

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 and the Duty to Teach the Gospel to Servants and Slaves”

Appendix B: “Puritanism and the Duty of Family Worship”

Appendix C: “Puritanism, the Sabbath Day, and Westminster Confession of Faith, 1647”

Appendix D: “Puritanism, the Sabbath Day, and the Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell (1653-1658)”

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

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

Appendix G: “Puritanism, Observations of American Slavery, and Frederick Douglass’s Sabbath School”

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

Appendix I: “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

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.

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

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

² See, e.g., **Appendix F**, “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).

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 [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.

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.

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.

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 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

¹⁴ Ibid.

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.

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

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.”)

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

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 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

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 105.

²¹ Ibid., p. 104-105.

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 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

²² Ibid., pp. 105-106.

²³ Ibid., p. 106.

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)
Obey/ Administer/ Teach Law of Christ	Obey/ Administer/ Teach Law of Christ

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

²⁴ Ibid., p. 101.

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
- (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 attire; 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 on 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

²⁵ Ibid., p. 101-102.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 99-102.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

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

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 slave-holding 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

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid, pp. 90-93.

guilty Puritan conscience. Puritan slaveholders were thus believed to be “Christ’s trustees” and “guardians” over the souls of their slaves: **“As Abraham was to circumcise all his servants that were bought with money, and the fourth commandment requireth masters to see that all within their gates observe the Sabbath day; so must you exercise both your power and love to bring them [i.e., the slaves] to the knowledge and faith of Christ, and to the just obedience of God’s commands.”**⁴⁰

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.

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?⁴¹ Indeed, under English common law and Anglican ecclesiastical law, the duty to provide religious instruction within the

⁴⁰ Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory or, A Sum of Practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience* (Re-printed in Columbia, S.C. in January 2019), p. [omitted].

⁴¹ 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.”)

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.⁴²

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.

⁴² Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2017), p. 327.

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....**⁴³

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 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....**⁴⁴

⁴³ Ibid., p. 219.

⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 167-168.

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.⁴⁵

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 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).**⁴⁶ The Puritans of colonial New England did not deny or shirk this responsibility to educate and elevate their slaves.⁴⁷ Dr. Carter G. Woodson⁴⁸ tells us:

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 327.

⁴⁶ See, e.g., **Appendix I**, Christianity—A Pillar of the HBCU.”

⁴⁷ 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.**”)

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 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....

⁴⁸ Carter G. Woodson, Ph.D. (Harvard '12), was the second African American to earn the doctor of philosophy degree from Harvard University.

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....⁴⁹

[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 cometen 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

⁴⁹ Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro* (Published by CreateSpace, 2013), pp. 12-20.

‘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.’⁵⁰

However, the Puritan example of moral uplift and emancipation of African slaves⁵¹ in North America was rejected in colonial Virginia, Maryland, the Carolinas and Georgia.⁵² As late as the 1830s and 40s, for instance, we hear Frederick Douglass’s poignant complaints against the denial of literacy, education, and religion to African slaves.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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

⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 18-19.

⁵¹ 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.**”).

⁵² 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.**”).

⁵³ See Appendix G, “Frederick Douglass’s Sabbath School and Observations of American Slavery”

⁵⁴ “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>.

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....⁵⁵

And with economics Paul Samuelson describing this same “chattel-slavery” system that had emerged during the early 1820s in the United states, as follows:

We do know how the profit motive led to the slave trade: pursuing maximum profit—equating marginal revenues and costs, so to speak—merchants used bribery and force to abduct Africans in order to export and sell them in the New World. So long as a plentiful supply of replacement imports could be counted on, each slave was regarded as an exhaustible resource. Just as a vein of copper can be worked to depletion, a slave could be worked to death without regard for natural reproduction or old-age incapacity....⁵⁶

This conception of the African slave as “property,” as “chattel,” and as “soulless subhuman brutes” who should be denied the rights of family, marriage, parents,

⁵⁵ William Goodell, *The American Slave Code in Theory and Practice* (1853)(republished by Univ. of Michigan Press). See, also, **Appendix H**.

⁵⁶ Paul A. Samuelson, *Economics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1976), p. 782.

education, literacy, freedom of religion and the like, grew out from the First Industrial Revolution (1760-1840) and the rise of industrial capitalism, secularism, and Enlightenment challenge to the Christian idea that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth” (Acts 17: 26-28). The secular conception of the African slave was that he was a “chattel”; whereas the Puritan conception of the African slave was that he was a brother, a human being, and person placed under the trusteeship of the slave-owner who had an obligation raise his moral, intellectual and cultural status in preparation, on a case-by-case basis, for manumission.

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 law⁵⁷, 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”⁵⁸ 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.

⁵⁷ “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>.

⁵⁸ 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).

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.

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 and the Duty to Teach the Gospel to Servants and Slaves* by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

A. Introduction

Much has been written on the so-called Christian Church's participation in the transatlantic slave trade and justifications for African slavery in the New World, but very little has been written on what Christian pastors, theologians, and laymen did, not only to ensure that American slavery comported with the parameters of the law of Moses and the law of Christ,⁵⁹ but to promote the general morals of both slave-holder and slave, and, ultimately, the abolition of American slavery.

Instead, the general but false presumption among many scholars and the general public is to assume that the Christian church as a whole both justified and accepted the institution of "chattel slavery," as it developed in the southern part of the United States during the 19th century. As the following index of tables reveals, the church continuously reminded American slaveholders of their obligation to treat the slaves humanely, to teach them the Gospel, and to elevate them:

Index to Tables

Table 1. "Slavery under the Colonial Law of British North America"

Table 2. "Dr. Cotton Mather on 'The Instruction of Negroes.'"

Table 3. "A Proposition for Encouraging the Christian Education of Indians, Negroes, and Mulatto Children" (1724)

Table 4. "Pastoral Letter of Bishop Gibson of London" (1727)

Table 5. "Sermon Preached by Bishop Secker of London" (1741)

⁵⁹ 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.**")

Table 6. “Excerpt from Sermon of Rev. Thomas Bacon” (1750)

Table 7. “Minutes of the Yearly Meeting of the Friends of Virginia in 1757 and 1773”

The historical evidence of Christian churches’ and their ministers’ efforts (see, e.g., Tables 1 through 7 below) to encourage American slaveholders to respect what was essentially the “human rights” of their slaves, reveals that the modern-day misconception that Christianity promoted and approved “chattel slavery” is misleading and inaccurate. The Christian church prior to 1800 clearly promoted the moral improvement and education of African slaves, and after 1820, it became staunch advocates for abolishing the system of chattel slavery that had then become so rampant on plantations throughout the American south and the British West Indies.

The Church of England and its leading Puritan theologians never approved of the atrocities of the transatlantic slave trade or chattel slavery. The Puritans of colonial New England, for instance, treated “slavery” as a form of benevolent “bond-servitude” where the slaveholder served as Christ’s trustee over the slave, with the primary purpose of helping to elevate the moral and material well-being of the slave. This trusteeship meant teaching the slaves about the Christian faith; treating the slaves humanely; providing the slaves for various forms of vocational education; and bringing the slaves into church membership.

According to the New England Puritans, the institution of African slavery served two primary functions: first, to morally, culturally, and spiritually elevate the slaves through the blessings of the Gospel; and, second, to prepare the slaves for ultimate emancipation. Therefore, Christian slaveholders were believed to be “Christ’s trustees” and “guardians” over the souls of their slaves: **“As Abraham was to circumcise all his servants that were bought with money, and the fourth commandment requireth masters to see that all within their gates observe the Sabbath day; so must you exercise both your power and love to**

bring them [i.e., the slaves] to the knowledge and faith of Christ, and to the just obedience of God’s commands.”⁶⁰

B. Against Men-stealing and Chattel Slavery

The slaveholders of British North America, under the laws of nature (and the law of nations), were expressly prohibited from engaging in “men-stealing,” or the taking of human beings from African who had committed no crimes or captured pursuant to a just war. However, the British colonists were allowed to purchase Africans who had been taken captive in just wars, but only so long as they endeavored to bring these slaves the blessings of the Gospel of Christ. They also had a lawful duty to treat their slaves humanely; to offer them the Christian faith, without force or compulsion;⁶¹ to offer them rest on the Lord’s Day and holidays; to provide them adequate good, clothing, and lodging; and to act as God’s stewards over their souls. Just as the patriarch Abraham circumcised his servants, so too did the English slaveholder have an obligation to teach the Christian religion to their slaves in North America and the West Indies.

In fact, bringing the Christian faith to the slaves had been the primary justification for the Church of England’s approval of the transatlantic slave trade. As the Puritan divine Rev. Richard Baxter (1615-1691) opined: “[m]ake it your chief end in buying and using slaves, to win them to Christ, and save their souls.”⁶² Forbidding slaves to receive the Gospel of Christ was therefore expressly forbidden. “Those therefore that keep their Negroes and slaves from hearing God’s word,” wrote Rev. Baxter, “and from becoming Christians, because by the law they shall then be either made free, or they shall lose part of their service, do openly profess rebellion against God, and contempt for Christ the Redeemer of

⁶⁰ Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory or, A Sum of Practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience* (Re-printed in Columbia, S.C. in January 2019), p. [omitted].

⁶¹ Richard Baxter reminded English slaveholder to not force the Christian faith upon infidels: “If they are infidels, neither be too hasty in baptizing them, when they desire it, nor too slow. Not so hasty as to put them on it, before they understand what the baptismal covenant is; or before you see any likelihood that they should be serious in making such covenant. Nor yet show as to let them alone to linger out their lives in the state of those without the church. But hasten them to learn, and stir up their desires, and look after them, as the ancient churches did after their catechumens; and when you see them fit by knowledge, belief, desire, and resolution, to vow themselves to God on the terms of the holy covenant, then put them on to be baptized.” Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory, A Sum of Practical Theology, and Case of Conscience* (Part 2 Economics)(Re-published in Columbia, S.C.), p. 93.

⁶² Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory, A Sum of Practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience* (Part 2 Economics)(Re-published in Columbia, S.C., January 2019).

souls, and a contempt of the souls of men; and indeed they declare, that their worldly profit is their treasure and their god.”⁶³

Accordingly, under the English common law, the concept of “chattel slavery” had been deemed odious to the Christian faith and therefore to the common law since at least the year 1102 A.D., during the reign of King William II. “Enslavement of Europeans by other Europeans had been abolished when villenage disappeared; and even under villenage, the enslavement of non-Europeans could not be supported. Church councils had repeatedly prohibited the practice; and a council in London in 1102 forbade anyone ‘henceforth to follow the guilty practice which until that time in England permitted the sale of men like wild animals.’ Consequently from the 12th century on, slavery had become rare or had disappeared from the English nation (Verlinden 128). And, throughout Europe, the Catholic church had forbidden enslavement of other Christians.”⁶⁴

Thereafter, “servant” and “slave” were synonymous terms in the English common law, which had been founded upon natural law, the law of nature, or the law of reason (all of which were thoroughly grounded in the Ten Commandments and the Christian faith). For this reason, the English common law, as guided by the Church of England, forbade slave holders from requiring “more of an innocent slave, than you would or might do of an ordinary servant, if he were at your will....”⁶⁵ Chattel slavery was prohibited by the Gospel, because God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth....”⁶⁶

The Anglican Church and the Puritans thus taught (a) that there was “[s]ufficiently difference between men and brutes”⁶⁷; (b) that slaves “are of as good a kind as” English slaveholders⁶⁸; that slaves “are reasonable creatures... born to as much natural liberty”⁶⁹; that “nature has made” slaves the “equals” to

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Charshie C.L. McIntyre, *Criminalizing A Race: Free Blacks During Slavery* (Queens, N.Y.: Kayode Pub., 1993), p. 2 (Citing Charles Verlinden, *The Beginning of Modern Colonization*. (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell U. Press, 1970), p. 128.)

⁶⁵ Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory, or A Sum of Practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience* (Part 2 Christian Economics)(re-published in Columbia, S.C. January 2019), p.93.

⁶⁶ Acts: 17:26.

⁶⁷ Baxter, *A Christian Directory* (Part 2), p. 90.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

slaveholders⁷⁰; that slaves “have immortal souls, and are equally capable of salvation with” everyone else⁷¹; that slaveholders “have no power to do anything which shall hinder [the] salvation” of slaves; and that slaveholders have no “warrant...to hold them so hard to work, as not to allow them due time and seasons for that which God hath made their duty.”⁷²

The Church of England and the Puritans abhorred the idea of “chattel slavery” and expressly forbade it as an odious crime. They detested what appeared to be gross atrocities throughout the British West Indies, where the slaveholders were rumored to have denied the right to religion to their slaves; where human beings were being reduced to the status of cows and brutes; and gross injustices were rampant. Rev. Baxter objected to such practices, stating: “How cursed a crime is it to equal men and beasts! Is not this your practice? Do you not buy them and use them merely to the same end, as you do your horses? To labour for your commodity, as if they were baser than you, and made to serve you? Do you not see how you reproach and condemn yourselves, while you vilify them as savages and barbarous wretches? Did they ever do any thing more savage, than to use not only men’s bodies as beasts, but their souls as if they were made for nothing but to actuate their bodies in your worldly drudgery?... Will not the example and warning of neighbor countries rise up in judgment against you and condemn you? You cannot but hear how odious the Spanish name is made (and thereby, alas! The Christian name also, among the West Indians) for their most inhuman cruelties in Hispaniola, Jamaica, Cuba, Peru, Mexico, and other places, which is described by Josep. A Costa, a Jesuit of their own; and though I know that their cruelty who murdered millions, exceedeth yours, who kill not men’s bodies, yet yours is of the same kind, in the merchandise which you make with the devil for their souls, whilst you that should help them with all your power, do hinder them from the means of their salvation.”⁷³

C. Natural Law and the Natural Rights of Slaves

The Declaration of Independence’s proclamation of the “Rights of Man” in 1776, and that “all men are created equal” and entitled to “life, liberty, and the

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 90-91.

pursuit of happiness” had been the original goal of Christian slaveholders for their African and Indian slaves. The institution of slavery was believed to be God’s trusteeship, and a Christian stewardship, whereby the slaveholder was charged with bringing civilization and human brotherhood to the slaves, in preparation for their ultimate emancipation.

Furthermore, the Anglican Church and the Puritans believed that slaveholders held only a “limited propriety” in their slaves, since “God is their absolute Owner.”⁷⁴ This benevolent attitude toward slaves is reflected in the actions of the New England Puritans, of whom Rev. Baxter spoke, as follows: “And on the contrary, what an honour is it to those of New England, that they take not so much as the native soil from them, but by purchase! That they enslave none of them, nor use them cruelly, but show them mercy, and are at a great deal of care, and cost, and labour for their salvation!”⁷⁵ Indeed, the Puritans believed that both slaveholders and slaves were believed to be “equally under the government and laws of God. And therefore all God’s laws must be first obeyed by” both slave and slaveholder.⁷⁶ The Anglicans held that God is the “reconciled, tender Father” of the slaves, and that the slaves were “the redeemed ones of Christ.”⁷⁷ In fact, **the English common law did not conceptualize “chattel slavery,” and such concept was certainly incomprehensible in colonial New England:**

Not being used to chattel slavery, English colonists in the seventeenth century, as repeatedly asserted, were not familiar with the law and practice of perpetual bondage. It has also been shown that to a great degree the New Englanders, influenced by the Mosaic Law, regarded the slave as synonymous with the Hebrew ‘servant,’ who was to serve for six years and then go free. In fact, until almost the end of the seventeenth century the records refer to the Negroes as ‘servants’ and not as ‘slaves.’ For some time no definite status could be assigned to incoming Negroes. Some were sold for a period of time only, and like the white indentured servant became free after their indenture. Others

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 91.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

were probably emancipated because of the early inability of the colonists to decide upon the disposition of the children of slaves.

Until 1670 slave offspring in Massachusetts were regarded as free, and only after that date, as has been shown elsewhere, were they legally enslaved. Just how many Negroes in New England were emancipated as a result of this uncertainty is not known, but the number could not have been large, for up to 1670 comparatively few Negroes had been imported.

Other Negroes were probably liberated through the application of the Rhode Island Law of 1652 which, as indicated, limited slavery to ten years. Although openly violated, the law was never repealed, and, it is, therefore, possible that, under its provisions, a few slaves may have won their liberty.

Further additions to the free Negro group resulted from private agreements between master and slave, whereby the latter would be set free after serving his owner for a stated number of years from the date of purchase. The net result of such compacts was to convert the slave into an indentured servant.

One of the earliest of these contracts was that between Judge John Saffin of Boston and his slave, Adam, in 1694, whereby the slave was to receive his freedom after six years of faithful service. Five years later, William Hawkins of Providence, Rhode Island, agreed to emancipate his Negro, Jack, providing the latter served him dutifully for twenty-six years. This practice continued into the eighteenth century....

The free Negro class also received accessions through the liberation of slaves whose emancipation had been provided for in the wills of appreciative masters. Many examples can be cited: Robert Dole of Newbury, Massachusetts, certified in his will of 1698 that his slave woman, Grace, could have her freedom 'if she will accept it.' Another slave, Betty, was to be manumitted after two additional years of service. In like manner, Reverend Timothy Walker of Concord, New

Hampshire, liberated his slave, Prince, and Cotton Mather freed on of his slaves.

Emancipated slaves did not always go forth empty-handed from their masters' service. Some Negroes, like indentured servants, were furnished with certain necessities for embarking upon their new life as freemen. In his will of 1708, Richard Arnold of Providence stipulated that when his slave, Toby, was freed at the age of twenty-five, he should be given 'two suits... a good narrow axe, a broad hoe, and a sithe with tackling fit for mowing and twenty shillings in money.' Upon freeing her slaves some time later, Lydia Plant of Newbury, Massachusetts, arranged in her will for the Negroes to have the use of her house and household goods for four years.

During the Revolution, Captain Samuel Smedley of Fairfield, Connecticut, not only freed Boston, but, before doing so, taught him a trade, gave him a workshop, and established him in business as a shoemaker and also stipulated that this executors should give Boston a thousand dollars. To Boston's father, Smedley granted thirty dollars a year for the remainder of the Negro's life.⁷⁸

For these reasons, when the Declaration of Independence (1776) and the U.S. Constitution (1787) were ratified, the residents of New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, thus considering bond-servitude to be inconsistent with the American constitution, soon after emancipated their slaves and (or) enacted laws for their gradual emancipation.

Table 1. "Slavery under the Colonial Law of British North America"

CATEGORY OF SERVANT	HOW ATTAINED	TERMS OF SERVICE
Servant (i.e., "slave by contract"; or "Indentured servitude")	Voluntary Contract (Indentures); Services the Master for a Term of Years	Duty of Humane Treatment: (1). "The soul of the servant

⁷⁸ Lorenzo J. Greene, *The Negro In Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2016), pp. 290-293.

		<p>must be cared for and preserved. He must have time to learn the word of God, and time to pray, and he must rest on the Lord's Day, and employ it in God's service. He must be instructed, and exhorted, and kept from sin."</p> <p>(2). "He may not be forced to commit any sin against God."</p> <p>(3). "He may not (though he forcedly consent) be denied such comforts of this life, as are needful to his cheerful serving of God in love and thankfulness, according to the peace of the gospel state; and which are called by the name of our daily bread. No man may deny a slave any of this, that is not a criminal, punished slave."⁷⁹</p>
<p>Slave (lawful)</p>	<p>Involuntary Servitude (Just War; Convicted Criminal)</p> <p>The African slave trade was justified on the premise that the slaves had been captured in a just ward and purchased lawfully with the primary objective of teaching the slaves Christianity.</p>	<p>Duty of Humane Treatment:</p> <p>(1). "The soul of the servant must be cared for and preserved. He must have time to learn the word of God, and time to pray, and he must rest on the Lord's Day, and employ it in God's service. He must be instructed, and exhorted, and kept from sin."</p> <p>(2). "He may not be forced to commit any sin against God."</p> <p>(3). "He may not (though he forcedly consent) be denied such comforts of this life, as are needful to his cheerful</p>

⁷⁹ Ibid.

		<p>serving of God in love and thankfulness, according to the peace of the gospel state; and which are called by the name of our daily bread. No man may deny a slave any of this, that is not a criminal, punished slave.”</p> <p>(4). Slaves who are “Convicted Criminals” are subject to “stripes and severities which might not lawfully be inflicted on another.”⁸⁰</p>
Slave (unlawful)	Involuntary Servitude (Slave attained through “men-stealing”; Unjust Wars, etc.)	<p>According Law of Nature:</p> <p>Slaves attained under these conditions must be freed</p>
Slave (Chattel Slavery; unlawful)	<p>Involuntary Servitude Based Upon Chattel Slavery or the Absolute Lack of Natural Rights in the African Slave; See, e.g., the U.S. Supreme Court case of <i>Dred Scott v. Sanford</i> (1857)(The African slave has “no rights” which a white person is bound to respect); and no natural rights in the common law, Declaration of Independence or in the U.S. Constitution).⁸¹</p>	<p>According to Law of Nature:</p> <p>Slaves subjected to the condition of chattel slavery may be freed or afforded legal and equitable remedies in a civil court against the master; said remedies to include emancipation from the involuntary servitude.</p> <p>Slaves held as chattels, but who were also attained from</p>

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ The Civil War Amendments, U.S. Constitution may be said to have been derived from natural law. See, e.g., the Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Ottawa, Illinois, August 21, 1858, with **Abraham Lincoln** stating: “**I hold that... there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. [Loud cheers.] I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects-certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the**

		<p>“unjust war” and “men-stealing” must be freed.</p>
--	--	---

Table 2. “Dr. Cotton Mather on ‘The Instruction of Negroes’”

“The following resolutions on the subject treated in this part (the instruction of Negroes) are from the works of Dr. Cotton Mather.—Bishop William Meade.

1st. I would always remember, **that my servants are in some sense my children**, and by taking care that they want nothing which may be good for them, I would make them as my children; and **so far as the methods of instituting piety into the mind** which I use with my children, may be properly and prudently used with my servants, they shall be partakers in them—**Nor will I leave them ignorant of anything, wherein I may instruct them to be useful to their generation.**

2d. **I will see that my servants be furnished with bibles and be able and careful to read the lively oracles.** I will put bibles and other good and proper books into their hands; will allow them time to read and assure myself that they do not misspend this time—If I can discern any wicked books in their hands, I will take away those pestilential instruments of wickedness.

3d I will have my servants present at the religious exercises of my family; and will drop, either in the exhortations, in the prayers or daily sacrifices of the family such pages as may have a tendency to quicken a sense of religion in them.

...

5th. I will be very inquisitive and solicitous about the company chosen by my servants; and with all possible earnestness will rescue them from the snares of evil company, and forbid their being

equal of every living man.” And see the Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Charleston, Illinois, September 18, 1858, with Lincoln stating: “I say upon this occasion I do not perceive that because the white man is to have the superior position the negro should be denied everything. **I do not understand that because I do not want a negro woman for a slave I must necessarily want her for a wife. My understanding is that I can just let her alone. I am now in my fiftieth year, and I certainly never had a black woman for either a slave or a wife.** So it seems to me quite possible for us to get along without making either slaves or wives of negroes.”

the companions of fools.

...

7th. I will **sometimes call my servants alone; talk to them about the state of their souls;** tell them to close with their only servant, charge them to do well and ‘lay hold on eternal life,’ and show them very particularly how they may render all they do for me a service to the glorious Lord; how they may do all from a principle of obedience to him, and become entitled to the ‘reward of the heavenly inheritance.’

Table 3 . “A Proposition For Encouraging the Christian Education of Indian, Negro, and Mulatto Children at Lambeth, Virginia, 1724”

“It being a duty of Christianity very much neglected by masters and mistresses of this country (America) **to endeavor the good instruction and education of their heathen slaves in the Christian faith,**-- the said duty being likewise earnestly recommended by his Majesty’s instructions,-- for the facilitating thereof among the young slaves that are born among us; it is, therefore, humbly proposed that every Indian, Negro, or mulatto child that shall be baptized and afterward brought to church and publicly catechized by the minister in church, and shall, before the fourteenth year of his or her age, give a distinct account of the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer and Ten Commandments, and whose master or mistress shall receive a certificate from the minister that he or she hath so done, such Indian, Negro or mulatto child shall be exempted from paying all levies till the age of eighteen years.”—Bishop William Meade’s *Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia*, vol. i., p. 265.

Table 4. “Pastoral Letter of Bishop Gibson of London”

To the Missionaries in the English Plantations (about 1727)

Dear Brother,

Having understood by many Letters from the Plantations, and by the Accounts of Persons who have come from thence, that very little progress hath hitherto been made in the conversion of the Negroe to the Christian Faith; I have thought it proper for me to lay before Masters and Mistresses the Obligations they are under, and to promote and encourage that pious and necessary Work....

As to those Ministers who have Negroes of their own; **I cannot but esteem it their indispensable Duty to use their best Endeavors to instruct them in the Christian Religion, in order to their being baptized;** both because such Negroes are their proper and immediate Care, and because it is in vain to hope that other Masters and Mistresses will exert themselves in this Work, if they see it wholly neglected, or but coldly pursued, in the Families of the Clergy....

I would also hope that the Schoolmasters in the several Parishes, part of whose Business it is to instruct Youth in the Principles of Christianity, might contribute somewhat towards the carrying on of this Work; by being ready to bestow upon it some of the Leisure Time, and especially on the Lord's Day, when both they and the Negroes are most at liberty and the Clergy are taken up with the public Duties of their Function.—Dalcho's An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina, pages 112-114.

Table 5 “Sermon Preached by Bishop Secker of London, 1741

“The next Object of the Society's Concern, were **the poor Negroes. These unhappy Wretches learn in their Native Country, the grossest Idolatry, and the most savage Dispositions: and then are sold to the best Purchaser:** sometimes by their Enemies, who would else put them to Death; sometimes by the nearest Friends, who are either unable or unwilling to maintain them. Their Condition in our Colonies, though it cannot well be worse than it would have been at Home, is yet nearly as hard as possible: their Servitude most laborious, their Punishments most severe. And thus many thousands of them spend their whole Days, one Generation after another, undergoing with reluctant Minds continual Toil in this World, and comforted with no Hopes of Reward in a better. **For it is not to be expected that Masters, too commonly negligent of Christianity themselves, will take much Pains to teach it their slaves; whom even the better Part of them are in a great Measure habituated to consider, as they do their Cattle, merely with a view to the Profit arising from them.** Not a few, therefore, have **openly opposed their instruction,** from an Imagination now indeed proved and acknowledged to be groundless, **that Baptism would entitle them to Freedom.** Others by **obliging them to work on Sundays** to provide themselves Necessaries, **leave them neither Time to learn Religion,** or any Prospect of being able to subsist, if once the Duty of resting on the Day become Part of their Belief. **And some, it may be feared, have been averse to their becoming Christians because after that, no Pretence will remain for not treating men like Men.** When these Obstacles are added to the fondness they have for their old Heathenish Rites, and the strong Prejudices they must have against Teachers from among those, whom they serve so unwillingly; it cannot be wondered, if the Progress made in their Conversion prove slow. **After some Experience of this kind, Catechists were appointed in two Places, by Way of Trial for Their Instruction alone: whose Success, where it was least, hath been considerable;** and so great in the Plantation belonging to the Society that out of two hundred and thirty, at least seventy are now Believers in Christ. And there is lately an Improvement to this Scheme begun to be executed, **by qualifying and employing young Negroes, prudently chosen, to teach their Countrymen;** from which in the Opinion of the best Judges, we may reasonably promise

ourselves, **that this miserable People, the Generality of whom have hitherto sat in Darkness, will see great Light.**”—Seeker’s A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1741.”

Table 6. “Excerpt from Sermon of Rev. Thomas Bacon Addressed to Masters and Servants about 1750”

“Next to our children and brethren by blood, our servants, and especially our slaves, are certainly in the nearest relation to us. They are an immediate and necessary part of our households, by whose labors and assistance we are enabled to enjoy the gifts of Providence in ease and plenty; and surely we owe them a return of what is just and equal for the drudgery and hardships they go through in our service....

“It is objected, They are such stubborn creatures, there is no dealing with them.

“Answer. Supposing this to be true of most of them (which I believe will scarcely be insisted on:) may it not fairly be asked, whence doth this stubbornness proceed?—Is it from nature? – Tha cannot be:-- for I think it is generally acknowledged that new Negroes, or those born in and imported from the coast of Guinea, prove the best and most tractable servants. Is it then from education? – for one or the other it must proceed from.—But pray who had the care of bringing up those that were born here?—Was it not ourselves?—And might not an early care, of instilling good principles into them when young, have prevented much of that stubbornness and untractableness you complain of in country-born negroes? – These, you cry out, are wickeder than the others:-- and, pray, where did they learn that wickedness?—Was it not among ourselves?—for those who come immediately from their own country, you say, have more simplicity and honesty. **A sad reproach to a Christian people indeed! That such poor ignorant heathens shall bring better morals and dispositions from home with them, that they can learn or actually do contract among us!**

“Most masters and mistresses will complain of their art and cunning in contriving to deceive them.—Is it reasonable to deny then they can learn what is good, when it is owned at the same time they can be so artful in what is bad? – Their ignorance, therefore, if born in the country, must absolutely be the fault of their owners:-- and such as are brought here from Africa may, surely, be taught something of advantage to their own future state, as well as to work for their masters’ present gain.—The difference plainly consists in this;-- that a good deal of pains is taken to shew them how to labour, and they are punished if they neglect it.—This sort of instruction their owners take care to give them every day, and look well to it that it be duly followed.—But no such pains are taken in the other case.—**They are generally left to themselves, whether they will serve God, or worship Devils—whether they become Christians, or remain heathens as long as they live: as if either their souls were not worth the saving, or as if we were under no obligation of giving them any instruction:--** which is

the true reason why **so many of them who are grown up, and lived many years among us, are as entirely ignorant of the principles of religion, as if they had never come into a Christian country**:-- at least, as to any good or practical purposes. ...

“I have dealt the longer upon this head, because it is of the utmost importance, and seems to be but little considered among us.—For there is too much reason to fear, that the many vices and immoralities so common among white people;-- the lewdness, drunkenness, quarrelling, abusiveness, swearing, lying, pride, backbiting, overreaching, idleness, and Sabbath-breaking, everywhere to be seen among us, are a great encouragement to our Negroes to do the like, and help strongly to confirm them in the habits of wickedness and impiety.

“We ought not only to avoid giving them bad examples, and abstain from all appearance of evil, but also strive to set a daily good example before their eyes, that seeing us lead the way in our own person, they may more readily be persuaded to follow in the wholesome paths of religion and virtue....

“We ought in a particular manner to take care of the children, and instill early principles of piety and religion into their minds.

“If the grown up slaves, from confirmed habits of vice, are hard to be reclaimed, the children surely are in our power, and may be trained up in the way they should go, with rational hopes that when they are old, they will not depart from it....

“To you of the female sex, (whome I have had occasion more than once to take notice of with honor in this congregation) I would address a few words on this head.—You, who by your stations are more confined at home, and have the care of the younger sort more particularly under your management, may do a great deal of good in this way,-- I know not when I have been more affected, or my heart touched with stronger and more pleasing emotions, than at the sight and conversation of a little negro boy, not above seven years old, who read to me in the new testament, and perfectly repeated his catechism throughout, and all from the instruction of his careful, pious mistress, now I hope with God, enjoying the blessed fruits of her labours while on earth.—this example I would recommend to your serious imitation, and to enforce it shall only remark, that a shining part of the character of Somon’s excellent daughter is, that she looketh will to the ways of her household.”—Rev. Thomas Bacon’s Sermons Addressed to Master and Servants....”

Table 7. “From the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting of the Friends of Virginia in 1757 and 1773”

“Are Friends clear of importing or buying negroes to trade on; and do they use those well which they are possessed of by inheritance or otherwise, endeavoring to train them in the principles of the Christian religion?”

“The meeting of 1773 recommended to Friends, ‘seriously to consider the circumstances of these poor people, and the obligation we are under to discharge our religious duties to them, which being disinterestedly pursued, will lead the professor to Truth, to advise and assist them on all occasions, **particularly in promoting their instruction in the principles of the Christian religion, and the pious education of their children;** also to advise them in their worldly concerns, as occasions offer; and it advised that Friends of judgment and experience may be nominated for this necessary service, it being the solid sense of this meeting, that we, of the present generation, are under strong obligations to express our love and concern for the offspring of those people, who, by their labours, have greatly contributed toward the cultivation of these colonies, under the afflictive disadvantage of enduring a hard bondage; and many amongst us are enjoying the benefit of their toil.”

APPENDIX B: “Puritanism and the Duty of Family Worship”
by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

Observe “the difference between praying and prayerless families” suggested the erudite Puritan theologian Richard Baxter (1615-1691), and one will observe significant differences in their prosperity and felicity.⁸² Prayerful families delight in the Lord in good times and in bad times and are generally quite healthy, content, and prosperous, whereas prayerless families tend toward family feuding and dislocation.⁸³ Thus, the grace and power of God is readily observable in this regard, that a “family that prays together, stays together” and as a rule is more prosperous than the family that does not. For this reason, the Puritans stressed frequent and daily family prayer and family worship.

A. Priesthood of All Believers

The “family prayer” is premised upon the theological concept of the “priesthood of all believers.” “Christians are a ‘holy priesthood, to offer up sacrifices to God, acceptable through Jesus Christ,” observed Rev. Baxter.⁸⁴ Therefore, “family worship” under the New Covenant is to occur not less frequently or intensely as “family worship” under the Old Testament: the Puritan family was directed to pray together daily, as frequently and as often as practicable.⁸⁵ Rev. Baxter recommended that the family worship occur in the morning and during the evening, or as often as possible. He opined that family worship occur daily, stating “We are bound to take all fit occasions and opportunities to worship God. Families have daily (morning and evening) such occasions and opportunities; therefore they are bound to take them.”⁸⁶

The Puritan theological viewpoint as to the justification of “family worship” was grounded in the reformist idea of “priesthood of all believers” and in Old Testament authority, such as:

⁸² Ibid., p. 39.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 38.

⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 38-39.

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 38.

Old Testament—Rules for Prayer

Book of Daniel: [“Daniel prayed in his house thrice a day; therefore less than twice under the gospel is to us unreasonable”⁸⁷].

Deuteronomy 6:7; 11:19 [“...it is expressly commanded that parents teach their children the word of God, when they ‘lie down , and when they rise up;’ and the parity of reason, and conjunction of the word and prayer, will prove, that they should also pray with them lying down and rising up.”⁸⁸]

1 Chron. 23:30; Exodus 30:7, 34:3; Leviticus 6: 12; 2 Chron. 8:11; Ezekiel 46: 13-15; Amos 4:4 [“The priests were to offer ‘sacrifices’ and ‘thanks to God every morning’....”⁸⁹]

1 Chron. 16:40; 2 Chron. 2:4; 13:11; 31:3; Ezra 3:3; 2 Kings 15:16; 1 Kings 18:29, 36 [“So morning and evening were sacrifices and burnt offerings offered to the Lord; and there is at least equal reason that **gospel worship should be as frequent....**”⁹⁰]

Psalm 119: David praised God seven times a day.

Psalm 145: “Every day will I bless thee.”

Psalm 5:3: “My voice shalt thou hear in the morning, O Lord; in the morning will I direct my prayer to thee, and will look up.”

Psalm 59:16: “I will sing aloud of thy mercy in the morning.”

Psalm 92:12: “It is good to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises to thy name, O Most High: to show forth thy loving-kindness I the morning, and thy faithfulness every night.”

Psalm 119: “I prevented the dawning of the morning and cried, I hoped in thy word: mine eyes prevent the night watches, that I might meditate on they word.”

Psalm 130: “My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning, I say more than they that watch for the morning.”

Psalm 4:17: “Evening, and morning, and at noon, will I pray and cry aloud, and he shall hear my voice.”

Psalm 141:2: “Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.”

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 38.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 38.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 38.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 38.

According to Rev. Baxter and the Puritans, the Old Testament's examples of prayer (including the content of prayer, frequency of prayer, and nature of prayer) had not been changed or modified by the New Testament. Therefore, "New Testament" saints had the same obligations of prayer as did the "Old Testament" saints. They cited ample authority for conclusion, including:

New Testament—Rules for Prayers

1 Tim. 4:5 "She that is a widow indeed and desolate, trusteth in God, and continueth in supplications and prayer night and day."

Luke 6: 14, 2:37, 18:17; Acts 26:7; 1 Thess. 3:10; 2 Tim. 1:3; Rev. 7: 15 [... show that night and day Christ himself prayed, and his servants prayed, and meditated, and read the Scripture.

Moreover, the Puritans reasoned that if the Old Testament Law required daily prayer, then today's Christians must be expected to exceed the requirements of this Mosaic Law through a far superior Christian holiness, which is the "law of Faith."

B. The Father as Priest of the Household

The father, as "master of the family"⁹¹ should normally lead in family prayer. See, e.g., Table 1, "Manhood: A Priestly Function in Church and Home." The family prayer should be used as a time of instruction, discipline, and building family cohesion. The family governors should teach "children and servants how to pray"⁹² during the family prayer.

⁹¹ Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory or A Sum of Practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience* (Part 2), pp. 132-133.

⁹² *Ibid.*

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

Father (Church)	Father (Home)
Priest	Husband
Church	Home (Wife/ Children/ Servants/ Slaves)
Obey/ Administer/ Teach Law of Christ	Obey/ Administer/ Teach Law of Christ

Normally, the family prayer should be at a time that is convenient for all members of the family to be together. At no time can the family prayer be a regular substitute for church attendance or public prayer services.

The family prayer should be special and meet the needs of each individual family. Everything should be done to make the “family prayer” engaging, and boredom should be avoided. “Rote prayers” and “general, pre-recorded” prayers should be sparingly utilized for “family worship.”⁹³

Instead, the family worship should be creative, thoughtful, well-planned, and spiritually uplifting. “Let it neither be so short as to end before their hearts can be warm and their wants expressed...,” writes Rev. Baxter, “nor yet so tedious as to make it an ungrateful burden on the family.”⁹⁴ “Let not the coldness and dullness of the speaker rock the family asleep; but keep awake your own heart, that you may keep the rest awake, and force them to attention.”⁹⁵

C. Family Worship—No Substitute For Regular Church Attendance

Finally, the Puritans kept regular church attendance on the Lord’s Day (i.e., Sunday) as a mandatory form of Christian worship. The regular or daily “family worship” should not be treated as a substitute for public worship at church, but

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

rather “family worship” was considered to be an indispensable and supplemental form of Christian worship.⁹⁶

⁹⁶ Ibid.

APPENDIX C: *Puritanism, the Sabbath Day, and the Westminster Confession of 1647* by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

The Puritans of England and colonial New England were engaged in armed struggle and civil war against the British monarchy and the “High-Church” Anglicans within the Church of England during the years 1642-1651. This armed struggle has been called the English Civil War, and it ended with the triumph of the Puritan-Parliamentarians and in the Puritan reign of Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector from 1653 to 1658.

During the period 1643 to 1650, the Puritans summoned English divines to Parliament to help draft a new “Confession of Faith” for the new British Commonwealth. Among this group of divines were about 121 Puritan theologians. Through their influence the “Westminster Confession of Faith of 1647” was drafted and proposed and submitted to Parliament. The House of Commons made several modifications and, through legislation, adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith as “Articles of the Christian Religion” in 1648.

However, with the restoration of the British monarchy and the Anglican episcopacy in 1660, the “Article of the Christian Religion” was rescinded. Soon thereafter, churches under independent Puritan influence (i.e., the Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Independents, etc.) continued to adopt the Westminster Confession of Faith of 1647. After 1660, many of these Puritans became “non-conformist” outlaws of the British Empire, thus inspiring men such as John Bunyan who authored *Pilgrim’s Progress*, a classic work in faith and civil disobedience. Many of these non-conformist Puritans fled persecution by emigrating to colonial New England or other parts of British North America.

The Puritan ideals of religious worship, daily living, and commemoration of the Sabbath Day (i.e., the Lord’s Day) were extracted from the Bible, the writings of John Calvin, Richard Baxter, and several other divines. These were codified in the Chapter 21 of Westminster Confession of Faith of 1647, as follows:

Chapter 21 - Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath-day.

Section 1.) The light of nature showeth that there is a God, who hath lordship and sovereignty over all; is good, and doth good unto all; and is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served, with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the might.(1) But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture.(2)

(1) Ro 1:20; Ac 17:24; Ps 119:68; Jer 10:7; Ps 31:23; Ps 18:3; Ro 10:12; Ps 62:8; Josh. 24:14; Mk 12:33. (2) Dt 12:32; Mt 15:9,10; Dt 15:1-20; Ex 20:4,5,6; Col 2:23.

Section 2.) Religious worship is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to Him alone:(1) not to angels, saints, or any other creature:(2) and, since the fall, not without a mediator; nor in the mediation of any other but of Christ alone.(3)

(1) Mt 4:10; Jn 5:23; 2Co 13:14. (2) Col 2:18; Rev 19:10; Ro 1:25. (3) Jn 14:6; 1Ti 2:5; Eph 2:18; Col 3:17.

Section 3.) Prayer, with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship,(1) is by God required of all men;(2) and, that it may be accepted, it is to be made in the name of the Son,(3) by the help of His Spirit,(4) according to His will,(5) with understanding, reverence, humility, fervency, faith, love, and perseverance;(6) and, if vocal, in a known tongue.(7)

(1) Php 4:6. (2) Ps 65:2. (3) Jn 14:13,14; 1Pe 2:5. (4) Ro 8:26. (5) 1Jn 5:14. (6) Ps 47:7; Ecc 5:1,2; Heb 12:28; Ge 18:27; Jas 5:16; Jas 1:6,7; Mk 11:24; Mt 6:12,14,15; Col 4:2; Eph 6:18. (7) 1Co 14:14.

Section 4.) Prayer is to be made for things lawful,(1) and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter;(2) but not for the dead,(3) not for those of whom it may be known that they have sinned the sin unto death.(4)

(1) 1Jn 5:14. (2) 1Ti 2:1,2; Jn 17:20; 2Sa 7:29; Ruth 4:12. (3) 2Sa 12:21,22,23; Lk 16:25,26; Rev 14:13. (4) 1Jn 5:16.

Section 5.) The **reading of Scriptures with godly fear**;(1) the sound preaching,(2) and conscionable hearing of the Word, in obedience unto God, with understanding, faith, and reverence;(3) singing of Psalms with grace in the heart;(4) **as also, the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ; are all parts of the ordinary religious worship of God**;(5) besides religious oaths,(6) vows,(7) **solemn fastings**,(8) and **thanksgivings upon special occasions**,(9) which are, in their several times and seasons, to be used in an holy and religious manner.(10)

(1) Ac 15:21; Rev 1:3. (2) 2Ti 4:2. (3) Jas 1:22; Ac 10:33; Mt 13:19; Heb 4:2; Isa 66:2. (4) Col 3:16; Eph 5:19; Jas 5:13. (5) Mt 28:19; 1Co 11:23-29; Ac 2:42. (6) Dt 6:13; Ne 10:29. (7) Isa 19:21; Ecc 5:4,5. (8) Joel 2:12; Esther 4:16; Mt 9:15; 1Co 7:5. (9) Ps 107; Esther 9:22. (10) Heb 12:28.

Section 6.) Neither prayer, nor any other part of religious worship, is now, under the Gospel, either tied unto, or made more acceptable by, any place in which it is performed, or towards which it is directed;(1) but God is to be worshipped everywhere(2) in spirit and truth;(3) as,

in private families(4) daily,(5) and in secret, each one by himself;(6) so more solemnly in the public assemblies, which are not carelessly or wilfully to be neglected or forsaken, when God, by His Word or providence, calleth thereunto.(7)

(1) Jn 4:21. (2) Mal 1:11; Tim. 2:8. (3) Jn 4:23,24. (4) Jer 10:25; Dt 6:6,7; Job 1:5; 2Sa 6:18,20; 1Pe 3:7; Ac 10:2. (5) Mt 6:11. (6) Mt 6:6; Eph 6:18. (7) Isa 56:6,7; Heb 10:25; Pr 1:20,21,24; Pr 8:34; Ac 13:42; Lk 4:16; Ac 2:42.

Section 7.) As it is the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in His Word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment binding all men in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in seven, for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto Him:(1) which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week,(2) which, in Scripture, is called the Lord's Day,(3) and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath.(4)

(1) Ex 20:8,10,11; Isa 56:2,4,6,7. (2) Ge 2:2,3; 1Co 16:1,2; Ac 20:7. (3) Rev 1:10. (4) Ex 20:8,10; Mt 5:17,18.

Section 8.) This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest, all the day, from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations;(1) but also are taken up, the whole time, in the public and private exercises of His worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy.(2)

(1) Ex 20:8; Ex 16:23,25,26,29,30; Ex 31:15; Ne 13:15-19,21,22. (2) Isa 58:13; Mt 12:1-13.

APPENDIX D: *Puritanism, the Sabbath Day, and the Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell (1653-1658)* by Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D.

The Sabbath Day and its holy obligations and duties were legally enforced in England during the reign of the Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell (1653-1658). During this brief period, England was governed by a Puritan constitutional document titled the *Instrument of Government (1653)*.⁹⁷ The *Instrument* established Christianity as the official religion of the new Commonwealth, but established no specific denomination to be the official state church.

Furthermore, the *Instrument* permitted “religious freedom” in the form of freedom and liberty of Christian differing and various Christian denominations to worship and profess the Christian faith. Articles 35, 36, and 37 stated:

XXXV. That the Christian religion, as contained in the Scriptures, be held forth and recommended as the public profession of these nations; and that, as soon as may be, a provision, less subject to scruple and contention, and more certain than the present, be made for the encouragement and maintenance of able and painful teachers, for the instructing the people, and for discovery and confutation of error, hereby, and whatever is contrary to sound doctrine; and until such provision be made, the present maintenance shall not be taken away or impeached.

XXXVI. That to the public profession held forth none shall be compelled by penalties or otherwise; but that endeavours be used to win them by sound doctrine and the example of a good conversation.

XXXVII. That such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ (though differing in judgment from the doctrine, worship or discipline publicly held forth) shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in, the profession of the faith and exercise of their religion; so as they abuse

⁹⁷ “Since America had already been colonised by the English—in 1607, at Jamestown, and in 1620, at Plymouth—the United States has sometimes claimed this historic document [i.e., *the Instrument of Government*] as a part of its political, legal, and historic heritage.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instrument_of_Government

not this liberty to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts: provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as, under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practise licentiousness.

However, under the rule of Oliver Cromwell, as Lord Protector, the Puritan faith became “law” in England. In *History of War: British Civil Wars*, a harsh critic of this period of British history has written:

Cromwell’s decision to change the governmental make up of England came in 1655 as result of a failed expedition to Hispaniola Island.... Cromwell became convinced that the defeat was God’s punishment for the ungodly nature of the ungodly nature of the English people. In response, he decided to win back the Lord’s favour by creating a country of pious, God-fearing people **Under the iron fist of Puritanism, the people were expected to follow the bible to the letter and live a pious, blameless life....**⁹⁸

[T]hose who gambled, drank and indulged in worthless pastimes such as sports or theatre would never be accepted into heaven, whereas those who rejected such pointless merrymaking would surely be warmly welcomed at the pearly gates. Pleasure for the sake of pleasure was something to be frowned upon and the punishments for those who dared to argue or go against the new laws were severe, ranging from corporal punishment to imprisonment.

It is hardly surprising that the behavior of women soon came under the eye of Cromwell and his major-generals. There was to be no more make-up and frippery, they decided. Instead, women must go bare-faced and wear the plainest garments, usually a black gown with white apron. Likewise, the fancy hairstyles that had been popular in preceding years were replaced by the severe white caps, beneath which the hair would be ridden.

⁹⁸ Ross Hamilton (Editor), *History of War Book of the British Civil Wars* (3rd Edition)(William Gibbons Publisher: Willenhall, West Midlands, WV13 3XT, 2019), p. 128.

Perhaps remembering the flamboyance of the 17th century court, the Protectorate imposed strict dress codes for men, too. Their hair was to be cut into a sensible short back and sides and their clothes should be predominantly black and plain, with no sign of the rich colours and fabrics that had once been a mark of money and prestige.

Sunday became the most important day in the weekly calendar. It was to be served for worship and reflection. It was to be reserved for worship and reflection, with any effort to work, enjoy one's hobbies or simply indulge in fun on the Sabbath resulting in punishment. Even something so simple as taking a stroll could see a walker fall foul of the law, unless they could prove their stroll was only going to take them as far as the nearest church and then straight home.

Famously, Cromwell is often referred to as the man who cancelled Christmas,⁹⁹ but in actual fact, it wasn't only Christmas celebrations that the Puritans looked down on. Gluttony and partying were the basest form of so-called worship, after all, and religious feasts were replaced by fasts. These were to be held once per month, and people were expected to pay their respects properly on holy days not by carousing, but by going hungry.¹⁰⁰

Thus, it is almost certain that the Puritan ideals in England during the period 1653-1660 reflected the Puritan ideals of colonial New England as well. This was not simply true of religion and culture, but also regarding structuring a new constitution. The Puritans of colonial New England, such as the Rev. Roger Williams, followed the events of the English Civil War (1642-1651) and of the Restoration of King Charles II (1660) very closely, and the American Puritans made frequent trips, back and forth, from North America to England.

⁹⁹ The author goes on to state: "The Godly Cromwell,' While Cromwell enforced piety across the nation, he didn't always follow his own strict rules. Although Oliver Cromwell, as lord protector, had strong views when it came to the piety and godliness of the people he governed, he didn't always follow his own rules. In a country held in the thrall by the sometimes fierce, always forceful rule of the major-generals, feasting, celebrating, entertainment and most sports were banned. Those who dared to transgress were fined, corporally punished or even imprisoned, but one who wasn't was Oliver Cromwell himself.... As the saying goes, 'do as I say, not as I do.'" Ibid., p. 131.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 129-131.

Indeed, “[t]he Civil Wars impacted on the English colonies in the Americas and saw an increase in the number of Puritan migrants, whose beliefs that the church and state should be separated and that people should be allowed to enjoy religious freedom would ultimately shape the future of the USA. As in Britain, there were advocates of different types of churches in the American colonies. Some championed episcopalianism, some Presbyterianism and others congregationalism. In terms of the latter, hundreds of men from Massachusetts and Connecticut sailed back to England during the war to fight on the Puritan side against Charles I, whereas in the Episcopalian-minded Royalist state of Virginia, Puritans were expelled, leading to fighting within the colonies.”¹⁰¹

For this reason, we might safely conclude that the Puritan theology of colonial New England (and, indeed, the Anglican theology of colonial North America), such as the relationship between Church and State, had a direct correlation to social, cultural, political, and theological state of affairs in the Mother Country.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 151.

APPENDIX E: “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 their understanding of “slavery” was more akin to that of “indentured servitude.” This was true not only in Puritan New England but in colonial Virginia as well. The first 20 Africans who arrived at Jamestown, Virginia in 1619 were not “slaves” but “indentured servants,” just as thousands of whites had been so classified. **The Puritans believed that the type of “chattel slavery” that had been established in the American South and in the British West Indies during the early 19th century violated every tenet of the Bible as well as the laws of nature.**

Hence, 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.”

Indeed, the Puritan family head was charged to “[t]each your children and servants how to pray themselves, that they may not be prayerless when they come among those that cannot pray”¹⁰²; and “[r]emember that you have a charge of the souls in your family, and are as a priest and teacher in our own house; and therefore see that you keep [your children and servants] to the constant worshipping of God, especially on the Lord’s day, in public and private; and that you teach them the things that concern their salvation.... And pray for them daily, as well as yourselves.”¹⁰³

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.

¹⁰² Richard Baxter, *A Christian Directory* (Part 2), p. 132.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 89 (“The Duties of Masters Towards Their Servants.”)

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

<p style="text-align: center;">TEN COMMANDMENTS (Decalogue)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NATURAL LAW (The Laws of Nature upon which the Secular Civil Government is founded; e.g., “... the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God....Life, liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness... that to Secure these Rights Governments are Instituted among Men.”)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">FIRST TABLE</p> <p>I am the Lord thy God! Thou shalt have no other Gods but me!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">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>
<p>Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain!</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p>Thou shalt make no graven images!</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p>Thou shalt keep the Sabbath Day holy!</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Thou shalt honor father and mother!</p>	<p>Same as above; domestic government (i.e., the family) is the foundation of the body politic</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 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>
<p>Thou shalt not commit adultery!</p>	<p>Civil government reinforces Church’s moral teachings against adultery. 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 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!”).¹⁰⁴</p>

¹⁰⁴ 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>Thou shalt not steal!</p>	<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>
<p>Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor!</p>	<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>
<p>Do not let thyself lust after thy neighbor’s wife!</p>	<p>Civil government reinforces Church’s moral teachings against 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!”).¹⁰⁵</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 against marital infidelity and tortious conduct against the integrity of the institution of</p>

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

marriage.

Civil government must establish complete justice and equity between parties or citizens within the body politic.

(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!”).

APPENDIX F: Carter G. Woodson, “Introduction” *The Education of the Negro* (1919)¹⁰⁶ 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.”¹⁰⁷

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”

¹⁰⁶ 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).

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

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

<p>16th Century</p>	<p>French and Spanish Roman Catholics led the way in educating African slaves</p>	<p>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.¹⁰⁸</p>
<p>17th Century</p>	<p>Church of England; Puritans; and Quakers followed the Roman Catholic example of providing moral, mental, and religious training for African slaves</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>As a result, the Puritans and the Quakers made Christian education a platform for the Abolition of Slavery altogether</p>
<p>18th Century- 19th Century</p>	<p>American Baptists and Methodists begin teaching, training, and establishing Sabbath schools for African American slaves</p>	<p>The Haitian Revolution, together with the Denmark Vessay and Nat Turner rebellions, led to harsh slave laws. Southern slave owners</p>

¹⁰⁸ 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>outlawed teaching slaves to read and write.</p> <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 the passage of brutal slave laws. Laws were passed to prevent slaves from learning 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.”**¹⁰⁹

This 16th- and 17th century French Code Noir was a blatant contrast to the nineteenth-century “American Slave Code,” as documented by the Rev. William Goodell. As Table 1, above, reveals, in the United States, the industrial revolution

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

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 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.¹¹⁰

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.**¹¹¹

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

¹¹⁰ 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.”)

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 6.

the Negroes but also opened schools for them. Education made the slaves more valuable assets to their owners.¹¹²

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.’”¹¹³ 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.

¹¹² Lorenzo Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776* (Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2017), p. 327.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

APPENDIX G: “Puritanism, Observations of American Slavery, and Frederick Douglass’s Sabbath School”
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).¹¹⁴

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.

¹¹⁴ 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.

“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 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 case 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.”¹¹⁵

Frederick Douglass’ description of slavery in his autobiographies was a depiction of the system of “chattel slavery” that had arisen up in the American South during the period 1820-1860—this was a period when the Puritan-Anglican and natural-law idea of slavery was replaced by a “secular” or industrial-capital understanding of the African slave as a “chattel.” The renowned economist Paul Samuelson described this same “chattel-slavery” system that had emerged during the early 1820s in the United States, as follows:

We do know how the profit motive led to the slave trade: pursuing maximum profit—equating marginal revenues and costs, so to speak—merchants used bribery and force to abduct Africans in order to export and sell them in the New World. So long as a plentiful supply of replacement imports could be counted on, each slave was regarded as an exhaustible resource. Just as a vein of copper can be worked to depletion, a slave could be worked to death without regard for natural reproduction or old-age incapacity....¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Frederick Douglass, *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (New York, N.Y.: Carol Pub., 1995), pp. 148-149.

¹¹⁶ Paul A. Samuelson, *Economics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1976), p. 782.

This conception of the African slave as “property,” as “chattel,” and as “soulless subhuman brutes” who should be denied the rights of family, marriage, parents, education, literacy, freedom of religion and the like, grew out from the First Industrial Revolution (1760-1840) and the rise of industrial capitalism, secularism, and Enlightenment challenge to the Christian idea that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth” (Acts 17: 26-28).¹¹⁷ It was the materialism and secularism of American slave holders and slave-investors who detested the episcopacy and theology of the Church of England and who justified chattel slavery. In the American South, slave holders and traders were far removed from the catholic theology of the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Puritan divines—the *Negro as “chattel slave” in the simply had no rights that a white person was bound to respect.*

What Frederick Douglass and others had been fighting for was the incorporation of African Americans into the fabric of American life by reading the language of the Declaration of Independence into the U.S. Constitution (i.e., the Bill of Rights, etc.) and by applying this language to the civil rights of African Americans. The language of the Declaration stated:

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which **the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them**, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.**--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

¹¹⁷ The secular conception of the African slave was that he was a “chattel”; whereas the Puritan conception of the African slave was that he was a brother, a human being, and person placed under the trusteeship of the slave-owner who had an obligation raise his moral, intellectual and cultural status in preparation, on a case-by-case basis, for manumission.

Frederick Douglass's observations and descriptions of the "wrongs" of slavery, as so eloquently stated in his autobiographies, were subtle appeals to the **natural laws** and **natural rights** that were enunciated in Amendment 1 of the American *Bill of Rights*, in the *United States Constitution*, as follows:

Amendment 1

- Freedom of Religion, Speech, and the Press

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Of course, this constitutional constraint applied to federal-government action, but Douglass and others reasoned that if it was "wrong" for the federal government to violate the First Amendment, then it was also "wrong" for American slave holders to do so as private citizens. It is important to remember the Frederick Douglass's scathing critique of American slavery was an appeal to a "Higher Law" that is found somewhere above the four corners of written constitutional and statutory law. His appeal was to natural law jurisprudence, which had been bequeathed to western jurisprudence through the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England. On this point, while analyzing John Locke's Anglican constitutional and political theory, the philosopher Bertrand Russell has said:

We may then identify 'natural law' with moral rules in so far as they are independent of positive enactments. There must be such rules if there is to be any distinction between good and bad laws. For Locke, the matter is simple, since moral rules have been laid down by God, and are to be found in the Bible.¹¹⁸

Frederick Douglass's philosophy and human-rights advocacy was founded upon the exact same Anglican or Puritan foundations. The "law of nature" had been referenced by St. Paul in his letter to the Romans, and so without question the official position of the Western Church was that natural law was reflected in the Decalogue and constituted the "law of Christ." Natural law, as developed by great western theologians such as St. Augustine of Hippo, St. Thomas Aquinas, and

¹¹⁸ Bertrand Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy*, (New York, N.Y.: Touchstone, 1972), p. 628.

Anglican theologian Richard Hooker, became the law of the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England, and it remained within the “church-state” theology of the separate Christian denominations which grew out from the mother Church of England (i.e., the Puritans, Independents, Baptists, Methodists, etc.). The Christian Church thus relied upon established sacred tradition and the sacred scriptures when launching its opposition to American slavery. See, e.g. Rev. William Goodell’s, *The American Slave Code* (1853). And so did Frederick Douglass, who, for example, compared American slaveholders and the churches and pastors who defended them as modern-day “scribes and Pharisees”; Douglass also linked the Christian faith and the “law of Christ” to the struggle for human and civil rights for African Americans. **Within an Anglo-American context, Frederick Douglass conceptualized “Christian brotherhood” as being the “first step” toward full manhood suffrage and freedom.** For example, in his autobiography *Life and Times*, Douglass wrote:

Two hundred years ago, the pious Doctor Godwin dared affirm that it was ‘not a sin to baptize a negro,’ and won for him the rite of baptism. It was a small concession to his manhood; but it was strongly resisted by the slaveholders of Jamaica, and Virginia. In this they were logical in their argument, but they were not logical in their object. **They saw plainly that to concede the negro’s right to baptism was to receive him into the Christian Church, and make him a brother in Christ; and hence they opposed the first step sternly and bitterly. So long as they could keep him beyond the circle of human brotherhood, they could scourge him to toil, as a beast of burden, with a good Christian conscience, and without reproach.** ‘What!; said they, ‘baptize a negro? Preposterous!’ Nevertheless the negro was baptized and admitted to church fellowship; and though for a long time his soul belonged to God, his body to his master, and he poor fellow had nothing for himself, he is at last not only baptized, but emancipated and enfranchised.¹¹⁹

The abolitionism of Frederick Douglass was shaped by a blend of New England Puritanism and African Methodism. After gaining his freedom, Douglass lived in New England and spent most of this time in New Bedford, Massachusetts under the tutelage of New England and Puritan abolitionists, while attaining a preaching license in the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. But the New

¹¹⁹ Frederick Douglass, *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (New York, N.Y.: Carol Publishing Co., 1995), p. 390.

England abolitionist spirit—one that merged Christian duty with civil duty—captivated Douglass and pulled away from his African Methodist roots. To a degree, Douglass’s abolitionism was much Puritan than an African Methodist in spirit and scope. According to Rev. Algernon Sidney Crapsey, **the New England Puritan spirit guided American political theory and discourse easily from 1787 up through the “close of the Civil War” (1861-1865)** and was the architect of abolitionism during this period.¹²⁰ Rev. Crapsey describes **“Puritanism as a theological system controlling American thought”** and which had produced the great American abolitionist leaders such as **“Whittier, the saintly poet; Emerson, the seer; Garrison and Phillips, the prophets; Brown, the martyr; Sumner, the tribune, and Lincoln, the far-seeing moral statesman.”**¹²¹ These abolitionist leaders were the friends or influential contemporaries of Frederick Douglass. And all of these abolitionists found a political ally and a chief political spokesman in a country lawyer named Abraham Lincoln. (See, e.g., the Lincoln-Douglas Debate, Ottawa, Illinois, August 21, 1858, with Abraham Lincoln stating: **“I hold that... there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. [Loud cheers.] I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.”**)

According to Rev. Crapsey, the Puritan influence in American political thought led men and women to think that natural law and natural rights were thoroughly interwoven into the church-state apparatus, -- the influence of Calvinism, where the Church administered the “first table” of the Decalogue, and the State administered the “second table.” “This union of Teutonism and Hebraism; this marriage of Mosaic theocracy to English democracy, is **the contribution of English Puritanism to the political life of the world, and the modern state is the offspring of this union.**”¹²² “It is easy to speak scoffingly of the *bigotry* and *narrowness of the Puritan*,” writes Rev. Crapsey, “to tell lurid stories of the whipping of heretics, the hanging of women, and the burning of witches; but **it is not so easy to measure the moral value and the spiritual potency of that conception of the state which looks upon it as the instrument of divine justice; which teaches that officers of the state are the vicegerents of**

¹²⁰ Algernon Sidney Crapsey, *Religion and Politics* (New York, N.Y.: Thomas Whittaker, Pub. 1905), p. 265.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² *Ibid.*, pp. 243-244.

God. Such a conception is the only one that can make the state other than a merciless machine. If the state is not divine it is brutal.”¹²³

It thus became quite curious to Christian sensibilities when in 1857 Chief Justice Roger B. Taney completely dismantled the Christian foundations of American jurisprudence when he ruled in *Dred Scott v. Sanford* that one group of human beings (i.e., African Americans) had “no rights or privileges,” including the natural rights which God affords to all human beings, unless another group of human beings (i.e., white Americans), acting as the sovereign people, chose to grant them. On this point, Justice Taney thus wrote:

The words ‘people of the United States’ and ‘citizen’ are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the Government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the ‘sovereign people,’ and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty. **The question before us is whether [African Americans]... compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty? We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word ‘citizen’ in the Constitution,** and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and, **whether emancipated or not,** yet remained subject to their authority, and **had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the Government might choose to grant them.**¹²⁴

Thus, in the writings and life of the great humanitarian Frederick Douglass we find the manifestations of Puritan theology within his biographical writings, which were poignant reactions to the brutal dehumanization of chattel slavery (as reflected in the *Dred Scott* case)¹²⁵ and a testament of how the Christian faith opened the door to abolitionism, resistance and liberation, enabling the

¹²³ Ibid., pp. 242-243.

¹²⁴ *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).

¹²⁵ Ibid.

abolitionists to appeal to a “Higher Law,” which was Frederick Douglass’s human-rights activism and American abolition had been the lasting manifesting and influence of colonial New England’s Puritan theology upon American constitutional and political thought throughout the nineteenth century.

APPENDIX H. 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, as 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. See, generally, Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro* (1919)(republished by CreateSpace in 2013).

The renowned economists Paul Samuelson described this same “chattel-slavery” system that had emerged during the early 1820s in the United states, as follows:

We do know how the profit motive led to the slave trade: pursuing maximum profit—equating marginal revenues and costs, so to speak—merchants used bribery and force to abduct Africans in order to export and sell them in the New World. So long as a plentiful supply of replacement imports could be counted on, each slave was regarded as an exhaustible resource. Just as a vein of copper can be worked to depletion, a slave could be worked to death without regard for natural reproduction or old-age incapacity....¹²⁶

This conception of the African slave as “property,” as “chattel,” and as “soulless subhuman brutes” who should be denied the rights of family, marriage, parents, education, literacy, freedom of religion and the like, grew out from the First Industrial Revolution (1760-1840) and the rise of industrial capitalism, secularism, and Enlightenment challenge to the Christian idea that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth” (Acts 17: 26-28).¹²⁷

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 during the period 1820-1865, but this fact alone should not be confused with the 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 African slaves. The first industrial revolution (1760-1820) and the discovery of the cotton gin changed American plantation slavery into an unconscientious, industrial machine whose sole aim was to sap the blood and

¹²⁶ Paul A. Samuelson, *Economics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1976), p. 782.

¹²⁷ The secular conception of the African slave was that he was a “chattel”; whereas the Puritan conception of the African slave was that he was a brother, a human being, and person placed under the trusteeship of the slave-owner who had an obligation raise his moral, intellectual and cultural status in preparation, on a case-by-case basis, for manumission.

sweat of black slaves, in order to make super profits. The church, religion, and the moral improvement of the slave were jettisoned in exchange for monetary gain and super profits. See, generally, Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro* (1919)(republished by CreateSpace in 2013).

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 this spiritual oppression also become theocratic despotism over the enslaved.

The chattel slavery of the American South, during the period 1820 to 1865, thus became an absolute tyranny over of black slave’s body and mind, thus depriving him of all natural rights. This form of slavery had always been opposed by the Christian church since the early 12th century.

-- 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 (Ist) 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 mea sure, 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 "lute 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 thle 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 com mon 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.) 3fountaineer of Nov. 2, 1838, contained the particulars.

**APPENDIX I: "Christianity-- A Pillar of the HBCU"¹²⁸
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.

¹²⁸ 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