

Many things prepared for this paper are crowded out by the article of Dr. Beecher. Long as this is we hope it will be read with attention.

[For the Journal and Luminary.]

MR. CHESTER.

Please publish in the Journal the following statement of facts, made necessary by the various assaults recently made in newspapers, and periodicals, on my ministerial and personal character and oblige your friend,

LYMAN BEECHER.

The papers which have given currency to unfavorable reports against me, are requested to publish this statement especially, the Hartford Watchman, the Presbyterian of Philadelphia, the Southern Christian Herald and the Western Presbyterian Herald.

DR. BEECHER'S STATEMENT OF FACTS.

It is generally known, that Dr. Wilson was President of the Board of Trustees, which gave me a call to the Presidency of Lane Seminary; that he presided when the call was given, approved of the measure, and with others, signed a letter to my church, containing urgent reasons for my acceptance of the call. The call was voted during one of the Presbyterian camp-meetings, since denominated "the new measures," of which for some time, Dr. Wilson was the patron, to the no small grief of many of his brethren, and with not a little reprehension of them on his part, for their coldness and formality. This call was given, not merely with his ministrations as a presiding officer, but with tokens of approbation and of great exultation, at the probabilities of my being induced to accept. At the time of giving the call, Dr. Wilson was by his own confession, acquainted with my views in respect to the natural ability of man and had seen and commented on my sermon on the native character of man, which he afterwards adduced as the principal evidence on his charge of heresy. He spoke of this sermon as if it was familiar to him, and although he had made some exceptions to it, his animadversions were of a friendly character, and altogether in the language of clarity and forbearance, while he spoke with cheering animation on the prospects of Lane Seminary, with the expected acquisition of myself at its head. This fact is corroborated by dates, and various local circumstances, and would be, if regularly called for, confirmed by oath, by one whose testimony would not be questioned. But after the time that Dr. Wilson admits that he had seen my sermon on the native character of man, it is declared by members of the board of Trustees, that he offered to compromise and co-operate with me and the board, provided that an Old School man should be added to the faculty. As this was not immediately done, he resigned, and published in the Standard his reasons, containing accusations of myself as holding heretical opinions and asserting the utter impossibility of my leaving the Congregational communion to join the Presbyterian church, without the shipwreck of a good conscience, and christian character. He says "I consider the charter of the Lane Seminary forfeited by the appointment of Dr. Beecher, as president and professor. The question is, how can he honestly and consistently alternate?" He then goes on to ask as if there was such a difference between Congregationalism and Presbyterianism, as that no alternation back and forth, in changing pastoral relations, could be consistent with honesty, and closes by saying, "the very thought of such a change is appalling." In a gain alluding to similar charges, he says "such men may have the appearance of piety, the garb of sanctity; they may be flattered and sustained for a season, by men whose minds are as flexible and consciences as ductile as their own." He then gives an extract from my sermon, on the native character of man; the sermon which he had read and commented on, before he gave the call, and then adds "you may call this Beecherism, or Taylorism, or Bostonism, or what you please, except *Bibleism* or *Presbyterianism*. These in truth you cannot call it."

About six months before my acceptance of the call, I made a journey to Cincinnati, for purposes of enquiry. My arrival was announced by Dr. Wilson in the newspaper in the following terms. "At the late meeting of the Cincinnati Presbytery, this gentleman (Dr. B.) was invited to sit as a corresponding member from an Association. (This looks very much like a President and professor elect for Lane Seminary, the charter of which binds them to admit none but Presbyterians in good standing.) Perhaps the Dr. has designedly made his debut here, in the character of a Congregationalist, to demonstrate to the people of the West, with what facility men can be transformed, not into angels of light, but into nominal Presbyterians."

A little before my arrival with my family in Cincinnati, Dr. Wilson published the following article of advice and information of the Synod, for the settlement of the difficulties in the Cincinnati presbytery.

"In regard to publications in periodicals or otherwise, the Synod enjoin that nothing be published that may give just cause of offence, either to the church courts, or to individuals." He adds "with the advice and injunction of Synod we are perfectly satisfied. We can never do our duty, without giving offence, but we trust by the aid of Divine Grace, to give no just cause of offence to any one." What his conceptions of just offence were, and how his resolution was kept, appears from the following article in the same paper. Alluding to my approach to assume my official duties, he gives this warning. "It can do the church no harm to watch as well as to pray, and we beseech them to read attentively Rom. 16, 17, 18. Now we beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them; for they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

This warning to the Churches, contains the charges of heresy, schism, hypocrisy, and preaching the Gospel for filthy lucre, either of which, if substantiated, would have been sufficient to silence me and send me back a beggar. My reception by the Presbytery was followed by the offer of a protest by Dr. Wilson, and an almost continual dropping in the newspaper, of accusatory paragraphs, while my repeated overtures for conversation and explanation were repelled, leaving me the only alternatives of newspaper controversy or silent endurance. I chose

the latter. At length when the leaven of accusation from the pulpit and the press, had wrought its effect, a motion was made in Presbytery to appoint a committee to enquire into the reports in common fame, unfavorable to my orthodoxy. And at another meeting of Presbytery, another motion was made to appoint a committee, to examine my two sermons on the Native Character of man, and on Dependence and Free Agency. Both these motions were overruled by the Presbytery, and on complaint, the same was done by the Synod and General Assembly. At length, after a period of public accusation for two years in the newspaper, and an attempt to get up a trial on common fame, which went through all the judicatories of the church, Dr. Wilson, assumed the responsibility of tabling charges against me, which resulted in my acquittal by Presbytery and Synod; and I believe by the unanimous consent of the General Assembly, Dr. Wilson at his own request, was permitted to withdraw his appeal.

It was now supposed that the matter was settled, and no suspicion was entertained, that a regular trial being waived, would be followed by a return to public accusations, and extra-judicial efforts to convict me of heresy in a more summary way. The first indication of such a purpose was the discovery while in New England, soon after the meeting of the Assembly that a secret letter had been sent to a friend of mine, warning him against putting confidence in me. Next I was given to understand by three different persons, that though my doctrines were unexceptionable, I should not be relieved from whisperings and public accusations, until I did formally and publicly denounce Dr. Taylor. This last proposal I understood to be the ultimatum, and a threat of war, if I did not comply. I said in reply, if it is not enough that I believe as my friends believe, but I must also denounce as they denounce, to escape their assaults and enjoy their favor, I will not do it.

Not long after this the Presbyterian opened upon me, and the Hartford Watchman, the first in publishing the rumor of conversations between Dr. Skinner and myself, about my attacking the Limited Atonement, and the doctrine of Election, and altering the Confession of Faith. For the truth of these reports, the editor would not vouch, but thought that if any body knew any thing on the subject, they ought to tell it, and asks whether Dr. Skinner and myself can deny their general truth and if we cannot, whether it does not prove that we are secretly designing the alteration of the Confession of Faith.—Mr. Musgrave in particular, is desired to say whether I did recommend preaching against Election. Mr. Musgrave replies that I did not, but that things were said that might be worth hearing, if I would permit him to tell. After waiting several months, and hearing of no permission from me, the editor concludes that the things worth hearing must be true, and my silence evidence of guilt.

But the publication of Dr. Porter's letter was the signal of a more powerful and extended onset. An attempt was made previous to the last General Assembly, to publish this letter, when it would have been calculated greatly to prejudice the trial. But Dr. Woods found it out and frustrated the attempt, saying that it was wrong—that the letter being confidential, ought not to be published, and got it out of their hands, and placed it in the hands of Mrs. Porter for safe keeping, saying that now it would not be published. Who they were, who were about to publish this letter during the pendency of my trial before the General Assembly, does not appear, but who Mr. Engles relied on to defend its publication, and substantiate the claim of Dr. Porter's dissatisfaction we know, and who volunteered to get Dr. Porter's letter republished with notes, in the Dutch Reformed paper we know, and who commented upon and misrepresented my reply to Dr. Porter, and published another private letter from him, none can be at a loss to know after reading the following letter which I have received from a gentleman of high character and unquestioned veracity. He says:

"I have come into possession of certain facts which I think it quite important, that Dr. Beecher should be acquainted with—for the purpose of learning the character of the men with whom he is in controversy. Soon after the publication of Dr. Porter's letter in the Hartford Watchman, the Rev. George Cowles of New Hartford, (formerly minister of Danvers, a friend of the East Windsor school and doctrines) wrote a letter to Mr. Case, associate editor with Mr. Harvey, of the Hartford Watchman. In this letter he disapproved of the publication of Dr. Porter's letter, and stated that he (Mr. Cowles) had from personal interviews with Dr. Porter, certain knowledge of Dr. Porter's views of Dr. Beecher and his doctrines, and that the editors of the Watchman were mistaken, with regard to the fact that Dr. Porter was dissatisfied with Dr. B. "until near the time of his death." In a postscript Mr. Cowles requested Mr. Case to publish his letter, or send it back. After waiting a suitable time for the publication of it, he wrote to his friend Case for the manuscript, Mr. Case in reply, informed him that it was not the custom to give back the manuscripts which were sent to them. Upon this, Mr. Cowles gave to the Rev. Mr. Hemmingway of Turkey Hills, an order on Mr. Case for the letter, which Mr. Hemmingway presented at Hartford, and received the same answer. After a long argument with Mr. Harvey to prove that Mr. Cowles had a right to dispose of his own property, Mr. Hemmingway was obliged to depart without the letter. In the course of conversation Mr. Harvey as an argument against giving it up, asked "how do I know but he will publish it?" Mr. Hemmingway afterwards asked Mr. Harvey, or Mr. Case for the manuscript to copy, with a promise to return either the original or a copy. The reply was, "how do we know but you will alter it?" At length consent was given, that if Mr. Hemmingway would go up to East Windsor, where the letter was at the time, he might copy it there, but not to take it away."

Thus it seems that the two editors of the Watchman were only desirous of my conviction, by the letter of my departed friend, and unwilling that its power to injure me, should be impaired by the testimony of a mutual friend. It appears too that this suppressed letter was in safe keeping at East Windsor. Of course its contents and history must probably have been known to Dr. Tyler and Mr. Nettleton, who according to appearances, would seem to be parties in the policy of publishing what makes against me, and suppressing what is in my favor.

The next assault made upon me, was by a correspondent in the Hartford Watchman, over the signature of *A Presbyterian*, a copy of which was forwarded by mail. To the editor's notice, that the letter was from a distinguished clergyman of the Presbyterian church, is appended the name of Dr. Hoge, in the handwriting of Dr. Tyler, as is attested by one who knows it well, and is confident. The writer of the article thus ascribed to Dr. Hoge, had seen it stated in the Watchman, that I had affirmed at a public meeting in Connecticut, the prevalence of a strong suspicion among the Old School members of the Presbyterian church, respecting New-England theology in general. For this he reprehends me severely,

and says: "It is not true that Old School men, or any considerable number of them, regard the Congregational ministers of New England as a body, or even a majority of them as holding these opinions which they charge on the New School among us, and which they believe to be subversive of truth, as we have professed to receive it." "It is not true that if a minister comes from New-England, he is at once supposed to be heretical, until he furnishes ground for it, by the avowal of unsound theology, or by identifying himself with the New School party." He says again, "I perceive that the opinions of some of the most eminent ministers in New-England, have reached the public through your paper or other channels, (that is, opinions adverse to the orthodoxy of their ministerial brethren) this is right. An outcry may be made, but it will do no harm. We want more light—it will do much good with us and with you. What has been the opinion which such men as Dr. Hyde, Dr. Cornelius, Mr. Everts, Dr. Griffin, Dr. Church, Dr. Humphrey, Dr. Tyler, Dr. Hewett, and Mr. Nettleton, have expressed about the New Divinity of New-England. In what position did they suppose Dr. Beecher had placed himself, in relation to this subject, and at what date, and with what consequent loss of confidence and disservice, from those with whom he had been previously united? Were any plans devised at the East, and executed in any measure, for the purpose of extending the influence of New Theology and New Measures in the Presbyterian church, and if so, by whom, and what was their character. Answers to these enquiries of a right kind, and to a proper extent, may be exceedingly useful to the friends of truth, love and order."

It is here avowed:—
1. That a man's orthodoxy will pass well with the Old School, if he does not preach heresy and joins the right party.
2. That all the New School are charged with holding doctrines ascribed to New Haven, called the New Divinity.

3. That it is right and desirable to collect and publish in the newspapers, the opinion of the living and the dead concerning large bodies of their brethren in good standing, and concerning individual members in particular, as the means of promoting truth, love and order.

Such is the kind of trial of ministerial character, which the writer thinks is right, and would have conducted in the newspaper and before the nation.—

The next assault and about the same time, was contained in the Southern Christian Herald, in a letter on "The Origin and progress of Arminian views in New England," written as I cannot doubt, from Connecticut and with the cognizance and aid of Mr. Nettleton. It is stated in this letter that on Dec. 1821 Prof. Goodrich of Yale College lecturing on the Catechism, advanced professedly some new views on the subject of original sin. "At this time" the historian says, "Mr. Nettleton was laboring with Dr. Beecher at Litchfield and on hearing what had transpired at New Haven, Dr. Beecher wrote to Dr. Taylor, and some correspondence ensued. Prof. Goodrich sent his lecture to Litchfield, Dr. Humphrey, who was present, and Mr. Nettleton examined it, and were greatly dissatisfied. Dr. Beecher did not entirely approve of the views of Prof. Goodrich and Dr. Taylor, yet in correspondence with them at this time he made some concessions with which, Mr. Nettleton was not satisfied."

My objections to this statement are, first, that the conversations were in the bosom of my family, and such as political men, even enemies, deem it dishonorable to make use of in their collision with one another. Secondly, it is conversation which passed sixteen years ago, now adduced to act as evidence in impairing confidence in my ministerial character. Thirdly, it lacks all the attributes of that evidence, which civil and ecclesiastical tribunals demand for the protection of character and rights. It is not under oath, is subject to no cross-questioning or explanation, and could not be admitted in an ecclesiastical trial. Fourthly, it is published at a period of alarm and party feeling, which gives it with thousands the effect of legal evidence, thus indirectly inflicting injury which the forms of laws and evidence forbid.—Fifthly, the representation that while Dr. Humphrey and Mr. Nettleton were "greatly dissatisfied," I "did not entirely approve," implies that I concurred much more nearly than they, and that I "made some concessions" implies a still nearer approximation. To this statement I have to say that it is contrary to the representations which Mr. Nettleton has repeatedly made on this subject. He has been wont to state, that my dissatisfaction was even stronger than his own—that I wrote a letter to Dr. Taylor of energetic remonstrance, which he has since tried in vain to get for publication—that I was not better satisfied with Prof. Goodrich's letter than he (Mr. N.) was.

From the beginning, I never made any secret of the particular respects in which I differed from Dr. Taylor on the subject of Original sin, either to himself, or his opponents, nor have I understood at any time, that Mr. Nettleton supposed me to be unsound on that doctrine. I recollect reading a sermon to him on that subject with which he professed to be pleased, and urged me to publish it. He renewed the request that I would loan or publish, when I was in New York on my way to Cincinnati, as the means of satisfying the minds of some, who wished to give to Lane Seminary, but had some fears of my soundness on the subject of Original sin. In speaking to a mutual friend last summer of his own views and feelings, at the time above referred to at Litchfield he said that Dr. Beecher, co-incided with him *entirely*, and even expressed himself more strongly than he, and added, "on the subject of original sin I believe Dr. Beecher's views have always been sound." On the removal of a misconception concerning Dr. Beecher, which was effected by this friend, which had long labored in his mind, he felt great relief, and said "I should really love to go to the West and labor with Dr. Beecher in revivals as I used to do."

Why these representations of Mr. Nettleton's of my concurrence with him at Litchfield should be suppressed, and statements be made, whose aspect and impression is directly the contrary, I cannot understand.

It is now about ten days since I received Dr. Wilson's Plea, made before the Synod of Cincinnati, Oct. 1835, and to have been repeated I suppose before the General Assembly in 1836, if he had not withdrawn his appeal. This pamphlet contains a protest against the decision of the Presbytery for my acquittal (since confirmed by Synod and by implication by the General Assembly also,) with some twenty five evil consequences of believing that God cannot in equity, require what men have no ability of any kind to perform, together with a great variety of other matters. To the plea itself when delivered before Synod I made reply, had the plea been repeated before the General Assembly, I should have replied to it again. As it is, it must be admitted that Dr. Wilson has managed the matter with more adroitness than equity. He withdrew his appeal from the assembly where I could have answered him, and published his argument, so near the meet-

ing of the convention and coming Assembly that no answer could be expected to follow it.

About the time that Dr. Wilson's Plea came out, I received notice of another publication entitled An Examination of the Pelagian and Arminian Theory of Moral Agency, as recently advocated by Dr. Beecher. By the Rev. Joseph Harvey D. D. As I have not seen the work I am not able to judge of its spirit and character, though I rejoice in the opportunity thus given for a public and thorough discussion of that subject.

The last and most formal assault upon my doctrines and character is contained in the Princeton Review, just published.

It is in effect a review of the evidence adduced against me, on my several trials and acquittals—and overrules the decisions of the judicatories of the church as made contrary to the "obvious meaning of my words," and founded upon the "wandering of confusion and nonsense in which I was lost." The reviewers announce the discovery of new evidence, which through some mistake or oversight, they deeply regret, was not produced on my trial. Had it been, they "see not how the Synod could have avoided convicting Dr. Beecher of having denied the confession of faith on this point" (i. e. the doctrine of original sin,) and having brought me out in contradictions "which no ingenuity can bridge over," leave to me no conceivable alternative of explanation but too great obtuseness to see a contradiction, or too much pride to acknowledge change of opinion, or the mean device of using words in one sense, while in danger of a church court, to be used in another sense, when the fear of discipline has passed away. And while there are not wanting expressions of high respect for my talents, it is only a foil to set off my disgrace in their perversion.

We do not question the right of these reviewers to criticise the literary and theological merits of published opinions. But if, as they are reported to be, they are ministers of the Presbyterian church and officers in her oldest and most important Theological Seminary, it is not seen how their ordination vows to observe and maintain the discipline of the church, and their pledged right hand to every minister of the church could have permitted them to publish, first in a periodical, new evidence, touching a trial which had gone through all the judicatories, attended in addition, with strong implications of moral delinquencies, and all this at a time of great excitement, and so near a crisis which may read as church and nation, as seemed to proclaim the probability of a reply from me. If I had committed myself since the last Assembly, political editors, and what enemies would have deemed it a matter of decorum to abstain from commenting on the evidence, and publishing their opinion on it, before it had been investigated by the regular tribunal.

Whether my case is as far from as the reviewers suppose, the public will be better able to judge when they shall have read my reply, which with Divine permission will be submitted to their consideration next week. I am conscious of no contradiction in my statements, and though the time is short, I expect to be able to show that there is none.

While I review this melancholy exhibition of lengths to which party spirit may carry good men, ministers of Christ I cannot but hang my head with shame and sorrow that the defence of my character, the welfare of the Institution under my care, and the interests of the church of which I am a minister, makes it my sorrowful duty to commit this exposure to a gossamer world.

Doubtless, if these my brethren are the children of God, an hour is coming when they will bewail the evils they have done, and their repentance and confession will find forgiveness in Heaven. But amidst, who should have been guided by the Spirit, are appointed to shed on the earth will know their shame, and never know the repentance which secures for them the efficacy of atoning blood, the fatal influence on themselves shall be revealed at judgement day.

I shall close this record of facts and principles, submitting to the consideration of the community several questions of deep interest with respect to the safety of personal character, and the safety of civil and religious institutions.

The first is, whether the conduct pursued in this case, and which is now becoming flagrant and common in our church, is not at war with the principles of the gospel, the Constitution of the Presbyterian church, and the vital principles of all society, civil and religious, and if persisted in, likely to terminate in anarchy and ruin.

It is certain that all society, both civil and religious depends on law, to the safe action of which judiciary and forms of proceeding, and rules of evidence are indispensable. A departure from these rules, Kings, is despotism, by the people mobocracy, and Lynch law, with the close attendance of anarchy, all the terrific forms of infidelity, passion, pride and revenge, illustrated by the reign of terror in the French Revolution. A trial by law may proceed, but the order cannot be reversed, and an appeal be taken to the supreme judicature to the people. And should popular combinations attempt to rejudge and reverse these decisions of the courts, it would be a crime to be punished by the laws. There may be cases where crime cannot be reached by the formal law, but evidence, but an attempt, by popular violence, to bring into the social state, more justice than can be introduced by law, would annihilate the protection of law, and throw society back to barbarism. Such are the fundamental principles of civil society, and such are the principles recognized in the ecclesiastical constitution of the Presbyterian church. Every minister who enters her communion, she pledges the protection of her judicatories and her laws, the legal forms of trial and evidence! Common law originating in rashness, censoriousness, or malice shall not be regarded, and never except as it respects some particular sin, is widely spread, permanent, gaining ground, and accompanied with strong presumption of truth, and shall be received with caution from an accuser who may be actuated by malignant spirit, or is not of good character, or der process, or in any respect deeply interested in the conviction of the accused. The charges shall specify, if possible, the time, place, and circumstances of the crime, shall be in writing, and a copy of them sent to the accused, with the names of the witnesses relied on for their support, at least ten days before trial. The witnesses must be competent and credible, and may be challenged, where there is any ground for doubt, and their credibility impaired by relationship, interest, rashness, indiscretion, or malice, and no witness to be examined, shall be present at the examination of another witness in the same case. The testimony shall be under oath, be reduced to writing, be read to the witness for his assent and be recorded. These are the elementary principles of our judicial constitution, of our church, whose roots off her ministry originate in Presbytery, and carried by appeal to the Synod, and the General Assembly. But they no more go back by appeal to the Synod, than civil causes can go from the

preme to the inferior courts. Much less can a cause thus decided, be carried by public accusations, to the popular assemblies of the church, and proclaimed before the world, and all attempts to break in this way the force of a regular judicial decision, is revolution in its principle and anarchy.

My second question is whether this onset upon me, from so many points and propagated so eagerly in so many forms of newspapers, reviews, books and paragraphs, and all starting forth just at this particular time, do not sufficiently put on the appearance of conspiracy, to accomplish in my case, by extra-judicial means, what has been in vain attempted by forms of ecclesiastical law. I say not that it is so, but complicated and extended coincidences are generally supposed to indicate concurrent design, and if there had been a concerted plan to write me down, with reference to the present crisis of our church, could it have been expected to have put on more indications of concerted action than it now exhibits? For myself, I only say, that very early after the session of the last Assembly, I had evidence which satisfied me that such plans were maturing, and I have witnessed accumulating evidence of it more than I can state, until the sudden onset from East Windsor, from Princeton, from South Carolina, from Louisville, from Columbus and from Cincinnati, all at once burst forth, and at a time so near the session of the Convention and General Assembly, as to exert their entire effect upon me, without the probable interposition of a shield.

Finally, I would submit to the consideration of the church and of the community, whether there is not sufficient evidence to demand attention, that the controversy which has become so inflamed and violent, has been excited and continued, by a coalition of Theological Seminaries, to propagate or perpetuate the peculiarities of their own theology, by means of ecclesiastical censures, and the intimidation of a combined and excited public sentiment. It would be the affectation of credulity to deny that I am violently and systematically assailed by those in the plans and interest of the East Windsor institution. The arrows are chiefly forged and furnished and pointed there, and shot into our church, to supply the quiver of any archer who desires to bend his bow at me. It is evident also that the friends of this institution are taking a deep interest in the concerns of the Presbyterian church, and that their sympathy for us is not unacceptable or unrequited. But is there a concert of Seminaries! This is a question to be pondered and a subject to be watched in its bearings on freedom of enquiry and the safety of our civil and religious rights. For it is certain, that while unpurposed, and holding the patronage and confidence of a vigilant community, Theological Seminaries are among a nation's greatest blessings, their unwatched and secret ascendancy and coalition, till they shall be able by intimidation, to dictate the faith of pupils, and punish delinquents, even in phraseology, with loss of character, would be a more vigorous germ of a second papal system, than we are authorized to expect, or prepared to endure.

As frequent reference has been made in my case, to the opinion of ministers in New England, it may be useful and proper to know some further particulars on the subject. I subjoin the following remarks from an intelligent divine in New England, who has most extensive facilities of observation, who is no partisan, and who is rather favorable than otherwise, to what is deemed the peculiar views of East Windsor Theological Seminary.

"I do not think that the publication of Dr. Porter's letter has done you any harm in N. E., or that there is, or has been any need of saying anything more about it. It might have started or revived some suspicion in the mind of a few, had not the feeling of indignation at the meanness of the proceeding, filled the minds of men so full, that there was not room for anything else.

Before the publication of Matthew's letter there was some danger that Dr. Porter would get a bad name, for faithfully sending around copies of his letter, which professed to you, to be strictly confidential; but I believe that matter is now understood.

East Windsor, I always thought, "had no business to be born." Now, it must find and furnish some good reason for its own existence. This necessity I take it, is the true root of all these evils. While that exists, I do not see how they can possibly be easy.

I have been thinking the public should be informed of the alliance between East Windsor and the Presbyterian party, but have seen no good way in which it could be done. The East Windsor men are saying to every man they meet that they are behaving strangely. I think their position will soon be understood by the public, if not by themselves. I am really sorry for poor Dr. Tyler. In his controversy with Dr. Taylor, I think on the whole, he had the advantage. I believe he went to East Windsor in a good temper, and with good intentions, and that since he went there, he has labored hard, to preserve the peace of the churches. But his position almost inevitably forces him upon some courses, at variance with his temper and better views. In some cases I know, he has been misled by false information.

What I have to add in reply to the Princeton Review, will probably be given to the public next week, and certainly I trust before the close of the General Assembly.

I am not willing to close this communication without volunteering an effort to avert what some seem to rejoice at, and many to be advancing by the most appropriate means, viz. the division of the Presbyterian Church. A subject which both in its religious and political bearings, draws deep and demands the silence and fear and humble importunity of prayer; for who can comprehend the measure of calamity, temporal and spiritual, which may follow the sundering of our ecclesiastical and political ties? Little do we consider, that while the blood flows healthfully, and every muscle performs its office, and all the affections sweetly flow, by how many ligaments of interest and affection we are bound together, and what tortures must attend the tearing apart of a body so powerfully compacted! that day when the ministry of the North and the South shall withdraw the hand of fellowship, and conscience and zeal, perverted, shall enlist under the banners of the carnal mind, then may devils cease from their fear of speedy exile from the earth, and rest from their labors of mischief, and scream out their joy at results of evil so surpassing their own power of production; and who are the men who shall put forth, in an evil hour, the hand, and open upon the church and the nation the door of such a desolation? Shall they be the ministers of Christ! the ministers of the Presbyterian Church? Is that bad eminence in future history to be ours? That imperishable record of our shame to go down thus to an unending eternity? I do not deny that a revolution may sometimes be justified both in the church and the state, but common sense and all writers agree that it can be justified only where the great ends of association are subverted, and all means of redress have been tried in vain, and that even then the probabilities of success and gain must be greater than those of loss and mischief; but has such a crisis arisen in our church? Has the end of church organization wholly failed? Will it be contended that the Presbyterian Church is anti-christ, defeating the end of her being, provoking divine abandonment, and demanding the flight of the righteous to escape the gathering plagues of heaven? Is she as corrupt and hopeless as the Jewish Church, when

the Saviour forlorn separation and enjoined subjection?— Is there as much to impede the truth and hinder the conversion of souls as appertains to every national Protestant Church in Christendom? In the church of England, within the memory of man, there were, it is said, less than fifty evangelical ministers, where now there are more than two thousand; in the time of Witherspoon, a majority of the church of Scotland was composed of moderate men, Unitarian and Arminian, but what had been the condition of these churches now, had the heaven then been exiled? In such cases, while impatient men cry divide, the language of heaven is "destroy it not, for a blessing is in it." Why, then, should we rush upon division, even if our condition were worse than it is? Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there?

Have all the appropriate means been tried? Has every thing been done that can be done, and in the best manner? to restore confidence and supercede division; what has been done? The press has lost her efforts to circulate accusation and suspicion through the land, and common fame has blown long and loud, her thousand trumpets of alarm and hostile ranks rallied to the onset, have met the shock of battle and alternate victory and defeat in the General Assembly, and no good has resulted, but evil only, as might have been expected; does this prove that nothing can be done? Are there no other and better means than those we have used for the conservation of our church? Our contentions have come gradually, and till recently without the apprehension of such desperate results, but now the precipice is before us, and we see the gulph. Are we prepared to leap it without an effort at recoil? Has all the patience of the church been put in requisition, and all the meekness of the church exhausted in vain efforts at peace? and all the mutual consultations of the wise and good been had, which such an exigency demands? And all mutual concessions offered and accepted which ought to be by brethren of the same household! and all the importunity and prayer which the urgency of our case demands, brought about the throne of grace? Is there not yet cause to hope in the mercy of God, that with the development of our danger, He will send thrilling through our whole church, an instinctive revision from precipitation and violence, which shall hasten to the next Assembly, the wise and the good, to mitigate the animosities and allay the convulsions which can no longer be endured, and precipitate the church. And can such eventful measures as those of revolution be taken with such consequences in view, without the evident stamp of infuriated councils? Is there any prospect that revolution will be a remedy? Is there not a moral certainty that it will be the dissolution of the only conservative power of the church, able to hold in check the ultraism of error and fanaticism. Besides if we separate, will not each of the divided parts carry in its bosom, portions of the same volcanic matter which now convulses the whole, with diminished power of resistance! And what can prevent a subdivision but just such patience, forbearance, and firmness mingled with kindness, as may now avail to maintain the unity and piety of the entire church? What cause can exist to vindicate the church from the sin and shame of a wanton schism!

Is it demanded how this difficult work of pacification can be accomplished?

I answer, not by open war in the newspapers, nor by accusations of heresy, and judicial trials. These may inflict mutual wrongs, and aggravate our animosities, and foam out our shame, and fill the church with a more intense burning, in which she will have no rest day nor night. Nor can a division of our church, or a decisive victory of one party over the other, secure peace. Division may be effected by coercion, but there can be no conquest that will produce peace. Neither party can be forcibly put down and subdued by the other.

But peace and harmony can be restored by the cessation of hostilities, and by seeking the things that make for peace. There is a loss of confidence, with fear and acrimonious action from misinformation, the very results which licentious press and wanton slander are calculated to engender, all of which may be expected to subside when the exciting causes cease. The quietness of a single year might go so far to subdue passion and restore confidence, as to render division impossible. Time, alone, would lay its lenient hand upon our febrile head and heart. But if, in addition to this, a conservative committee, composed of the wise and good on each side, should be appointed to enquire into the causes of our trouble, and the means of restoring confidence to the church, and report to the next assembly, with recommendations to the churches in the mean time to cultivate holiness, and prayer for the effusion of the spirit, and efforts for the propagation of the gospel, there is little reason to doubt that our past relations of confidence and peace and brotherly love would be restored. May the Lord in his infinite mercy forgive us all, and pour out upon the Assembly his restraining grace, and copious measures of the wisdom from above, is the unceasing and importunate prayer of my heart.