritans and the Quakers thus early and largely advocated for the abolition of slavery as early as the beginning of the late 1600s, and by the 1800s, the American abolition movement was firmly established in New England.

⁶⁵ Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2017), p. 327.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

APPENDIX C: “Frederick Douglass’s Sabbath School and Observations of American Slavery” by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

One of my primary arguments throughout this entire series (i.e. Volume One of these apostolate papers) is that Christianity has been a great benefit to Africans or African Americans both prior to and after the U.S. Civil War (1861-1865).⁶⁷

The most seminal writer to influence my thinking on this subject matter was Frederick Douglass. During the late summer of 1995, after I had successfully taken and completed the Florida Bar examination, I read Frederick Douglass’ three autobiographies, which had just been published by the Library of America, with Dr. Henry Lewis Gates as editor. Within about two weeks, I read this book from cover to cover; not because I was unfamiliar with Douglass’ thought, life and writings; but because I had never had the free time to devote my undivided attention to his life’s work. It turned out to be one of the most extraordinary intellectual and literary vistas of my life—here was an extraordinary genius, an extraordinary man, a proof that there must be a personal God governing the universe!

It was during this reading that I discovered the following passage on the importance of spiritual and moral development of the slaves on the “Sabbath Day,” and on why the slave-holders tried to sabotage the proper usage and purpose of the “Sabbath Day.”

Douglass writes:

“As summer came on, and the long Sabbath days stretched themselves over our idleness, I became uneasy, and wanted a Sabbath-school, where to exercise my gifts, and to impart the little knowledge I possessed to my brother-slaves.

“A house was hardly necessary in the summer time; I could hold my school under the shade of an old oak tree as well as anywhere else. The thing was to get the scholars, and to have them thoroughly imbued with the desire to learn.

“Two such boys were quickly found in Henry and John, and from them the contagion spread. I was not long in bringing around me twenty or thirty young

⁶⁷ I disdain the false premise that Christianity—i.e., the true “universal” Christian faith—was the source of the black man’s abject docility and servility to white supremacy. It is my firm position that this true Christian faith has always remained the greatest threat to both the institution of chattel slavery, racism (of any type), and white supremacy.

men, who enrolled themselves gladly in my Sabbath-school, and were willing to meet me regularly under the trees or elsewhere, for the purpose of learning to read.

“It was surprising with what ease they provided themselves with spelling-books. These were mostly the cast-off books of their young masters or mistresses. I taught at first on our own farm. All were impressed with the necessity of keeping the matter as private as possible, for the fate of the St. Michaels attempt was till fresh in the minds of all. Our pious masters at St. Michaels must not know that a few of their dusky brothers **were learning to read the Word of God**, lest they should come down upon us with the lash and chain.

“We might have met to drink whisky, to wrestle, fight, and to do other unseemly things, with no fear of interruption from the saints or the sinners of St. Michaels. But to meet for the purpose of improving the mind and heart, **by learning to read the sacred scriptures,** was a nuisance to be instantly stopped.”⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Frederick Douglass, *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (New York, N.Y.: Carol Pub., 1995), pp. 148-149.

APPENDIX D. William Goodell, “The American Slave Code,” No Rights of the Slave to Religion, Conscience, or Religious Liberty

PREFACE

The type of slavery practiced in the American South from the period 1820 to 1865 was not the type of slavery practiced in the Old Testament or among the Puritans of colonial New England. Nor was this form of “chattel” slavery, practiced in the American South, the type of benign servitude which the Roman Catholic Church, Church of England or the Puritan divines cautiously permitted as a tool to bring the Christian faith to the less fortunate.

To be sure, there were so-called Christian divines, clergymen and the like who did endorse “chattel” slavery as it was practiced in the American South, but this fact alone should not be confused with authentic Christian theology and law on the subject-matter of slavery.

For, as the Rev. William Goodell has correctly stated in *The American Slave Code*, “[r]eligious liberty is the precursor of civil and political liberty and enfranchisement, and must be suppressed. The gospel would indeed abolish American slavery, (as is often said,) if it could only be introduced among the slaves so far as to confer upon them religious liberty.... This our American slaveholders understand, as will now be shown.”

Thus, by the early 1800s, American capitalism shoved the Christian church and its moral teachings aside in order to position itself to earn super profits from the world-wide cotton trade and the trade in slaves. The industrial revolution and the discovery of the cotton gin changed American plantation slavery into unconscientious, industrial machine whose sole aim was to sapped the blood, sweat and tears of black slaves in order to make super profits. The church, religion, and moral improvement of the slave were jettisoned in exchange for ungodly economic system that was designed wholly around monetary gain.

The effect of all of this was an ungodly “American Slave Code” which restricted the teaching of the Christian faith (at least in its authentic, true form) to African American slaves during the period 1820 to 1865.

Moreover, “religion” and “conscience” are the same idea. The right to believe in an idea, as the truth, is religious freedom. The right to distinguish between falsity and truth, and to believe in that truth, is also religious freedom. But when someone else tells one what to believe as truth, and forces that opinion upon him, this becomes spiritual oppression. Additionally, when this spiritual oppression is utilized to divest innocent victims of property rights, economic rights, freedom of movement, freedom from assault, battery, and slander, then they also become theocratic and religious despotism over the enslaved.

Frederick Douglass who considered himself a professed Christian, for instance, castigated this American slave code as evidence of a very false, demonic “Christianity.”

-- Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

CHAPTER XXII. RIGHT TO EDUCATION-RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE. The Slave, being held as a Chattel, is held by a tenure which excludes any legal recognition of **his rights as a thinking and religious being.** WE are not now speaking of laws or of usages that directly infringe such rights and prohibit their exercise. Where are such laws, and we shall give some specimens of them, when we come to inquire after the condition of the slave in relation to civil society.* At present, we are only unfolding to view "the legal relation of master and slave."

We affirm that a recognition of the validity or lawfulness of that relation is equivalent to **a denial of the literary and religious rights of the slave.** And if that relation be an innocent one, then the denial and the withholding of those rights, AS RIGHTS, are innocent likewise. The mere bestowal of privileges, with the permission to enjoy them, is not the recognition of rights; it is rather an implied denial of their existence.

Men do not grant permission nor confer privileges where they recognize rights. The power to permit and to confer, carries with it the power to refuse and to withhold. Both the master and the slave understand this, where permissions are most frequently given. It is injurious to confer, as it is degrading to accept as a boon, **what belongs to every man AS man, by absolute and inherent RIGHT. The rights of investigation, of free speech, of mental culture, of religious liberty, and of conscience, are of this class.**

Man may no more affect to confer them or permit their exercise, than he may presume to take them away. The statement, then, is not that slave masters do not educate nor permit the education of their slaves, nor allow nor furnish them the benefits of religious instruction and social worship. As a general statement, with particular and local exceptions, it might be made and sustained, as will appear in its allotted place. But we waive and pass by all this, for the present, to affirm distinctly that "the legal relation" of slave ownership, in America, as defined by the code that upholds it, is a relation that cannot and does not consist with the recognition (either in theory or practice) of the intellectual and religious RIGHTS of the slave.

The slave "is a chattel." But **chattels have no literary or religious rights.** He is a chattel "to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." He is "in the power of a master, to whom he belongs" — "entirely subject to the will of his master" — "not ranked among sentient beings, but among things." **It would be an absurdity for such a code to recognize the slave as possessing religious rights.** It is free from any such absurdity. Except the provisions, in some of the States, for the "baptism" of slaves, and for their "spiritual assistance when sick," (see Chap. VII., Part II.,) **we have found no recognition of their religious wants, their religious natures, or immortal destinies.**

Even where they seem to be **considered passive beings, whose salvation is to be bestowed by their masters.** The American Slave Code, from beginning to end, knows **no rights of conscience** in its subjects. The master is to be implicitly obeyed. His will is to be law. The slave is allowed **no self-direction, no sacred marriage, no family relation, no marital rights** — none that may not be taken away by his master. Religion and its duties are based on human relations, including family relations. These relations, the "relation of slave ownership" and chattelhood abrogates. Religion requires and cherishes self-control; but the "owner's" authority

supersedes and prohibits self-control. **Religion implies free agency; but "the slave is not a free agent."**

His "condition is merely a passive one." So says the Slave Code, and so says ecclesiastical law, and therefore releases him from the obligations of the seventh commandment. Witness the decision of the Savannah River Baptist Association, while allowing its slave members, without censure, to take second or third companions, in obedience to their masters, by whom their original connections had been severed!

Rights of conscience require, and therefore authorize a man to choose his own place of worship, and not "forsake the assembling together;" nay, to choose and follow the avocation, and select the residence and the associates where, in his own judgment, he can best serve God, fit his own soul for heaven, and lead his fellow-men to the Saviour. **It commands and authorizes him to "search the Scriptures," and train up his family "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."** The master emancipates his slave, and ceases to be his "owner" when he fully accords to him, in practice and in theory, these Heaven-conferred RIGHTS.

It is useless to attempt evading this, by adducing the case of children and minors. The slave, at maturity, is entitled to the rights and responsibilities of a man, and without them he is despoiled of his religious rights. **The slave master may withhold education and the Bible; he may forbid religious instruction, and access to public worship. He may enforce upon the slave and his family a religious worship and a religious teaching which he disapproves.** In all this, as completely as in secular matters, he is "entirely subject to the will of a master, to whom he belongs."

The **claim of chattelhood extends to the soul as well as to the body**, for the body cannot be otherwise held and controlled. **There is no other religious despotism on the face of the earth so absolute, so irresponsible, so soul crushing as this.** It is not subjection to an ecclesiastical body or functionary of any description; a presbytery, a conference, a bishop, a prelate, a pope, who may be supposed to be sensible, in some sort, of their sacred and responsible charge!

The free white American exults in his exemption from the jurisdiction of these, except during his own free consent. He would freely part with his life's blood, in martyrdom or in war, rather than relinquish or compromise this right! But he thinks it a light matter (if he thinks of it at all) that three millions of his countrymen are in a worse spiritual thralldom than this, under bishops that regard and treat them as "chattels personal!" a bishopric entailed by descent, or conferred by the hammer of the auctioneer, the writ of the sheriff, or the chances of the billiardtable, and transferable in the same manner!

Nay, exercised by deputation every day, by the brutal overseer, the ignorant housekeeper, the spoiled child; a bishopric, Christian or infidel, drunken or sober, chaste or lewd, as the chances may happen! **Who thinks of t, that the religious RIGHTS of izmMotal men are thus trampled in the dust in this country; that their religious privileges are in such keeping? How is it that Christian ministers, "sons of the Pilgrims," can overlook all this, as they do, when they speak of the "innocent legal relation" that involves, of necessity, all this?**

The absolute power of the Pope, though conferred, as it once was, by the almost unanimous consent of all Christendom, they can denounce as "THE Antichrist," forgetful of the more absolute power of every "owner" of an American slave! The doom of the former they read in the Apocalypse; the latter they deem Heaven sanctioned and approved, blaming only its abuse! Why may not Papal power have the benefit of the same apology? Whence comes it that the absolute religious despotism (for such it is) of the slave owner is so much more sacred and unapproachable than that of the Protestant or Catholic Church?

CHAPTER VII. FREE SOCIAL WORSHIP AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION PROHIBITED. The Government not only permits the Master to forbid the free Social Worship and Religious Instruction of his Slaves, at his pleasure, but it also steps in with direct prohibitions of its own, which even the Master himself may not relax or abrogate.

It is quite remarkable, that all the real practical restraints which the Slave Codes of the South throw around the slave master, are obviously for the purpose of withholding him from some exercise of humanity or of justice towards the slave; not one of them is for the purpose of restraining him from inhumanity and injustice!

From no act of barbarity, cruelty, or even murder, is he in reality restrained. The enactments professing to have that object, we have found to be ineffectual, impossible to execute, deceptive, self contradictory, and, in fact, sheer pretense! We have found no laws that even professed to guard the highest interests of slaves as human beings, family sanctities, female chastity, education, religious development. No restraints upon the violation and destruction of these are attempted to be thrown around the slave master.

But, on the other hand, he is restrained, as has been shown, from allowing to his slave (for the mutual benefit of both parties) a peculium of property from a tithe of his own earnings, with the benefits of "I hiring out" for that purpose! He is restrained, as we have seen, from bestowing upon his slave an education that would increase his usefulness, or of employing him to do any kind of writing! **The slave may be "used" so as to be "used up" in seven years; may be used as a "breeder," as a prostitute, as a concubine, as a pimp, as a tapster, as an attendant at the gaming table, as a subject of medical and surgical experiments for the benefit of science, and the Legislature makes no objections against it! But he may not be used as a clerk!** In all-this, the master's absolute right of ownership is restrained!

It is restrained too, as we shall see, by not permitting even the master to allow his slave the privileges of free social worship and religious instruction, well calculated as these privileges may be to increase in him those Christian virtues for which he is sometimes commended in advertisements, to enhance his value in the market! The master's right we shall also find restrained by the laws forbidding him freely, and at self discretion, to emancipate! The great solicitude of the law seems to be, to prevent the master from being too kind to his slave!

The philosophy of this is readily seen. A minority of slave owners are deemed exposed to the weakness of exercising some humanity and justice, of manifesting some feeling of

responsibility to God in their treatment of their fellow-men! **The majority of slaveholders, who make the laws, will not tolerate this! They enter, fully and understandingly, into the spirit of slave ownership.** That "legal relation" must be preserved at all hazards; and they know it is endangered by humanity, by justice, by education, and by religion.

They know that if others emancipate, their own tenure will be weakened. **The rise of an oppressive oligarchy of slave owners begins here. And religious liberty is the very last thing to be tolerated by it. Religious liberty is the precursor of civil and political liberty and enfranchisement, and must be suppressed. The gospel would indeed abolish American slavery, (as is often said,) if it could only be introduced among the slaves so far as to confer upon them religious liberty.. This our American slaveholders understand, as will now be shown.**

In Georgia, by an Act of Dec. 13, 1792, with the title, "To PROTECT religious societies in the exercise of their religious duties," it is required of every justice of the peace, &c., to take into custody any person who shall interrupt or disturb a congregation of WHITE PERSONS, &c., assembled at any church, &c., and to impose a fine on the offender; and in default of payment he may be imprisoned, &c., &c. Yet the same law concludes with these words: **"No congregation or company of NEGROES shall, under pretense of divine worship, assemble themselves, contrary to the Act regulating patrols."** (Prince's Digest, 342.)

This Act regulating patrols is understood to be the Act of May 10, 1770, "for ordering and governing slaves," wherein slaves are forbidden to assemble "on pretense of feasting," &c., and "any constable," on direction of a justice, is commanded to disperse ANY assembly or meeting of slaves which may disturb the peace or endanger the safety of his Majesty's subjects; and every slave which may be found at such meeting, as aforesaid, shall and may, by order of such justice, immediately be corrected, WITHOUT TRIAL, by receiving on the bare back twenty-five stripes with a whip), switch, or cowskin," &c. (Prince's Digest, 447.)

From the general terms of this Act, there can be no doubt that it was applicable to religious meetings before the Act of 1792 occasioned its reiteration with more distinct specifications. In South Carolina, in the same Act of 1800, already cited as forbidding "slaves, free negroes, mulattoes, and mestizoes" to assemble for "mental instruction," there is the following additional section: "It shall not be lawful for any number of slaves, free negroes, mulattoes, or mestizoes, even, in company with white persons, to meet together and assemble for this purpose of mental instruction or religious worship, either before the rising of the sun or after the going down of the same.

And all magistrates, sheriffs, militia officers, &c., &c., are hereby vested with power, &c., for dispersing such assemblies." (2 Brevard's Digest, 254-5.) "Three years afterwards, upon petition, as the Act recites, of certain religious societies, the rigor of the Act of 1800 was slightly abated, by a modification which forbids any person, before nine o'clock in the evening, "to break into a place of meeting wherein shall be assembled the members of any religious society in this State, provided a majority of them shall be white persons, or otherwise to disturb their devotion, unless such person, &c., so entering said place [of worship] shall first have obtained from some magistrate, &c., a warrant, &c., in case a magistrate shall be then actually

within a distance of three miles from such place of meeting; otherwise the provisions, &c., [of the Act of 1800,] to remain in full force." (Brevard's Digest, 261. Stroud's Sketch, pp. 93-4.)

So that, **in order to attend a religious meeting securely, the slave must know beforehand (1st) that there will be present "a majority of white persons;** (2d,) that there will be **no person there with " a warrant" from a justice to apprehend him;** and (3d) that a justice will not " be then" within three miles' distance! For a mistake in either of these particulars, he (or she) is subjected to the penalty of " twenty-five lashes with the cowskin on the bare back, well laid on!" "In Virginia, all evening meetings of slaves at any meeting-house are unequivocally forbidden." (Jay's Inquiry, p. 137. See Stroud, p. 94. See also 1 Revised Code (of 1819), 424-5, already cited (Chap. VI.) as prohibiting meetings for promoting education.)

The first clause will be found to **prohibit " all meetings" of slaves, &c., in the evening. "Slaves may, however, attend at church on any day of public worship."** (Stroud, p. 94.) Mississippi-same as Virginia, **with a proviso that a master may permit his slave to attend the preaching of a white minister, regularly ordained and licensed, or where at least two discreet and respectable white persons, appointed by some regular church, shall attend.** (Mississippi Rev. Code, 390. Stroud's Sketch, p. 94. Jay's Inquiry, p. 137.)

Religious liberty secures the right of the worshippers to choose and arrange their own modes and forms of religious worship, and to select their own teachers; not the privilege of being permitted to worship when, where, and how the Government or a slaveholder may appoint, and under such religious teachers as they may select. The essence of spiritual despotism and of religious persecution lies in the enforcement of such claims.

It is no discredit to the slaves that they have little or no desire to hear religious harangues from their oppressors, or that they loathe the instructions of ministers who preach the rightfulness of slaveholding. The Southampton slave insurrection of Nat. Turner (once a preacher) may have furnished a pretext for the following: "The Legislature of Virginia passed a law in 1831, by which any free colored person who undertakes to preach or conduct a religious meeting by day or night may be whipped, not exceeding thirty nine lashes, at the discretion of any justice of the peace; and any body may apprehend any such free colored person without a warrant.

The same penalty, adjudged and executed in the same way, falls on any slave or free colored person who attends such preaching; and any slave who listens to any white preacher in the night-time receives the same punishment. The same law prevails in Georgia and Mississippi. A master may permit a slave to preach on his plantation, to none but his slaves." (Child's Appeal, p. 67.) An early law of Maryland, (Act of 1715, chap. 44, sec. 23,) and a similar one in South Carolina, (in 1711,) **permits the baptism of slaves, but carefully provides that " such baptism shall not be construed to effect the emancipation of any slave."**

This arose from a contrary apprehension growing out of ancient usages in England, and the opinion of some jurists that Christians could not be lawfully enslaved. In Louisiana the Legislature enacted: "It shall be the duty of every owner to procure his sice slaves all kinds of temporal and spiritual assistance which their situation may require." (1 MAartin's Dig., 610.)

These Maryland and Louisiana privileges of baptism at birth, and of extreme unction on a deathbed, apparently of Roman Catholic origin, were undoubtedly considered great kindnesses; and they constitute, to this day, almost, if not entirely, the sum total of the legal provision for the slave as a religious being. The prohibitions recorded in this chapter have found their defense or apology in the alleged dangers of insurrection and insubordination!

The plea is strongly condemnatory of the system, its apologists, and its administrators! **Of no system but an iniquitous one could it be true that religious liberty would array and arm its subjects against its fundamental law!** No right-minded person, who was at heart neither a slave nor a tyrant, would ever urge such a plea. **And if the slaveholders treated their servants justly and kindly, the danger of insurrection would cease.**

The plea, if false, should itself be execrated. If founded on a real danger, it reveals the inherent and inexpressible wickedness of slaveholding, and of the so-called "legal relation" that sustains it, and that is itself maintained at such a sacrifice! The "necessity" of such laws, rightly interpreted; resolves itself into the necessity of "immediate and unconditional abolition." The general condition of the slaves is not better than is indicated by these enactments. We have not room to present a full specimen of Southern testimony on this subject.

The Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, in 1834, said: "Slavery deprives its subjects, in a great measure, of the privileges of the gospel." "The law, as it is here, does not prevent free access to the Scriptures; but ignorance, the natural result of their condition, does. The Bible is before them. But it is, to them, a sealed book. Very few of them enjoy the advantages of a regular gospel ministry." The Address of the Synod proceeds to say that some have proposed missionaries among slaves, but adds that the "community" will never sustain this measure until they are "fitted for measures for emancipation."

They add: **"It is evident that, as a body, our slaves do not enjoy the public ordinances of religion. Domestic means of grace are still more rare among them."** From a sermon of Bishop Meade, it may be inferred that the religious condition of slaves is not better in Virginia. The Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in 1833, published a statement in which they said of the slaves: "There are over TWO MILLIONS of human beings in the condition of heathen, and some of them in a worse condition." "They may justly be considered the HEATHEN of this country, and will bear a comparison with heathen in any country in the world.

The negroes are destitute of the gospel, and ever WILL BE under the present state of things. In the vast field extending from an entire State beyond the Potomac [i. e., Maryland] to the Sabine River, [at that time our South-western boundary,] and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not twelve men exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes. **In the present state of feeling in the South, a ministry of their own color could neither be obtained NOR TOLERATED. But do not the negroes have access to the gospel through the stated ministry of the whites? We answer, No. The negroes have no regular and efficient ministry: as a matter of course, no churches; neither is there sufficient room in the white churches for their accommodation.**

We know of but five churches in the slaveholding States, built expressly for their use. These are all in the State of Georgia. We may now inquire whether they enjoy the privileges of the gospel in their own houses, and on our plantations? Again we return a negative answer. They have no Bibles to read by their own firesides. They have no family altars; and when in affliction, sickness, or death, they have no minister to address to them the consolations of the gospel, nor to bury them with appropriate services."

Again, in 1834, the same Synod said: "The gospel, as things now are, can never be preached to the two classes [whites and blacks] successfully in conjunction." "The galleries or back seats on the lower floor of white churches are generally appropriated to the negroes, when it can be done without inconvenience to the whites.

When it cannot be done conveniently, **the negroes must catch the gospel as it escapes through the doors and windows.**" "If the master is pious, the house servants alone attend family worship, and frequently few or none of them." "So far as masters are engaged in the work, [of religious instruction of slaves,] an almost unbroken silence reigns on this vast field." The Charleston (S. C.) Observer, and the Western Luminary, Lexington, (Ky.,) fully corroborate these statements. So also does Rev. C. C. Jones, of Georgia, who says further: **"We cannot cry out against the Papists for withholding the Scriptures from the common people, and keeping them in ignorance of the way of life, for we withhold the Bible from our servants, and keep them in ignorance of it, while we will not use the means to have it read and explained to them."**

The North Carolina Baptist Convention adopted a Report concerning the religious instruction of the colored people, with a series of Resolutions, concluding as follows: "Resolved, That by religious instruction be understood **VERBAL communications on religious subjects!" But not even verbal instructions, it seems, could be tolerated in South Carolina.** In 1838, the Methodist Conference of South Carolina appointed a missionary, Rev. Mr. Turpin, to labor among the colored people, but it was soon suppressed by the principal citizens. The Greenville (S. C.) Fountain of Nov. 2, 1838, contained the particulars.

**APPENDIX E: "Christianity-- A Pillar of the HBCU"⁶⁹
by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.**

“The Black Church, together with tremendous aid from white Christian philanthropists, laid the foundation for black elementary, high school, industrial, and college education in the United States.

“The significance of the Christian spirit should not be diminished, since during the 19th Century, many people believed that Africans and African Americans were too intellectually inferior to master "European" standards of learning.

“And so the positions taken by several white Christian groups-- especially the Quakers, Presbyterians, and Methodists-- in favor of educating African Americans, were both laudatory and extraordinary!

“I. The BAPTIST CHURCH-- Contributions

“The Black Baptist Churches, with the cooperation from the white-run American Baptist Home Mission Society, established some eighty elementary and high schools between 1865 and 1900.

“The Black Baptist Churches also established eighteen colleges or semi-colleges designed for African Americans in South.

“II. The METHODIST CHURCH-- Contributions

“The Black Methodists established 11 colleges between 1870 and 1900, as follows:

The African Methodist Episcopal Church founded six colleges;

The Colored Methodist Church founded four colleges;

The Zion Methodist Church founded 1 college.

⁶⁹ This Appendix is a re-print of a 2014 Face Book article created and posted by the author.

“The Black Methodist denominations received support from the white Methodists through the “Freedmen’s Aid Society of the Methodist Church,” which was an auxiliary of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“By 1878, the Freedmen’s Aid Society of the Methodist Church founded five colleges, two theological seminaries, and two medical schools.

“III. The PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—Contributions

“The white Presbyterians founded Lincoln University in Pennsylvania in 1854, and, after the Civil War, Johnson C. Smith University in 1867; Scotia Seminary in 1870; and Knoxville College in 1872.

“IV. The CATHOLIC CHURCH-- Contributions

“The Catholic Church has been notable for educating northern black children in inner city communities and southern blacks primarily in the state of Louisiana. In 1915, it established the only black catholic university in the United States: Xavier University of Louisiana.

“As a rule, the student body in these schools tended to be all-black, but the faculty members were mixed, with black and white instructors. The Historically Black College and University (HBCU) owes much of its history to Christianity and the Black Church.

“The article below, "Echoes of Faith: Church Roots Run Deep Among

“HBCUs” is an excellent overview of that history.
<http://diverseeducation.com/article/17259/>

*“Let your works praise you, so that we may love you;
and let us love you so that your works may praise you....”*

-- St. Augustine of Hippo