

1835

Schism in Charleston

South Carolina Annual Conference

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wofford.edu/methodistbooks>



Part of the [Church History Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

South Carolina Annual Conference, "Schism in Charleston" (1835). *Methodist Books*. Book 4.
<http://digitalcommons.wofford.edu/methodistbooks/4>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Methodist Collection at Digital Commons @ Wofford. It has been accepted for inclusion in Methodist Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Wofford. For more information, please contact stonerp@wofford.edu.

*With Compliments
of Yeter Sawcher*

REPORT

287.061
C2
pam.
cop. 2

OF

THE COMMITTEE

OF THE

SOUTH-CAROLINA CONFERENCE,

OF THE

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

ON THE SUBJECT OF THE

SCHISM IN CHARLESTON,

WITH THE

ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE CONFERENCE.

Charleston.

PRINTED BY J. S. BURGESS, 18 BROAD-ST.
1835.

EXTRACT OF THE JOURNAL
OF THE
SOUTH-CAROLINA CONFERENCE,
FOR THE YEAR 1885.

Feb. 11.—Immediately after the appointment of the usual Committees, it was, on motion of W. Capers and W. M. Kennedy, *Resolved*, That a Committee of five be appointed, to investigate the subject of the late Schism in Charleston, and report whether or not any act of this Conference is called for on that account.

Samuel Dunwody, Malcom McPherson, Hartwell Spain, Daniel G. McDaniel, and Robert Adams, were appointed that Committee.

Feb. 16.—Brother Dunwody, from the Committee on the Charleston affairs, presented a Report, after the reading of which, and several documents accompanying it, the hour of adjournment having arrived, Conference adjourned.

Feb. 17.—Bishop Andrew made some statements in reference to his connexion with the affairs of the Church in Charleston, and the Report of the Committee was then *unanimously adopted*.

It was farther *Resolved*, That the Report, and accompanying documents be published. The Preachers to be appointed to Charleston were fixed on as a Committee to publish, and 5000 copies, with the "REJOINDER" appended, ordered to be printed.

The above is a true extract of the Journal of Conference.

(Signed)

W. M. WIGHTMAN, *Secretary.*

REPORT.

The Committee appointed to investigate the causes which led to the late Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, and to report whether or not any act of the present Annual Conference is called for on that account, Reports as follows:

After having attentively considered the various documents put into its possession, your Committee is decidedly of opinion that the following matters of fact are true:

At a Quarterly Meeting in Charleston, August 30, 1833, the following Resolutions were passed: 1st. That the Gallery is the only proper place

for the Slaves in our Churches; and that the Trustees be requested to remove the boxes on the lower floor and place benches there with a railing up the centre aisle for the use of free persons of color. 2. That it is expedient there should be a small gate cut on each side of the large gate leading into Bethel yard, on a line with the gallery doors, for the use of colored persons entering the Church. And also that a paling fence be erected in all our yards, leading from each side gate to the Church. 3. That a Committee be appointed to communicate the foregoing Resolutions to the Board of Trustees, and request their immediate action upon them; and in case the Trustees are unable to do so for want of funds, the Committee be instructed to raise a subscription for that purpose.

Agreeably to the above Resolutions a Meeting of the Board of Trustees was speedily called, but from the short notice given, there happened not to be a quorum present, and of course no business could be done. A free conversation however took place concerning the Resolutions of the Quarterly Conference, and the general opinion seemed to be that they were unfortunate, and had better not be carried into effect. To this opinion the Members of the Committee themselves did not object. So far, brotherly love seemed to prevail, and not the least evil consequence could reasonably have been anticipated. The scene however was quickly changed, as will appear in the sequel. In the next Society Meeting, Rev. William Capers, the Preacher in Charge, having slightly alluded to the subject of the removal of the boxes, took occasion to inculcate the propriety of Christian charity towards our colored members, especially those who gave evidence of sincere piety, and were otherwise respectable in their stations. These remarks, though uttered in pastoral faithfulness and affection, gave offence to several persons, an evidence of which soon appeared in a letter addressed to brother Capers, charging the Trustees with wilful negligence in failing to attend the meeting of the Board, and peremptorily requiring brother Capers as Chairman of the Board, to call another Meeting, to ascertain, as they said, whether the wishes of the Quarterly Conference should be complied with, or not. Your Committee is of opinion that at this stage of the business, brother Capers took the wisest and most inoffensive course he could, in promptly resigning his office as Chairman of the Board of Trustees, which he and his predecessors had held from courtesy, and not by any requirement of the Discipline. This was certainly a peaceable measure, and well calculated to refute what his opponents have charged him with, namely, a love of power. The Committee of the Quarterly Conference, however, were not so easily satisfied. They shortly after addressed another letter to brother Capers, the evident design of which was to compel him to call another Meeting of the Trustees, to carry into effect the Resolutions of the Quarterly Conference. And to ensure success, they drew up a paper approving those resolutions, and procured to it a large number of signatures consisting of men, women, boys and girls, who were here represented as authorising the Committee of the Quarterly Conference to carry the Resolutions into effect if the Trustees refused to do so. Here your Committee have no hesitation to avow their belief that the Committee of the Quarterly Conference acted inconsistently with the Discipline; and exceeded their own instructions, which sent them to the Trustees and not to the membership in general.

The Committee of the Quarterly Conference, finding they could not procure a meeting of the Board of Trustees through brother Capers, who had

resigned his relation to the Board, addressed themselves to the Trustees in another manner, and procured a meeting of the Board on the 19th September, 1833. At this meeting a resolution was passed expressing the willingness of the Board to fulfil the wishes of the Quarterly Conference, but for reasons given, requesting a suspension of the proposed alteration of the sittings in the Churches. At another meeting of the Board (on the 10th October following,) the Trustees declared their conviction that the proposed alterations would injure and not promote the welfare of the Church; but still, that to promote peace and avoid collision with the Committee of the Quarterly Conference, that Committee should be at liberty to carry the proposed alterations into effect, and should be put in possession of the keys of the Churches for that purpose, if they still insisted on it. As the Trustees had now substantially yielded to the Committee, even against their own convictions of the inexpediency of doing what was proposed to be done, it might have been reasonably expected that no farther disturbance would take place. This, however, was not the case, and it soon became evident that an organised opposition to the constituted authorities of the Church had been formed, and which aimed at nothing less than the entire subversion of the Methodist Discipline. And here it may be proper to take notice of the silence of the expelled and seceding party, in their published exposition of the matter, as to that resolution of the Board of Trustees, above mentioned, which authorised the Committee of the Quarterly Conference to make the alterations about which they were raising so much clamor. There can be but one reason assigned for this otherwise unaccountable silence; and that is, a wilful design to keep the people in the dark as to the real motives of their conduct. It is true that they ask the question in their "Rejoinder," "Does he [Dr. Capers] not know that this resolution was a mere feint? What authority had the Committee to make alterations in the Churches? Had the Quarterly Conference appointed them to have the work done?" Now there were three resolutions passed by the Board of Trustees at the same time, the first and second of which were published by the seceders, and the third wholly left out of their publication. Why did they publish the two, and not the third? If the third resolution was a mere feint, was it not as likely the first and second were also mere feints? Why then take two out of three of the resolutions and publish them as the whole? The reason is obvious: it would not have suited their purpose to publish the third Resolution, because in that Resolution the Trustees granted in substance the very thing for which the Committee of the Quarterly Conference was contending; and this thing (the alterations in the sittings) was not their real object, but, as will appear in the sequel, they were only drumming on that to muster a party for something else. But if the Committee of the Quarterly Conference were really scrupulous about exceeding their instructions in one respect, why were they not equally so in another? If they held themselves unauthorised to effectuate the changes proposed in the Churches, even after the Trustees had authorised them, why had they gone about to get such a number of signatures to a paper expressly to authorise them to do the same thing whether the Trustees would or not? But when they had thus procured authority among the members, old and young, male and female, to make the proposed alterations, and the Trustees had given their consent that the work might be done, why did they forbear to act, in a case which they themselves had so long and loudly declared to be of such vast importance to the Church? Obviously, because they had another object in

view. Again, if the white *male members* of the Church only, could compose the corporate body to transact the temporal business of the Church, why then solicit the signatures of not only men, but women, boys, and girls, to authorise the alterations in the Churches? We leave them to reconcile their inconsistencies as they can.

As an evidence that the removal of the boxes was not the main thing the opposition party had in view, peace was far from being restored to the Church by the Trustees giving their consent that the work might be done. On the contrary, the agitation increased, and on the 29th October following, a meeting of the opposition party was held at Trinity School Room, at which it was resolved, that a Committee be appointed to procure a meeting of the Church in its corporate capacity, and to take such measures as should be effectual towards that object. This Resolution was conveyed to the Preacher in Charge, with a request that he would call a meeting. The Presiding Elder, Rev. Henry Bass, being then in the city, he and the other Preachers on the station were consulted as to what was best to be done; and it was concluded to be inexpedient to call a *corporate* meeting, but desirable to have a meeting of the white male members of the Church for a free conversation on the affairs of the Church. Such a meeting was accordingly called, to take place in Trinity Church on the evening of November 12. Here the design of the opposition party became more clearly manifest, and which was, to get all the Church property into their own hands, and eventually, to control the administration of the Discipline. One evidence of this was the refusal of a majority present (and to which they were instigated by the master mover in this whole plot) to recognise brother Bass as President of the meeting, by virtue of his office as Presiding Elder; declaring that it was a corporate meeting, and they had a right to elect their Chairman. It was in vain that brother Capers, the Preacher in Charge, declared he had not called a corporate meeting; some insisted that he had; and as the Preachers could not surrender their pastoral and ministerial functions, made theirs by the Discipline, they concluded the meeting by prayer and the benediction. A considerable number however remained, and proceeded to adopt an entire new system of rules for the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, entirely at variance with her Discipline and usages, and in effect, renouncing the authority of the General Conference.

Another remarkable circumstance attending this meeting, was, their proceeding to elect a Board of Trustees. For though they elected the same persons who constituted the proper Board of the Church, their design was to get rid of them altogether, the more certainly to get the Church property into their own hands. This is evident from the following considerations. They knew the Trustees would not act under their new appointment from men whose authority they did not acknowledge, and whose whole course they considered a palpable violation of the Discipline; and accordingly, one of their resolutions provided to vacate the elections, if the newly elected Trustees should not signify their acceptance of office within fifteen days. What then? why of course another Board would be elected who would comply with all their revolutionary measures. And this accordingly happened, for, as had been foreseen, the Trustees refused their new election, and another Board was elected in their places. We might pause here to remark on several instances of gross inconsistency in the schismatics. One only may suffice. All their clamor had been raised in pretend-

ed respect for that provision of the Discipline which makes the Trustees responsible to the Quarterly Conference; but in their new code for the Church, they took away all responsibility to the Quarterly Conference and transferred to themselves. And yet these were the men who vehemently contended they were fully covered by the Discipline.

One only alternative now remained for the Preacher in Charge: i. e. either to suffer our whole system of Discipline to be prostrated, or to take measures for the infliction of its penalties on these offenders. A sense of duty compelled him to adopt the latter course. Before its execution, however, another last effort was made to restore peace to the Church without cutting off those who had so long violated, and even trampled upon, her just authority. It was an affectionate proposal by brother Capers to withdraw the charges preferred against some of the principals of the opposition, provided they would retract their illegal proceedings and submit the decision of the disputed point about Church property to the Appeal Judges, and that about the Discipline to the Bishops. This proposal was acceded to, and that under circumstances peculiarly solemn and affecting, and for a while universal satisfaction seemed to prevail. But the scene became changed, almost as soon as one absent member of the opposition had returned to town, a few weeks after the reconciliation. The party receded from their most solemn engagements, threw themselves back on their former proceedings, and again jeopardized the peace of the Church. This was the posture of affairs at the time of the session of our last Conference in Charleston.

Your Committee would here offer a remark or two touching the administration of the Discipline, in relation to this affair, by brother Capers. He has been warmly accused of being arbitrary and domineering in his conduct towards the Church, and towards this schismatic party in particular. So far from this having been the case, your Committee are fully persuaded that if he erred in any respect it was in excessive forbearance, which had rather a tendency to encourage the disaffected than to bring them to repentance. And concerning the accusation of his having read a paper falsely in the meeting in Trinity Church on the 12th of November, 1833, we consider it unfeasible in itself, and amply refuted by the testimony of several of the most respected members of this Conference who were present, as well as a number of the members of the Church in Charleston. For farther information on this particular, and others touching brother Capers' conduct, and that of the party towards him, we beg leave to refer to his communication to us, and the accompanying documents herewith submitted.

Your Committee would now notice another circumstance of considerable importance. During the time of the sitting of the Annual Conference in Charleston, Bishop Emory made several attempts to effect a reconciliation, but could not succeed. The reason why he could not, appears to have been this: The Corporation party were determined to hold a claim to the election of the Trustees in order to their controlling the Church property, (which was their favorite design from first to last,) while the Board of Trustees, supported by the wishes of a majority of the members, scrupulously adhered to the letter of the Discipline. But even could it have been expedient for the members, generally, to elect the Trustees, and admitting also that the Discipline would allow it, still the Corporation party were glaringly inconsistent with their professed principles; for they, the Corporation party, were a minority of the members, and had always been so, a decided

majority of the Church being with the Trustees. Bishop Emory prevailed only so far with them as to induce them to consent to leave their pretensions as to the Discipline to the decision of the Bishops, and till that decision should be had, not to attempt any proceedings under (or *as if* under) the act of the Legislature of 1787, incorporating the Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston. As in former instances, however, so in this again, they grossly violated their engagement. On the 5th July following, the party held a meeting in Trinity School Room, at which they passed a series of inflammatory resolutions, and among others this one—That they would not thereafter agree to any proposal of accommodation, come from what quarter it might, that was not based on the by-laws adopted by them in November preceding. That is in amount, they would not agree to any proposal of accommodation which should not recognise the right of the minority of the male members to make laws for the majority of the male members, however against the will of the majority, and against the Church Discipline.

This party have taken much pains to have it believed that the reason of their passing those resolutions was, that the Board of Trustees had not kept promises made by them not to act as a Board, unless in some necessary instances, till the decision of the Bishops should be known. The truth was, the Trustees had never made any such promise at all, nor had any such been required of them. This is evident from the testimony of Bishop Emory himself.

The party have also labored hard to prove that Bishop Emory justified their proceedings; even their acts of Nov. 12, 1833, by which on an assumption of corporate powers they took to themselves the right of superceding the authority of the Discipline, and make what laws they pleased for the Church in Charleston. But here again the Bishop is conclusively against them, as will fully appear by reference to his letter herewith presented to the Conference.

Passing over a number of particulars too tedious to narrate, and which do not touch the main points of the case, your Committee proceed to the circumstances nearly connected with the closing scene of this unhappy affair. The inflammatory resolutions above mentioned had shut up all the avenues to conciliation; and the Preacher in Charge, brother William M. Kennedy, had no alternative left but to execute our wholesome Discipline on the refractory, or suffer the whole Church to be prostrated before the self-created corporation party. Measures were accordingly taken to bring the principals, about eight in number, to trial. In the mean time the party who had so long disturbed the peace of the Church, now seemed roused to do all the mischief they possibly could. They procured the signatures of about one hundred and eighteen persons, of both sexes, minors and adults, to a paper in which they pledged themselves to withdraw from the Church if the persons cited to trial should be expelled. This was done, and the paper exhibited to the Preachers, in hope of deterring them from their duty. The Preachers, however, were not to be scared into compliance. A conscious sense of rectitude and duty bore them up at this trying crisis. The Discipline was enforced, and the eight accused persons were expelled from the Church. As was to be expected, the one hundred and eighteen persons who had pledged themselves to the leaders of the party by signing a paper, left the Church immediately after the expulsion of the eight, and subsequently others withdrew.

In reviewing the history of this wretched affair, your Committee are fully

impressed with the belief that the main design of the leaders of the corporation party was to get the whole of the Church property into their hands, and then free themselves of the restraints of the Methodist Discipline. This is indeed the true key which unlocks all their proceedings. Your Committee are also fully persuaded that our ministers who have been stationed in Charleston, during the time of this whole affair, so far from being guilty of the aristocratic and tyrannical conduct attributed to them, have rather carried their moderation and forbearance to a degree bordering on error, and finally were driven to act under an absolute necessity of either cutting off the refractory, or suffering the Church to be prostrated by a lawless faction.

In conclusion, your Committee would remark that the bitter invectives which have been published against the Preachers of the Charleston station, can be looked upon only as the genuine fruits of disappointed ambition; and we esteem it a sufficient refutation of these calumnies, to refer our people to the accompanying documents. Your Committee therefore recommend the publication by order of Conference, of this Report, and the documents which are herewith presented.

All which is respectfully submitted.

SAMUEL DUNWODY, *Chairman.*

WE the members of the Committee of the South Carolina Conference, charged with the investigation of the late Schism in Charleston, do hereby certify that we have carefully examined the original documents published by Dr. Capers, in his exposition of that Schism, last autumn, and have found them to be exactly, in every particular, the same as published. In particular, the paper which he offered to the persons who were cited to trial by him, and to the face of which he appealed in his exposition as furnishing evidence of the truth of his statement of the transaction at Mr. Honour's on the 8th of December, we find to be just as he affirmed of it, in all respects.

SAMUEL DUNWODY,
HARTWELL SPAIN,
MALCOM M'PHERSON,
DANIEL G. M'DANIEL,
ROBERT ADAMS.

DOCUMENTS

REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING REPORT.

To the brethren SAMUEL DUNWODY, MALCOM MCPHERSON, HARTWELL SPAIN, DANIEL G. MCDANIEL, and ROBERT ADAMS, *Committee*.

DEAR BRETHREN,

You having been appointed "a Committee to investigate the subject of the late Schism in the Church in Charleston, and to report to the Conference whether or not any act of this body is required on that account," I lay before you the accompanying documents, and with them a few brief remarks.

1st. The Document marked (A.) concerns what was read by me in the meeting in Trinity Church Nov. 12, 1833. To you I need not explain why this document is offered in the form of a certificate and not that of an affidavit. I could not ask brethren to swear on the bare account that others had rashly adventured an oath. Indeed, I hold that Christian men ought not to swear unless required by the civil authority. To swear of their own motion, without Cesar's command, I consider profane. You know the persons whose names are subscribed well enough to be assured that what they have here certified they would swear to on a proper occasion.

2nd. The Document marked (B.) is a certificate of Major Benjamin Hart, of Columbia, So. Ca. to prove that I have returned to him still "sealed" the address or "resolutions" of the meeting in Columbia, of which he was Chairman. What those resolutions were I never knew. They were sent to me separately sealed, with a request that I would not open the paper except in a meeting of the Church. Whatever they might be, they came too late to be of any service. I wrote the next day to Major Hart on the subject, and he was content. But the infatuation which conjured against me the false reading in the meeting of Nov. 12, 1833, and swore to it, must needs sustain itself by farther aggression; and having first made me a liar without any conscience, it makes me also a base fellow without any heart. I had said in my Exposition that my mind was agonised in view of the expulsion at one stroke of nine of the official members of the Church of my charge, and having exhausted in vain what stock of argument I had to prevent that issue, I drew up a paper which I thought might preserve the integrity of the Discipline and plead with them by tears and entreaties, for Christ's sake, for the sake of their wives and children, and even for my own sake, not to persist in their Schismatic measures. They say in their Rejoinder,—“The members positively refused to sign the paper, and Dr. Capers left the room without a single signature being affixed to it, observing as he went out *in an apparent agony*, ‘brethren you may not care about being expelled the Church but I do, and I cannot and will not expell you.’ And his making this remark, together with *the feelings manifested by him*, were the only reasons why the members signed it at all, one of them observing ‘let us sign it, for if we refuse any longer it will kill brother Capers.’

According to the gentlemen's own shewing then, it appears there was no room for doubt at the time, both as to my "agony of mind" and the cause of it. But what spirit is this which moves them now to turn the whole scene into a contemptible farce, and worse? The gentlemen represent that I violated a seal which had been confided to me, and so got information which set me to cajoling them by a mimicry of pious grief. The testimony however, is conclusive against them; and I again affirm that to this day I have not been informed what were the resolutions of the meeting in Columbia. If the statement in the Rejoinder was contrived for the purpose of raising offence towards me in the respected brethren who formed that meeting, I am glad to know that it has failed of its object. If it was only an ebullition of passionate ill-will, then let its authors be assured that I pity and pray for them.

The Document marked (C.) is a communication from Bishop Emory, spontaneously written and sent to me on his receiving the Rejoinder. I need make no remark on it. Its testimony is unequivocal, and shews throughout, what credit ought to be given to the statements of that pamphlet.

Will my persecutors betake themselves again to their oaths, "eight to one?" Will they swear to their statement of the conference they say they had with the Bishop about impeaching me? Will they swear to the long quotations they have published, marked at every line as quoted verbatim from the Bishop? But I forbear.

With the above mentioned documents I also submit for your examination, the original documents published in my exposition; and request you to examine them closely, and certify to their exact agreement with what I have published.

I am dear brethren, affectionately
and sincerely yours,

W. CAPERS.

P. S. I have not thought it worth my time to follow my persecutors through all their vagaries. If, however, in the course of your investigations, you find any thing in the "Rejoinder" which you judge important to be answered, and which I have not noticed, please let me know; and I think I can promise you as ample and satisfactory an answer as you can wish. Their repetition in the Rejoinder of what I had fully refuted in my exposition last fall, while they have not ventured to encounter the force of the evidence, in a single particular, by which their statements had been proved untrue, I deem unworthy of any notice. God knows I pity them. They have causelessly assailed me. I never did them any wrong, nor would I.

W. C.

(A.)

Certificates concerning the reading of a paper in Trinity Church, Nov. 12, 1833.

WHEREAS in a pamphlet by Messrs. William Laval and others, in August last, a circumstantial statement has been given of the reading of a certain paper by Dr. William Capers, in a Church meeting held in Trinity Church, Nov. 12, 1833, and the principal particulars of this statement of Messrs. Laval and others, have been subsequently sworn to, and the affidavits published in a second pamphlet, called "A Rejoinder"—WE the undersigned having been present as members of said meeting and witnessed all

the proceedings, believing it due to truth and justice that we should declare our testimony in the case, do say and declare as follows:

1st. The point of dispute which induced the reading of a paper by Dr. Capers in the meeting above mentioned, was not respecting any resolution of a previous party meeting, as to what such resolution expressed, but was respecting the particular character of the meeting then present, whether it was a meeting of the Church as a corporation or not, and how it had been called.

2nd. What was read, and the reading repeated by Dr. Capers in the aforesaid meeting of the 12th Nov. 1833, and of which he affirmed that it expressed nothing about corporation, was not read by him as the resolution of a previous party meeting, nor do we believe it was said resolution. But to the best of our knowledge it was either what had been addressed to him by the Committee of the party meeting, or the notice by which the then present Church meeting had been called.

3rd. After reading a first and second time, as above, and affirming as above, Dr. Capers did then, at the call of some one present, read the resolution of the party meeting of the 29th October preceding, and in the words of said resolution as published, adding that he cared not for what it said; or words to this effect.

4th. There was no manifestation in the meeting, by silence or otherwise, of astonishment at the reading of what was read by Dr. Capers; (as is affirmed in the pamphlet before mentioned;) nor did we discover in what he said on that occasion any thing inconsistent with sincerity and truth; but he appeared undisguisedly, earnestly, and candidly opposed to the pretensions set up by the corporation party, and in this, we believe, consisted his whole offence.

We further add, that from the time of the aforesaid 12th November, 1833, until the pamphlets appeared, (being a space of seven or eight months,) we never heard it intimated from any quarter that Dr. Capers had been guilty of any unfairness or duplicity in reading on that occasion.

(Signed)

JOHN MOOD,
ABEL M'KEE,
HENRY MUCKENFUSS,
BENJ. S. D. MUCKENFUSS,
JOHN C. MILLER,
WILLIAM H. WHITE,
JOSEPH CURTIS,
GEORGE JUST,
SOLOMON L. REEVES,
WILLIAM BIRD,

SAMUEL J. WAGNER,
GEORGE CHRIETZBURG,
FREDERICK BURROWS,
ALEXANDER C. TORREY,
WILLIAM WIGHTMAN, JR.
PAUL REMLEY,
JOHN C. SIMMONS,
JACOB RABB,
ORRIN C. PARKER,
PETER MOOD.

The Undersigned ministers of the South-Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, having been present in the meeting in Trinity Church on the 12th November 1833, and witnessed the proceedings in said meeting, do concur fully, unequivocally, and without reserve in the preceding certificate.

HENRY BASS,
JOSEPH HOLMES,
HUGH A. C. WALKER.

I was in the meeting above mentioned during all the time it was held. My hearing is too imperfect for me to affirm positively of words spoken, but I affirm that from what I could hear, and saw, and understood at the

time, and have always since believed, I am fully persuaded the foregoing certificates are correct. I always understood the subject as it is here represented.

REDDICK PIERCE.

I was in the aforesaid meeting, but not in time to witness the reading of the papers referred to. I affirm, however, that I have no recollection of ever having heard Dr. Capers charged with any thing improper in reading the papers above mentioned until the appearance of the pamphlet in August afterwards.

WHITEFOORD SMITH, JUNR.

(B.)

Major Hart's Certificate.

I do hereby certify, that during the session of the Legislature in the month of December, 1833, a number of the members of the Methodist Church, who were at that time in Columbia from various parts of the State, as well as some of those who reside there, having heard of the unfortunate dispute and misunderstanding that had taken place among their Brethren in Charleston, determined to call a meeting, to see, if they could devise and recommend such measures as would probably restore that peace and harmony to the Church, that had been so unhappily disturbed. A meeting was therefore called for this purpose, on the evening of the third of December, at which meeting a Committee was appointed to draft an address to be sent to the Pastors and members of the Methodist E. Church in the city of Charleston. At a subsequent meeting the Committee reported an address, which was unanimously approved and adopted. And the meeting instructed me, as their Chairman, to transmit their proceedings, to the Pastors and other members of the Methodist Church in Charleston, as early as practicable. I therefore inclosed it in an envelope, and directed it, as I had been instructed. This packet was inclosed in another envelope, and directed to the Rev'd Doctor Capers, with a request that the enclosed, should not be opened, but in a meeting of the members of the Church. Some short time after this, I received a letter from Doctor Capers, acknowledging the receipt of the communication, and also stating that a previous meeting had taken place, and that he had some assurance that the whole matter would be amicably adjusted. I further certify, that the packet containing the proceedings of the meeting in Columbia, and which had been inclosed and sent to Doctor Capers, was returned to me on the 11th Feby. 1835, by Doctor Capers himself, in precisely the same situation, that it was, at the time I inclosed it to him. I am fully satisfied that the seals had not been broken, nor could the contents of the packet be taken out, or seen, without either breaking the seals, or cutting, or tearing the paper, neither of which appears to have been done.

BENJAMIN HART.

(C.)

Bishop Emory's Letter.

To the Rev. H. BASS, W. M. KENNEDY, and W. CAPERS.
DEAR BRETHREN,

The use which has been made of my name in connexion with yours, in certain pamphlets published in Charleston, on the subject of our late Church difficulties in that city, induces me to trouble you with the following communication. In doing this, however, it is my purpose barely to make such

corrections and explanations as candor seems to require, simply in the order in which the matters occur to me, without regard to their comparative importance.

The authors of the pamphlet published in August last, subscribed by "John Kingman" and others, make certain statements (p. 41-2 edition annexed to the "Exposition" &c.) on which I will submit a few observations.

That the mere fact of a Church being incorporated is not a violation of our Discipline, I considered so plain, that it would be no departure from my rule of proceeding to answer a question on that point; and also to state that there are places, where, in such incorporated Churches, the male members, under certain regulations, elect the Trustees. I think, however, that I did not use the term "many," and am satisfied that I gave no opinion on the question whether it be consistent with our Discipline for the members themselves to solicit such a charter, or to institute such a regulation of their own, *when not required to do so by any law.*

The paper which I read to the Society in Trinity Church on the 16th of February last, was not submitted as a *proposition from me.* This was repeatedly stated at the time of reading it. Nor had the Trustees, personally or otherwise, pledged themselves to abide by it. Having failed to effect an agreement by personal mediation, my object in drawing that paper was to embody in writing the precise terms on which *the corporation party*, so called, would agree to a settlement. This is expressly stated in the paper itself. I endeavoured, at the same time, to bring them as near as I could to the opposite side, to remove misunderstanding, and, in any event, to secure the Discipline of the Church. That part of the paper which provided for the decision of questions of Discipline by the Bishops, and of law by common counsel, was of my suggestion.

The gentlemen who acted in the name of the corporation party, did agree to suspend all farther proceedings under the act of 1787 till the decision of the Bishops on the questions to be submitted to them, should be known. This is also stated in the paper; but I had no pledge from the Trustees for any suspension on their part. The Rev. H. Bass and W. M. Kennedy were never considered by me as representatives of the Trustees. I invited them to be present at our interviews in their own proper relation, as Presiding Elder, and Minister in Charge; and regarded whatever they said or did, as on their own individual judgment and responsibility. They made no "agreement" for the Trustees; nor did I ever consider it as "expressly understood," that action should be suspended by both parties and nothing done, save the ordinary business of the Church, till I should be heard from. After reading the paper in Trinity, I did not afford any opportunity for discussion, nor expect or desire any at that time. I thought it better to leave a copy with the preachers, to which all might have access, and stated publicly that I would do so—adding such earnest exhortations to mutual forbearance and peace as I was enabled, in hope that, with better feelings, and after individual consultations, the paper might lead to an ultimate adjustment which should both be satisfactory to the Society in Charleston, and preserve the integrity of our general economy.

I did not promise to send the decision of the Bishops in two months; but stated in answer to an enquiry, that I thought it probable it might be had in that time. Neither did I mean to be understood in my letter to brother Kennedy, that I had obtained the decision, but thought it unnecessary to forward it. My statement was, that I had commenced a correspondence

with my colleagues on the subject, on my journey from Charleston, but had found it difficult, from our great distance apart, &c. to come to a speedy result; and that indeed, unless the brethren on both sides agreed to abide by the measures stated in the paper read in Trinity, in case of the judgment of the Bishops, I hesitated as to the propriety of communicating it, since, in that case, it would probably not effect the object in view, the peace of the Church. Of this result, all hope was cut off by the resolutions of the gentlemen on the 5th of July, announcing their determination no longer to be bound by the arrangement, &c.

In the appendix to the pamphlet above quoted, it is stated that it had been the intention of the corporation party to impeach Dr. Capers before the last South-Carolina Annual Conference; and among other reasons for not prosecuting that design, the following is given:—"Although Bishop Emory very justly remarked, when informed of the design of the members to impeach, that the Dr. was amenable to the South-Carolina Conference until discharged from it; yet as he was to fill an important station in Georgia, it was apprehended that his usefulness might be materially affected by an exposition of his aristocratic government of the Church here, which we did not wish should be the case."

I cannot be surprised if the readers of that pamphlet have received the impression that I used efforts to dissuade the gentlemen from impeaching Dr. Capers, and particularly, on the ground of the injury which would be done to his usefulness by "an exposition of his aristocratic government of the Church in Charleston." I must hope, however, that they did not intend to make this impression, nor designedly use so ambiguous a phraseology; for they certainly know that there was not a particle of ground for such a statement. I was never informed that "the members" (if by this be meant the members of the Church generally,) intended to impeach Dr. Capers; and it is my strong impression that none of the gentlemen ever mentioned to me that such had been their own intention, till after the close of the South-Carolina Conference, and, I think, till after Dr. Capers had left Charleston. It was at this period, as my impression is, that one of them in the course of conversation remarked to me, that if Dr. C. had been present at the interview which they had with Bishop Andrew and myself, on the evening previous to the Conference, it had been their design to impeach him; or some such term. I answered, that I should not have expected such a course in such an interview, nor have considered it the proper time or place for preferring an impeachment. That Dr. C. was amenable to the Conference, just then on the eve of sitting; and that an impeachment should have been preferred to that body, if any had been intended. The gentleman replied, that it had been stated in the newspapers, that Dr. C. had been transferred to the Georgia Conference, and stationed in Savannah. I rejoined that such a statement had not been authorised by me, and that Dr. C. had continued a member of the South-Carolina Conference, and amenable to that body, till its close. This was the substance of the conversation, and that, after the close of the South-Carolina Conference, to the best of my recollection.

I must say too, that I never did request Bishop Andrew to urge the attendance of Dr. C. at the interview above referred to, as might be supposed by the readers of the "Rejoinder," (p. 9.) published by the same gentlemen. In conveying to Dr. C. an invitation to be present, I did nothing more than fulfil the expressed wish of the gentlemen who had requested the interview;

but I never urged it, nor requested any other person to urge it, as I considered Dr. C. entirely competent to judge for himself in the matter, and entirely at liberty, after receiving the invitation, to be present or not, at his own discretion.

I am now compelled to notice a statement in the "Rejoinder" which surprises me above measure. The authors there state, (p. 19) that I had said that the acts which they had done, and proposed doing, under the showing of their by-laws, &c. were not contrary to the Discipline. The same thing seems to be intimated (p. 13,) in regard to the proceedings which they had had, or proposed to have, under the organization of the 12th Nov. and 2d Dec. 1833. But I certainly never did say any such thing. To have said so, would have been a plain violation of the principle which the gentlemen acknowledge I had declared myself determined to be governed by from my entrance into Charleston. Indeed, in their first pamphlet, they themselves fully acquit me of so glaring an inconsistency; for they there expressly say (p. 41,) that I "*carefully abstained, and very properly too, from giving any opinion on the questions in dispute*" there. How then could I have given an opinion in favor of the proceedings had, or proposed to be had, by them under the organization of Nov. 12, and Dec. 2, 1833, when these proceedings embraced the fundamental points of the whole controversy.

In a note (p. 13 of the Rejoinder) it is said that justice to me required it to be stated that I had carefully avoided any departure from the rule which I had laid down for my government, as far as was practicable, considering the questions propounded to me from time to time. But I desire not the protection of this cover, and trust you know me too well to believe that I could have been drawn into so gross an inconsistency, even by a direct question, if I either felt myself not prepared to answer it, or thought it not proper to be answered. Besides, had I once given such an opinion on the very essence of the controversy, would it not have been quickly circulated, and have been worse than idle afterward, to pretend to waive an opinion on any minor point? The gentlemen themselves indeed, on this point too, seem to me in another place (p. 18, Rejoinder) expressly to vindicate me from their own imputation; for they there reproach Mr. Kennedy with having undertaken to decide a matter which I, after consulting with Bishop Andrew, had declined adjudicating without a consultation with a majority of the Bishops. Now that matter, I understand to be precisely the same as above referred to.

At p. 28-9 (Rejoinder) I am introduced as a witness, with many expressions attributed to me (marked too, with quotation marks at every line) which I certainly never used. I am persuaded I did not say, that I would draw up what I considered would meet the views of both parties; nor suggest "an appeal to the court;" nor that a resort to the law by a hostile suit might be the only way to terminate the controversy. The institution, by mutual agreement, of an amicable suit for its settlement, was conversed on, I do not now remember at whose suggestion; but even this was not then thought expedient. Other particulars might be noticed, but I will only add that, as a whole, the testimony imputed to me is clothed in language, and put together in a manner, which my conversations never warranted, and so as to make impressions which I never intended.

That I was induced to believe the gentleman *sincere in their frequent and solemn declarations of attachment to the Discipline of the Church*, I frankly

acknowledge. The idea of "*a reformed Church rising up*" among them in Charleston, I understood them distinctly to spurn with indignation, as a slanderous imputation. If I erred in this, I still do not regret the judgment of charity which exposed me to it; although I have to beg the pardon of brethren, far and near, whom I may have led into a similar error, by repeating the assurances which had been given to myself.

The gentlemen quote parts of a letter which I addressed to two of their number on the 31st of July last, in answer to one received from them. At the time of writing my answer, I was unapprised of their expulsion. They had requested me to remove the Rev. Wm. M. Kennedy from the station. After declining to comply with this request, for reasons given, I added as follows:—"Is there not some better course—some preferable alternative—painful as it may be? I confess I begin to fear, that with your existing views and feelings, on both sides, you will hardly be brought to harmonize, agreeably to our earnest desire, under one pastoral charge. If this be so, will it not be better—less scandalous in the public eye, and more in the spirit of the Gospel—to agree that those who desire it shall worship together under a distinct Charge, in the common bond of the same general communion? As a temporary measure at least, till your next Annual Conference, perhaps some arrangement of this sort might be made, if desired by any considerable portion of the society, without taking on myself to decide definitively the questions submitted to the Episcopal judgment. In this case, however, you are doubtless aware that we have no power over the existing Church property inconsistent with the trust-deeds under which it may be held; and that any arrangement for the occupation of any part of it, as a distinct charge, if effected, will have to be by compromise. But should you incline to think it practicable and expedient to acquire any new Church property, or place of worship, the question of its settlement would then be less embarrassed. I beg you however, to understand, that all I say is on the supposition that you will adopt no course which shall not expressly recognize our discipline and economy; as I have always understood you, and I have believed *sincerely*, to aver and declare it to be your desire and design to do. Moderate then, I beseech you brethren, your agitated feelings—be jealous of your spirit, and guard your language with godly watchfulness—and if I can yet serve you, in any way consistently with my conscientious sense of duty, be pleased to let me know. But I entreat you never to forget, that whatever else you may gain, if you lose the true Christian spirit, you lose all."

This extract furnishes the true grounds of my action; and how far it justifies the statement, that in the course the gentlemen have taken, they go "in company" with me, you can judge.

In another place, they "appeal to the invitation of two bishops to remain in the connexion, with the privilege of procuring *an act of incorporation to suit themselves*." If this appeal be intended to include me, I disclaim ever having given such an invitation. So also, if I am intended as one of the

* In a written paper, dated Charleston, Feb. 4, 1834, signed W. Laval, W. G. Mood, J. H. Honour, W. Kirkwood, W. W. Godfrey, F. D. Poyas, F. A. Beckmann, J. Kingman, and O. B. Hilliard, the following "solemn declaration" is made, for themselves, and in behalf of those by whom they were elected, viz:—"We deprecate the charge of "*Reformers*," which has been unjustly and sinfully urged against us. Our declarations, with our actions, are proofs of the honesty of our motives, and the unfairness of our calumniators."

The following, is a reprint of the second pamphlet of the seceders, (called "A Rejoinder to an Exposition of the late schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston,") to which the preceding Report, and Documents, have reference.

A REJOINDER.

At the close of the Exposition made by us in August last, of the causes which led to the secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, we remarked, that with that exposition the controversy on our part ceased, unless we were compelled to renew it in self-defence. We hoped to have been spared the trouble of doing so; for although we expected that all the arts of sophistry would be put in requisition to *explain away* our statements, we could not believe it possible that men "professing godliness," however suspicious we might be of their *professions*, would be so reckless as publicly to deny the facts themselves. Their having done so however, necessarily compels us again to appear before the public, to make some brief remarks upon the book published by Dr. Capers, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Martin and Mr. Pierce, and to point out *some* of the most prominent misstatements; to notice them *all* would occupy more of our time than we have to spare to the performance of so onerous a duty, and would swell this publication to such a size, as would tire the patience of the reader. In doing this, we hope to manifest that our religion is "not in word and tongue only," by endeavouring to avoid the example so bountifully set us, of vituperation and abuse.

The first thing we shall notice, is Dr. Capers' denial of having read the paper at the meeting of the corporation of the church, held on the 12th November, 1833, as set forth in our previous publication, page 8.

He observes, "To the best of my recollection, the paper which you say I read, *was not the one I did read*; nor did I read the paper which was read, after the manner related by you. I had two papers of the committee, one the resolution adopted by the corporation party, at their meeting in the school room, on the 29th Oct. and the other a *note from the committee* to myself. The one being a sort of official document of your party, then just beginning to shew itself as a party, I was induced to put among my papers, the other, to my great regret, I did not consider of any future consequence, and did not preserve."

Can any man hope to impose upon an intelligent community by such a "puerile" statement as this? Why was one paper, admitting for the sake of argument that he had received two, more of an "official document" than the other? If he deemed it so important to preserve *one*, why destroy *the other*? Strange indeed, that he who has so carefully "put among his papers," every trifling communication, however unimportant, and which are spread out in such an imposing manner in his publications, should have destroyed *the only one* which could establish his innocence of a grave charge publicly made against him; and made too, at a time when we could not possibly know but that this important document, which was so clearly to convict us of falsehood, was in his possession and would be brought forward against us! But he flatly contradicts himself about this same paper. First, he tells us that one was a "sort of official document of the party," and he preserved it; but on the very next page he asserts that this same "official document" was so irrelevant to the matter in hand, that he did not read it at the meeting, but chose rather to read the one which was so unimportant that he did not think it worth preserving. But again, why did he not say one word about this second paper when he published his first pamphlet? Turn to page 19 of it as republished, and read, "a few days after this date, the *following paper* was handed me by the committee mentioned in it," and then follows the *identical paper* which we charge him with having read in a *perverted* manner. Is there a single word said about *any other paper*? and if there had been another, can any person believe for a moment that he would have omitted men-

tioning it? He does not say the committee *enclosed*, but *handed* him the paper. If the committee waited upon him in person, as he admits they did, and handed him the paper containing the proceedings of the meeting, where was the propriety of writing a note? Did they write to explain the object of their call, *deliver their own note personally*, and then having thus introduced themselves, and stated in writing the object of their visit, deliver the other paper? Preposterous! The Doctor is very careful however, not to assert positively that he did not read the paper, but says, "to the best of his recollection!" Is his memory so very treacherous that he cannot with certainty, remember a transaction of such great importance? If so, why not get it refreshed by "a bit from the memory of one, and a bit from another" of his friends, so as to render the matter certain? His communication is dated "Savannah," but as it was published here, and he superintended the publication, we presume his object here *was* to obtain the support of his friends. Were they unwilling to give it?

But we unhesitatingly affirm, on the authority of the committee themselves, that no paper was handed to him, save the one purporting to be the proceedings of the meeting, as published both by Dr. Capers and ourselves. We have asserted that he *did* read the paper published by us, and that he read it in the manner stated. This he denies. Here then we are at issue; who shall determine between us? We have at least this advantage; we are *eight to one*. But we refer to the annexed affidavits in substantiation of the truth of what we say; and we beg leave to premise, (*though we have no wish to enlist the sympathies of the public on our behalf*;) that we too have "sons and daughters;" and that our reputations are as dear to us, as Dr. Capers' can be to him; and we will add, that if condemned by the community, in which we have spent nearly all our lives, we cannot run off to "Georgia," or any where else, but must stand and bear the contumely and disgrace which must come upon us if found guilty of intentional falsehood.

STATE OF SOUTH-CAROLINA.

Personally appeared before me, W. Laval, Wm. Kirkwood and Oliver B. Hillard, who, being duly sworn, severally depose, and say, that they, as a committee, appointed by a meeting of the male members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held on the 29th October, 1833, under a resolution requiring a call of the church in its corporate capacity—did call on Dr. Capers at the Parsonage house, and presented him with a certified copy of the resolution, published in the pamphlet by Dr. Capers last year, and referred to in this controversy; that after some conversation on the subject, Dr. Capers requested to be allowed time to communicate with the Presiding Elder, the Rev. Henry Bass, which was readily acceded to by the committee. Deponents further state, that Dr. Capers' last remark to them, on leaving, was, "If you will meet and elect your Trustees, let me beg you to make them responsible to the Quarterly Conference, and not to the church." They further testify, that they did not then, either individually, or as a committee, give any note or other paper to the doctor, *except the Resolution in question*; neither did they previously or subsequently, give, send or write to him any note or paper other than the one already mentioned.

W. LAVAL,
WILLIAM KIRKWOOD,
O. B. HILLARD.

Sworn to before me, this 24th Sept. 1834.

WM. ED. HAYNE, Q. U. & Not. Pub.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, } City of Charleston. }

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned persons, who being severally sworn, declare, that the paper read in Trinity Church, on the 12th November, 1833, by Dr. William Capers, was the same paper referred to in the pamphlet published by our committee, as the resolution of the meeting of October 29th, 1833, requiring a meeting of the church in its corporate capacity, and the same as published by Dr. Capers, in his pamphlet dated November 28, 1833; that is to say, the words as read by Dr. Capers from a paper held by him, and which he said was the resolution handed to him by the committee, were verbatim those which were contained in the resolution as stated by the committee, and acknowledged by the doctor in his first pamphlet. Deponents further declare, that Dr. Capers did deny that there was "one word of corporation in the whole paper," that he omitted the reading of the words "in its corporate capacity," at the same time declaring that he "read honestly, and if any one doubted it, he might come and read

for himself." They further testify, that he again read the paper, including the words previously omitted, saying, "I care not what it says, I did not call a corporation meeting." Furthermore, deponents declare, that the statements as set forth in our pamphlet, touching the transactions of the meeting of the 12th November, 1833, are substantially true, and to the best of our belief specifically so.

OLIVER B. HILLARD,
JOHN BROWN,
W. S. WALKER,
W. W. GODFREY,
JOHN T. SYME,
EDWARD M. MOOD,
WILLIAM KIRKWOOD,
JOHN KINGMAN,
F. A. BECKMANN,
J. LAVAL, Jr.
SAMUEL NORTON,

THOMAS A. HAYDEN,
CHARLES W. HURST,
W. LAVAL,
J. H. HONOUR,
GEORGE M. KEELS,
J. F. STIENMEYER,
JOSEPH A. HINES,
HENRY W. SMITH,
C. L. HAPPOLDT,
THOMAS HONOUR.*

The above affidavit has been sworn to before me, this 24th Sept. 1834.

THOMAS MARTIN, Q. U. [L. S.]

The next misstatement which we shall notice, is one that is repeated several times through the book, viz: that we were always in a *minority of one third of the male members*. In a note on page 13 it is said, "the whole number," (of the corporation party) "was under fifty persons;" and "at that time there were one hundred and forty five male members belonging to the church." "The list of names;" we are told "may be seen by any one at the Methodist Parsonage, corner of Boundary and Pitt streets, Charleston, the authors of the pamphlet excepted." And why except them? because they are "sufficiently informed." True: they are sufficiently informed to detect any imposition which may be attempted, by shewing the names of persons who, either never were members, or who have died, resigned, or been expelled years since.

It is not a great while ago, that Dr. Capers charged a preacher in the annual conference, with having returned to the conference the names of persons as members of the church in Charleston, who were dead, or had removed ten years previously. Have the proper corrections ever been made on the book? But if we were always a minority of "one third of the male members," why so fearful at all times, to submit a question to the decision of the members? It will not do, gentlemen, your bare assertions are insufficient; we want *proof*. The best evidence we can give, of our number, is that *sixty two* (not forty five,) male members have seceded from the church; and now we challenge you in the face of this community, to publish the names of (we will not say one hundred twenty four, which number you ought to have to shew that we are a minority of one third) but of *sixty* male members remaining in the church. No equivocation if you please; come out openly; your refusal to do so, will be construed into something worse than a "rhetorical flourish."†

On page 16 is the following. "It was a principal object with us to induce them (the corporation party) to pass the adjourned meeting of December 2, without going further toward a revolutionary organization. Brother Kennedy, whose interference at my invitation seemed to be well taken, applied himself earnestly towards this object, and on Saturday evening, November 30, he informed me that the leading members of the party, had agreed to suspend proceedings, provided, we would call a meeting of the male members of the church, to adopt measures for the settlement of the question," &c. "It was understood that they might come together on the evening of the 2d, according to their previous adjournment; but they pledged themselves to brother Kennedy, to do nothing on the subjects in dispute." We ask, who pledged themselves? *Not us* certainly, nor any other person that ever we heard of before. We hope Mr. Kennedy did not make this statement; if he did, we would respectfully ask these Reverend gentlemen, if either

* Many whose names are not subscribed to this affidavit, are withheld in consequence of their not having been present during the *whole* of the proceedings. We presume the truth of the statement will not be denied by the "godly" men who were present.

† Since writing the above, we have fully ascertained that the invitation to see the "list of names" of the "one hundred and forty five male members," is an empty bravado, intended for effect. Several gentlemen, not "authors of the pamphlet," have called at the "Methodist Parsonage, corner of Pitt and Boundary streets," for that purpose, and were told that the church books were *private, and not subject to the inspection of every body!!!*

of them ever preached from a text which may be found in Exodus xx. 16. And again on page 17, it is said, "Brother Kennedy re-affirmed in presence of them all what they had promised, as he had informed me from them, and no man denied it." Why will men be so disingenuous? Mr. Kennedy re-affirmed *no such thing*; but when repeatedly urged by Dr. Capers to speak, he made some remarks which were deemed incorrect, and as soon as he finished, Mr. Kirkwood arose to put him right, when the Reverend Doctor took his hat and *walked out of the church while the gentleman was speaking.*

"On Sunday the 8th December, while my mind was in great agony," &c. page 20. Perhaps we can give a better reason for this "great agony," than the one assigned by the doctor. A meeting of the male members of the church in Columbia, was held a few days previous to this date, on the subject of our church difficulties, which was attended by members of the Legislature from various parts of the State, who were members of the church, (that body then being in session,) and some resolutions passed not very grateful to the doctor's feelings. These resolutions were forwarded to him, *sealed*, in a letter from the chairman of the meeting, requesting that the paper might be opened and read *only at a meeting of the members.* We have incontestible evidence, that this document was given to Doctor Capers on this same "Sunday, the 8th December;" but it *never was read to the members*; nor did we ever hear of it *through him.* May not the reading of this document have produced the "agony?" But we have introduced this paragraph to remark upon some of its misstatements. Speaking of the meeting at Mr. Honour's house, he says, his "proposition was acceded to, and the paper being signed, the citations were withdrawn;" leaving the natural inference that the paper was signed in his presence, and the citations withdrawn that night; but such was not the fact. The members positively refused to sign the paper, and Dr. Capers left the room without a single signature being affixed to it; observing as he went out in an apparent "agony," "Brethren you may not care about being expelled from the church, but I do; and I can, not, and will not expel you;" and his making this remark, together with the feelings manifested by him, were the only reasons why the members signed it at all, one of them observing, "Let us sign it, for if we refuse any longer, it will kill Brother Capers." He then followed the doctor, and informed him that the paper would be signed. The doctor immediately returned to the house, and then made the voluntary promises mentioned in our former pamphlet, and which we repeat, *he never fulfilled!* He then left the house. The next morning the citations were withdrawn, but the paper was not delivered to him until the Tuesday following. There is no "deficiency of memory," no "morbid imagination," but the plain sober truth respecting these promises; and when "Mr. Knight, Mr. Kingman and Mr. Honour, called at the Parsonage," they announced themselves as a committee, though he pretends not to know in what capacity they called, and told him very distinctly, that they were sent to request the return of the paper signed at Mr. Honour's house, and gave as a reason, that he had failed to fulfil his promise, (oath if he pleases.) The statement on pages 20, 21, about his entreating us to spare ourselves, our wives and children; and the reply to Mr. Godfrey's question, that the church could not connive at what we had done, reads very prettily, and is well calculated for effect, but unfortunately, it is nothing but a "rhetorical flourish;" no such words were ever used. The paper was signed purely from "kindness to the feelings of the ministry," and we also "appeal to the evidence furnished on the face of the original document, to prove" that such was the fact. He did entreat us to spare him, and put it in his power to undo what he had done; that is to withdraw the citations; and in confirmation of this, he stated to several of the signers the next morning, that he had received a letter from Mr. Kennedy, *urging him not to bring us to trial.* Will he publish this letter?

In the preface to the book it is stated (and the initials of Dr. Capers and Mr. Kennedy are affixed to it) that "near the close of the month of November last, the minister then in charge deemed it proper to lay before the members of the church, a succinct account of the rise and progress of these difficulties in the church up to that time. This account, which was furnished to the members generally, was never contradicted in any of its statements; but, as far as we have understood, was admitted on all hands to be faithful in its facts." And again on page 9, "None of its statements were contradicted at that time, nor subsequently to my knowledge; on the contrary, I understood from various quarters, up to the time of my leaving Charleston, that you all admitted it to be a faithful account of the transactions therein set forth." This we positively affirm to be untrue; instead of its being admitted on all hands to be faithful in its facts, we constantly asserted that many of the statements were incorrect; and we said so in the plainest and most unequivocal manner to Mr. Kennedy, when here on Dr. Ca-

pers' invitation in November last. Will he deny it? And do not these Reverend gentlemen know that a reply to the pamphlet was in preparation, and nearly ready for the press, and its publication prevented only in consequence of the arrangement which took place at the meeting held at Mr. Honour's house on the evening of the 8th December!

On page 10 is the following:—"Some time on Monday, the 28th October, I was told by an old and respectable member of the church, that he had reason to apprehend the young men's prayer meeting in Trinity School Room on Tuesday evenings had been turned into a sort of caucus meeting, where certain revolutionary measures were agitated." That such "caucus meetings" were held, we give the most unqualified contradiction, the apprehensions of the "old and respectable member," to the contrary notwithstanding. The first meeting ever held in Trinity School Room, was on the evening of the 29th October, at which Dr. Capers was present. It is perfectly well known that all our meetings were held with open doors; and on every occasion some of Dr. Capers' friends were either at the door or windows; and so devoid of common decency were these persons, that when gentlemen finished speaking, they would hiss or clap their hands as if in a Theatre. Strange indeed, that "revolutionary measures" should be "agitated" in a public building with open doors.

With regard to what is said on pages 6 and 7, respecting our reasons for not impeaching Dr. Capers at the Annual Conference, we shall only say this much: If the doctor is in earnest in his expressions of doubt respecting our statement, we refer him to two of his own Bishops,—Andrew and Emory. Ask them what was said at the first conference, which was held with the "Schismatics," (a committee of nine) and why they urged his presence as they did; they may bring to his recollection the reason why he so pertinaciously refused to go into the room, although Bishop Andrew, at the request of Bishop Emory, went out and urged his attendance.

In a note on page 10, Dr. Capers remarks—"It is a pity that those who seek so hard to justify themselves, should make matter for fresh objections; perhaps it is a pity to object to them, but justice obliges us to notice a particularly glaring impropriety in giving part for the whole, of the resolutions passed by the Board (of Trustees;)" and then follows a resolution of the Trustees notifying the committee where the keys of the churches might be found, if they should "think proper to have the alterations made." It is a "pity" that Dr. Capers had not read over his first pamphlet, before he wrote this note; he would have saved himself from the charge of gross inconsistency. Does he not know that this resolution of the Trustees was a mere feint? What authority had the committee to make alterations in the churches? Had the Quarterly Conference appointed them to have the work done? The reader will please refer to the doctor's letter to the committee, in his republished pamphlet page 11, and he will find the following. "You seem to consider this (the object of your appointment,) as having been that you, in the name of the Quarterly Conference, should effect the change of the sittings in the churches; but such was not the object of the Quarterly Conference." "Any change appertaining to the buildings, was appropriate to the functions of the Board of Trustees." "You were appointed for the purpose of formally communicating to the Trustees, the request of the Conference, respecting the sittings for free coloured people, and for the purpose of obviating the difficulty, which it had been suggested might arise, from the Trustees not having money in hand to defray the expense of the contemplated change." "The duties appropriate to your appointment, farther than representing the wish of the Conference to the Board of Trustees, as above stated, were wholly contingent, and consisted in this, that in case the Trustees should be unable to furnish money for the work, you were to raise it for them by subscription. The resolution under which you were appointed, proves explicitly that no other duties were assigned you."

With regard to what Dr. Capers chooses to term our "offences towards the church;" "forming factions in the church;" "getting our party ready for action;" "abusing the charity of the preachers" &c. &c. &c. we let pass for just as much as they are worth. Enough has been said to prove most incontestibly to every unprejudiced mind, that our former statements are facts; and that we have been most shamefully vilified and misrepresented. We are perfectly satisfied that the "tie that has bound between us" should be severed. We rejoice to know that there is "One who judges," and cordially unite with Dr. Capers in this one thing, to commit our cause into His hands.

REJOINDER CONTINUED.

In our reply to Dr. Capers, we have necessarily introduced several parts of the "Exposition continued," a production from the fanciful pen of Mr. George F. Pierce, designed for effect, and supported by the fostering hands of Messrs. Kennedy and Martin. We will now particularly direct our attention to the "continuation" of the "narrative," (although the suicidal character of the new work is manifest to our view) and for truth sake, shew that the Scriptures *are true*, although men may be fallible, that indeed "all are not Israel, who are of Israel." The necessity of this remark is painful, and although the force of that exclamation, "O that mine enemy would write a book," has never before been presented to us in such glowing colours, as it does in this instance, yet we profess (if "*Schismatics*" can be believed) not to rejoice that such an evil has come upon our enemies. We repeat it, we believe the book works its own destruction; but while its sponsors

With Parthian art, shoot arrows as they fly,
Intent on killing, though themselves should die,

we feel it a duty we owe to truth, to society and to our friends, again to buckle on our armour, and while our chief efforts shall be of a defensive character, we will be ready for offensive measures, when, and we trust only when, the necessity of the case shall demand it.

The Reverend gentlemen commence with remarks on the proceedings of the Quarterly Conference, in reference to the motion for an examination of the books of the Trustees; this will be treated of in its proper place, (and we trust satisfactorily so) in our notice of the "Appendix," signed by the Trustees, to which we ask the serious attention of the reader.

The next subject which they bring into view, is one to which we also invite the particular notice of our readers; it is one on which the right or wrong, the truth or fallacy of the statements on both sides depend; one which, when rightly understood, will develop the true character of the whole controversy, according to our humble opinion, and prove incontestibly, that a book of a hundred and more pages, has been published more with a view of concealing facts, by the multifarious character of extraneous matter which has been thrust into it, than with any rightful expectation of acquittal, in the judgment of a discerning, and impartial public. We allude to the paper submitted by the Bishop, to the church (page 31 Exposition continued.)

In order to aid in a proper understanding of the case, it will be well perhaps to present a brief synopsis of the rise and progress of the difficulties in the church, up to the time when this paper was drawn and submitted by the Bishop, and which led to the proposition contained in it. The outlines are these.—The mulattoes, or a certain set of them, had encroached on the privileges of the white members; their arrogance was rebuked by thrusting them from the seats they occupied. Dr. Capers, who had advised the measure, and suggested the mode of doing it (by a call of the Guard) rebuked the brethren for executing it; the matter was referred to the Quarterly Conference; the Conference adopted a resolution, supported by the Doctor and the Presiding Elder, directing the Trustees to make such alterations as would prevent similar outrages in future. The committee appointed by the Conference requested a call of the Board of Trustees; the call was made; the committee attended, and were told there was no quorum—one more was necessary—one more could have attended (Mr. S. J. Wagner,) if he had employed the time in going to the meeting, which he occupied in writing a long letter explanatory of his objections to enforce the resolutions of the Conference, the chief of which was the loss of peace which the Church would sustain, if the mulattoes were offended; the objection was potent; the Committee were told by Dr. Capers, that he would converse with the mulatto chiefs, Holloway, Clark and others, on the subject; if they agreed, well—if not, nothing ought to be done. Holloway, (a coloured man) called on him, remonstrated against the acts of the Conference, and threatened to leave the church if the alterations were made: nothing was done—the members sought redress, and found it could only be obtained through the exercise of their chartered rights; they resorted to the act of incorporation; were resisted by the Doctor and Trustees; cited to trial for "disobedience

to the order and discipline of the church;" refused a trial before the society; wheedled into the signing a paper by tears and solicitations, which effected a suspension of further proceedings until the arrival of the Bishop in the city. Previous to this, however, the party of the Doctor and old Trustees, busily employed themselves in defaming the incorporators, (so called); the Parsonage had become a "School for scandal;" "*godly men and women*," were continually pouring surmises and reports into the ears of the preachers; Dr. Capers himself declared to one of the committee, that scarcely an hour passed, but some one carried him intelligence of evil intentions against himself; to one of his informers, he himself gave the cognomen of "*termagant*;" the church tottered; at this juncture the Bishop arrived, and entering by our request into an investigation of the troubles in the church, held frequent consultations with both parties, or their representatives, separately, and finally proposed, what appeared to him a sure basis for the peaceful adjustment of every difficulty. We believed he was honest; we have never doubted it; we professed to desire nothing that the discipline, *fairly and equitably* administered, could condemn; we were honest in our professions, and in proof of being so, agreed solemnly to abide the decision of the Bishops on the matters in question, be that decision *what it would*: we had previously to this, put into the hands of the Bishop, such evidence of what our intentions were, with such proof of the extent to which our claims under the act of incorporation would be carried, that he was not only satisfied, but positively, and in the presence of more than one, said (in reply to a direct question from one of the committee whether the proceedings already had, or which were proposed to be had under the organization of the 12th November, and 2d December, 1833, were a violation of the discipline) "*Brethren, I perceive a great difficulty in the church here, but it is altogether with the members; if either party would yield the difficulty would vanish.*" The proof of this is within the reach of the gentlemen; we give it fearless of contradiction; it is the language of Dr. John Emory, a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church; a man whom we believe to be above the little artifices practiced by some who occupy a less elevated station. While on this subject, we will mention another declaration of the Bishop, lest we should omit it hereafter; we think it essential, because we have heard from some who have read the pamphlet of the gentlemen, that it appeared to them it was contrary to methodism to have churches incorporated; it was this—Mr. A—n, a gentleman of the Bar, who was present at one of our interviews, by the request of the Bishop, enquired if it was contrary to the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or if it contravened any rule, or subverted any part of their economy, to admit of incorporations in their churches? The Bishop's answer was emphatically, "No, we have churches incorporated in various parts of the country." The evidences in support of this, are Messrs. W. Laval and J. H. Honour, and J. A—n, H. B—y, Esquires, Attorneys at Law, of the one part; and Bishop Emory, Henry Bass, P. E. and W. M. Kennedy, preacher in charge, on the other part.* If further proof be necessary on this point, we offer one whose testimony will be conclusive with the sponsors of the "Exposition continued," at least. We call on Dr. Capers. In page 13, line 10, of the "Exposition," he says, "a meeting of the male members, as a corporation, we were decided not to call, on *purely legal grounds.*" And again in a note on same page, he says, "If it be asked, why I called a meeting of the corporation some six or seven years ago, if its existence was so doubtful, my answer is, I am not a lawyer, and was not informed on a legal question, till I got legal advice." A full, clear, and undeniable admission, that the discipline did not suffer violence by incorporations. "But the charter was void;" so say Messrs. Smith and Grimke; doctors will differ. Pray, gentlemen, did either or both of you ever beguile a tedious moment in looking over the second volume of Kent's Commentaries, title corporations, p. p. 251, 252? The evidence there makes hard against your *ex parte* statement.

The discipline then does not restrict corporation in its churches. So says Bishop Emory; so says Dr. Capers; so writes Dr. Bangs; so the General Conference determined; (ALL METHODISTS;) so say the facts existing in various States and Territories, known and affirmed by gentlemen of this city and others, visitors.

Having established this point, which the disingenuousness of the gentlemen alone has made doubtful to a few, we proceed to examine the second point in the case; which in our view is this: Were the acts of the "Schismatics" "palpable violations of the dis-

* Justice to Bishop Emory, who had said that to be useful, he must avoid becoming a partisan, demands of us the acknowledgement, that he carefully avoided any departure from this rule in his conference with us, as far as was practicable, considering the questions which were propounded to him from time to time.

discipline?" The Reverend gentlemen affirm they were; and after an exordium of vulgar abuse, and vilifying epithets, discreditable to *gentlemen*, and much more *Ecclesiastics*; after borrowing from the kennels all the slang terms peculiar to lowness of breeding, and pouring them in unmeasured wrath upon our heads; after denouncing us, (some of whom have more than twice told the years which *two* of them have seen) as "Schismatics," "adepts in cunning;" "practising chicanery;" "unjust;" "gladiators;" "culprits;" &c. &c. they gravely produce the following charge and specifications in support of the case so modestly presented: viz.

"Charge. Disobedience to the order and discipline of the church.

Specification 1st. Taking a part in a meeting, calling itself the church in its corporate capacity, and which assumes the right to do away at pleasure the order and modes of management prescribed by the discipline, to remove from office the Trustees; to fill their places, change their responsibility, &c.

Specification 2d. Receiving appointment as Trustees under the assumed authority of said meeting, thus organizing a Board for the transaction of the business of the church, in opposition to the Board appointed under, and acknowledged by the discipline.

Specification 3d. After a written avowal of your determination, not to perform any acts that would be a palpable violation of the discipline, and after having received from the Preacher in charge a *decision*, declaring the course you have adopted, to be a *palpable* violation of discipline, you have gone to law with the Trustees, by levying on the property of one of their tenants, thus giving evidence of a determination to pursue your own course, in defiance of the *constituted authority of the church*.

WM. M. KENNEDY,
WM. MARTIN,
G. F. PIERCE.

Methodist Parsonage, July 28, 1834.

After this unaccountable discrepancy between their words and actions, their assertions, pledges, appeals, and abuse; and the matters set forth in their charge and specifications, amounting at most to the sin of denying *infallibility* in Mr. Kennedy, (which we will show we were right in doing) the gentlemen, instead of pursuing the subject, by adducing the proof necessary to substantiate their charge, indulge themselves in a mirthful digression: Their favorite pastime of *abuse* is taken up, and we are charged with insidious attempts to defeat the *church* trial, by changing the day of trial before the Magistrate's court, from Wednesday to Tuesday, (see page 46 of their book.) Fie, gentlemen! such sportiveness is unbecoming your profession, besides, it is hazardous; you have ventured on dangerous ground; your play-fellows have unwittingly tumbled you into the very pit which they dug for you to thrust us in. *Changed the day of trial!* Yes, we acknowledge the fact; we *did* change the day of trial in one sense; not as "an insidious attempt to defeat the church trial," but as an open expression of our indignation at the insidious attempts *you* made, to defeat the Court trial. Wednesday was *not* the day first appointed, but *Tuesday*; and as it was deemed important that we should be put out of the church *before* the trial could take place, Mr. Abel M'Kee and Mr. Samuel J. Wagner, (two Trustees) waited on their Attorney, and persuaded him to procure the consent of our counsel, to have the trial postponed till Wednesday: and he, not suspecting the device, yielded to the solicitation, and authorised the postponement, *when we immediately received our citations for TUESDAY*. One of our committee calling on our counsel to state the attempt which had been made to interrupt our attendance at the court, learned for the first time, what had been done; we then insisted, that the day first named by the Magistrate, should be the day for the trial; and to prevent the preachers from meeting and thrusting us out of the church, for non-attendance at the Parsonage, (as we had good reason to suppose they would) we had them cited to attend the Court on Tuesday. Intent however, on their purpose, they instructed their Attorney, to arrest the trial, which was effected by a legal process, that took the case from the Magistrate's court, into a Superior Court, which has *not yet met*. This is the manner in which we were "foiled," as the Reverend gentlemen assert we were: we prefer it much to the triumph they obtained, a triumph somewhat tarnished by the loss of reputation, for the Magistrate emphatically declared from the Bench, that the *arrest* of proceedings in his court, was effected by a "*breach of faith on the part of the defendant*." Quere.—Who are the Defendants now? (See page 47, lines 3 to 10, of "Exposition continued.")

With a consistency equal to that just noticed, the gentlemen have hopped, skipped and jumped from page 31 of their book, to the 60th, backwards and forwards, like little wanton boys who play unmindful of the task before them; they first try to establish their right by *promising* to do so, then make the attempt; discover that it is onerous and perplexing; cavil at words because the signification don't suit their views; are filled with ire; suf-

fer passion to usurp the place of reason, wound religion, drag young and old before their potential bar, and doom them all to woe remediless. (Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.)

The next gambols of the gentlemen, are to be found on page 53 of their "Onnium Gatherum;" the versatility of their genius is there admirably displayed, and the facile manner in which they change

"From grave to gay, from lively to severe"

is happily illustrative of *well trained minds*. The little discrepancies which are discoverable occasionally between the grave rebukes, and the listless practice of like offences, is but the sportiveness of exuberant imagination. The exhibition of the note or "letter" to the "woman," "a widow," is also ingeniously introduced to heighten the illusion, and continue the variation of "lights and shadows." (The writer of that letter, takes this opportunity to say, that in a moment of anxious solicitation by a friend, he yielded his own judgment, and did that which has been to him from the moment after he sent it, to the present time, a cause of deep and sincere regret; it was following a bad precedent.) The *adroit* manner in which they evade the motive for introducing the letter in the book, shows them to be gentlemen of considerable *tact*, and deep penetration. The request "to be let alone," is decyphered by them to mean, *not to be abused*: that would indeed be hoping against hope; it would have been asking a rest, which "*hope, when bidding us be of good courage,*" never promised; and which "*fancy in the splendour of its brightness, dazzling us with our gilded chains,*" never once cheered us with the expectation of obtaining. The gentlemen do themselves and their friends great injustice, in supposing that we would suspect them for a moment, of being idle, whilst a reformed church was rising full in their view. The history of reform in Baltimore, and that in Georgia and Alabama, &c. satisfied us fully on that point. We have some of the accounts in our possession, and the recital of *one* occurrence, in Baltimore particularly, will speak more on this occasion, than all we have written: we reserve it with other matter for future use. Our meaning was expressed in very simple language; it suited the humbleness of our views; we only asked in behalf of those who instructed us to do so, (we had no hope of such favours for ourselves) not to be flattered by the *gilded* prospect of being again allowed to go in and out of the temple with the "*godly men and women*" who had been so miraculously rescued by the timely "sifting of the wheat from the chaff." But it was an incident; and however incidental, whether relevant to their justification or not, it was necessary with a great many other incidents of equal irrelevancy, to make up a book; and a book was necessary, as well to show their skill in manufactures, as to inform the public, that the good old times had returned, when Preachers were once more released from the vulgar obligation of practicing their own precepts. We may be wrong in this conjecture; if so, we apologise by charging our error upon that false system of education which taught us to trace effects to their cause (if practicable) and if not, to judge of causes by their effects.

After a digression which in our ignorance we would pronounce unpardonable, if we were not restricted in our judgment by the high authority of Messrs. Kennedy, Martin and Pierce, that "*like begets like,*" [which according to the new dictionary of the young *Ananensis* of Messrs. Kennedy and Martin, means, "that sin is sinless because sinners set the example;"] we return to the subject, and again enquire, whether the acts of the "Schismatics," were *palpable violations of the discipline* or not. In our examination of this subject, we must be excused for not following the gentlemen in their favourite walks of *fancy*; we are dull presers, and prefer an *honest fact* to a *whole book of gilded fictions*. What then are the facts? The converse, we say, of all that is spread throughout the whole of the "Exposition," and its spurious offspring the "Exposition continued." Bold as this assertion may seem, we venture the success of our cause on the proofs which we shall adduce in support of it. In the first place, the book charges us from the commencement to the termination, with being "Schismatics." *We deny it*. According to Walker, a Schismatic is one "who separates himself from the true church;" now we either *did not* separate ourselves from the church, or the Reverend gentlemen have been very *poetic* in their prose; they have delighted themselves in repeatedly affirming that we were "*expelled,*" and that those who resigned only escaped a *similar fate* by their early withdrawal. The Rev. John Wesley defines a Schism in the church to be "the want of a tender care for each other;" we deny being of that class, and ask the gentlemen to judge us ourselves, he that is least sinful among them all in this particular casting the first stone. As the gentlemen one and all, evince such satisfaction in branding us a hundred times over with the appellation of Schismatics, they

must not be offended if we prove that the honour of being such, belongs exclusively to themselves, and their "godly" adherents; we have nearly proved it already, but will offer one more view of the subject. We go to the root of the matter. Perhaps the gentlemen know that the word is derived from the Greek—if so, they know that it means a "rent, a cleft, a fissure;" now it is only necessary to determine what, or who the power is, or was, that caused the cleft, and made the rent or fissure, to enable them to make the right application. (Vide causes which led to action under the charter, and mock trials.)

Once more—The celebrated Dr. Campbell is of opinion, that Schism, in the Scripture sense, often means that alienation of affection between brethren, which violates the internal union subsisting in the hearts of christians. *Judge ye yourselves* in this matter; do it *righteously*, and we are content. But they say we were guilty of *palpable violations of the discipline*; and because we affirmed that we were not, and could give a better reason for the denial than their own logic—that it is so, *because it is so*, they met us with the *argumentum ad hominum*, that we were Schismatics because they said we were; and in confirmation of their belief, and godly abhorrence of our heresy, emptied their Pandora's box of vile abuse full on our devoted heads.

In the second place, the book charges us with being all that is vile, abominable, and offensive, in the sight of heaven and men. One hundred and seventy (170) immortal souls, some of whom have been members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, longer than two of the denunciators have been in existence, and others twice their seniors in years, stand charged at the merciless bar of these three *Preachers*, with offences which, if true, must exclude them forever from the kingdom of grace and glory, (a heavy judgment from men who teach others not to judge lest they be judged.) "Oh shame, where is thy blush!" The evidence produced by these gentlemen, in support of the allegations which they make against these "reckless" beings, is—first, the assertions which they make of their *being so*. Secondly, they are so, because we have complained of their *just administration of the discipline*. Thirdly, they are so, because "it was *worthy of remark, that they had never known a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church who walked with God, and lived above censure, that found fault with the economy of the church!*" Fourthly, they must be so, because of "*personal irregularities*," damning heresies, evidenced by our claiming *under the discipline*, the right given in the act of incorporation to elect the Trustees by a majority of the male members of the church. And lastly, if all the foregoing prove insufficient, it shall be so, because we *dared* to question the infallibility of Mr. Kennedy's decision on a point of discipline, which Bishop Emory, after consulting with Bishop Andrew, declined adjudicating without a consultation with a majority of the Bishops of the church (six in number.) From the gentlemen's own showing, (we appeal to their own book) it is conclusive that our offences, first and last, consisted even in their own view, in persisting to act under the charter incorporating the church. For proof of this, see letter of admonition, page 44, and charges drawn by themselves, pages 45 and 46 of "Exposition continued." It is now our intention, as well as duty, to prove incontestibly, that we are guiltless of any offence against the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church; unless the sin of questioning the correctness of the decision made by Mr. Kennedy, on a strictly controverted point, be an offence against it; and that it was not a "vaporous bravado," which made us affirm, that we had high authority for saying we were right, and that we were also in the majority. The evidence which we shall adduce, to support these statements, will be both positive and circumstantial; the admission of one, or rejection of the other, will involve the gentlemen in an awkward dilemma; but they have our hearty consent to lay hold on either horn they please.

1. We are not guilty of "disobedience to the order and discipline of the church," in the first place, because the discipline does not restrict the members of the church from the performance of any one single act which has been specified against us; the gentlemen have furnished no proof to the contrary of this: *we know of none*, and in the absence of proof the charge falls.

2. We are not guilty of the charge in the second place, because the discipline positively does provide for the contingency under which we acted, in a clause introduced at the *General Conference* by Dr. Capers, fixing the responsibility of the Trustees, occasioned by a collision he had with them, and amended by Dr. Bangs of New-York, expressly to meet the contingency, of *incorporated churches*, (the New-York churches generally being incorporated.)

3. We are not guilty of the charge in the third place, because the church is incorpora-

ted: and we would respectfully ask Messrs. Smith and Grimke, if they ever heard of a corporate action, under an *unlimited, unrestricted and unconditional* charter, being invalid (if within the limits of the act) unless, or until, some high judicial tribunal, at the instance, or in the name of the power granting the franchise, had adjudicated it to be so?

4. We are not guilty of the charge in the fourth place, because the allegation is not made for acting under a *doubtful* charter, but of "disobedience to the order and discipline of the church;" and the church, we are told, consists of preachers, exhorters, official and lay members, (so say Dr. Capers, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Martin and Mr. Pierce,) and they have *never told us* that our acts were a disobedience of their orders, or of the discipline; (if incorrect, we invite the proof in contradiction.)

5. We are not guilty of the charge in the fifth place, because Bishop Emory, who was bound by a solemn oath, (readministered at the time of his installation) to preserve and enforce the discipline, said that corporations were not contrary to "the order and discipline of the church;" and that the acts which we had done, and proposed doing, under the showing of our by-laws, &c., were not contrary to the discipline; and that they would cease to be a cause of contention in the church, if the old Trustees would *cease their opposition*.

We leave the reader to determine for himself, on the sufficiency of the proofs adduced in support of our plea of "not guilty to the charge." The specifications which follow, are so dependent on the *charge*, that the failure of one, almost necessarily involves the destruction of the others. We will, however, devote a few moments to the consideration of them.

The first alleges, that we "took a part in a meeting calling itself the church in its corporate capacity; and which assumes the right to do away at pleasure, the order and modes of management, prescribed by the discipline, to remove from office the Trustees, to fill their places, change their responsibility," &c. We admit that we did take part in the meeting, which not only *called* itself the church in its corporate capacity, but which was *ipso facto* the corporation itself; convened in a legal way, and transacting its business according to law, and the usage of all corporations; assuming nothing but what the law guaranteed, and what the discipline provides for; asserted its rights, and maintained its dignity, even by rebuking and putting down the ungentle attempt of one who, until then, had arrogated to *himself* the right of uncontrolled rule over the church.

The second specification charges us with "receiving appointment as Trustees under the assumed authority of said meeting; thus organizing a board for the transaction of the business of the church, in opposition to the board appointed under, and acknowledged by the discipline."

We admit that we did receive appointment under the *corporation*; not at the "*same meeting*;" nor from any assumed authority, nor in opposition to any board; but at a subsequent meeting, by the *rightful* authority, and only to fill vacancies occasioned by the contumacy of those who refused to acknowledge the right of action by the corporation, and to receive appointment under it.

The third and last specification charges "a palpable violation of discipline on us, in going to law with the Trustees by levying on the property of one of their tenants," and this "after having received from the preacher in charge a *decision*, declaring the course we had adopted, to be a palpable violation of the discipline, contrary to a written avowal of our determination not to perform any acts that would be such; thus giving evidence to pursue our own course in defiance of the constituted authorities of the church."

We deny positively ever having gone to law with the Trustees of the *church*; the church was incorporated; the corporation had appointed us its Trustees, in lieu of the former refractory ones, and had directed us to manage its temporal matters; (see by-laws of the corporation, and Dr. Capers' first pamphlet.) We levied on one of the tenants of the corporation; the property he held, was bequeathed to the church in its corporate name. Not one word about the "*Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and to their successors in office, in trust for the church*," as the gentlemen have so "*recklessly*" asserted in page 47 of their book, is to be found in the whole will; and we *know* that they examined the will for themselves, and took extracts from it before their book was written; [Mr. Kennedy certainly did so.] And even if it had been, as they so palpably misstate it, we were certainly their legal successors. We deny having committed any palpable violation of the discipline in this matter, even if the old Trustees were officers of the Quarterly Conference.

The gentlemen in this matter, as in several others, suffered prudence to be beguiled by

intemperate zeal, "and reckoned without their host." The church either is incorporated, or it is not. We give them the choice. If it is incorporated, we were the only persons that could manage that piece of property, [with two other lots similarly situated,] because it was demised to the church by its corporate name. No person or persons, officer or officers, trustees or agents, were mentioned in, or authorised by the will to hold in trust for the church. As a corporation, it had the right and the power to take the management of property conveyed to it as such, into its own hands: it did so, and we were appointed the managers of it.

If the church is not incorporated, then the old Trustees, with the sanction of the preachers, have arrogated to themselves the power of holding what rightly belongs to another; not only holding unlawfully, but withholding the lawful rights of those who alone are entitled to it. If the church is not incorporated, as Messrs. Smith, Grimke, Capers, Kennedy, Martin and Pierce affirm, the property not having been secured to Trustees in trust for it, necessarily reverts to the heirs of the testator: and as it is known that there are none, it must be escheated, according to the statute of the State, and pass into the hands of the Commissioners of the Orphan House, for the benefit of that institution.

We deny "acting in defiance of the constituted authority of the church." The church is either the preacher or the discipline, or the congregated body of preachers, exhorters, official and lay members together. The preacher will not say that he is the church; the discipline, powerful as it is in arming the preacher with authority to do as he pleases, neither claims to be the church, or affects to be offended by the existence, or exercise of chartered rights in the church; and the preachers, exhorters, official and lay members united, have never reproved us; and as we always outvoted them two to one, we had good reason for believing, if we were not the "constituted authorities," that our opponents had less claim certainly, to arrogate the title for themselves.

Having disposed of the first and second points contained in the book, as far as the mixed character of the production will admit understanding it, we proceed to notice those parts on which the gentlemen affect to build their chief hope of justification: in pursuing this part of the subject, we profess to consider it one of our strong points, and propose by its aid, to lift the cover from the gentlemen's hotbed, to expose their fancy works, and show that their rhetorical flowerets, like most precocious buddings, only flourish in feculent soils and heated atmospheres. With hardihood equalled only by a strongly marked attachment for fiction, the gentlemen have loosened the reins of discretion, galloped over the field of piety, heralded their disregard for the precepts of religion, emptied their full quivers of abusive missiles; revelled in the joy of their fancied destructions; gazed with delight on the ruin they had sought, and filled to excess with their "chivalrous" deeds, fell sweetly to sleep "under the power of song."

Leaving them for a while to the entertainment of their fairy queen of slumber, we will proceed to the work of reality, and prepare to show them at their awaking, that though "cast down we are not destroyed;" though wounded, yet are we not slain. The burden of the gentlemen's efforts [true to the policy of all Hierarchies] has been, not to defend their rights, by proof of right or argument demonstrative of right, but by resorting to the power of prejudice and superstition, laying hold on the popularity of some favourite, and aiming to excite the sympathies of the community, seek to destroy any, and all who dare assert their rights, by opposing an unjust domination. The illustration of the subject before us, will carry conviction, we think, to the mind of every unprejudiced person, who will read and act for himself. After exhausting the store-houses of abuse, and attempting to render us odious by the stigmatizing epithets of "SCHISMATICS," "TRADUCERS," "FALSE-WITNESSES," "BUSY-BODIES IN OTHER MEN'S MATTERS," "PUERILISTS," "ADEPTS IN CUNNING," "MEN OF CHICANERY," "UNJUST," "BASE FABRICATORS," "CALUMNIATORS," "PERJURERS," "GLADIATORS," "CULPRITS," &c. &c. After a sound of triumphal joy, issuing from the very altars, proclaiming a miracle, a miracle, "the chaff sifted from the wheat," offer all their indications of our villainy; witness the proofs which they adduce to substantiate them. Turn to the page which contains the charge and specifications, and see the doleful array of crime exhibited there against us. Read "disobedience to the order and discipline of the church," spread out in three specific articles, the utmost stretch of the whole being to show that the Vice Hierarch, "a man of as great judgment as any among us," had solved one of the deep mysteries contained in the Sybil's book, [discipline,] and that we had dared to question his infallibility in the right interpretation thereof. See in that charge, and in the letter of admonition which precedes it, the justification for gentlemen who teach the doctrines of truth and meekness, that if men are

reviled, they shall not revile again; that they must not judge, lest they themselves be judged, &c. [We here remark, that conduct like this, will do more to favour the cause of infidelity, than all the labours of Hume, of Paine, and of Voltaire, united, could ever have effected without such aid as they have given.] Apprehensive, however, that such glaring inconsistency, such a manifest abuse of the public mind, would awaken a spirit of inquiry, that would pierce the veil of prejudice, and bring the indignation of an offended people upon their own heads, they resort to the favourite device used on all such occasions, an appeal to prejudice and superstition. A prolepsis is raised, and perched on a promise, keeps prating about proof which is just within reach; but mark carefully the issue; the promise dissolves by the skill of the actors, and shows in the distance, the shadow of deeds which are yet to be done. True to their purpose, they adroitly shift the scene, appear suddenly at another point, and like seers with nobler gifts than second sight, they dart a look beyond futurity; see high above intention, detect the rovings of a bounded will, catch a thought yet unconceived, and by the mighty magic of delusive spell, grasp the scathful ghost, and mould a monster from a shadow's shade. The stratagems of the gentlemen are numerous enough, but the machinery is worn, the wires are rusted, and the figures move awkwardly about; the illusion can no longer be kept up; hyperboles even fail the desperate cause, for poets have restrained their rage—large

"Hyperboles, so daring and so bold,
Disdaining bounds, are yet by rules controlled."

We would fain avoid the reproach of following the gentlemen through so many of their absurd hypotheses; but as they have laboured much for our instruction and amusement, we think it but courtesy to notice some of their flashes. In support of one of their assertions, that we wickedly meditated the downfall of Methodism, and consequently were "schismatics," and "culprits," they instance the demand which was made to be tried by the Society; gravely pronounce it a "trick" to avoid "merited punishment," eulogize the framers of the discipline, laud "him of us good judgment as any among us," for wisely deciding that the discipline "did not allow of that which, if allowed, could not be done;" raise a supposition in support, and in praise of their wonderful acumen, and argue most eloquently in defence of a defenceless nothing. Is it possible that he who "has as good a judgment as any among them," should have jeopardized his judgment by subscribing his name to all the vagaries of the youthful *Amanuensis*? Hear their argument—"Suppose the discipline had said the whole society, then unless the whole society [men and women, boys and girls, minors we suppose] attended, there could be no trial, and the offenders would go unpunished." It is only necessary to remark here, that the discipline does not speak any such nonsense; and the introduction of it in the gentlemen's book, proves more against their cause than we have leisure to comment on.

The next supposition of the gentlemen is one on which they seem to fix their whole hope of success; it is the sweeping charge of "concealed designs;" a dark conspiracy against the peace and good government of the church, and a fixed determination to stop short of nothing but taking the church away from the church. Hear the gentlemen—"We had good reason to believe that they intended more than was shown," &c. Some "godly members" had whispered treason in their ears. This was sufficient; the ghostly form of murdered power, stalked reeking in their view; arguments ceased to convince; documents became traitors' cloaks; actions were daring inroads on priestly power; smiles or frowns were all alike but daggers half concealed. We pass no judgment on conduct like this; we do not hold ourselves responsible for the perversity of other people's minds, neither do we acknowledge any obligation we are under to pilot every wayward understanding into the road to reason. We confess that it is difficult sometimes to arrive at the intentions of men, but we have been taught to believe that actions were generally indicative of motive, and that when an action was of a binding and controlling character, it was so strong an indication of purpose, as to arrest the scepticism of the most incredulous observer. We now proceed to the important part of our duty, that of showing our intention, and by it the character of the parties, and the true nature of the controversy; and we propose to do it in a way that will enable the reader to judge for himself, and see what are the real merits of the case in dispute. It will be borne in mind that we have been charged with "a palpable violation of the discipline of the church." The preachers have declared that they were supported in what they did "by the highest authority;" that we claimed to exercise rights, which they were bound by their oaths to oppose; that we were borne with until "forbearance was no longer a virtue;" that we were always in a minority of one third of the members; that we prevented the Bishop

by our hasty and intemperate actions, from sending on the decision which he had obtained from the other Bishops, and which was to have restored peace to the church; that we were "Schismatics," "culprits," "gladiators," "hypocrites," and every thing that should cut us off from membership and communion in the church; that "power," "supremacy," was our object, and all our designs were sinister; and finally, all who find fault with the economy of Methodism, are persons who neither walk with God, or live above censure. It must also be remembered, that the only proof which the gentlemen have adduced to support their extraordinary allegations, has been their own assertions, bottomed upon the supposed existence of "sinister designs," and enforced by arguments, remarkable only for the sophistry of their reasoning, and the vulgarity of their abuse. In view of establishing the correctness of these remarks, we submit the following statement and proofs: viz.

Evils of an intolerant character, originating in the presumption of a certain class of our population, brought us in contact with the then ruling powers in the church, and an opposition to what was at first admitted to be just and proper, was hastily gotten up against us, from an apprehension that success with us, though for the good of all, would be accompanied by a loss of power in the preacher. The effort to remedy the evil, [rendered more offensive by the resistance of those whose ready co-operation we had a right to expect] created a cabal among the preachers, who, uniting with such of the membership, as recognized the doctrine of infallibility in preachers in charge, resolved on maintaining their power, though it should be at the hazard of all that was dear and valuable to man. In pursuance of this decision, a proposition was made us to surrender at discretion; give up all our rights, or submit to expulsion from the church. The course pursued by the preachers, evidenced to our minds, that the love of power with them, was greater than their regard for the souls of the people. Knowing full well, however, that the prosecution of our rights, could not possibly interfere with the system of government in the church, in any other manner than lessening the power of the preachers in the management of the temporal concerns of the society, and willing to believe they understood what they said, and said what they meant [in their denial of a desire to rule in temporal matters,] we perceived no cause for changing the rule of action, laid down in the constitution and by-laws, adopted at the meeting of the corporation in November, especially after the violation by Dr. Capers of one of the important articles of the trust, which had been agreed to by a few individuals under the extraordinary circumstances, as heretofore stated. An occasion, however, for a further suspension of positive action on our part, occurred through the intervention of Bishop Emory, during his visit here in February. At his suggestion, a proposition was made to the church generally, to refer the matter in controversy, to the Bishops, or a majority of them, [six in number,] for their adjudication, which was to be final, and binding on all parties. A paper specifying the questions to be submitted, the object to be effected, and the conditions on which the decision was to be made, and forwarded to the church here was drawn out by the Bishop himself; read to the members, and taken on by him to Baltimore for the purpose of obtaining the opinions, and decision first proposed, [a copy being left at the Parsonage.] This paper in connection with some others, which we shall introduce in their proper places, determines the character of the whole controversy; it is the key which unlocks the door of mysticism; that has so long shut out the light of truth, and which caused doubt to linger for a while on the minds of a few: it explains motives, rebukes disingenuousness, develops intention, chases fiction, falsifies assertions, and places truth in the light of a sunbeam.

The first witness which we shall introduce to rebut the charge [so insidiously made] of "sinister designs," is a paper which the gentlemen have published in a mutilated form on the 31st page of their book. It purports to be the paper which contained the propositions made to the church by Bishop Emory. It is a part of that paper, we acknowledge, and we thank them for giving so much of it, [the "omission" of the remainder whether "ignorantly," or "intentionally," it is not our business to say.] The portion which they have given, contains two interrogatories, submitted for the decision of the bench of Methodist Bishops, or a majority of them. The first is as follows; "whether an incorporation, either of the Trustees, or of the male members of the church, is inconsistent with the discipline."

The second is, "whether in case of such an incorporation, the principle of electing Trustees by the votes of the male members of the church, at such times, and in such manner, as might be agreed on, would be inconsistent with the discipline.—PROVIDED, it be the wish of the church in this city to adopt such a principle." The use we pro-

pose making of this paper is two-fold—first, to show the true character of our "designs," and secondly, to develop the true character of our opponents.

The "paper," we apprehend, speaks a language which needs no interpreter, it brings the whole subject to one point; viz: Whether the acts proposed to be performed by us under the charter, were inconsistent with the discipline, provided it was the wish of the church in this city to adopt such a course. It will be perceived, that the intent of the "power," claimed by us, was specifically set forth, and clearly defined to be, the right of electing the Trustees of the church, [men who receive and disburse the revenues of the church at their pleasure,] by the vote of the church, and making them responsible to the church, provided, it be the wish of the church that it should be so. This paper is incontrovertible evidence of the intent of power claimed by us; and the privileges which it would have conferred upon the party, [provided we were the majority,] would have fallen as far short of "supremacy," as the book of the gentlemen does of being an exemplification of the spirit of that master whom they boastfully profess to love and serve.

The first enquiry we consider superfluous; the fact of the Methodist Episcopal Churches being incorporated in various places would suffice of itself, but as we have the authority of the General Conference, and the frank avowal of Bishop Emory, that incorporations are not invasions of the discipline, it is as well to take them into the account of evidence on this point. If more were necessary, we could quote from Dr. Capers, [than whom there is no higher authority with these gentlemen] and show that with all his love for exclusive rule by the ministry, he actually convened the corporation once, for the purpose of instructing, and empowering the Trustees, to act in a certain matter then at issue, [but he "was not informed on a legal question" then] and again in November 1833, he was "decided not to call a corporation meeting on purely legal grounds." The second interrogatory is so comprehensive, that it embraces the whole matter in dispute, and taken in connection with the parts of the paper which the gentlemen accidentally remembered to forget, puts to shame the authors of the calumny which has been so "recklessly" dealt out against us. We invite particular attention to the phraseology of this portion of that "paper," for it propounds questions, which involve all the controverted points that was raised between the parties in the church, and places us, we think, in a position of perfect security against the malevolent attacks of the intriguing and disingenuous members of the conclave. Now what are the questions propounded? Why precisely such, and such only, as honestly belongs to the matter in dispute. We claimed the right, in behalf of the members, of electing to office those persons who managed the temporal concerns of the church, and of making them responsible elsewhere than to themselves. We thought that the members of the church had a deeper interest in the temporal affairs of the society, than any other class of individuals could possibly have, and in view of this we adopted rules, and regulations, which would break up the corrupting practice of a board perpetuating itself, by limiting the term of office to one year, and giving the right of election to the members of the church. The opposition to this natural right, by Preachers and Trustees, led to the proposed arbitration of the Bishops; and as we had been charged by those in power with "sinister designs," with an attempt to rob the preacher in charge of a power which the discipline guaranteed to him—that of nominating to the board candidates to fill vacancies in the board, of which he was chairman, who were to be elected by the members of the board—We yielded to the suggestion of Bishop Emory, that as the discipline was made the cause of contention, and the Bishops were the authorized expounders of it, to submit the questions of right to their adjudication. The paper was drawn up by the Bishop himself, and a careful perusal of it will satisfy every mind, that he was no partisan of a "disaffected minority," and that unless our claims were based on principles of strictest justice; unless the discipline openly admitted our rights, and unless we were in an unquestioned majority of the church, neither preacher, discipline, trustees, or any adherent of priestly power, had cause to tremble at the reference thus made. The question it will be remembered was, whether in case of an incorporation of the male members of the church, the principle of electing Trustees by the votes of the male members, at such time, and in such manner, as might be agreed on, would be inconsistent with the discipline.—PROVIDED, it be the wish of the church, in this city to adopt such a principle: Mark the difficulties then, which obstructed our march on the road to "supremacy." First, the ruling powers, [the Bishops,] must have bended to our will, and unaidful of their oath to maintain the discipline, have yielded their judgment, their mitres, and their consciences, to our "factious" desires. Secondly, it must have been agreed on by the church, consisting of preachers, exhorters, official and laymen, that they desired such a course, and would have

the change effected; and thirdly, it required the assistance of superhuman agency, to transform our "minority of less than one-third," into a number equal to that which is universally admitted as necessary to determine the wishes or sentiments of any, and every public society. The only possible ground on which the gentlemen, in our view, could hope to escape the condemnation due to such "reckless" conduct, as that of charging us with the intention of subverting the discipline, and economy of the church, with this paper in their possession, is one which ought to mantle their cheeks with hues of deepest dye; it is a concealment of the truth, a keeping back part of the price of honesty; it is the withholding that which was unknown to many, and which they hoped was forgotten by the few; it is in fact the other parts of that very paper, an allusion to which, drove them to the specious sophisms that spread themselves through the 31, 32 and 33 pages of their "Arabian Tales." It is the key to their undoing, the "ghost of Banco," which obtrudes its unwelcome presence on their guilty feastings. It is that which we alluded to a few pages back, as developing intention, by the controlling character of the act; it is that which says, "the brethren claiming under the corporation, agree, that in case the Bishops shall decide, that what they propose is inconsistent with the discipline, they will abandon their whole ground." [the gentlemen have the paper, if we err, we invite correction.] This is not all. The paper proposed an application to the Legislature of this State, for a new charter, or a remodeling of the old one, so as to remove the objections which were urged against it by the Doctor, and those who thought with him. Aye, still more; that same paper contained an outline of an act for re-incorporating the church in this city, in which was a denial of right, or a renunciation on the part of the corporators of all right to intermeddle with any matters of a spiritual character, and giving the preachers, and the Quarterly Conference, the sole right of appointing the Stewards, and the entire management of all monies collected in the churches, and classes, with all bequests for the benefit of the preachers, or stewards funds, the appointment of class leaders, exhorters, &c. &c. Will the community believe that men who prate so much about "HONESTY," and "policy in war," who declaim so violently against holding back things that "have an important bearing on the case," should be guilty of so gross an abuse of the public confidence, as to present a paper for consideration, and conceal from view those parts which had, not only an "important bearing on the case," but without which, there could be no understanding of the objects or aims proposed by it; [for shame gentlemen:] But perhaps "THERE WERE TWO PARAGRAPHS," and the first was considered sufficient for their purposes, or perhaps there were "TWO PAPERS," and the gentlemen quoted from the one which was "LOST," or perhaps the young novelist who performed the onerous duty of amanuensis to his own composings, grew tired of prosing over facts, and having refreshed himself with a draft of his favorite fiction, forgot to take up the right thread when he resumed the "narrative." Comment here would be an insult to the understanding of the reader.

We pass on to the examination of the second witness, and call on *Bishop Andrew*. The reader will bear in mind that Bishops Andrew and Emory, were in Charleston together, in February last, that they had interviews with Dr. Capers at the Georgia Conference, just previous to their coming to Charleston; were informed on all points touching our "revolutionary designs," as presented to them by the doctor; also that they had seen the doctor's first pamphlet; and consequently all our proceedings as a corporation, which were fully spread out on the pages of that pamphlet, were familiar to them: added to this, they had all the advantages which could accrue from being on the spot when the "REBELLION" was raging. What is the testimony of Bishop Andrew?—first, a declaration that the old Trustees were a wrong headed set of men; secondly, that there had been too much heed given at the Parsonage, to the tales of ill omened gossips, who had nothing to do but to deal out slander as a pastime; thirdly, that the obstinacy of the old Trustees would, [he feared] compel a resort to the courts of LAW for the final settlement of disputes among us; fourthly, that as a quiet and peaceful measure, he would recommend a separation, or a division of the disputants, and as we were the most tractable, he advised as a last resort, that we should form a distinct congregation, be placed under a separate charge, have an act of "incorporation to suit ourselves," and be supplied with a minister who would be furnished us by the Bishop presiding over this diocese. In a letter from Bishop Andrew to us, of the 6th August, 1834, he says—"would it not have been the better course in the commencement of this unhappy affair, instead of arraying parties under hostile banners, and calling into requisition the worst passions of human nature, to have procured an authoritative legal decision of the points of law, embraced in the controversy." Again—"I foresaw from the commencement, that a law suit

"must settle the matter, and I thought it had better be done peaceably than otherwise." Again—"Another plan suggested at my last conference with Bishop Emory, was to advise the brethren claiming corporate rights, to form a separate congregation, procure a charter such as they might approve, with the assurance that in such an event, the Bishops would make it a separate charge and send them a preacher accordingly." QUERY: Did Bishop Andrew consider a resort to LAW, as sufficient cause for expulsion, (with two-thirds of a days notice for trial) or did he view our proposed action under the act of incorporation as a "palpable violation of the discipline" of the church? Or did he believe that we were SCHISMATICS, CULPRITS, MEN OF CHICANERY, ADEPTS IN CUNNING, &c. &c. because we endeavoured to accomplish what he had foreseen from the commencement, (a settlement of the dispute by a resort to law as inevitable) or did he consider chartered rights as "legalising a combination of DISORGANIZERS, and as outraging the discipline with impunity?" (see page 51 of Exposition continued.) Verily the day of wonders can never cease whilst young imported "SUBSTITUTES" (see page 9 of Dr. Capers' pamphlet) are permitted to chatter away the sober reflections of their grave seniors, (the Bishops.)

We pass on the third witness, and introduce *Bishop Emory* to the gentlemen. The reader will please bear in mind, that Bishop Emory was, and still is, the head of the Church in Charleston, (South-Carolina being a part of his diocese) that he was intimately acquainted with the facts of the case before us, having conversed freely and repeatedly with the parties on both sides of the question, had seen the constitution and by-laws, which had been adopted by us, the corporation party, in Nov. 1833, was bound by the obligation of an oath of great solemnity, to support and defend the discipline and economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, has been a lawyer of eminence, and perhaps the best expounder of the Methodist code known in the Church. What is the testimony of this witness? Why, that "incorporations of the Methodist churches are not inconsistent with Methodist discipline," we have churches in various parts of the country "which are incorporated. I perceive a great difficulty in the Church here, but it is altogether with yourselves, if either party would yield to the other, the difficulty would cease. I have power to decide the controversy at once, but as the old Trustees appear wedded to their opinions, I would prefer submitting the questions to the Bishops generally, or to a majority of them. I will draw up what I consider will meet the views of both parties, and submit it to the congregation on next Sabbath after service, will leave a copy at the Parsonage, and take the paper with me to Baltimore, for the purpose of obtaining the opinions and decision of the Bishops upon it; I will be able at farthest to send you the decision in two months; I understand you distinctly, as binding yourselves to submit to the adjudication of the Bishops, be their judgment for or against you; I understand you distinctly as pledging yourselves in the event of a decision adverse to your views, to abandon all your claims under the charter; the government of the church to continue as heretofore. In the event of the old Trustees, and others continuing refractory, if the Episcopal judgment be in opposition to their views, I will instruct the Preacher in charge to enforce the discipline against them. If (as you suggest,) any occurrence should prevent me from sending on the decision, I will notify the Preacher and yourselves; and you will then be where I found you: perhaps a resort to the law will then be the only way to terminate the controversy. I believe, sincerely, you desire nothing but what you conscientiously think the discipline warrants you in claiming." In a letter from Bishop Emory to us, dated Baltimore, July 31, 1834, he says—"your letter of the 19th inst. brings me painful intelligence, painfully expressed under feelings of excitement, doubtless, which as well as the occasion of it, I cannot but deeply regret. The cause of my delaying to communicate a decision of the Bishops in the question referred to them, I have before explained in a letter to brother Kennedy, which I perceive you have seen as I desired. The object of that reference being a pacific adjustment, I still doubt the propriety of communicating any decision till both parties pledge themselves to abide by it, which has not yet been done." Speaking on the subject of the interviews with us when Mr. Kennedy and the Presiding Elder were present, he remarks—"Brother Kennedy in particular accompanied me, not as chairman of the old board of Trustees, but as the minister in charge of the station." Again he adds—"I confess I begin to fear, that with your existing views and feelings on both sides, you will hardly be brought to harmonious, agreeably to our earnest desire, under one pastoral charge; if this be so, will it not be better, less scandalous in the public eye, and more in the spirit of the gospel, to agree, that those who desire it, shall worship together under a distinct charge, in the common bond of the same general communion, as a temporary measure at least, till your next Annual Conference? Perhaps some arrangement of this sort might be made, if desired, by any considerable portion of the Society?" and concludes by saying "I entreat you never to forget, that whatever else you may gain, if you lose the true christian spirit you lose all."

A brief application of the foregoing, may not be unimportant, though the plainness of the case commends itself to every man's understanding."

Are we then the vile characters represented in the book of these pious gentlemen? Are we "disorganisers," "self-willed," "factious," "adepts in cunning," "men of chicanery," "base fabricators," "revolutionists," "culprits," "gladiators," "schismatics," &c. We trow not! or, if we are, we go in company with two of the gentlemen's Bishops. Have we done any thing that is palpably obnoxious to the Discipline? We apprehend not; for the Bishops, under the solemnity of a peculiarly binding oath, were bound to tell us, if we had so done, and they have not so told us. Was our conduct of that atrocious character that made "forbearance no longer a virtue?" We appeal to the invitation of two Bishops, who were conversant with the whole proceedings to remain in the connexion, "in the common bond of the same general communion," with the privilege of procuring an "act of incorporation to suit ourselves." We appeal to the letter of admo-

nition, and the official charges of the gentlemen themselves; did we meditate the destruction of the church, by "assuming the right of setting aside the discipline," and "acting according to our own lawless notions of right and wrong?" ("a mere minority of less than one third!") We shield ourselves, by the panoply of truth; we refer to the paper which irrevocably bound us to submit to the adjudication of the sworn defenders of the Discipline. Did we violate scripture rules, and discipline restrictions, by going to "law with the brethren?" We boldly deny the charge. We went to law with a stranger, who occupied premises that were either subject (alone) to our control, as a corporation, or that belonged of right to the Orphan Institution of this city. Were we trying to overturn the rightful government of the church, by instituting a suit which would enable us to get into the Appeal Court, and procure a final decision on a controverted point, which had distracted the church for a year: we ask, what did Dr. Capers mean, by his ostensive desire to get the matter into the Appeal Court? What did the Bishops design, when they suggested an appeal to the Court? What mode of proceedings could have been adopted to effect this end, other than the one which was adopted, or that which was often proposed, and which they as often rejected, "an amicable suit?" Are we peculiarly chargeable with "daring effrontery," in rising to speak in the presence of Priests, when they had unshielded their sanctity, by violating a pledge given not two hours previous, not to do, what they so "recklessly" did do? Have we falsely boasted of having high authority, for what we did, when we show the opinions of two Bishops, (the Bishops being the highest authority in the church?) Have we compelled the gentlemen to do what they have done, by forcing upon them, acts, which they "were bound by their oaths to oppose," the Bishops, (whose oaths are more binding, not considering, that their consciences suffered, by permitting us to proceed? Did we "prevent the Bishop from sending on the decision," which he had undertaken to procure, when the resolutions which we passed on the subject, were not adopted until the Bishop had twice written, that he was prevented from sending it by the act of the old Trustees? Did we aim at "supremacy in the church," when we surrendered every right into the hands of the Preachers, except that of electing the Trustees? Could we have been in the minority, which they speak of, when we outvoted them, on every occasion, that we were permitted to meet together as a society or church? Can any man of common sense, or common honesty, charge us "with sinister designs," when we had put it in the power of the Bishops, to prostrate us with a word; when we had solemnly agreed to a proposition, which specialists stated all that was claimed, and that proposition made by a Methodist Bishop, and referred to the bench of Methodist Bishops, for their opinion, as to its harmony with the discipline and economy of the church, and a pledge given to abandon our whole ground, if it was pronounced "inconsistent with the discipline?" Will any but a dupe to the mazy artifices of the holy conclave, believe that the ruffian "Diotrephes," with his banditti of "drilled adherents," his lawless hosts of conspirators, ("aiming at supremacy,") his trained band of "hypocrites," "traducers," "false witnesses," "busy bodies in other men's matters," "puerilists," "base fabricators," "adepts in cunning," "men of chicanery," "unjust," "calumniators," "perjurors," "schismatics," "culprits," and "gladiators," will it be believed we say, that these daring rebels, thirsting for power with vehement desire, regardless of the means by which they should obtain it, had voluntarily deposited all their engines of war, their shields and bucklers, and armour too, in the arsenal of the foe whom they intended to destroy? We apprehend not; the gentlemen must have been frightened at the ghosts of their own murdered consciences. What else could have alarmed them? Why did they and their adherents oppose the sending on of the Bishop's decision? We could have done nothing without their sanction, and not then, unless we were greatly in the majority; refer to the "paper," "provided it be the wish of the church in this city to adopt such a principle." Why then be afraid? "conscience does make men cowards sometimes." Aye, and robs them of splendid victories too. Suppose the gentlemen had honestly believed that what we had done, and proposed doing, under the act of incorporation, were actual violations of the discipline, must they not have anticipated a decision against us, which would have put our whole troop completely "hors de combat," which would have given the band of the faithful, a peaceful opportunity of charging us, horse, foot and dragoons, and acquiring for their goose quill chieftain, a victory equal to his highest, fondest, dearest hopes! Luckless youth! where, oh! where was the genii that presided over thy fortunes, when thou wast chosen a "substitute," to fill a mighty chasm in the Charleston station! Where was that genius which developed himself so toweringly in the novel invention of an "ALARM FLAG!" Gone, gone, gone. Alas, poor George!

The gentlemen boast of their impartial administration of discipline, and in proof of it, say, that they did not cite us to trial with a view of getting rid of the suit before the magistrate,—will they be pleased to tell us why they were in such haste about the matter, "will the community receive the ridiculous statement," which they have made in absence of all testimony to support it? What is their proof, why, the assertion that "they had meditated it some time before." Suppose they had, the less excuse certainly, for notifying us at midday on Monday, to appear before the Sanhedrim on Tuesday at 9 A. M. and when interrupted by a citation to appear before the court, to alter the citations to 4 P. M. same day, and serve them at 12. Why if our conspiracy had equalled that which was meditated against the Senate of Venice, they could not have proceeded with great urgency. But, "they had meditated it," aye, and like Nebuchadnezzar's irreversible decree, it had gone forth throughout the vast empire of their three-fold thoughts. Justice was to be silenced, equity was to be hushed, religion with her preceptive rule, "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you," was laid aside until a more convenient season would authorise them to resume it: Mordecai was in the gate, and Haman was unhappy. But they "selected the most impartial inoffensive men that they could find." They were all "sober," "grave," "considerate, experienced men." Well, perhaps so. We regret, however, that we do know

that they did know, that three (at least) of the four who did not attend, had expressly refused to do so, and those who did attend were known (two excepted) to be among the most violent of their party, one having said on being addressed, by the usual appellation of "brother," that he "would as soon call the Devil his brother, as a corporation man," another, that "he would spill the last drop of his heart's blood" before he would suffer Holloway to be removed from the seat which he was occupying in the church, though contrary to the wishes of many of the members and the resolutions of the Quarterly Conference; a third had a son in the ministry, who was known to be violently opposed to us, and to all who denied infallibility in the Preachers; a fourth was incapable, from his own confessions, (neither understanding how to read or write,) of perceiving the right or wrong of the matter; and a fifth, from a cause of too disqualifying a character to require an argument; the sixth yielded his own judgment to the solicitation of the Preachers, and the seventh stoutly defended us to the last. These are the men, who, nodding assent to the dictates of him "who has as good a judgment as any among them," determined, what two Bishops had declined the responsibility of doing, on what had been referred to a bench of Bishops for their adjudication.

But the gentlemen have said, that they had not expressed any opinions on the subject. We could say much on this point, but it would be daring "effrontery," to correct an error in these gentlemen; it would absolutely be little short of saying that they were Aristocrats, and that would be so inconsistent with the "peculiar delicacy of feeling," which they say we possess; but they admit that one had prejudged the case, and he was only taken to fill the vacancy. Indeed, take a sworn enemy for a Juror? Were they so straitened for men, as to be obliged to take one whose prejudices were notoriously known, who resided at the opposite extreme of the town, and whose avocations called him daily from the city. This has an ugly squinting at something.—What had become of the large majority of "godly men?" If this is a sample of the "cheat," we are not surprised that the "winnowing fan" was applied to the "floor."

To follow the gentlemen in their tortuous course throughout, would be as fatiguing as it is unnecessary. They are anxiously flying from facts; we seek repose with the ramparts of truth. We believe that we have maintained the position which we assumed in our first pamphlet; and if it should be remarked that we have omitted noticing any particular points in the book which may seem to be important, we beg the reader to examine again, and see whether such are any thing more than fancy conclusions, hastily drawn from premises, only assumed to exhibit their skill at "rhetorical flourishes." In such exercises, we admit their "supremacy;" we refuse the gauntlet, lower our lances, and proclaim them the victors in all combats of errantry. Our business is with facts, and though the plainness of the garb may estrange us from the dealers in fiction, by reason of its homespun quality; yet it commends itself on account of the reminiscences of early impressions which are brought in review before us; it tells us how satisfied we were when we heard things always called by their right name; and how sorry we felt for a rude, listless neighbour, whom we saw checked in a moment of improper exultation, at the success of a fictitious tale, which he had invented to screen himself from public odium, by being told that "fictions were lies, and that a lie was a desperate cowardice." It was "fearing man, and braving God." It reminds us too of what our good old parson used to tell us, that "honesty (whether in war, or in peace, in state, or in church) was always the best policy." That "religion was the best armour in the world, but the worst cloak." That the more "honesty a man had, the less he affected the air of a saint." "That the affectation of sanctity, was a blotch on the face of piety." That "they who could be puffed up by a gale of thoughtless applause, would be made to bend beneath the force of an honest reproof," and, that

"Those who were given most to railing,
Were found to have the greatest failing."

In a note at the bottom of the last page of the gentlemen's book, an allusion is made to an affidavit of ours, which they had. That affidavit was made to correct a misstatement which they had sent to the Bishop. That affidavit would stamp "recklessness," of a daring character, on the authors of the "Exposition continued," especially as it relates to their extraordinary denial of what occurred between the committee appointed to prosecute the old Trustees, and the Preacher in charge. That affidavit would have been published in this pamphlet, but that it implicates a gentleman of their party, whose name is not among the avouchers of their fictions. The insertion of it by us, under such circumstances, would savour of revenge; by doing this we would be but even with our enemies; by passing it over, we may be superior. Circumstances may render it necessary to produce it hereafter; if so, it shall appear with other matters kept in reserve.

Let us in conclusion, draw the attention of the gentlemen to the dilemma into which they have brought themselves, and see whether the acumen of some, have not been obscured by the obesity of others. As they appear to be fond of logical deductions, we will endeavour to effect a lodgment on their parapet wall, and bring ourselves, if possible, within reach of their understanding. We will try a syllogism or two, and if beaten off, will acknowledge a defeat.

First. The gentlemen pledge themselves in the commencement of their book, to withhold nothing that was necessary to a right understanding of the question at issue. The paper submitted to the Bishops, contained matter that was every way important to a right and fair understanding of the case. They presented a part only of that paper, withholding all that could explain the dispute; consequently, they did us an injury, and violated their own pledge.

Secondly. They affirm that they always had a majority of two-thirds of the male members of the church; a minority of one-third cannot outvote two-thirds; we outvoted them on every oc-

cession, even when their runners called in aid from the highways and hedges, (as we can prove they did on the night of the 12th November, 1833,) therefore, they were not a *majority* of the male members of the church, and their affirmation is—unsustained.

Thirdly. They assert that we had *palpably* violated the discipline: the Bishop is the highest authority in expounding discipline; Bishop Emory, (the diocesan of this charge) told us that "if the old Trustees would cease their opposition, the difficulty would vanish;" therefore, we did not violate the Discipline, and the assertion is unsupported.

Fourthly. They charge us with being "given to chicanery," "adepts in cunning," "false witnesses," "culprits," &c. Such characters, the church is bound to expel, unless they "repent deeply," "evidence a godly sorrow for sin," and "show deep contrition." The only repentance they required of us was, that we should withdraw a suit against Mr. Ling, acknowledge the old Trustees, and Preacher in charge, as Lords paramount in the church; and consequently, we were not what they so modestly have asserted we were.

Fifthly. They assert that they had not the means of carrying the wishes of the Quarterly Conference into execution, in respect to the separation of negroes from among the white members: the means necessary was *sixty dollars*; they have since purchased the Academy of Fine Arts, (to accommodate the ——) at *three thousand five hundred dollars*, consequently the want of means, was not the cause of the refusal.

Sixthly. They denounce all who oppose the discipline and economy of the church, as persons who walk not with God, and who are guilty of personal irregularities: there are *forty-three thousand* Methodist Protestants in the United States, who oppose the discipline and economy of their church; consequently, these 43,000 reformers, together with every person of other denominations, who agree with us in matters of church government, are guilty of personal irregularities, and of walking with the devil.

Seventhly. They charge us with not discovering any error in the discipline, or in their administration of it, until our expulsion: we discovered the errors in the discipline, and their administration of it, a year ago, and opposed it. They appointed a committee of the Preachers and seven members, five being *congenial spirits*, and thrust us out, when we gave a practical illustration of our discovery; and consequently the illustration of a proposition *is with them* the evidence of the non-existence of a fact.

We here close with these gentlemen, and as we verily believe that the love of power with them is a paramount consideration, we earnestly exhort them to cast aside "the sin that so easily besets them;" to be instant in prayer, to remember the fate of Ananias and Sapphira; to ask forgiveness while it is yet to-day, lest while they *seem* to labour for others, they themselves should become castaways.

NOTE.—If it is asked why so little allusion is made to *one of the three* authors of the "Exposition continued," we answer, because, "*Is fatuus perinde ac ovis, bē, bē dicens, incedit.*"