

HOUSES DIVIDED: EVANGELICAL SCHISMS, SOCIETY, AND LAW
AND THE CRISIS OF THE UNION IN MISSOURI, 1837-1876

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
LUCAS P. VOLKMAN
Dr. Mark M. Carroll, Dissertation Supervisor
May 2012

© Copyright by Lucas P. Volkman 2011

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

HOUSES DIVIDED: EVANGELICAL SCHISMS, SOCIETY, AND LAW
AND THE CRISIS OF THE UNION IN MISSOURI, 1837-1876

presented by Lucas P. Volkman,
a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,
and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Mark M. Carroll, Associate Professor of History, Chair

Richard J. Callahan, Jr., Associate Professor of Religious Studies

Robert M. Collins, Professor of History

Robert L. Smale, Associate Professor of History

John H. Wigger, Professor of History

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have incurred debts to a number of individuals and institutions for whom I would like to believe this dissertation represents some measure of compensation for their generous support: my parents, Phillip and Barbara Volkman, who instilled in me the interests and values I hold; professors John H. Wigger and Richard J. Callahan, Jr., who whetted my interest in the history of American religion and provided foundational instruction and guidance for the early phases of this study; Professor LeeAnn Whites, whose seminar in gender, the Civil War, and Reconstruction provided important new perspectives on my work; Professor Mark M. Carroll, my committee chair, who opened my eyes also to the value of incorporating legal and constitutional history approaches and who provided much kind, patient, and useful direction. I extend many thanks to all the members of my dissertation committee, including professors Robert M. Collins and Robert Smale, for their patient readings of and commentary on multiple chapter drafts and to the University of Missouri department of history for a dissertation fellowship for 2010-2011, which provided me relief from teaching assistant duties to complete the most challenging research and early writing phases of this project. I am deeply grateful for the comradeship and support of my peers in the MU history graduate program. Their suggestions and comments on my dissertation work, over a course of years, were extremely helpful. The comments provided by several historians on numerous conference papers were particularly useful in this endeavor, and many thanks, in particular, go to professors William G. Piston, Silvana Siddali, Scott McDermott, and Mark. A. Noll. Anonymous reviewers for the Journal of Law and Religion provided valuable suggestions for the presentation of material included in chapter three, which deals with African Methodists in St. Louis. The archivists at the Missouri State Archives also deserve much credit for their extraordinary commitment to preserving and

making accessible the judicial records of Missouri as do those at the State Historical Society of Missouri for their work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract		v
Preface		vii
Introduction		1
Chapter		
One	GEOGRAPHY OF CONTENTION: FRONTIER DYNAMICS OF RELIGIOUS STRIFE, 1795-1860	32
Two	TURMOILS AND TEMPORALITIES: WHITE WOMEN’S BENEVOLENCE, THE SLAVERY QUESTION AND CHURCH PROPERTY DISPUTES TO 1860	124
Three	CHURCH PROPERTY LITIGATION, LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, AND THE ORDEAL OF AFRICAN METHODISTS IN ST. LOUIS: <u>FARRAR V. FINNEY</u> (1855)	219
Four	PRINTED RELIGION, THE PUBLIC SPHERE, AND THE DISORDERING OF THE UNION	297
Five	SUNDERED FLOCKS, MILITANT GODLINESS, AND THE WOES OF EMBATTLED CHURCH-GOERS DURING THE CIVIL WAR	392
Six	WARTIME TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS: EMANCIPATION, DISLOYAL BELIEVERS AND THE HARD BIRTH OF A NEW CIVIL RELIGION	459
Seven	RECONSTRUCTION: RIGHTEOUS RULERS AND THE UNREPENTANT	544
Eight	ECCLESIASTICAL STANDOFFS, FREED PEOPLE, AND THE RIGORS OF REDEMPTION	636
Nine	FAITHS UNDER SIEGE, JIM CROW, AND THE MAKING OF A WHITE EVANGELICAL MIDWEST	736
Conclusions		837
Bibliography		858
Vita		939

HOUSES DIVIDED: EVANGELICAL SCHISMS, SOCIETY, AND LAW
AND THE CRISIS OF THE UNION IN MISSOURI, 1837-1876

Lucas P. Volkman

Dr. Mark M. Carroll, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

Houses Divided argues that congregational and local denominational schisms among Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterians in the Border State of Missouri before, during, and after the Civil War were central to the crisis of the Union in that state from 1837 to 1876. Employing an array of approaches that examine these ecclesiastical fractures beyond the customary antebellum temporal scope of analysis, and as local phenomenon, this study maintains that the sectional schisms were interlinked religious, socio-cultural, legal, and political developments rife with implications for the transformation of evangelicalism and the United States in that period and to the end of the nineteenth century. The evangelical disruptions in Missouri were grounded in divergent moral and political understandings of slavery, abolitionism, secession, and disloyalty. Publicly articulated by factional litigation over church property and a combative evangelical print culture, the schisms were complicated by race, class, and gender dynamics that arrayed the contending interests of white middle class women and men, rural church-goers, and African American congregants. These ruptures forged antagonistic northern and southern evangelical worldviews that increased antebellum sectarian strife and violence, energized the notorious guerilla conflict that gripped Missouri through the Civil War, and fueled post-war vigilantism between opponents and proponents of emancipation. As such, the schisms produced the intertwined religious, legal and constitutional controversies that shaped pro- and anti-slavery

evangelical contention before 1861, wartime Radical rule, the rise and fall of Reconstruction and social reform to the end of the nineteenth century.

PREFACE

In a famous June 16, 1858, speech that President Abraham Lincoln gave in Springfield, Illinois, he compared the growing sectional conflict over slavery to a house divided, a grim state of affairs that threatened the very existence of the United States. In part, he did so because the Union had sheltered, strengthened, and unified citizens who had heretofore co-existed under its expansive roof without internecine strife. His speech thus skillfully suggested an imminent threat to a personal place of safety, refuge, and family unity that all Americans held dear. Women and men of Christian faith, enslaved and free, also commonly referred to the customary meeting place of their neighborhood religious societies as a “house of worship.” And this was so, to some extent, because of the nurturing and protective domestic meanings that believers commonly attributed to this usage. It seems unlikely that Lincoln intended to raise the specter of religious division in his address, although that is certainly quite possible. Regardless, his metaphorical framing of the dire situation usefully suggests the basic purpose of this study. It seeks to show, in heretofore unexamined ways, that the political crisis of the Union and the difficult resolution of that decades-long upheaval fundamentally generated and resulted from widespread religious conflict over the moral question of slavery. With its focus on Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in the tumultuous slaveholding Border State of Missouri in the period 1837-1876, it seeks to demonstrate the extent to which that conflict divided many houses – not only that of the Union and those of national denominations but also those of families, clans, communities, and their local congregations. The full socio-cultural, institutional, and political significance of the evangelical schisms, as well as their consequences, can only be gauged in this light.

Introduction

On Saturday July 28, 1866, southern Methodist minister Samuel S. Headlee set out for the Pleasant View Church in Webster County, where the Marshfield Quarterly Conference was convening. Headlee was the presiding elder of the Springfield District in southwest Missouri. Because he was responsible for the welfare of the congregations in his charge Headlee's visit was an important one. Wartime had made his job difficult. Many religious societies, whose members identified with the southern cause, including the one he was visiting in Webster County, had been scattered and disorganized, rendering the southwest part of the state "the burnt district." Through the brutal conflict, Headlee had, according to church chronicler William Leftwich, "labored faithfully and extensively to reclaim the waste places – to reorganize and rebuild the wasted, desolated Church."¹ Earlier in July 1866, he had publically announced the quarterly conference meeting, circulating notices throughout the area. Fourteen women and men met him at the church and were eager to hear his preaching.²

No sooner had the Reverend Headlee received a warm reception at the Pleasant View Church than a mob of twenty-four armed men descended on the meeting house.³ The leader of the vigilantes, Henderson McNabb, had publically warned Headlee, with an ad placed in the Springfield, Green County, Missouri Patriot, not to step foot in the Pleasant View Church. In McNabb's view, Headlee was a traitor to the Union for supporting the Confederacy and continuing his membership in the southern Methodist Church.⁴ To that end, many had signed a remonstrance against Headlee preaching at the Pleasant View Church some days earlier. McNabb refused to let Headlee enter the meeting house and threatened him with violence if he attempted to do so.⁵

Undaunted, the Reverend Headlee challenged McNabb and the other vigilantes, asking them under what authority they threatened and forbade him “preaching to the people then and there assembled at their own house?”⁶ McNabb simply pointed to his armed band proclaiming “there is my authority.”⁷ Headlee, nonetheless, informed the vigilantes that he was going to preach, notwithstanding the he had refused to swear loyalty to the Union, as required by the new Test Oath – a provision that the Radical Republicans had placed in the 1865 Missouri Constitution requiring all ministers to make a solemn vow before God that they had never sympathized with the Confederacy during the Civil War. Most southern men of the cloth in Missouri could not take the oath in good faith or refused to take it out of principle. But the mob made it all too clear “that they cared nothing about the law, but they intended to stop his preaching there.”⁸

The Reverend Headlee attempted to mollify the vigilantes by asking if he and his followers could leave and go to a grove three-quarters mile distant to conduct their meeting. McNabb and the ring leaders consented to this proposal. But a few men in the mob prodded Headlee with the muzzles of their guns as he left the scene. To that Headlee’s only remark was “let me alone; I can walk without help.”⁹ The southern Methodist preacher and his flock had made it a half mile to the grove when four members of the armed band approached them on horseback. One of the men, William Drake, rode up beside Headlee and began to pose a number of insulting and otherwise offensive questions. Headlee retorted that “if you talk to me as a gentleman I will talk with you.”¹⁰ With that response Drake drew his gun and shot Headlee three times. One shot grazed the lapel of his coat while another left a wound in his hip. The shot that went through his right side, however, penetrated his lungs. The four vigilantes rode off to rejoin the rest of their company at the home of Henderson McNabb. After having been shot, Headlee

managed to mount a horse and rode quietly another fifty yards or so, then stopped, placed his gloves in his pockets, and calmly said “friends I am a dead man.”¹¹ His company somehow found a chair for the stricken preacher and carried him, in the chair, about a half mile to the home of his sister. He died about ten hours later.¹²

Webster County authorities never brought to justice the men who killed the Reverend Samuel Headlee. But the publicity arising from his cold-blooded murder sorely tested the tenuous authority of Radical Republicans in the state. The prime southern Methodist newspaper in Missouri, the St. Louis Christian Advocate, condemned the killing. According to the sheet, “that sweet-spirited, pious and holy man – the Rev. Samuel S. Headlee, has been murdered, foully and cruelly murdered, because he would preach the gospel of the ever blessed Son of God.”¹³ Editor of the newspaper, Methodist minister David Rice McAnally, had been imprisoned during the war for publically expressing support for the Confederacy. The Springfield Missouri Weekly Patriot soon laid the blame for Headlee’s death at his feet. Its editor declared that “if the Rev. Mr. M’Anally, and others, will examine their hands, they will find that they are stained with blood.”¹⁴ McAnally promptly responded that he had “examined his hands; there is no blood on them.”¹⁵ The prime competitor of the Patriot in the area, the Democrat Party-affiliated Southwest Union Press, however, condemned Henderson McNabb, averring also that, with Headlee’s death, “another has fallen a martyr to intolerance.”¹⁶ A Webster County grand jury was convened to take action against McNabb and his men, but no indictment was ever returned against any of them. A number of southern Methodist leaders in the area charged that the grand jury had been rigged by a northern Methodist who had served as its foreman.¹⁷ Radical Republican Governor Thomas Fletcher sent Sheriff J. A. Patterson from Springfield to investigate the case. But Patterson claimed he was unable to ascertain the identity of Headlee’s murderers. Unionist

residents were unwilling to give up the mob and the southern Methodist eye witnesses were too scared to talk.¹⁸

The lynching of Samuel Headlee had its origins in the 1845 national Methodist schism and its unusually complex manifestation in the slaveholding Border State of Missouri. McNabb and many in his mob were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a denomination that was, after the national Methodist rupture in 1844, largely composed of pro-Union congregations in the northern states. Headlee and the southern Methodists who had come to hear him preach were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, resulting from the same fracture. While the majority of the Methodists in Missouri had sided with the southern church after the national schism, Missouri was one of the few states in the Union that was home to substantial numbers of southern and northern Methodists. Emboldened by wartime United States Army and Radical Republican control of the state, many Methodists, including McNabb, had switched their allegiance to the northern church. With fervent Unionist sympathies, they continued to hound suspect southern Methodists even after the formal conclusion of the Civil War.¹⁹

The violent 1866 conflict between northern and southern Methodists in Webster County reveals much about the denominational strife that divided Missouri Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians after the national evangelical schisms in the period 1837-45. As had been the case in St. Louis and other commercial river towns in Missouri before the war, Springfield had grown rapidly and drawn liberal-minded migrants from the more urbanized North. It thus had emerged as a stalwart locus of Union support and northern Methodist devotion in the last several decades of the antebellum period. As was the case in most rural precincts in Missouri, however, most of the residents of nearby Webster County hailed from the Upper South, and many had supported slavery and the southern cause. That key Civil War battles had been fought in and around

Springfield during the first years of the war was the consequence of this demographic, political, and religious disjuncture.

The divisions among white residents that had spurred the mob action against Headlee stemmed from divergent articles of faith concerning the morality of African American bondage dating back to the original rupture of the Methodist Church over the question in 1844. But they also derived from more recent contention over the rights to be afforded those who had been disloyal to the victorious Union. The refusal of Headlee to comply with the Test Oath was emblematic both of this heated conflict and the continuing entanglement of religious and political questions. As much as the morality and constitutionality of secession, resentments of divergent wartime sectional loyalties re-energized conflict among Missouri evangelicals in the years immediately following the war.

Traditions of informal communal justice and vigilantism, transplanted by the settlers of Webster County from the mountainous Upper South to the Ozark highlands, undoubtedly helped spur the attack on Headlee. The deadly mobbing of the Reverend Headlee thus extended a practice, which flourished unabated through the war years, that was grounded in a popular will theory of government that often discounted the imperatives of law in the name of “the people.” But the murder also constituted a perpetuation of the endemic mob violence that community leaders had directed against abolitionist preachers and anti-slavery presses in the decades preceding the Civil War – including the mob attacks on abolitionist Presbyterian editor Elijah Lovejoy of St. Louis in 1836-37 and those that occurred in western Missouri and Kansas amid the bloody “Border War” in the late 1850s fought over the question of whether Kansas would enter the Union as a free or slave state. Reportage of the Headlee lynching in the St. Louis Christian Advocate, Springfield Missouri Weekly Patriot, and Southwest Union Press,

furthermore, highlights the fact that denominational schisms in Missouri over the moral question of slavery, were, from their beginnings, powerfully driven by disputation that had spilled over into the public sphere of political oratory and partisan newspaper editorializing.

The aftermath of the 1866 episode in Webster County also reveals persistent antebellum patterns of evangelical strife of more practical interest to denominational combatants than questions about the morality of slavery and political disloyalty. Within months of the murder, contending factions of Webster County Methodists had moved from virulent public disputation over the killing of Headlee to litigation over which congregational faction rightfully owned its traditional plot of land reserved for camp meetings. This kind of conflict over church property, or “temporalities,” had energized congregational ruptures over slavery since the late 1830s, especially among town-dwelling middle-class church-goers. The legal clash among Webster County Methodists over ownership of their camp meeting ground, however, constituted something of a change in the priorities of Missouri’s rural evangelicals. In the opening years of the Second Great Awakening, church property rights had been a relatively minor concern among evangelical settlers in the trans-Mississippi Southwest. Those who had garnered new converts at extended bucolic camp meetings and revivals counted souls not real estate values.

By the turn of the twentieth century, Missouri northern Methodist Church histories made no reference whatsoever to the murder of the Reverend Headlee or to any other such post-Civil War episodes.²⁰ This lapse demonstrates rather well that, while northern and southern evangelicals remained ecclesiastically divided, their powerful common reaction to the perceived threats of secularism, Roman Catholic immigration, and the bane of alcohol spurred church chroniclers, memoirists, and autobiographers to paper over longstanding mutual resentments, as

well as the atrocities that they had committed upon one another only three decades earlier in the name of loyalty and Godliness.

Scholarship on the Evangelical Schisms

Most histories of the nineteenth-century evangelical schisms in the United States have focused on the disruptions of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches primarily in the period 1837-45 and their effects to about 1860. That most historians have ignored the sweep of evangelical strife beyond this period stems fundamentally from the standard explanatory paradigm, which emphasizes that the schisms within the three major churches over the question of slavery are most significant because they foreshadowed secession and the Civil War. A handful of historians, such as Christ Padgett, Randy J. Sparks, and Beth Barton Schweiger have, in the last decade or so, produced important article-length studies examining the antebellum schisms in specific locales.²¹ But virtually all historians exploring the upheavals with book-length studies have examined them from an almost purely national or sectional perspective. Such work emphasizes denominational strife almost strictly in terms of division between North and South, with Border States sometimes set off as additional piece of a largely national puzzle.

A number of historians argue that the evangelical schisms constituted a prime source of sectional tension and played a major role in the process of disunion. In Broken Churches, Broken Nation (1985), Clarence C. Goen casts the evangelical schisms as ruptures in the political fabric of the nation.²² Goen, among others, also argues that contention over slavery figured uppermost in the Presbyterian schism, while the majority of scholars hold that theological concerns were central to the split.²³ More than a few historians, including Goen, place schismatic developments in the Border States within an essentially political framework. Richard Carwardine, for example, contends that the evangelical schisms only appear to have constituted fundamentally religious

upheavals. While exploring the violence that marked the schisms in Border States such as Missouri, Carwardine argues, much like Goen, that the crucial impact of the schisms was to weaken sectional political bonds and cultural ties and thereby spur the crisis of the Union.²⁴ Such conclusions thus add yet another theory of Civil War causation to the long list that has developed since the conflict itself.²⁵ After the major evangelical schisms, according to historian John Patrick Daley, an unfettered pro-slavery publishing industry, solidly under the control of the most influential ministers in the region, permitted evangelical leaders in the slave states to build the distinctive religious and cultural foundations that fostered southern nationalism and later supported secession.²⁶

History scholarship contending that evangelical ruptures over slavery did not, in fact, generate national political disintegration similarly focuses on inter-sectional tensions. Donald Mathews argues that the Methodist schism was the one most obviously marked by conflict over the morality of slavery. But, in his estimation, the Methodist fracture did not significantly contribute to the snapping of national bonds.²⁷ Historian John R. McKivigan pursues a similar argument in The War on Proslavery Religion, contending that the evangelical schisms did not transform the northern churches into bastions of antislavery activism. McKivigan maintains that a contemporaneous critique of abolitionism by northern church leaders makes this conclusion all too evident. In his view, the Methodist and Baptist schisms were the result of attempts by northern conservatives to keep antislavery members from abandoning the established churches. In this interpretation, furthermore, the Presbyterian schism primarily dealt with the theological disputes over the possibilities of human and social perfection rather than the moral question of slavery.²⁸ In a paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Filson Club in 2008, McKivigan applies these arguments to the Border States, including Missouri. Even in this case, he maintains,

the schisms did not substantially undercut national cohesion since they did not divide evangelicals in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches along sectional lines prior to secession. The denominations, he points out, split in ways that left a significant number of adherents in slave holding states bound to national church organizations.²⁹

Historians seem to agree that Reconstruction did not heal the denominational schisms of the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians and that mutual recriminations prevented the contending factions from rectifying their differences. Most scholars concur that, while Methodists began to establish fraternal relations with one another in the years after the war, they were unwilling to take significant efforts toward reunification until decades afterwards.³⁰ Historians generally agree that northern Presbyterian support for the Civil War led to the reunification of the Old and New Schools after the war and to the formation of a separate southern Presbyterian general assembly, one that soon absorbed the United Synod of the South. There is general consensus, furthermore, that persistent sectional animosities contributed to the permanency of the division between the northern and southern Presbyterian churches in the decades after Reconstruction.³¹ Historians Bill J. Leonard and C. Douglas Weaver both assert that northern and southern Baptists drifted further apart after the war as they accused one another of evangelizing into the other's territory. Many southern Baptists led the way in embracing racial segregation and the "Lost Cause" while holding northern Baptists far too theologically liberal.³²

The Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches were the three largest Protestant denominations in Missouri during the period under study. None of the smaller denominations that thrived in the state experienced ruptures over the question of slavery similar to those of the largest three.³³ Church historians R. S. Douglas, J. Gordon Kingsley, Frank Tucker, and Joseph H. Hall have examined the schisms in one or the other denominations in Missouri from the mid-

1830s through to the end of Reconstruction, but only as developments within more encompassing denominational accounts. While certainly valuable, this body of work is generally limited to close examination of the institutional processes of denominational division in each case and does not investigate systematically the larger socio-cultural or political dynamics of denominational division, much less the experiences of individual congregations and congregants.³⁴

Approaches

Houses Divided breaks new ground by assessing the schisms of all three major evangelical denominations as local denominational and congregational developments rife with implications for the larger crisis of the Union from 1837 to 1876. While the extant scholarship explores the ecclesiastical ruptures with a wide angle lens, it also typically focuses tightly on the sermons, writings, and activities of high-profile clerics, who were, generally speaking, seminary-trained white men. This body of work is valuable, indeed indispensable. But such scholarship too often ignores the feelings, convictions, motivations, and lived experiences of the vast majority of ordinary evangelicals, lay and clerical, in specific social and cultural settings -- and the way that members of particular religious societies interacted with each other, their pastors, and denominational leaders personally accessible to them. At one level of analysis, this study departs from the established mode of enquiry by examining the geographic, socioeconomic, religious, and political dynamics that spurred the choices of myriad Missouri church members to preserve, or not, their denominational ties, the cohesiveness of their congregations, and their relationships with affiliated local institutions, such as schools and denominational academies and colleges. At another, it explores heretofore unexamined dynamics of race, class, and gender pertinent to the schisms by taking into account not only leading white clerics but also the full contingent of lay

membership, including women, African American church members, and rural and town-dwelling congregants, including the influential urban middle class.

Houses Divided expands the temporal scope of enquiry into the schisms beyond the traditional one. As indicated, it is the first comprehensive work dealing with all three of the major denominations to examine carefully the entire era of evangelical schism, which commenced in the mid-1830s and continued through to the early 1870s. By the same token, it expands the parameters of enquiry to go beyond assessments of the cause-and-effect relationships of denominational ruptures 1837-45 with secession and the Civil War. This question is important, and this study certainly seeks to provide answers in this connection. On the other hand, by also examining the experiences of northern and southern evangelicals to the end of the nineteenth century, Houses Divided provides a vantage point to assess more cogently the relationship of the schisms to key processes of socioeconomic, cultural, religious, legal, constitutional, and political transformation through the Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Gilded Age.

To the extent that Missouri constituted a microcosm of the United States through the period under study, the findings set out in Houses Divided provides insights useful for gauging the origins and legacies of the evangelical schisms for the nineteenth century United States as a whole. First, from its contentious inception in 1820-21, Missouri was both a Border State and a slave polity that, by far, experienced more conflict over slavery than any other state in the Union. With its distinctive mix of slavery, white settlement, and rapid urbanization, Missouri constituted a virtual laboratory of conflict and consensus, stasis and change, progress and reaction. Within its borders in the decades under study, evangelical growth, denominational schisms, and their realignments were inextricably intertwined with the processes of trans-Mississippi Southwest

frontier expansion, massive European immigration, ethnic conflict between Protestants and Catholics in St. Louis, middle-class formation, as well as the development of a capitalist legal infrastructure, the market and communications revolutions, the expansion of popular politics, the rise of a competitive two-party system, and the full-blown emergence of contending regional and national print cultures.³⁵

Second, more than any other state, Missouri experienced the tensions between libertarian commitments to white man's democracy, free political expression, and the constraints imposed on that expression by official commitments to slavery and the imperatives of a popular will theory of government that placed a premium on informal communal justice and vigilantism.³⁶ Emblematic of this was Missouri's bloody "Border War" with Kansas beginning in 1854.³⁷ By the same token, its people singularly engaged the problems arising from the widely felt need to maintain slavery and, simultaneously, establish common understandings about appropriate church-state relations.

Third, because of its distinctive Border State situation, Missourians experienced singularly the full destructive impact of the Civil War – and were ultimately forced to deal with the challenge of African Americans Emancipation, the adoption of the post-Civil War amendments to the Constitution, the lingering dilemmas of state and national loyalties, the process of national political consolidation, and the decisive victory of perpetual Union over separatist versions of states' rights. With a rural and urban populace hailing variously from North and South, the middle-class leadership of the war-torn state faced extraordinarily difficult challenges in recovering from the Civil War and reaching acceptable understandings of national and regional identity with which its increasingly diverse peoples could live in harmony.

Drawing on a novel combination of approaches, Houses Divided seeks to examine the evangelical schisms as interlinked religious, socio-cultural, institutional, and political phenomena. In this connection, the author follows, for example, the lead of historian of American religion John H. Wigger and specialist in American religious studies Richard P. Callahan.³⁸ Their scholarly work reveals the extraordinary value of examining closely the experiences, sentiments, and beliefs of ordinary people of faith, including those who were subject to civil disabilities or otherwise the victims of widespread biases, such as the laboring poor, women, and Roman Catholics. One important benefit of this approach is that it helps to ensure that close study of the schisms as important political phenomenon does not obscure the vital evangelical faith that fundamentally generated them.³⁹ The work of historian Robert M. Collins linking modern American politics to religiously-infused social issues and “cultural wars” provides an equally useful mode of interpretation, as does the scholarship of historian LeeAnn Whites, which unpacks the complexities of Civil War and post-war social and political transformation through the lens of gender.⁴⁰ Because Houses Divided seeks to explore the evangelical schisms in the totality of their ideological and institutional aspects, however, it necessarily examines linkages between the sentiments, beliefs, and lives of ordinary evangelicals and their local leaders with theology, Protestant Christian ethics, and the law, including the ecclesiastical, civil, and constitutional law relevant to church property disputes.⁴¹ The scholarship of legal historians Christopher L. Tomlins, Laura F. Edwards, and Mark M. Carroll focusing on “popular legal cultures,” however, provides equally important avenues of enquiry for understanding the ways ordinary church-goers and local pastors routinely, and while locked in schismatic battle over church property, thought about, responded to, and employed formal “law on the books” to suit their own ends.⁴²

Sources

Houses Divided relies on a number of standard sources that one might expect for a study of this kind: contemporaneous memoirs, diaries, and letters written by ordinary evangelicals and ministers, church records, church meeting minutes, sermons, and theological treatises. Thanks to the innovative work of historians of religion, such as E. Brooks Holifield, Mitchell Snay, and John Patrick Daley, Houses Divided also employs direct analysis of treatises in nineteenth-century moral philosophy, which Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian theologians, ministers, and politicians commonly employed to craft arguments on the moral question of slavery.⁴³ Legal treatises, appellate opinions, and trial court transcripts and other records further enrich the mix of sources. Trial court transcripts include voluminous manuscript records of testimony, which provide unique insights into the conflicts between individuals that disrupted congregations. Such testimony was typically given only under adversarial questioning and taken under oath. This study also examines carefully evangelical tracts, books, and newspapers, which, as will be shown, constituted a vital component of the blossoming print culture that swept the United States in the first half of the nineteenth century and played a critical role in producing the denominational ruptures.⁴⁴ Last but not least, Houses Divided relies on late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century local histories and autobiographies pertinent to particular denominations and congregations. They provide excellent sources for illuminating the cultural legacies of the evangelical schisms and for employing approaches worked out in the last several decades that focus on historical memory and commemoration.⁴⁵

Thesis

Houses Divided argues that congregational and local denominational schisms among Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterians in the Border State of Missouri before, during, and after the Civil War were central to the crisis of the Union in that state from 1837 to 1876. Employing an array of approaches that examine these ecclesiastical fractures beyond the customary antebellum temporal scope of analysis, and as local phenomenon, this study maintains that the sectional schisms were interlinked religious, socio-cultural, legal, and political developments rife with implications for the transformation of evangelicalism and the United States in that period and to the end of the nineteenth century. Such fractures were grounded in divergent moral and political understandings of slavery, abolitionism, secession, and disloyalty. Publicly articulated by factional litigation over church property and a combative evangelical print culture, the schisms were complicated by race, class, and gender dynamics that arrayed the contending interests of white middle class women and men, rural church-goers, and African American congregants. These ecclesiastical ruptures forged antagonistic and uncompromising northern and southern evangelical worldviews that increased antebellum sectarian strife and violence, energized the notorious guerilla conflict that gripped Missouri through the Civil War, and fueled post-war vigilantism between opponents and proponents of emancipation. As such, the schisms produced the intertwined religious, legal and constitutional controversies that shaped pro- and anti-slavery evangelical contention before 1861, wartime Radical rule, the rise and fall of Reconstruction and social reform to the end of the nineteenth century.

Summary of Chapters

Chapter one argues that the development of Missouri as a trans-Mississippi Southwest Border State colonized by benevolent-minded Northeastern missionaries provided the basic demographic context spurring ecclesiastical ruptures over slavery in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches of the state beginning in the late 1830s. Equally important, it shows that these schisms were most virulent when they pitted town-dwelling, middle-class Methodists and Presbyterians who supported slavery against their more liberal-minded, anti-slavery urban counterparts who had immigrated to the frontier from the Northeast and from Europe.

Chapter two shows that intra- denominational and intra-congregational strife over African American bondage became most intense when it implicated the conflicting claims of urban middle-class congregants over church-owned property. While divergent views on the morality of slavery underlay evangelical strife, the determination of antagonistic middle-class congregational factions to retain ownership of disputed church lands and buildings made congregational and denominational splits highly-contentious public altercations. Equally important, this chapter demonstrates that benevolent women in town-dwelling congregations had vital stakes in disputed church lands, buildings, and schools, and that these women sometimes played key roles in such contests.

Focusing on the St. Louis Circuit Court case Farrar v. Finney (1855), which culminated in the Missouri Supreme Court, chapter three reveals that intra-congregational conflicts over church property among Methodists became especially heated when they pitted independently-minded urban slave and free black congregants against all-white pro-slavery congregational factions. As did civilly and ecclesiastically disempowered white women, African American congregants, both men and women, had substantial spiritual and material stakes in the bi-racial

churches they helped to build. The high court of Missouri, however, discounted informal bi-racial church customs for handling the affairs of virtually-independent black congregations and ignored rules of law and equity to safeguard the material interests of pro-slavery church-goers. As well, chapter three reveals that highly-publicized litigation battles over church property, such as Farrar v. Finney, occurred almost exclusively in the slaveholding Border States of Missouri, Kentucky, and Virginia. Such contention in Missouri ratcheted up tensions between contending pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals and between non-church-goers divided on the moral question of slavery. Evangelical strife and litigation in the Border States spurred high-profile judicial pronouncements, print commentary, and other public disputation that shaped the parameters of national debate and radically increased sectional tensions.

Chapters four and five show that the evangelical schisms in Missouri spurred a radical escalation of theological and political disputation between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in religious newspapers and other printed publications. This verbal sparring played a heretofore unexamined central role in spawning a vicious guerilla conflict between northern and southern evangelicals and partisans on the border with Kansas after 1854 and across Missouri through the Civil War. To the extent that sectarian strife over the morality of African American bondage spurred armed strife in Missouri from spring 1854 through 1860, it played a heretofore unexamined role in generating the larger sectional tensions that led to secession and the Civil War. Chapter five, moreover, provides new insights into exactly how the vicious wartime struggle between pro- and anti-slavery partisans in Missouri drew impetus from antagonistic northern and southern evangelical worldviews infused by religious belief and sentiment. Conflict between northern and southern evangelicals over the question of slavery contributed substantially to the pro- and anti-slavery guerilla depredations that disrupted congregations and

church activities through the bloody conflict. This chapter also demonstrates that northern and southern evangelicals invoked Divine Providence variously to justify their respective causes and to settle the daunting existential question of which of their contending worldviews were true.

Chapter six reveals how anti-slavery Unionists embraced the view that disloyalty to the United States and support of slavery were tantamount to sin, a position that northern evangelicals, Union troops, and Radical Republicans sought to impose on southern evangelicals as a new civil religion via wartime ecclesiastical sanctions and loyalty oaths. It also shows that such sentiments prompted Union authorities to muzzle the pro-slavery evangelical press, while spurring Unionist evangelicals to appropriate the church lands and buildings of their pro-slavery counterparts. Challenged in the courts by dispossessed southern evangelicals, these were seizures that local tribunals under Radical control generally ratified in the name of well-established rules of ecclesiastical law, constitutional doctrine, and equity jurisprudence. This variegated body of law, however, did not determine such outcomes as much as the religious, social, and political preferences of partisan judges. Their rulings, moreover, obscured the boundaries of church and state, while powerfully shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and the armed struggle.

Chapter seven shows how Radical Republicans during Reconstruction, with a new state constitution, disqualified ministers of the gospel from preaching for failure to take a Test Oath professing present and past loyalty to the Union -- while northern evangelical church leaders made a declaration of loyalty and a profession that slavery and slaveholding amounted to sin a litmus test for church membership. It also shows how opposition to the Test Oath, on the ground that it infringed upon the liberties of conscience and free speech, produced the 1867 ruling of the United States Supreme Court in Cummings v. State of Missouri. This decision overturned the

Test Oath and undercut the Radical redefinition of Protestant faith and citizenship. It also provided the legal grist with which southern evangelicals, aided by state courts once again sympathetic to the southern white majority, reclaimed the church lands and buildings that Union soldiers, Radicals, and their northern evangelical allies had seized during the war. As before and during the Civil War, high-profile litigation over church property reflected less the imperatives of church, civil, and constitutional law than the social, religious, and political preferences of judges. These disputes further clouded the boundaries of church and state, while further shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and emerging civil religions among both former Confederate and Union supporters.

Chapter eight demonstrates that, during Reconstruction, new civil and political liberties for African Americans secured for them the right to worship independently and the means to protect their church property -- but that black believers abandoned white-controlled churches in droves, created their own Baptist and Methodist organizations, and faced down the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan to nurture distinctive faiths that nurtured African American advancement. It also demonstrates that, after political "Redemption" in 1875, white evangelicals remained ecclesiastically divided over the religious and political meanings of slavery, secession and disloyalty. This chapter also highlights a key modulation in white evangelical faith arising as a consequence of the schisms and the sectional struggle they helped to spawn. New and delimited understandings of Divine Providence, which prompted evangelicals now to look only to the past for signs of God's intervention, could no longer provide rosy and confident predictions of social and political transformation. This was a view that coincided with a decreased willingness on the part of most evangelicals to support social reform and their growing desire to separate religion from civil government.

Chapter nine shows that, notwithstanding voluminous immigration from the Northeast and rapid urban growth after 1876, there were three times as many southern evangelicals than northern ones in Missouri by 1900 – but that black church-goers in the state energetically resisted the imposition of racial segregation after Redemption and strove to advance the socioeconomic, civil, and political rights of African Americans. It also reveals that industrialization and the rise of huge urban centers engendered a siege mentality among white evangelicals, one that focused on the evils of demon liquor and the supposed threat to Protestantism posed by the massive immigration of Roman Catholics into the large cities of the state. This chapter also shows that the horrors of Civil War and lingering southern evangelical resentment of abolitionism redoubled their opposition to the use of government power to promote liberal evangelical social ideals, a position that a substantial number of war-weary northern evangelicals also adopted in the decades following Reconstruction. But a revitalized temperance crusade ultimately bound together ecclesiastically-divided white northern and southern evangelicals. Last, chapter nine demonstrates that post-Civil War commemoration did not always serve to perpetuate sectional antagonisms. By the late nineteenth century, evangelical chroniclers, memoirists, and autobiographers crafted accounts of Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist church development in Missouri that obscured the evangelical schisms and the intertwined theological and political controversies that had produced and sustained them. Most white evangelical chronicles refrained from discussing the African Americans who had abandoned the white churches, while prominently featuring anti-Roman Catholic diatribes. By the turn of the twentieth century, the histories and commemorative writings of northern and southern evangelicals had papered over their bloody histories of sectarian conflict and

contributed substantially to the discursive construction of Missouri as a constituent polity in a prosperous, white evangelical Protestant Midwest.

Notes

¹ Rev. W. M. Leftwich, D. D., Martyrdom in Missouri: A History of Religious Persecution, the Seizure of Churches, and the Persecution of Ministers of the Gospel, in the State of Missouri . . . 2 vols. (St. Louis, 1870), 2:427.

² *Ibid.*, 2:426-28, 436; W. S. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri: Containing an Outline of the Ministerial Life of More Than One Thousand Preachers, and Sketches of More Than Three Hundred (Columbia, Mo, 1893), 265. Present at the meeting were George Kooner, Sarah Kooner, W. C. Dryden, Sarah Dryden, Willis Spence, Sarah Spence, John Kontner, William Olman and an unnamed woman who was with him, Riley Humes, Rhonda Humes, Caleb Humes, James Cousins and Dr. Tuttimore.

³ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:436; Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 265. The mob that met Headlee at the church was reportedly composed of Henderson W. McNabb, Virgil McNabb, Martin McNabb, John McNabb, Manasseh P. Derick, Jessey B. Derick, A. J. Hall, S. T. Reeves, William Halbert, William Drake, William Powell, Marion Chitty, James Frank Davis, John N. Davis, Clark Davis, Thaddeus Snider, J. W. Snider, Frank Warnack, J. C. Wiseman, John Jackson, J. T. Robins, William Popegay, Ned Popegay and Joseph Nimo.

⁴ St. Louis Christian Advocate, 22 August, 1866, p. 4.

⁵ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:428.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, 428-9, 440.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 429.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 430.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ “The Days of Martyrs Have Returned – Rev. S. S. Headlee,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 8 August, 1866, p. 4.

¹⁴ “The Killing of Rev. S. S. Headlee,” Missouri Weekly Patriot, 9 August 1866, p. 2.

¹⁵ “From Springfield MO Patriot, 8/9/66,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 22 August, 1866, p. 4.

¹⁶ “Webster County, July 30,” Southwest Union Press, 11 August 1866, p. 2.

¹⁷ Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 268.

¹⁸ Michael Fellman, Inside War: The Guerrilla Conflict in Missouri During the American Civil War (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 239-40.

¹⁹ Cowan, et al., v. McNabb, et al., Webster County Circuit Court Records, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, C 22249.

²⁰ For example, a 1955 history of Webster County lists the 1888 lynching of Richard Cullen as the only example of mob violence turning to bloodshed in the hundred year history of the county. Floy Watters George, History of Webster County, 1855 to 1955 (Springfield, Mo.: Roberts and Sutter, printers, 1955), 38-39. Cullen, who was white, was lynched for allegedly killing his four-

year-old step-brother. There is no mention of Headlee or the details of the nineteenth century Methodist turmoil.

²¹ Chris Padgett, “Evangelicals Divided: Abolition and the Plan of Union’s Demise in Ohio’s Western Reserve”; Randy J. Sparks, “‘To Rend the Body of Christ’: Proslavery Ideology and Religious Schism from a Mississippi Perspective”; and Beth Barton Schweiger, “The Restructuring of Southern Religion: Slavery, Denominations, and the Clerical Profession in Virginia,” in John R. McKivigan & Mitchell Snay, eds., Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1998), 249-316.

²² Clarence C. Goen, Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the Civil War (Macon Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1985), 6.

²³ The historiography of the theological versus slavery debate over the schisms is summed up in George M. Marsden, The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth Century America (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), 250-51. Ernest Trice Thompson asserts that southerners were theologically inclined towards the Old School Presbyterians before the schism but only became willing to expel the New School members when the abolition issue was introduced and the Old School leadership promised to silence the issue. Ernest Trice Thompson, Presbyterians in the South 3 vols. (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963), 1:296-97. Marsden was generally in agreement with that assertion as is Mitchell Snay. Snay, Gospel of Disunion, 115-17. Richard Carwardine holds that the Presbyterian schism was largely a result of theological differences but acknowledges the possibility that slavery was a key issue in the South. He discusses the Presbyterian sectional tensions in the decades after the break. Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 166-68. Elwyn Smith asserts that the South played a crucial role in the General Assembly of 1837 by giving the balance of the power to the Old School. The schism, nonetheless, was not over slavery as theological issues made the break inevitable years before the slavery issue was debated in the Presbyterian Church. Elwyn Smith, “The Role of the South in the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-38” Church History, 29 no. 1, (March 1960): 60. Mark Noll places a heavy significance on the role of theology and the differing biblical interpretations of both sides, an argument echoed by Peter J. Thuesen. Mark Noll, America’s God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 308-11; Peter J. Thuesen, Predestination: The American Career of a Contentions Doctrine (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 178-83. Earl R. MacCormac holds that the desires of the Old School clerics and lay leadership to eliminate the missions that the New School favored played a crucial role in the schisms. Earl R. MacCormac “Missions and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837,” Church History, 32, no.1, (March 1963): 43. Articles that support the primacy of slavery in the schism include C. Bruce Staiger, “Abolitionism and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-1838,” The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 36, no. 3 (Dec 1949): 391-92. Clarence Goen is more inclined to emphasize the role of slavery and of the South in the schism. Goen, Broken Churches, 68-75. Examining in part the New School Synod of Western Reserve in Ohio, Catherine Glennan Borchert contends that slavery was a crucial reason for the schism, although other issues cannot

be discounted either. Catherine Glennan Borchert, "Excinded!: The Schism of 1837 in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Role of Slavery" (Ph.D. Diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2009), 21-23. On the other hand, Robert Doherty contends that the New School Presbyterians were wealthier than the Old School members in Philadelphia, making the schism class-based. Robert Doherty, "Social Basis for the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-38: The Philadelphia Case," Journal of Social History, 2, no. 1, (Autumn, 1968), 69, 73-74.

²⁴ Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 162-66. Richard Carwardine (chapter 9) provides a detailed account of how the Methodist Episcopal Church experienced the trauma of national schism and the tensions and deep mistrust this separation created over issues of finance and property. Richard Carwardine, "Trauma in Methodism: Property, Church Schism, and Sectional Polarization in Antebellum America," Mark A. Noll, ed., God and Mammon: Protestants, Money, and the Market, 1790-1860 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 195-217.

²⁵ Since the late nineteenth century, historians have argued at various times, that the Civil War was the result of an "irrepressible conflict" between contending socioeconomic systems; a "blundering generation" of politicians and extremist reformers; ethno-cultural tensions exacerbated by the processes of "modernization"; and the socio-cultural dynamics of particular locales. Arthur C. Cole, The Irrepressible Conflict: 1850-1865 (New York: MacMillan, 1934); James G. Randall, "The Blundering Generation," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, no. 27 (June 1940): 4-16; William W. Freehling, The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); Eric Foner, "The Causes of the American Civil War: Recent Interpretations and New Directions," Civil War History 20 (September 1974): 194-214; Drew Gilpin Faust, Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); LeeAnn Whites, The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta Georgia, 1860-1890 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995); Edward L. Ayers, What Caused the Civil War: Reflections on the South and Southern History (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005).

At this juncture, most at least agree that the North and South took up arms in 1861, one way or another, because of African American bondage was an immoral institution that undercut the rights of free labor. These were problems with which Americans could not avoid dealing aggressively. James M. McPherson, Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction (New York, 1982); Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era (New York, 1988); Richard H. Sewell, A House Divided: Sectionalism and the Civil War, 1848-1865 (Baltimore, 1988); James Huston, Calculating the Value of the Union: Slavery, Property Rights, and the Economic Origins of the Civil War (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003). Several historians have recently argued that one reason the sectional conflict reached critical mass was because the new Republican Party abandoned federalism or a bi-sectional constitutional understanding embodied in the Constitution that placed a premium on intersectional consensus regarding future decisions by Congress about slavery. James H. Read, Majority Rule versus Consensus: The Political Thought of John C. Calhoun (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2009); Mark A. Graber,

Dred Scott and the Problem of Constitutional Evil (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

²⁶ John Patrick Daly, When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 78-80, 91.

²⁷ Donald Mathews, Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965), 282.

²⁸ McKivigan, War Against Proslavery Religion, 74, 82-83, 86-88.

²⁹ John McKivigan, "The Battle for the Border State Soul: The Slavery Debate in the Churches of the Middle States," presented 1 October 2008, Annual Meeting of the Filson Club, 12.

³⁰ Smith, "Background and Consequences of Methodist Union," 7-9.

³¹ Davis, "Presbyterians and the Sectional Conflict," 124, 128-33; Thompson, Presbyterians in the South, 2:87-105.

³² Bill J. Leonard, Baptists in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 93, 100-1; C. Douglas Weaver, In Search of the New Testament Church (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2008), 114, 146-50. A significant amount of scholarship on the Baptists after the Civil War focuses on either purely local issues or the role of African Americans in the denomination, generally contributing little to further understanding of the schisms during the post-war period. For example, see John W. Storey "Southern Baptists and the Racial Controversy in the Churches and Schools During Reconstruction," Mississippi Quarterly, 31, no. 2, (March, 1978): 211-228.

³³ The Disciples of Christ, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Cumberland Presbyterian and Episcopalian churches, while not nearly as numerous as the Methodists and Baptists, and still smaller than the Presbyterians (Old and New School), all had a large number of adherents in antebellum Missouri. Each denomination avoided schism for different reasons. According to Mark Noll, the vast majority of Roman Catholics and Lutherans tended to think more along the lines of their European brethren rather than like evangelical Americans. They were just beginning to Americanize their theologies, in each case, when the Civil War broke out. Noll, furthermore, holds that Catholic thought on the war from abroad was far richer than American Catholic thought. The hierarchy of the Catholic Church also helped to provide unity in that church. Mark A. Noll, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 108-10, 125-32. Clarence C. Goen explains that the Episcopalian and Cumberland Presbyterian Churches officially adapted neutrality on the slavery issue, though the Episcopal Church divided briefly during the Civil War because of administrative problems. Goen, Broken Churches, Broken Nation, 134-35. Carwardine adds that the Cumberland Presbyterians viewed slavery as solely a political matter, similar to the Disciples of Christ. Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America, 185.

³⁴ For a discussion of the Missouri Baptists see R. S. Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists (Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1934) and J. Gordon Kingsley, Frontiers: The Story of the Missouri Baptist Convention (Jefferson City: Missouri Baptist Historical Commission, 1983). Frank Tucker gives a detailed history of the Missouri Methodists Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939 (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966). A

discussion of the Missouri Methodist schism can be found in Hauser Winter, “The Division in Missouri Methodism in 1845,” Missouri Historical Review, 37, no. 4 (October 1942) discusses the schism in the state. Finally, on the Presbyterians, see Joseph H. Hall, Presbyterian Conflict and Resolution on the Missouri Frontier. Lewiston/Queenston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1987).

³⁵ For a good discussion of these contending paradigms, at least in the antebellum period, see Daniel Walker Howe, What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848 (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1-7.

³⁶ Mark M. Carroll, “‘All for Keeping His Own Negro Wench’: Birch v. Benton (1858) and the Politics of Slander and Free Speech in Antebellum Missouri,” Law and History Review, 29, no. 3 (Aug. 2011): 835-97.

³⁷ The work of historian Nicole Etcheson makes this point rather clear. According to Etcheson, in her book Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004), Missouri-Kansas border strife in the 1850s was in fact a mini-Civil War – the most violent and disturbing consequence of the national debate over slavery’s expansion. Donald Gilmore’s Civil War on the Missouri-Kansas Border (Gretna, La: Pelican Publishing, 2006) reiterates this argument.

³⁸ According to John H. Wigger, Methodism was a major social movement involving not simply the work of clerics and denominational leaders but a development wrought by the desires and needs of ordinary people. The extraordinary expansion of Methodism in the West during the first several decades of the Second Great Awakening was a consequence of the labors of devout and dedicated circuit riders (from further east) who served as missionaries and church organizers in the Old Southwest (Kentucky & Tennessee) and the Old Northwest (Ohio and Indiana). John H. Wigger, Taking Heaven by Storm: Methodism and the Rise of Popular Christianity in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998). Richard J. Callahan, Jr., work explores the lived religious experiences of miners in the eastern Kentucky coal fields in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. He reveals the role of Holiness faiths in the shaping of class identity in an industrializing former slaveholding Border State. Richard J. Callahan, Work and Faith in the Kentucky Coal Fields: Subject to Dust (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008); Richard J. Callahan, ed., New Territories, New Perspectives: The Religious Impact of the Louisiana Purchase (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008).

³⁹ The scholarship on middle-class evangelical women in the antebellum slaveholding states has focused on the extent to which their involvement in benevolent activism pushed the boundaries of traditional gender roles to allow them more opportunities outside the home and a more active role in influencing civic life. Of considerable importance, none of this scholarship examines the active benevolence of evangelical middle-class women in the slaveholding Border States, where northern and southern gender prescriptions competed vigorously for predominance. John W. Quist, “Slaveholding Operatives of the Benevolent Empire: Bible, Tract, and Sunday school societies in Antebellum Tuscaloosa, Alabama” Journal of Southern History 62, no. 3 (August 1996): 481-527; Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and

Michigan (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998), 1-17; Jonathan Daniel Wells, The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1861 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 5-16, 69-132; Barbara L. Bellows, Benevolence among Slaveholders Assisting the Poor in Charleston, 1670-1860 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993). Jean Fagan Yellin and John C. Van Horne, eds., The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994). Gail S. Murray, "Charity Within the Bounds of Race and Class: Female Benevolence in the Old South," South Carolina Historical Magazine 96, no. 1 (Jan. 1995): 54-70. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 61-66, 232-35; Jean E. Friedman, The Enclosed Garden: Women and Community in the Evangelical South, 1830-1900 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); Stephanie McCurry, Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 188-89.

Elizabeth R. Varon, We Mean To Be Counted: White Women and Politics in Antebellum Virginia (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 2-3, 10-70, 182-83; Suzanne Lebsock, The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860 (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984), 143-44, 194-236; Anne Firor Scott, Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 19-20, 195; Frederick A. Bode, "'A Common Sphere': White Evangelicals and Gender in Antebellum Georgia," Georgia Historical Quarterly 79 (Winter 1995): 775-809.

⁴⁰ According to Robert M. Collins, "cultural wars" over religiously-charged social issues in the United States in the last quarter of the twentieth century played a critical role in explaining the political mobilizations and movements of that era. Robert M. Collins, Transforming America: Politics and Culture During the Reagan Years (Columbia University Press, 2006). LeeAnn Whites and Alecia P. Long, eds., Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009); LeeAnn Whites, The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995).

⁴¹ By 1791, nine of eleven state constitutions contained similar provisions. Leonard W. Levy, The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment (New York: Macmillan; London: Collier Macmillan, 1986), 146-147. What disestablishment actually meant continues to fuel scholarly debate. Much of the American leadership believed that individual states should promote Protestant morality and republican virtue among their citizens. Federalist-controlled Connecticut maintained an official state religion and various sumptuary laws for decades. Constitutional historians Philip Hamburger and Daniel L. Dreisbach suggest the "wall of separation" to which Jefferson alluded in his 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptist Association of Connecticut is actually something of an historical myth. According to Dreisbach, Jefferson believed that separation was strictly a federal issue. Historian Shelby M. Balick reveals the difficulties Vermont officials faced in their efforts to disassociate church and state following disestablishment in that polity. Philip Hamburger, Separation of Church and State (Cambridge:

Harvard University Press, 2004); Daniel L. Dreisbach, Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation between Church and State (New York: New York University Press, 2002); “Mr. Jefferson, A Mammoth Cheese, and the ‘Wall of Separation between Church and State’: A Bicentennial Commemoration,” Journal of Church and State 3, no. 4 (2001): 725-45; Shelby M. Balik, “Equal Rights and Equal Privileges: Separating Church and State in Vermont,” Journal of Church and State 50, no. 1 (2008): 23-48. See also Joseph M. Dawson, “The Meaning of Separation of Church and State in the First Amendment,” Journal of Church and State 50, no. 4 (Fall 2008): 677-82. Arguing that Jeffersonian Republicans effectively challenged state support of religious institutions, historians Frank Lambert and Johan N. Neem emphasize that they produced an independent civil society in which groups unaffiliated with churches could viably debate the public good. Frank Lambert, The Founding Fathers and the Place of Religion in America (Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003); Johan N. Neem, “Beyond the Wall: Reinterpreting Jefferson’s Danbury Address,” Journal of the Early Republic 27, no. 1 (2007): 139-54; Barbara A. Perry, “Jefferson’s Legacy to the Supreme Court: Freedom of Religion,” Journal of Supreme Court History 31, no. 2 (2006): 181-198. See also Mark D. McGarvie, America’s Early National Struggles to Separate Church and State (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004); Steven D. Smith, “Separation as a Tradition,” Journal of Law and Politics 18, no. 1 (2002): 215-275; Thomas E. Buckley, “After Disestablishment: Thomas Jefferson’s Wall of Separation in Antebellum Virginia,” Journal of Southern History 61, no. 3 (1995): 445-480. Historians Richard J. Carwardine and James R. Rohrer argue that the Democratic party of Andrew Jackson energetically countered Whig party efforts to employ the power of the state to promote Protestant morality. Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 100-28; James R. Rohrer, “Sunday Mails and the Church-State Theme in Jacksonian America,” Journal of the Early Republic 7, no. 1 (1987): 53-74. Positing a substantial separation of church and state through at least the late 1840s, historian Daniel Walker Howe maintains that middle-class individuals and working-class people voluntarily engaged in evangelical church life and benevolent activism. How, What Hath God Wrought, 164-202. See also Nathan O. Hatch, The Democratization of American Christianity (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991). Constitutional thinkers remain divided over the utility of the “wall of separation” metaphor and the benefits and detriments of government policies that accommodate religious institutions. Christopher L. Eisgruber and Lawrence G. Sager, Religious Freedom and the Constitution (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); Kent Greenawalt, Religion and Constitution: Vol. 1: Free Exercise and Fairness (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Marci A. Hamilton, God vs. the Gavel: Religion and the Rule of Law (Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Legal history scholarship on early national and antebellum church property disputes, including litigation, implicates a vast body of work emphasizing that the United States distinguished itself notably from Great Britain by embracing disestablishment with the First Amendment. But there has been a considerable amount of attention devoted to church property disputes, most of which focuses on the seemingly inevitable transition from privileged established churches and related

corporate powers and a willingness of courts to intervene in ways that upheld orthodoxy to a tendency to defer to the findings of church judicatories, in keeping with the growing power of disestablishment principles. And most of this scholarship deals with historical developments only to illuminate the complexities of contemporary adjudication of church property disputes. A number of scholars have explored church property disputes in contemporary contexts. Cameron W. Ellis, "Church Factionalism and Judicial Resolution: A Reconsideration of Neutral-Principles," Ala. L. Rev. 60, no. 4 (2009): 1001-1029; Natalie L. Yaw, "Cross Fire: Judicial Intervention in Church Property Disputes after Rasmussen v. Bunyan," Mich. St. L. Rev. (2006): 813-39; Ashley Alderman, "Where's the Wall?: Church Property Disputes within the Civil Courts and the Need for Consistent Application of the Law," Ga. L. Rev. 39 (2005): 1027-1064; Arlin M. Adams and William R. Hanlon, "Jones v. Wolf: Church Autonomy and the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment," Pa. L. Rev. 128, no. 6 (June 1980): 1291-1339; Alan R. Friedman, "Church Property Dispute Resolution: An Expanded Role for the Courts after Jones v. Wolf?" Geo. L. J. 68 (1980): 1141-68. See also Joseph M. Dawson, "The Meaning of Separation of Church and State in the First Amendment," Journal of Church and State 50, no. 4 (2008): 677-81; Frank Way, "Religious Disputation and the Civil Courts: Quasi-Establishment and Secular Principles," Western Political Quarterly 42, no. 4 (1989): 532-543; John Witte Jr., "Facts and Fictions about the History of Separation of Church and State," Journal of Church and State 48, no. 1 (2006): 15-45. Mark P. Strasser, "When Churches Divide: On Neutrality, Deference, and Unpredictability," Hamline L. Rev. 32 (2009): 427-75; Greenawalt, "Hands Off!," 1843-63; Justin M. Gardner, "Ecclesiastical Divorce in Hierarchical Denominations and the Resulting Custody Battle over Church Property: How the Supreme Court Has Needlessly Rendered Church Property Trusts Ineffectual," Ave Maria L. Rev. 6, no. 1 (2007): 253-63; Troy Harris, "Neutral Principles of the Law and Church Property in the United States," Journal of Church and State 30, no. 3 (Summer 1988): 515-531.

⁴² Tomlins and others have articulated the concept of "legality" to convey how ordinary people, across genders, races, and ethnicities in colonial America employed law and legal discourses to achieve their own ends and in ways that often departed from and conflicted with formal legal rules and the practices of courts. Christopher Tomlins and Bruce H. Mann, eds., The Many Legalities of Early America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001). Edwards similarly describes the persistence of informal "local law" in the Carolinas at least through 1840. She shows that slaves and free blacks routinely asserted rights to property short of formal "ownership." Often with the support of owners or other white benefactors, African Americans actually possessed and managed property and otherwise engaged in transactions, claims the formal law on the books did not recognize. According to Laura Edwards, ordinary people, including slaves and free blacks, ordered their relationships in ways that deviated substantially from law on the books but in keeping with local preferences and needs. Magistrates and district courts did not administer a unitary body of law grounded in commitments to due process and individual rights. Local custom and recognized the rights of slaves to possess and control property, notwithstanding legal rules that declared this impossible. Laura Edwards, The People

and Their Peace: Legal Culture and the Transformation of Inequality in the Post-Revolutionary South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009). In Homesteads Ungovernable, Carroll explores how religion, law, and gender prescriptions shaped and reflected Anglophone settlement in the trans-Mississippi Southwest (Texas), often in ways unintended and unanticipated by law makers. Mark M. Carroll, Homesteads Ungovernable: Families, Sex, Race and the Law in Frontier Texas, 1823-1860 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001). He also examines the interconnections between popular free speech traditions, rising democracy, print culture, political vituperation, and conflict over slavery in antebellum Missouri. Carroll, "All for Keeping His Own Negro Wench," 835-97.

⁴³ Notwithstanding the rapid rise of new secular frameworks for explaining the natural world after the Civil War, the prime framework for virtually all intellectual disciplines in the United States through the antebellum period was moral philosophy or "moral science": a vital link between Protestant faith, conceptions of duty, government, and the law. Moral philosophy enjoyed an exalted standing in the Old South as the growing colleges in Missouri and the region required a course in the subject to aid the preservation of Victorian culture. These courses employed ethics, as they embodied religious and civil duties, but also mental philosophy, social decorum and political theory. Many of the moralists who taught these classes were clergymen who placed their ethical philosophy under a theological umbrella. E. Brooks Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture 1795-1860 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1978), 127-54; Mitchell Snay, Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 60-61, 84-85; Daley, When Slavery Was Called Freedom, 47-55. See also Susanna L. Blumenthal, "The Mind of a Moral Agent: Scottish Common Sense and the Problem of Responsibility in Nineteenth-Century American Law," Law and History Review 26, no.1 (2008): 99-159; Rem B. Edwards, A Return to Moral and Religious Philosophy in Early America (Washington, D.C. : University Press of America, 1982); Donald E. Frey, "Francis Wayland's 1830s Textbooks: Evangelical Ethics and Political Economy," Journal of the History of Economic Thought [Great Britain] 24, no. 2 (2002): 215-231; Norman Fiering, Moral Philosophy at Seventeenth Century Harvard: A Discipline in Transition (Chapel Hill : Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1981); Allen C. Guelzo, "'The Science of Duty': Moral Philosophy and the Epistemology of Science in Nineteenth-Century America," in Mark A. Noll, et al. eds., Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective (New York : Oxford University Press, 1999); J. David Hoeveler, James McCosh and the Scottish Intellectual Tradition: From Glasgow to Princeton (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1981); Jerome Huyler, Locke in America: The Moral Philosophy of the Founding Era (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995); Thomas P. Miller, "John Witherspoon and Scottish Rhetoric and Moral Philosophy in America," Rhetorica 10, no. 4 (1992): 381-403; Mark A. Noll, ed., The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983); Mark A. Noll, Princeton and the Republic: 1768-1822: The

search for a Christian Enlightenment in the era of Samuel Stanhope Smith (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1989); Wilson Smith, Professors and Public Ethics: Studies of Northern Moral Philosophers before the Civil War (Ithaca: Published for the American Historical Association by Cornell University Press, 1956); Scott Philip Segrest, America and the Political Philosophy of Common Sense (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2010).

⁴⁴ For scholarship regarding evangelicals and the nineteenth century print revolution, see Paul C. Gutjahr, An American Bible: A History of the Good Book in the United States, 1777-1880 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); David Paul Nord, Faith in Reading: Religious Publishing and the Birth of Mass Media in America (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Wesley Norton, Religious Newspapers in the Old Northwest to 1861: A History, Bibliography, and Record of Opinion (Athens, Ohio University Press, 1977); David Paul Nord, "Benevolent Books: Printing, Religion, and Reform," in Robert A. Gross and Mary Kelly, eds., A History of the Book in America. Vol. 2. An Extensive Republic: Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation, 1790-1840 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 221-46; Paul C. Gutjahr, "Diversification in American Religious Publishing," in Scott E. Casper, et al. A History of the Book in America. Vol. 3. The Industrial Book, 1840-1880 (Chapel Hill: Published in Association with the American Antiquarian Society by the University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 194-202; Candy Gunther Brown, "Religious Periodicals and Their Textual Communities," *ibid.*, 270-78.

⁴⁵ A number of historians have written on commemoration of the Civil War. For example, see Daniel Aaron, The Unwritten War: American Writers and the Civil War (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973); William W. White, The Confederate Veteran (Tuscaloosa: Confederate Publication Company, Inc., 1962); Stuart McConnell, Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Charles Reagan Wilson, Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980); Gaines Foster, Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987). See also Michael Kammen, The Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991).

Chapter One

Geography of Contention: Frontier Dynamics of Religious Strife, 1795-1860

David Nelson made numerous visits to the East during the early 1830s, traveling from city to city in order to raise funds for Marion College, a manual labor school that he had recently founded in northeastern Missouri. The students would farm in lieu of paying tuition in order to ease Missouri's ministerial shortage, with the college situated near Palmyra, seat of the newly-established Mississippi River county of Marion. Originally a medical doctor, Nelson had entered the Presbyterian ministry and felt it was his duty to bring the gospel to those in the West who had not heard it preached. Nelson was a tall and powerful man, but it was evident from his haggard appearance that he hailed from the West. His cloths hung loosely, and he clearly looked out of place in the pulpits of the rich eastern churches. Once he began to preach, however, the wonder that his congregation initially expressed about his appearance was transformed to a wonder of another sort. When Nelson prayed, his audience was deeply drawn to his voice, and some found themselves moved to tears after hearing him. Many congregants asked "Who is this man; he is the most wonderful preacher who has ever spoken in this church."¹ Others exclaimed after his sermon that "the bottom is entirely gone from my infidelity."² It was clear for those who heard Nelson preach that his sermons were drawn from no human model but were divine in origin. It came as no surprise to many that Nelson was a popular preacher in many eastern circles. During these trips he was able to gain both students and funds for Marion College.³

Nelson's decision to preach against the institution of slavery placed him within a cadre of New School ministers who had been gently persuading Presbyterians in the North and Border States to abandon the practice. Indeed, the national General Assembly had accommodated to this

reform effort seemingly with as much broadmindedness as it had accepted other New School ideas concerning contentious articles of faith. Nelson soon learned, however, that national Presbyterian initiatives could meet with unpredictable responses in slaveholding Missouri. Nelson's astounding preaching ability had brought numerous converts to the Presbyterian Church in both Missouri and the East. As he expanded his preaching to not only focus on spiritual concerns but slavery, his situation deteriorated in Missouri. Nelson, whose family once held slaves, according to a friend J. J. Marks, had "reached the conclusion that slavery was essentially wrong, and that its continuance was a perpetual menace to the religious and social life of the southern states."⁴ When he first founded Marion College, Nelson and his lieutenants believed that slavery was dying in Missouri. But by 1835 these men realized that their cause was futile as Missourians vocally supported the institution in light of the abolitionist postal campaign. As many within the Missouri Presbyterian Church moved against him, taking control of Marion College in the process, Nelson relocated his family a short distance away to Quincy, Illinois. He nevertheless continued to preach at the Greenfield Presbyterian Church west of the college in Shelby County.⁵

On the last Sunday of May 1836 Nelson was preaching in Greenfield to an unusually large congregation. At the end of the service, William Muldrow rose and handed Nelson a piece of paper, which he asked him to read.⁶ Muldrow was a prominent farmer and land speculator in the area, a leading member of the church, and the benefactor who had donated to the Presbyterian Church the land upon which Marion College was built.⁷ On that paper were scrawled words that conveyed Muldrow's heartfelt conviction that Missouri could only grow to be a prosperous state with the elimination of slavery. He proposed that a fund be started in order to purchase all of the slaves in the state in preparation for their emancipation. Shortly after

Nelson read the paper, another member of the congregation, John Bosley, a preeminent slaveholder and physician, arose and denounced Muldrow “as an unprincipled schemer and an enemy of the state.”⁸ Drawing his sword, Bosley attempted to strike Muldrow. In the ensuing melee, however, Bosley was seriously wounded. He survived the confrontation only to be killed in a provocation two years later over a card game in nearby New London, Missouri.⁹

It was not only Muldrow who would face angry criticism for his statement against slavery; Nelson’s life would soon be in danger. The same day Bosley was wounded “all the friends of slavery flew to arms. Many expressed the determination that Dr. N[elson] should never leave the State a living man.”¹⁰ Nelson, nonetheless, was able to flee from Missouri to Illinois after an arduous journey that took three days. Once back in Quincy, Nelson was still not free from the ravages of the mob that had formed against him in Missouri. The mob appeared the next day at the office of the mayor and, after taking an oath, demanded that Nelson be surrendered to their custody as a murderer since it was feared that Bosley would die from his wounds. The mayor and an unnamed judge who was with him desired to satisfy the mob and were willing to turn Nelson over to them. Fortunately for Nelson, two of the leading men of Quincy, John Wood, the future Republican governor of Illinois, and Edward B. Kimball soon approached the mayor. They adamantly argued that

You know that this charge is utterly false. These men are the murderers, for Dr. N[elson] once in their hands they will assassinate him at the first moment possible Now you know us, and we most solemnly assure you that if you surrender Dr. N[elson] and he is shot or hung, his fate awaits you and the attorney who so vehemently insists on his surrender, without warrant or form of law.¹¹

As quickly as they were willing to turn Nelson over to the mob, the mayor and the judge were just as quick to send the mob on its way, ensuring the safety of Nelson as long as he remained in Illinois.¹² Notwithstanding the threats against his life, Nelson would return to Missouri two other

times shortly after this incident and again face angry citizens in northeastern Missouri aroused against him. Nelson, however, continued to preach against slavery in both Illinois and in the East. He never died at the hands of a mob, but rather in his bed in 1844.¹³

The trials and tribulations of David Nelson certainly reflected a number of ominous national political developments in the United States during the 1830s. Tensions over slavery increased with the formation of the New England Anti-Slavery Society in 1831. Many southerners blamed that organization for the Turner Revolt in Virginia in August of that year, while founder William Lloyd Garrison grimly sanctioned the uprising. The 1835 postal campaign organized by the American Anti-Slavery Society spread abolitionist ideas across the country. In response, Americans rioted as they never had before over the question of slavery. While mobs took to the streets in response to a number of economic and political issues during the presidency of Andrew Jackson, anti-slavery vigilantism, such as that which threatened Nelson, figured among the most troubling of this resurgent species of mass political action.¹⁴ Nelson's fellow Presbyterian minister and friend Elijah Lovejoy ruffled sensibilities North and South by advocating anti-slavery in his St. Louis Observer.¹⁵ By debating the merits of slavery in sermons and newspapers, both Nelson and Lovejoy openly engaged in political disputation, which most Protestant ministers had traditionally avoided.¹⁶

The Nelson imbroglio also resulted from the situation of Missouri as a trans-Mississippi South-West border state that included slavery and distinctive frontier patterns of development that made it a target of anti-slavery benevolent activism. Following the War of 1812, immigrants from the Upper South, many of them with slaves, flooded Missouri. After attempts by northern congressmen to ban slavery in Missouri failed in 1820, many in the new state remained uniquely sensitive to anti-slavery activism.¹⁷ Unlike most states with slave-based agricultural economies,

Missouri also developed thriving commercial towns, such as St. Louis. Access to both the Mississippi and Missouri rivers provided prime opportunities for western trade. Presbyterianism appealed mostly to the rural gentry and emerging middle class, a conservative group in Missouri that typically sided with National Republicans and then the Whigs. Ambitious southern migrants to the new state who were affiliated with Presbyterianism developed congregational strongholds almost exclusively in newly-established county seats and in commercial towns that cropped up along the rivers. Included among these was Palmyra, the town near which David Nelson established Marion College.

The social and institutional primitivism that persisted on the Missouri frontier through the 1830s undoubtedly placed pressures on Presbyterians who settled in the state to draw on eastern, seminary-trained ministers if they were to have pastors for their new churches. But the rise of new Presbyterian congregations in Missouri was primarily the consequence of a coordinated effort by the Presbyterian General Assembly, dating back to the American takeover of Louisiana, to grow the denomination in the West. The effort of David Nelson to establish a Presbyterian stronghold in Missouri was not accidental. He was, in fact, a leading Presbyterian revivalist of the Second Great Awakening and an agent of Northeast-based “benevolence.” As evidenced from the success of Nelson’s preaching, matters of faith often dominated the day to day thinking of the ministry and faithful. Dissatisfied with the fact that missionary efforts had produced only forty Presbyterian churches in Missouri by 1833, prominent Presbyterian minister and clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church Ezra Styles Ely of Philadelphia had, in the words of church historian Ezra H. Gillett, “conceived the plan of establishing a colony in Missouri . . . to erect and found a college and theological seminary.” David Nelson had been his choice to establish Marion College in the trans-Mississippi Southwest.¹⁸ Like the work of his

more famous student, Elijah Lovejoy, however, Nelson had executed his mission by promoting the most radical design of New School ministers within the Presbyterian Church. By the same token, his mission reflected the most potentially disruptive evangelical agenda affiliated with the westward advance of the Benevolent Empire.

Thesis

The development of Missouri as a trans-Mississippi Southwest Border State colonized by benevolent-minded Northeastern missionaries provided the basic demographic context spurring ecclesiastical ruptures over slavery in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches of the state beginning in the late 1830s. As indicated, from the broadest national perspective, evangelical contention over slavery in Missouri in the period 1837-1860 resulted from the contentious expansion of the “Benevolent Empire” into a slaveholding polity situated in the trans-Mississippi Southwest.

Beginning shortly before the American takeover of Louisiana in 1804, evangelical missionaries dispatched from the Northeast established congregations in Missouri to redeem the frontier West from what denominational leaders perceived to be a degree of Godlessness prevailing in the region that posed a threat to the well-being of the young nation. In doing so, well-intended Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian missionaries met the needs of isolated white Anglophone settlers and a smaller number of African Americans extraordinarily hungry for religion. These energetic operatives established congregations that grew steadily to the end of the antebellum period and were testimonies to the sincere faith of many involved. But they did so in a slaveholding Border State that distinctively combined agriculture, slavery, and free market commerce. Town-dwellers involved in commerce, moreover, hailed variously from the Upper South, the urban Northeast, and Europe and, thus, held widely divergent views about the

morality of African American bondage. Baptist and Methodist congregations rose quickly in the rural precincts of the state, which were largely inhabited by white southerners who mostly supported slavery. But Presbyterians, as well as Methodists, had much more success than Baptists at increasing their numbers among members of the white middle class situated in growing towns, including St. Louis before and after it became a large city.

The evangelical schisms were most virulent when they pitted town-dwelling, middle-class Methodists and Presbyterians who supported slavery against their more liberal-minded, anti-slavery urban counterparts who had immigrated to the frontier from the Northeast and from Europe. Beginning in the late 1830s, Northeast-based benevolent activism against slavery in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches produced fractures in all three national denominations but divergent ecclesiastical ruptures among evangelicals in Missouri. Its distinctive situation as a frontier border state inhabited by a largely southern-oriented white population committed to slavery and to the expansion of commerce in culturally-diverse urban venues ultimately shaped the contours of these schisms. Two-party politics increasingly preoccupied with the volatile issue of slavery further fueled this essentially moral conflict. The resulting discord ultimately severed Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian organizations in Missouri from pre-existing national affiliations. The relatively homogenous opposition of white rural Baptists to abolitionism left their local societies intact and free to align with a new southern-based regional association. But the trans-regional dynamic of conflict completely fractured a number of town-based Methodist and Presbyterian congregations and channeled the remnants, as reorganized societies, into newly formed, but antagonistic, regional and national ecclesiastical organizations. These often tumultuous ruptures and re-alignments were, ultimately, the result of two intertwined circumstances: 1) the traditional organic connection of Methodist

and Presbyterian societies to hierarchically-organized national ecclesiastical bodies, and 2) the fact that anti-slavery religious beliefs advanced within town-based Methodist and Presbyterian congregations, and within those that flourished the City of St. Louis, appealed strongly to a substantial number of their liberal-minded middle-class members. At the same time, this advocacy utterly alienated co-congregants of the same class who continued to adhere to older denominational beliefs that included a neutral position on slavery or supported the practice.

Literature Review

Scholar of American religion Richard J. Callahan, Jr., makes the point that traditional histories of religion in the United States commonly characterize the spread of evangelical Protestantism in the early nineteenth century as, fundamentally, an organized thrust into the unsettled West. According to him, two overarching narrative lines shaped the customary story of religion in the polities carved out of the territory of Louisiana acquired by President Thomas Jefferson in 1803. First, it was overwhelmingly a Protestant story, and, second, it was a nationalist story. Callahan's introduction to New Territories, New Perspectives: The Religious Impact of the Louisiana Purchase (2008) sets the stage for a collection of essays focusing on the too-often-ignored Roman Catholic French and Spanish peoples who long resided in Louisiana before the United States acquired the territory in 1803. But his comments highlight a key feature of the traditional history of American religion in the newly-opened trans-Mississippi West. That body of work emphasized the westward movement of evangelical Protestantism into a region uninhabited by Anglophone peoples and, notwithstanding having to deal with substantial dilemmas, the ultimate success of that advance in uplifting and civilizing the residents of the region.¹⁹

Historian Steven Mintz demonstrates that antebellum reformers were led by devout, middle-class evangelicals who sought both to advance Protestant religion and modernize and improve the United States. The prime movers within the Benevolent Empire, initially at least, were a handful of Congregationalists and Presbyterians educated at Princeton, Williams, Yale, and Andover Theological Seminary informally allied with the Baptist, Dutch Reformed, Episcopal, and Methodist churches. More than a few of the most important leaders of the Evangelical United Front were educated at Andover seminary, which Congregationalists founded in 1809 to combat the perceived irreligious influence of Harvard's increasingly liberal divinity school. Led early on by Ebenezer Porter, Andover divines devised plans for doing good, which were generally in keeping with the "New Divinity" doctrines articulated by Congregationalist ministers, such as Samuel Hopkins and Nathaniel W. Taylor. The idea was to spur the millennial kingdom of the Redeemer both in the United States and among peoples across the globe. Clerical leaders promoted this cause within their respective denominations and through the instrumentality of multidenominational benevolent organizations, such as the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the nation's largest missionary society; the American Tract Society; the American Education Society; the American Temperance Society, and the Association for the Better Observance of the Sabbath. Committed evangelicals, swept up in a hopeful, millennial vision of progress, joined together to form voluntary societies that would disseminate Christian values, upgrade the character of the citizenry, and revamp the leisure pursuits of increasingly diverse residents in a rapidly developing nation. Their solutions were multifold, ranging from the advancement of education, to a campaign for world peace, to the creation of new institutions, such as hospitals for the poor and asylums for the insane. Their most

radical reform agendas, of course, were abolitionism and the movement to promote equal rights for women.²⁰

Mintz emphasizes that the missionary work of the Benevolent Empire targeted the western frontier as a region equally in need of religious uplift as the nation's increasingly disordered cities. Denominational missionary work and interdenominational reform societies struck at what the leaders of the United Evangelical Front perceived to be the main cause of the growing disorder – “irreligion.” The Benevolent Empire identified as prime vices to be rectified, atheism, deism, profane speech, non-observance of the Sabbath, drunkenness and other sources of moral disintegration and related social dysfunction. The United Front struggled to combat growing urban disorder with Bible and tract societies and urban missions, responding assertively to the problems they perceived to be a consequence of growing cities, industrial manufacturing, immigration, working class formation, and widening class divisions. But its leadership was equally convinced, “that the western frontier was as bereft of religion as ‘the Valley of the Shadow of Death’ (in the words of the Reverend Samuel J. Mills).” By targeting the supposedly Godless frontier West, the benevolent campaign in the United States became something quite different from its British predecessor.²¹

Several historians have explored carefully the adverse reaction of some antebellum Baptists in Missouri to organized benevolence and missionary work within their own denomination. According to historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown, writing in 1970, scores of those that became members of anti-mission Baptist churches in Missouri in the 1820s and 1830s were minimally-educated people who lived in the rural Ozark country encompassing the southern half of the state. These congregants opposed missionary activities that had been organized at the national level, particularly those that combined with national publishing houses, because they

sought too aggressively to interfere with the traditional prerogative of a Baptist congregation to select and maintain its own articles of faith and practice. To this extent, Wyatt-Brown argues, they were reacting to the organizational complexity of a rapidly modernizing society.²² More recently, John Ayabe maintains that theological differences contributed to the debate among Missouri Baptists over the appropriateness of organized missionary activity; anti-mission Baptists certainly believed that the term “predestinarian” described the view that God had chosen who would be the recipients of his grace. But he also maintains that anti-mission Baptists in the state never claimed to be rigidly doctrinaire Calvinists. More important, he argues that the independent western identity of rank- and-file anti-mission Baptists fundamentally spurred their fierce desire to retain congregational autonomy and resentment of a missionary movement that might encroach on their face-to-face “faith communities.”²³ A recent article by historian David T. Moon, Jr., about primitive Baptists on the Georgia frontier at about the same time reveals the capacity for missionary Baptist benevolence to produce fractures within congregations and associations.²⁴

Scholarship on the schisms within the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches in Missouri from the later 1830s through the end of Reconstruction does little to explain the relationship of the denominational and congregational splits to the larger economic, geographic, socio-cultural, and political trends that reshaped Missouri and the nation in the antebellum period. This work generally omits to assess in any systematic way the impact of Northeast-based benevolence and the powerful divisions that this multi-faceted ecclesiastical insurgency created within the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian congregations and affiliated organizations it helped to establish. Most of this scholarship generally presupposes that congregational and denominational splitting in the state was merely a consequence of national ecclesiastical

ruptures. Hauser Winter's 1942 article "The Division in Missouri Methodism in 1845," published in the Missouri Historical Review simply chronicles the schism in that denomination and demonstrates that, regardless of some initial apprehensions by some members, the vast majority of the Missouri Methodists joined the Methodist Episcopal Church South. Frank Tucker's The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939 (1966) discusses local congregations in extensive detail. Published by Missouri Methodists, it describes events but provides virtually no interpretive analysis. Joseph Hall's Presbyterian Conflict and Resolution on the Missouri Frontier (1987) merely chronicles the antebellum Presbyterian Church in Missouri and, like the work of Winter and Tucker, only briefly touches on larger contexts.²⁵

The Baptist Schisms: National and State

Disputes over the morality of slavery generated rising tensions among a number of developing national Baptist organizations in the first four and a half decades of the nineteenth century. In these years there arose the Baptist Triennial Convention (1814), the American Baptist Home Mission Society (ABHMS), which was formed in 1832, and the Baptist General Tract Society (1824). The General Tract Society became the American Baptist Publication Society in 1841.²⁶ Baptists valued highly congregational autonomy, so their national and local organizations were associations of independent churches. In theory, the lack of a strong national structure negated the need for a full-fledged schism because of sectional differences over the morality of slavery. This was a situation similar to that of the Disciples of Christ, whose members had broken with the Presbyterian Church over its standards for ministerial training and rigid hierarchical structure. Yet this was not to be the case with the Baptists, and they formally divided over slavery in 1845.²⁷ With the national Baptist schism and the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention in that year, Baptists had another associational option for individual

congregations. By 1845 both the Triennial Convention and the ABHMS had convinced many Baptists in the South that the national organizations would trample upon the rights of congregational members to hold slaves. In 1844 the ABHMS had attempted to remove Jesse Bushyhead, a Cherokee missionary who was a slaveholder. Chief Justice of the Cherokee Nation, Bushyhead died before the matter could be resolved.²⁸ Later that year the Georgia Baptists attempted to present James Reeves, a slaveholder, as an ABHMS missionary. Reeves was rejected on the grounds that the Georgia Baptists had presented his appointment as a test case. The attempt of the ABHMS to appoint a select committee to pacify both the North and South subsequently failed.²⁹ The Triennial Convention had been relatively free of problems over slavery throughout its history. At its 1844 meeting, however, the sections reached a compromise on slavery, although not everyone was pleased.³⁰ Outrage boiled over in Alabama as its state convention decided to test the resolve of the Triennial Convention on the question of slavery. Led by vehemently pro-southern ministers, such as Basil Manly, they sent a letter to the Triennial Convention asking for “explicit avowal that slave-holders are eligible and entitled, equally with non-slaveholders, to all the privileges and immunities of their several unions.”³¹ Daniel Sharp, the president of the Acting Board, which oversaw the day-to-day operations of the convention gave its response. Sharp, who was an anti-slavery Boston minister, explained that, while slaveholders could enjoy the privileges of the convention, it would not appoint slaveholding ministers, confirming the worst fears of the Alabamans.³²

In 1845, the stances of the Triennial Convention and the ABHMS on slavery led to the formation of the national organization with which Missouri Baptists affiliated the next year – the Southern Baptist Convention. Virginia Baptists, led by James Taylor and Jeremiah B. Jeter, argued for the necessity of a new Baptist association alongside the Alabama and Georgia

Baptists.³³ Jeter would eventually leave Virginia and from 1849 to 1852 serve as the pastor of the Second Baptist Church in St. Louis, doing a great deal to build the denomination in the city.³⁴ During the months prior to the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention, nevertheless, Baptists throughout the South argued over the necessity to form a separate national association that supported slavery.³⁵ In May of 1845 a convention opened in Augusta, Georgia that formed the convention. According to Jeter in his memoirs, the meeting was relatively free from strife and saw “all questions pertaining to the boards and plans of the Convention decided promptly and with great unanimity.”³⁶

Given the loose organizational structure of the Baptists nationwide, that denomination did not experience a great deal of intra-congregational strife over the schism. Only the most fervent abolitionists or pro-slavery advocates refrained from expressing some modicum of disappointment over the schism.³⁷ While there was some reorganization of the northern national organizations, the Triennial Convention became the American Baptist Missionary Union. There were few major changes in the associations as most northern congregations retained their pre-schism membership. The northern Baptists, who had resisted the efforts to form a unified national organization since the 1820s, only created the loosely-organized Northern Baptist Convention in 1907 (now the American Baptist Churches, U.S.A.).³⁸ The Southern Baptist Convention functioned as a unified organization that combined the erstwhile efforts of the northern national organizations. There was still some lingering support for the northern associations in the South. For example, Georgia Baptists, who were among the leaders in establishing the Southern Baptist Convention, contributed a small amount of money to the northern national associations in the years after the schism. Annual reports and pleas for money were periodically printed in Georgia Baptist newspapers.³⁹ In the North the American Baptist

Missionary Convention had been in existence since 1840 as a national black missionary organization. It could not, however, evangelize in the South prior to the Civil War.⁴⁰

The distinctive cohesiveness of the Missouri Baptists in the face of anti-slavery activism in the mid-1840s would hardly have been apparent to those who initially settled Upper Louisiana. The first Baptists arrived there in the mid-1790s. At that time, about a thousand white and black French Creoles resided in the Missouri region, which was then part of Spanish Louisiana. Like many within the Protestant denominations that arrived in Upper Louisiana before 1803, Baptists from the United States confronted a number of difficulties in the sparsely-settled Spanish domain. Although under Spanish law the only religion that was allowed in Louisiana was Roman Catholicism, Protestantism was practiced in the state once American immigrants flowed into the state. There was still a strong Catholic presence that remained in the state around St. Louis and southeastern Missouri that the Protestants in the state often sought to counteract.⁴¹ A commonly told story in many contemporary sources was that Spanish Lieutenant Governor Zenon Truteau was willing to look the other way for any Protestant churches organized in Missouri as long as the places of worship were not officially called a church or had any sort of bell or spire.⁴² While it was illegal for Protestants to preach in Missouri, according to the legend advanced by many Missouri Baptists, Truteau permitted missionary John Clark to make his rounds.⁴³

Ministers and congregants perceived a religiously destitute frontier with inhabitants little interested in Protestant conversion. When the United States took official possession of the territory in 1804 following Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase, the majority of the approximately ten thousand residents were Americans. But their numbers increased thereafter only haphazardly.⁴⁴ Even after America took full control of the Louisiana Territory, Baptist organization proceeded

slowly. The extraordinary violence endemic in the region seemed unassailable. Ministers preached heartily against the duel and other kinds of masculine vice and violence but often with little effect.⁴⁵ Widespread fears of Indian attack and growing concerns about British aggressions hardly predisposed most American settlers to concentrate on matters of faith.⁴⁶ John Mason Peck, a highly-regarded minister sent to the West by the Triennial Baptist Missionary Convention, commented that “no real progress was made in church affairs during the period of the war from 1810 to 1815.”⁴⁷ While there were several Baptist churches clustered throughout Missouri, they were few and far between and were not organized into any associations.⁴⁸

The years following the establishment of the Territory of Missouri saw division over slavery within the fledgling Baptist congregations that emerged in the new polity. Most Missouri Baptist congregations did not engage in heated disputes over slavery. In fact, they generally favored it. Baptists in rural St. Louis County, however, established a church there in July 1812 primarily to maintain the institution. Cold Water members formed their church in a breakaway movement from Canteen Creek, Illinois Baptist Church, which had been a bulwark of anti-slavery activism in the Illinois Territory.⁴⁹

Massive immigration from the Upper South after the War of 1812 generated considerable Baptist support of slavery during the Missouri Crisis. In these halcyon years, camp meetings and revivals drew isolated settlers into the Baptist fold across the South-West frontier. Baptist missionaries often worked with Methodist itinerants to stage these often protracted outdoor events. New classes and congregations cropped up across the region. In 1816 a group of Baptists met in southeastern Cape Girardeau County and formed the Bethel Association, the first Baptist organization of its kind in the state. With this organizational milestone, numerous Baptist churches continued to form throughout the territory. Baptist missionary John Mason Peck

remarked in his memoirs that the settlement of Missouri was proceeding so quickly in the years after the war that “it seemed as though Kentucky and Tennessee were breaking up and moving to the ‘Far West.’”⁵⁰ While Peck was exceptional because of his New England anti-slavery views, his arrival highlights how many Baptist migrants arrived with their ministers, albeit largely from the Upper South. Missouri’s population went from an estimated 25,000 in 1814 to 66,000 in 1820, enough to qualify for admission as a state.⁵¹ In the years following the War of 1812, men, women, children, and slaves streamed in from Kentucky, Tennessee and Virginia to the central Missouri region known as the Boone’s Lick.⁵² Between 1810 and 1820 the slave population of the Territory grew from 3011 to 10,222.⁵³ The immigration of southern settlers changed the social composition of the territory and heightened demands that Missouri be established as a slave state. After New York Congressman introduced the Tallmadge Amendment in February 1819 to Missouri’s controversial application for statehood, leaders in the state condemned slavery as a necessary evil, while asserting the constitutional right of Missourians to maintain it. Boone’s Lick Baptists counted among the many who took this view. On September 11, 1819, the Baptist Association at Mount Pleasant Meeting House in Howard County petitioned Congress with these assertions: “Although with Washington and Jefferson . . . we regret the existence of slavery at all . . . and look forward to a time when a happy emancipation can be effected, consistent with the principles of . . . justice . . . the constitution does not admit slaves to be freemen; it does admit them to be property . . . we have all the means necessary for a state government, and believe that the question of slavery is one which belongs exclusively to the people to decide on.”⁵⁴

The formation of the Missouri Baptist General Association in 1834 produced the first major schism among Missouri Baptists over the question of missions and evangelical

“benevolence.” Beginning in the early 1830s, many Baptist ministers expressed concern over the supposed religious destitution of the state. Meeting in the fall of 1833 in the Boone’s Lick county of Howard, they determined that a general society needed to be established in the state for missionary purposes. Sending letters to the leading Baptist ministers in Missouri, they held another meeting in August of 1834 at the Providence meeting-house in Callaway County, a Baptist stronghold in the Boone’s Lick. At that meeting, the organization that would eventually be called the Missouri Baptist General Association was created by a number of the leading Baptists in the state of Missouri.⁵⁵ But a substantial segment of Missouri Baptists staunchly opposed missionary outreach to convert non-believers either domestically or abroad.⁵⁶ At the initial meeting, two of the ministers, Theodrick Boulware and T. Peyton Stephens, attempted to deter members from forming the association and then carried this campaign across the state. Boulware and Stephens were fairly successful in their endeavor as “they denounced the organizers of the “Central Society” [i.e., the Missouri Baptist General Association] as “mercenaries,” “hirelings,” and “money-made preachers.”⁵⁷

The rural isolation that most Missouri Baptists experienced in a frontier setting established the conditions that made anti-mission sentiment appealing to many of them. Some historians have argued that the anti-mission Baptists in Missouri were hyper-Calvinists, believing that God would save the elect regardless of human effort. Primitive Baptists opposed reform-minded “benevolence,” including Sunday Schools, tract and Bible societies, and missions to the slaves. The articles of faith to which the Primitive Baptists adhered encouraged them to eschew possibilities for reform and thus missionary work. They generally discounted the idea that individuals could perfect themselves or that society could do so. Fiercely jealous of the congregational autonomy of their face-to-face faith communities, Boulware and Stephens, both

of whom farmed in rural Callaway County, fit the mold of the typical anti-missionary Baptist described by John Ayabe and Bertram Wyatt-Brown. That Boulware was relatively well educated, however, allowed him to become one of the leaders of the movement.⁵⁸

While they faced consistent opposition, the anti-mission Baptists established a solid foothold in Missouri shortly after the 1834 schism. Individual congregations and associations followed the lead of Boulware and Stephens and adopted anti-missionary commitments. Bethel church in Cape Girardeau, the oldest Baptist congregation still in existence in Missouri during the 1830s, became an anti-mission church, expelling any pro-missionary member.⁵⁹ One of the associations that Stephens was influential in persuading to join the anti-missionary movement was the Mt. Pleasant Association. Initially stretching from St Charles to St Joseph on opposite ends of Missouri, by the mid-1830s it was composed of churches primarily from the Boone's Lick in central Missouri. The anti-mission faction, however, was able to gain control of the association at its 1835 meeting and proceeded to elect a sympathetic moderator, Thomas Turner. With the association condemning the idea of missions, the missionary segment was forced to form a new association with the same name, which they did the next year. As a result of the anti-mission controversy, two Mt. Pleasant Associations continued to exist for decades after the 1835 meeting.⁶⁰

The anti-mission churches constituted a significant segment of the Baptists in Missouri during the 1830s. But they never experienced the growth that the missionary Baptists aligned with the General Association did. There were 4,972 Baptists in the state of Missouri in 1830. With 140,455 people counted in the 1830 federal census, the Baptists constituted about 3.5 percent of the Missouri population.⁶¹ Anti-missionary Bethel church added few members after the 1830s.⁶² The anti-mission upheaval led to an overall decrease in the numbers of Baptists by

1836. That year there were approximately 8,753 Baptists in Missouri. Of these, thirty-eight percent or 3,366 were in eighty anti-mission churches. The remaining 150 churches were made up of 5,357 regular Baptists.⁶³ ⁶⁴ By 1840, the effects of the anti-mission schism were still being felt as there were 10,958 members in the pews of the Baptist churches in Missouri, comprising 2.9 percent of the 383,702 people in the state.⁶⁵ By 1846, the anti-missionary Baptists had added thirty-eight churches and a thousand members. The regular Baptists, however, had added 142 new churches and 9,974 members, bringing their total to 15,331. The percentage of anti-missionary Baptists had shrunk to twenty-two percent of the total Baptist population in Missouri.⁶⁶

Pro- and anti-mission Baptists established their congregations in response to a pattern of development shaped by spreading settlement and increasing economic, ethnic, racial, and religious diversity in the state. Missouri featured a number of rapidly-growing river towns increasingly connected to the emerging national market economy. Included among these were St. Louis, Fayette in Howard County, Columbia in Boone County, and Jackson in Cape Girardeau County. Most sources indicate Baptist strength was solid in the leading slaveholding region of the state, the Boone's Lick counties along the Missouri River. For instance, the national American Baptist Home Missionary Society (ABHMS) financed the salary of Kemp Scott who organized twenty churches in the Saline County area during the 1830s.⁶⁷ Other parts of the state in the northeast and the west, which also had significant slave populations, also contained a large proportion of Baptists.⁶⁸ The denomination experienced a surge in the growth of new churches south of the Missouri River after about 1840.⁶⁹ In the last several decades of the antebellum period, many Scotch-Irish mountain people from the Upper South relocated to the Ozarks of southern Missouri. A substantial segment of those settling the Ozark highlands established

Baptist churches in established rural communities not as dependent on slavery or connected to the national market economy as were other regions of the state.⁷⁰

As indicated, the Missouri Baptists were far stronger in the rural districts of the state than they were in the more urban areas, such as St. Louis. Throughout the South, the Baptists struggled in the early 1800s to gain urban converts. The Baptists and Methodists had to overcome their rural origins in order to function in the growing towns and cities of the South. After 1830, the city of St. Louis became one of the largest cities in the West, with tens of thousands of new residents arriving from eastern cities. Beginning in the 1840s, furthermore, Irish and German immigrants flooded into the city. The explosive growth of St. Louis and its increasing number of Yankee merchants and German Catholic residents alienated Protestant arrivals from more rural precincts. Farming folk who embraced the Democratic-Republicanism of Jefferson and Jackson were suspicious of the merchants that predominated in the city.⁷¹ The growing anti-slavery sentiment of its residents only prompted rural Baptists to embrace their opposing views with greater energy. Although it was, by far, the most populous part of Missouri, St. Louis did not experience the Baptist growth of the rural regions of the state. This was a fact that was not lost on chronicler I.M. Allen. He noted that the first white Baptist church in the city did not have a large membership during the 1830s.⁷² Only a handful of Baptist churches existed at any given time in the city during the antebellum era. It was only over time during the late 1840s and 1850s that the Baptists were able to get clergy in urban pulpits, like St. Louis.⁷³

In rural settings across Missouri, both enslaved and freed African Americans comprised an important portion of the Baptist population in Missouri, although white Baptists limited their contributions before and after the schism. The slave population of 87,422 in 1850 had tripled since 1830. It, moreover, grew to 114,931 in 1860, but the overall population in Missouri had

grown to 1,182,012. The proportion of slaves in the overall population, nevertheless, fell to 12.8 percent in 1850 and to 9.7 percent in 1860.⁷⁴ In 1860 there were 39,902 slaves in the ten Boone's Lick counties. With 154,474 people, slaves were 25.8 percent of the populace in those counties, far more than the 9.7 percent in the state as a whole.⁷⁵ As Missouri had few plantations, there were very few African American congregations in Missouri prior to the Civil War. The vast majority of blacks worshiped with whites, albeit in segregated circumstances. Robert S. Duncan gives example of the segregated seating arrangements in these churches when he described his pastorate at Union, Missouri, about forty miles west of St. Louis. There, the church had an edifice that contained a gallery for the African American members to sit in during church services.⁷⁶ For congregations that had a larger number of black members, they were sometimes allowed to regularly meet apart from the white members under the instruction of their own preacher.

In the last two decades before secession, many bi-racial Baptist churches had grown sufficiently in the river towns of the Boone's Lick to permit them to host separate meetings of their black members.⁷⁷ First Baptist Church in the Cooper County town of Booneville offers such an example. A congregation in the central Missouri Boone's Lick, in 1859 it licensed a preacher referred to as Brother Grandison in the minutes to preach to the African American congregants twice a month on Sunday evenings. When the black members of the First Baptist Church left to form their own congregation after the Civil War in 1865 they had fifty-two members.⁷⁸

The urban setting of St. Louis facilitated the emergence of several independent African American Baptist churches. The First African Baptist Church was formed there in 1827 and was the largest Baptist church in the city during the 1830s. The congregation originated in the efforts of John Mason Peck and James Welch, who had also been sent west by the Triennial Baptist

Missionary Convention, to organize a Sunday-school for African Americans in St. Louis beginning in 1818. The school taught the scriptures along with reading and writing. Any slave with a certificate from their owner was allowed to attend, and the school soon averaged 90 to 100 students. Many in the class eventually became members of the First Baptist Church in St. Louis. In 1822 separate meetings were organized for the African American members under the supervision of the white church. When the First African Baptist Church became an independent body, a new brick church building was constructed to aid them in their worship. While Peck continued to periodically assist at the church, a free black minister who had been born a slave, John Berry Meachum, was its pastor until his death in 1854.⁷⁹ Meachum had assisted Peck with the school and was a successful carpenter and cooper when he was ordained in 1825.⁸⁰ As the church's membership grew to 800 by 1846, the Second Colored Baptist Church was formed in St. Louis. All of the nineteenth century African American Baptist churches in St. Louis were formed out of the First African Church.⁸¹ Duncan in his History of Missouri Baptists believed that other black Baptist churches existed prior to the Civil War in Hannibal, St. Joseph, Jefferson City and most likely Lexington. In all likelihood, however, there are others that he did not count.⁸²

Shortly after the Mexican War, Missouri Baptists reacted to the contentious public debate over the annexation of Texas by cutting ties with their northern anti-slavery brethren. Northerners did not want Texas to enter the union as a slave state after it achieved its independence from Mexico in 1836.⁸³ Many Missourians, at least in St. Louis, shared these sentiments. A group met in St Louis in April of 1844 that was vehemently opposed to the annexation of Texas, proclaiming that it would be an "ill-gotten slave state" if it joined the union.⁸⁴ Organizations such as the Anti-Texas Legion continued to stir anti-annexation forces

into the 1840s.⁸⁵ The majority of Missourians, however, were in favor of accepting Texas into the Union and the maintenance of slavery. The death of Whig president William Henry Harrison in 1841 and the elevation of Virginian John Tyler to the presidency led to the annexation of Texas as Tyler sought an issue with which he could build his presidency. The subsequent Mexican War only added to these tensions, and Missourians debated the future of slavery in the West.⁸⁶ Missouri Baptists severed their affiliations with national Baptist associations in 1846 over the increasingly vexing issue of slavery.

The vast majority of Baptists in Missouri shifted their allegiance to the Southern Baptist Convention on the heels of the national Baptist schism. Like other Baptists in the United States, those in Missouri were not part of a well-organized denomination. They sent delegates, often referred to as messengers, to a variety of bodies and associations, such as the Missouri General Association.⁸⁷ Notwithstanding these connections, Missouri Baptists did not engage in extensive debate over the national schism, as was the case in other parts of the country.⁸⁸ There was no Baptist newspaper successfully published for more than a few months in the state prior to the schism. But the General Association, however, recommended that its membership patronize the Louisville Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer, a newspaper that dealt extensively with the rupture.⁸⁹ The secular press, such as the leading paper in St. Louis, the Missouri Republican, also discussed the national schism within its pages. In May of 1845 as the Southern Baptist Convention was being formed, the Republican laid out the grievances of the convention delegates, demonstrating to many Missourians the importance of the question of slavery to the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention.⁹⁰

Missouri Baptists formally affiliated with the Southern Baptists in 1846, several months after the national break and the decision of the General Association to join the Southern Baptist

Convention. Congregational autonomy, which frontier isolation powerfully reinforced, blunted the power of national Baptist associations to impose antislavery ideas on Missouri Baptists. Although there were no Missouri delegates present at the meeting to form the Southern Baptist Convention, there was little disputation concerning the decision of the Missouri Baptist General Association to affiliate with the Southern Baptist Convention in August of 1846. At the state convention, held in the western town of Lexington, Samuel W. Lynd of the Second Baptist Church of St. Louis presented a committee report on possible affiliation with the Southern Baptist Convention to the entire association. Lynd expressed a gratitude for the previous alliance with the ABHMS and Triennial Convention. While regretting for the need for a division that Missouri Baptists had no control over, Lynd and his committee concluded that “this association will better harmonize with the views and the enterprise of the Southern Baptist Convention.”⁹¹ After he gave his report, the entire association voted unanimously to affiliate with the Southern Baptist Convention. Jeremiah B. Jeter of Virginia, who had argued for the necessity of a new Baptist association alongside the Alabama and Georgia Baptists, served as the pastor of the Second Baptist Church in St. Louis beginning in 1852 and thereby contributed to the building of the new denomination in the city.⁹²

Neither Missouri Baptists as a single association nor as individual congregations experienced significant divisions in 1846. The unanimity in voting to affiliate with the Southern Baptist Convention was followed by virtually all Missouri Baptists. These women and men were seemingly content with letting the General Association make the decision to switch its affiliation to the Southern Baptist Convention and did not mention the schism in their minutes. As was the case in other slave states, the six missionaries from the AHBMS that served in Missouri were withdrawn after the decision to affiliate with the Southern Baptist Convention took place, as was

the case throughout the southern areas that had missionaries. A single missionary, however, still labored among the fiercely anti-slavery Germans through 1852.⁹³ Only during the Civil War did ABHMS missionaries return to Missouri and the rest of the South in significant numbers.⁹⁴ There is no record of individual congregations voicing concern over the schism in Missouri until the Civil War. The only exception to this phenomenon may have been the African American Baptists in St. Louis, who were never represented at the Missouri Baptist General Association. None of the ministers in the black Baptist churches, furthermore, ever appear on the role of ministers from the General Association prior to the Civil War.⁹⁵ During and after the war, however, the affiliation with the Southern Baptist Convention did become problematic. Over time, like the rest of Missouri, the state's Baptists grew increasingly radical in their proslavery rhetoric, which an affiliation with the Southern Baptist Convention allowed them to maintain.

That most white Missouri Baptists were Democrats almost certainly played a role in their alignment with the Southern Baptist Convention. Available evidence suggests that the majority of Baptists in Missouri were Democrats. The opposition of that party to religious establishments, its Jeffersonian antecedents, and its increasing solicitude for the vote of common white men after the political ascendancy of Andrew Jackson in the mid-1820s made it their party of choice. While most Baptist leaders were Democrats, some, like William Pope Yeaman of St. Louis, were initially Whigs and only became Democrats after the collapse of the former party in the mid-1850s.⁹⁶ The political orientation of individual congregants certainly cannot be determined from the data that is available. But many of the rural Missouri counties that constituted Baptist strongholds were also primarily Democratic, which further lends credence to the claim that many, if not most, Baptists were affiliated with that party.⁹⁷

That white Missouri Baptists overwhelmingly supported slavery also predisposed them towards the Southern Baptist Convention. Their status as citizens of a western slave state and the political peculiarities of the state powerfully shaped their attitudes toward slavery. As westerners, many Missouri Baptists felt the need to form anti-missionary churches during the 1830s. While the Baptists in the rest of the South were interested in maintaining the acceptance of slavery within their church, the Missouri Baptists lived in a state that was fiercely critical of anyone seeking to destroy the peculiar institution. In the decades following the establishment of Baptist congregations in the state, members faced difficulties dealing with the slavery question. For William Pope Yeaman, the slavery question also played a significant role in helping the denomination to prosper in Missouri, a role that was not always positive.⁹⁸ Individual congregations, moreover, such as the Cold Water Church, registered the disdain that many Missouri Baptists felt towards anti-slavery theology.

The pro-slavery stance of the majority of Missouri Baptists explains the virtually unanimous support for the decision of denominational leaders in the state to affiliate with the Southern Baptist Convention. The vast majority of the Baptists in the state had no desire to remain affiliated with national organizations that condemned slavery. Missouri Baptists did not have an opportunity to send delegates to the convention in Augusta since Georgia was too far from Missouri for them to travel there in time.⁹⁹ This fact, not ambivalence to what was going on, explains Missouri's absence from the meeting as the details of the national schism were fully known by 1846 via Baptist and secular newspapers. Chroniclers William Pope Yeaman and Robert S. Duncan, moreover, hold that slavery was the reason that Missouri Baptists felt the need to undertake the schism and did not argue over it.¹⁰⁰ It could be asserted that the national schism was already complete by the time that Missouri acted in 1846 and there was little reason for the

state's Baptists to hold out or debate the schism in the state. But, the Missouri General Association choosing to align itself with the Southern Baptist Convention, when it could have remained an auxiliary to the northern organizations, argues to the fact that the unique aspects of Missouri Baptist development helped lead the denomination into the fold of the Southern Baptist Convention.

The loss of assistance from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and the transition to membership in the Southern Baptist Convention after the schism seemingly did little to limit the numbers of Missouri Baptists, who grew considerably in the years immediately after the schism. By 1851, Baptist numbers had increased almost 5,000 in five years to 24,205, which was 3.5 percent of Missouri's overall population of 682,044 in 1850. Baptist accommodations, recorded by the federal census starting in 1850, do give a more complete idea for the actual attendance of those congregations that had buildings. In 1850, they had room for 73,525 men and women in 300 churches, significantly higher than their actual membership. These accommodations enabled the Baptists to host 10.8 percent of Missouri's population if they so desired.¹⁰¹ The census figures do not take into account the Baptist congregations in Missouri that were either too small or too poor to have their own church building. The Baptists themselves reported 439 congregations in 1851, somewhat higher than the census number.¹⁰²

Missouri Baptists established themselves in almost every well-settled county in Missouri after the national schism. The post-schism growth, however, was confined primarily to erstwhile Baptist stronghold areas. Counties in the northwestern, northern and Ozark portions of the state that had not been heavily settled in 1850 were among the twenty-six counties that were without a Baptist church building. Many of the 300 church buildings in 1850 were heavily concentrated in Boone's Lick area in central Missouri. Two of the counties in that area of the state, Howard and

Callaway, were the sites for the first two meetings that led to the formation of the Missouri Baptist General Association. Callaway County, with eighteen Baptist churches was second only to neighboring Boone County with twenty-one Baptist churches. Besides the Boone's Lick, there were a number of Baptist churches in the northeastern counties along the Mississippi River. While Pike County had nine Baptist churches, the other counties in that region had only four to eight churches each, somewhat less than in the Boone's Lick. By 1850 there was some Baptist growth in the rapidly developing western part of the state; Clay County had eleven churches that year. The majority of the Baptist churches in the state were still in the Boone's Lick. Otherwise, there was some growth in the southwestern and southeastern parts of the state, equal to the presence of the Baptists in the western part of the state. While there were some Baptist churches established in the Ozarks, in 1850 the population was just beginning to reach substantial numbers in only some parts of that area.¹⁰³

Missouri Baptists struggled to recruit ministers for their growing number of congregations, which strengthened the relationship with the Southern Baptist Convention. Surviving lists of ministers strongly suggest that there were many more churches than available clergy. William Russell Wiggington, the son of a slaveholder and a minister in Boone County in the Boone's Lick, often expressed worries about the lack of ministers in his autobiography.¹⁰⁴ Some of these congregations were among the larger churches in the state. In 1850, Jeremiah Jeter, as the chairman of a General Association committee dealing with the relationship between the association and the southern convention, concluded that "the board cannot only furnish us money, but what is more important still, men to occupy many of the important towns in the state."¹⁰⁵ The rest of the association agreed with the committee report and proceeded to undertake a significant effort to work more closely with the Southern Baptist Convention.¹⁰⁶ The

Domestic Board of the convention, while not providing a minister for every church in Missouri that needed one, did send some help to Missouri as part of its overall evangelization efforts in the southwest. Prior to the schism, many southern states had little help from the northern-based national organizations, a problem that helped lead to the schism and the Southern Baptist Convention sought to fix in the 1840s and 1850s.¹⁰⁷

Many Missouri Baptists became far more involved with political issues after the schism than in the 1830s. Take, for example, the involvement of Baptist minister Samuel W. Lynd. While he had studied in Pennsylvania, Lynd lived in Maryland and Cincinnati before coming to Missouri in 1845.¹⁰⁸ In January of 1849 Lynd was on the move again as he left his post at the Second Baptist Church in St Louis to become president of the Western Baptist Theological Institute in Covington, Kentucky. While there were initial hopes that the Ohio and Kentucky Baptists that founded the institution could cooperate in the endeavor, it fell apart soon after Lynd's arrival. Southern trustees, including Lynd, attempted to gain control of the institute in order to eliminate many of the antislavery Ohioans, leading to the failure of the school.¹⁰⁹ Consider also the exploits of Baptist activist and editor William Crowell, who took over in 1851 the St. Louis Western Watchman, a Baptist newspaper established three years earlier with circulation not only in Missouri but in Illinois, Iowa and Kentucky.¹¹⁰ Under Crowell's editorship the paper took a decidedly anti-slavery stance as Missouri's ordeal over the extension of slavery into the West reached crisis proportions.¹¹¹

The increasing political activism of Baptist leaders such as Samuel W. Lynd and William Crowell came in response to the growing debate over the question of slavery's extension into the Mexican Cession and the new Territory of Kansas. United States Senator from Missouri Thomas Hart Benton became the focal point of controversy. In Benton's view, slavery had reached its

natural demise as modern technology was passing it by in favor of the industry of the North. He held that the South could eliminate the institution on its own if it was given the opportunity. Its expansion, however, was a futile endeavor that politicians used only for their political advantage.¹¹² For that reason, Benton began to vote against slavery's expansion. His brief flirtation with supporting Martin Van Buren, the Free Spoil candidate, in the 1848 presidential election enraged a number of politicians in the state. Claiborne Fox Jackson, a pro-slavery Democratic state senator from Howard County, was one of them. Jackson responded with a series of resolutions in the senate, penned by "Central Clique" leader Missouri Supreme Court Judge William Barclay Napton, denying the power of Congress to limit slavery in the West and "instructing" its United States senators to act accordingly.¹¹³ The Democratic Party in Missouri soon split into pro and anti-Benton factions, with the rabidly pro-slavery politicians joining the anti-Benton wing of the party. This upheaval cost Benton his Senate seat in 1851.¹¹⁴ Tensions in the western reaches of Missouri reached crisis proportions after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854), when anti-slavery settlers began arriving in the Territory of Kansas. In the period 1854-58, amid the infamous "Border War," pro-slavery Missouri vigilantes suppressed anti-slavery proclamations and routinely crossed into Kansas to break abolitionist presses at Lawrence and undercut the free-state movement.¹¹⁵

Amid the growing political upheaval over slavery, Missouri Baptists continued their antebellum expansion through the 1850s. Missouri remained overwhelmingly populated by rural residents, mostly southern whites and African Americans to the end of the antebellum period. From the time of statehood through 1860, the percentage of the working population who resided on farms, ranged, roughly, from 85% to 82%.¹¹⁶ In 1856, Baptists added 3,413 new women and men for a grand total of 31,358 members.¹¹⁷ Finally, on the eve of the Civil War, there were

42,080 Baptists in Missouri, 3.6 percent of the total state population of 1,182,012. This was a slight increase from the 1850 percentage total. There were 457 congregations reported in the census and 713 by the Baptists.¹¹⁸ The Baptists almost doubled their worship space, having 141,515 seats in their buildings, or enough for eleven percent of the state population. While the numbers of Baptist churches in the Boone's Lick and the northeastern parts of the state went up in the ten years prior to the Civil War, the Baptists also saw increases in the other areas of the state where they were showing some significant numbers in 1850. The Boone's Lick still had the largest concentrations of Baptists in Missouri, but the southwest, southeast, and western parts of the state featured substantially increased numbers of Baptists by the eve of the Civil War.¹¹⁹

The Methodist Schisms: National and State

The ties that bound both sections of the Methodist church began to unravel in the 1830s as slavery tore the national church asunder. Beginning in the 1770s, many Methodists, including Methodism's founder John Wesley and the leader of American Methodists Francis Asbury, began to speak out against slavery. As the nineteenth century dawned many Methodists began to soften their opposition to slavery in order to placate the South.¹²⁰ Several subordinate conferences, such as the Missouri Conference, established loopholes for ministers who became slaveholders, notwithstanding the fact that the Methodist Discipline said that any minister who was a slaveholder "shall forfeit his ministerial character in the church."¹²¹ By the late 1830s, northern Methodists had begun to harden their anti-slavery theology and presented a number of petitions to the General Conference to end the institution.¹²² In the two decades leading up to the Civil War, the Methodist Church moved from being an apolitical institution to one intensely involved in politics. The question of slavery and its future in the United States constituted the

most divisive political issue for the church, and many became increasingly unwilling to live with the status quo.¹²³

Tensions among Methodists over slavery began to spiral out of control at the 1844 General Conference held in New York City. The focal point was the case of Georgia Bishop James O. Andrew, who had become a slaveholder after his episcopal election.¹²⁴ While Andrew did not see his increasing entanglement with the institution as a problem, many northern Methodists viewed his slave ownership as unacceptable.¹²⁵ The General Conference soon deteriorated into a debate over whether or not Andrew could remain a bishop and, by extension, the future of slavery within the Methodist Church. After weeks of debate, the northerners, who held the majority of the votes, passed a resolution demanding that Andrew desist from his office until he manumitted his slaves. Southerners, who realized that the future of slavery in the Methodist church was now threatened, moved to divide important church property in preparation for the possible formation of a second southern General Conference. After some debate, a Plan of Separation to facilitate the possible split, subject to the approval of the annual conferences. A meeting was called in Louisville the following summer at which delegates proceed to establish a separate southern church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.¹²⁶ At its 1848 General Conference, however, the northern church repudiated the Plan of Separation, which its annual conferences never approved, thereby opening the door to its members to evangelize in slave states in the border regions of the South, such as Missouri. Southern Methodists also sent missionaries into northern Methodist enclaves.¹²⁷

The tensions between rural slaveholders and liberal-minded urbanites within Missouri Methodism that rent the denomination in the mid-1840s were hardly evident upon the initial entry of the denomination into Upper Louisiana. Like the Baptists, Missouri Methodists could

trace back their lineage in the state to John Clark, who preached from 1798 until he gradually left the denomination.¹²⁸ In 1806 John Travis, a South Carolinian of middling origins, was the first minister officially appointed to work in Missouri, although he eventually located eight years after beginning his ministry.¹²⁹ Perhaps the most influential minister in the early Methodist church in Missouri was Jesse Walker. Nineteenth century Methodist historian, Holland Nimmons McTyeire, referred to him as “a Church Extension Society within himself.”¹³⁰ Appointed to the Illinois Circuit, in the fall of 1806, Walker soon found himself assisting in Missouri by 1808.¹³¹ Like other Methodist ministers, and their Baptist counterparts, Walker joined with those from other denominations to organize camp meetings and revivals in the frontier precincts of Missouri beginning in the years following the War of 1812. In 1816, Walker was transferred to the Missouri district and assigned to St. Louis in 1821. After experiencing some initial setbacks, Walker was determined, according to Bishop Thomas A. Morris, “to go back and take St Louis.”¹³²

As did the Baptists, the Methodists found early Missouri a difficult environment in which to establish a foothold. John Peck explained that “the circuit preachers made several efforts to organize a class and bring St. Louis within the circuit, but without success.”¹³³ After these initial failures, Walker built a church building in St. Louis in 1821 at Fourth and Myrtle Streets, which eventually became the Fourth Street Methodist Church.¹³⁴ More early Methodists than Baptists were affluent, well-educated, and engaged directly in town-based economies. Consequently, these members rather quickly gathered the resources for church buildings in new settlements, especially in the river towns along the Boone’s Lick and in Mississippi River counties.¹³⁵

The Methodists built a substantial following in the state. But, as Methodist minister David Rice McAnally explained, the conference still experienced a multitude of troubles. Many

ministers did not want to be assigned to Missouri and chose to remain in either Illinois or Indiana when the conference was split. These men had been from Virginia and Kentucky and left those states originally to avoid slavery in states like Missouri. At the same time, the peoples that were settling the Missouri frontier were not inclined to participate in organized religion, which made the work of the Methodist ministers even more difficult.¹³⁶ Even after the turmoil of the War of 1812 concluded, the restless frontier ethos continued to hurt the Methodists' numbers. Even so, during the early 1820s the annual conference that oversaw Missouri was quite large, including not only the state of Missouri but Illinois, part of Indiana and the Arkansas Territory. Methodist minister Stephen R. Beggs describes in his memoir the long journeys that he and others undertook in order to reach their circuits as inordinately long, owing to the size of the conference.¹³⁷ Frontier conditions notwithstanding, new circuits sprouted up. While the Methodists had considerable strength in the market-oriented towns in the state, they also cultivated a large rural membership.¹³⁸ In 1825 the annual conference that embraced Missouri was restructured to center around the state as Illinois and Indiana were moved into the Illinois Annual Conference. The first meeting of the annual conference held after it was constricted to Missouri took place in 1826. There, the conference reported 2,821 members, including 339 African Americans, in twelve circuits and one station.¹³⁹ Two years later, in 1828, however, the membership had been reduced to 2,587 with only 308 African Americans. There were also two fewer circuits in Missouri.¹⁴⁰ The problems in the 1820s that McAnally mentioned seem to comport with the statistics. In 1830, nonetheless, the Missouri Methodists had finished two years of constant growth, adding an additional circuit from a year previous. There were 3,403 members including 325 African Americans, as most black Methodists worshiped in mixed race

churches.¹⁴¹ The Methodists had about 2.4 percent of the state's 140,455 people as members in 1830.¹⁴²

Missouri Methodists established their churches in virtually all of the towns and counties that underwent rapid settlement and development after the War of 1812. In the early years of Methodism in the state, the stronghold areas were around St. Louis, the Boone's Lick, Cape Girardeau in southeastern Missouri and the northeastern part of the state.¹⁴³ By 1830 there were 13,787 men and women that were part of forty-four circuits and stations in the Methodist Church of Missouri, including 1,224 blacks.¹⁴⁴ In 1840, Methodists made up approximately 3.6 percent of the overall Missouri population of 383,702, a significant percentage increase from a decade earlier.¹⁴⁵ The Methodists had expanded in their geographic strongholds during the 1830s. But by the mid-1840s there were also Methodist districts in southwestern Missouri around Springfield and in the northern part of the state.¹⁴⁶

The majority of Missouri Methodists were affiliated with the Democratic Party, while the more affluent congregants frequently sided with the Whigs. The Whig Party was, more or less, the political embodiment of middle-class ideology. Its members generally supported education reform, intersectional harmony that promoted free trade and prosperity, and state and federal funding for internal improvements, such as toll roads, railroads, and harbor clearance.¹⁴⁷ It is difficult to assess how adult white male members of specific congregations in Missouri voted. But many of the stronghold Methodist counties in the state garnered Democratic majorities through most of the antebellum era. Unlike the Baptists, however, the Methodists also had significant populations in areas that trended Whig, such as Marion County and St. Louis County until the mid-1830s, when Irish and German immigration began to generate a preponderance of Democrats in the city. More than a few middle-class Missourians were willing to join the

Methodists.¹⁴⁸ Not surprisingly affluent town-dwellers in the denomination found the pro-commercial policies of the Whigs attractive. Many Methodists were strong Democrats and, after the slavery issue came to dominate politics, fervently favored states' rights.¹⁴⁹ Other Methodists, nonetheless, remained active Whigs in one way or another through to the collapse of the party in the mid-1850s.¹⁵⁰ But even Whig Methodists supported the notion of a church that allowed for slaveholding.

The vast majority of Missouri Methodists wanted to be members of a church that tolerated slavery. For example, in 1835 the Missouri annual conference passed a resolution that condemned the abolitionist movement while supporting the removal of free blacks from the state.¹⁵¹ These same sentiments prompted many Methodists in Missouri eventually to support the MECS when it became impossible for them to avoid choosing sides in the schism. As many Missouri Methodists ministers were from the South, the majority of its members tended to express positions similar to other southern Methodists.¹⁵² There were some exceptions to this rule, as a significant minority of Methodists in Missouri continued to adhere to the northern church. For example, in 1840, Silas Comfort, a minister who was originally from New York State, was convicted by the annual conference for maladministration when he was stationed in St. Charles. He allowed a black member to testify in a church trial against a white man. Comfort soon returned to New York after his case.¹⁵³ Other Methodists were not from the South, but eventually supported the MECS as well. Almost immediately after the national schism both sides came into conflict as they became wedded to the ideas that dominated in their respective sections.

While Missouri Methodists favored the formation of the MECS, some regretted that such a step had seemed unavoidable. One of the Missouri delegates to the General Conference, James

Jamison, initially voted in favor of restricting slavery within the Methodist Church. But he was persuaded to change his mind. All four of the Missouri delegates, Jamison, William Redman, William Patton and Jerome C. Berryman, voted in the end with the southern delegates. These four men, moreover, voted in favor of the Plan of Separation. The Plan of Separation called for subordinate bodies to vote on which general conference they wanted to join upon the formation of a southern church.¹⁵⁴ The resolutions that the southern delegates had brought to the floor in New York were presented to the entire Missouri Annual Conference at the meeting of the Missouri Annual Conference in St. Louis in September of 1844. The conference placed them before a committee, including William Patton, which considered the matter for six days.¹⁵⁵ Patton's committee did not relish its task at it looked "with painful apprehension and disapproval, upon the agitation of slavery and abolition subject in our General Conference, and now behold . . . the disastrous results which it has brought about."¹⁵⁶ The committee, moreover, denounced the vote on Bishop Andrew's case, explaining "we are compelled to pronounce the proceedings of the late General Conference against Bishop Andrew, extra-judicial and oppressive."¹⁵⁷ Regardless of these misgivings, the Missouri Annual Conference adopted the report of the committee.¹⁵⁸ Many individuals and congregations in the Missouri Methodist Church, nonetheless, hoped that the northern Methodists would come to their senses and compromise with the South in order to avoid a schism.¹⁵⁹ The Fourth Street Church in St. Louis was one of these congregations, which approved a resolution in January of 1845 proclaiming "that a division of our Church is uncalled for, by any circumstances that have yet come to our knowledge."¹⁶⁰

During the Louisville conference that formed the new MECS, the Missouri delegates spoke out in favor of and voted for its formation.¹⁶¹ Wesley Browning, Joseph Boyle, John

Glanville, Jesse Green, Thomas Johnson, John H. Linn and Andrew Monroe represented Missouri.¹⁶² These delegates “showed their warm adherence to the South and assured the convention that, though they had been somewhat disturbed by internal divisions, in the end their people would go en masse with their Southern brethren.”¹⁶³ Notwithstanding the specter of division, Jesse Green, “claimed to understand the sentiments of the people; and he did believe that the interests of Methodism in that region [Missouri] required the separation.”¹⁶⁴ Another delegate to the conference in Louisville, Andrew Monroe, wrote a presiding elder in eastern Missouri, Jacob Lanius, as he looked forward to the formation of the MECS. Throughout his letter to Lanius, Monroe conveyed his shining optimism about the proceedings of the conference and the future formation of the MECS.¹⁶⁵ Missouri newspapers kept members of the Methodist church in the state and the general population abreast of the complexities of local reaction to the national schism.¹⁶⁶

While Methodist ministers in Missouri were not unanimous in their support of the MECS, the Missouri Annual Conference ultimately voted to join. The 1845 annual conference was held in Columbia to consider its affiliation with the MECS. Presiding at the conference was Bishop Joshua Soule, a northerner who had decided to side with the southern church.¹⁶⁷ One of the ministers of the Missouri Conference, Lorenzo Waugh, was an anti-slavery man and wanted to maintain the conference’s affiliation with the northern church that he himself eventually joined. Waugh was originally from what became the state of West Virginia and grew up in a poor family.¹⁶⁸ He explained that the desire of the ministers to join the MECS was apparent at the onset as Soule was complicit in this goal.¹⁶⁹ During debate over whether or not to join the MECS, Waugh claimed that the ministers most adamantly in favor of joining the MECS ensured that the floor time was rigged in their favor.¹⁷⁰ Given that by the order of Soule the ministers

could vote at any time to adhere to either of the general conferences, this fact seems plausible.¹⁷¹ Following the lead of the delegates that had attended the organizing conference in Louisville, the Missouri ministers voted eighty-four to thirteen to join the MECS.¹⁷² With that vote, the official apparatus of the Missouri Annual Conference would be affiliated with the MECS.

Under the Plan of Separation, each Methodist congregation in Missouri was authorized to decide whether it would join or part ways with the MECS. The vast majority of the congregations and quarterly conferences chose to follow the lead of the annual conference and affiliated with the new southern Methodist organization, regardless of some initial apprehensions. For example, the New Madrid Quarterly Conference in southeastern Missouri simply voted to join the MECS.¹⁷³ The Danville Quarterly Conference in east central Missouri did the same.¹⁷⁴ The St. Louis Fourth Street Church overcame its initial fears about leaving the unified Methodist Church and voted 206 to 44 in favor of joining the new southern church. The African Methodist Church on Green Street in St. Louis, however, voted to remain with the northern church, ushering in years of legal wrangling with the Fourth Street Church.¹⁷⁵

Not all the ministers overseeing individual congregations in Missouri were willing to side with the MECS, a persistent tendency that generated defections from the annual conference. The thirteen ministers who had voted for the Missouri Annual Conference to remain part of the MEC had to work within the MECS or leave the conference in hopes of finding a position in the North. According to Lorenzo Waugh and the Missouri Republican, James Jamison, the Missouri delegate to the General Conference in New York who did not entirely support the southern delegates, was the leader of the ministers who voted against the proposal for the annual conference to join the MECS.¹⁷⁶ Along with three other ministers who had fought against the MECS, Jamison left Missouri to join the MEC shortly after the vote.¹⁷⁷ It is not clear what

happened to any of the other three leaders, William S. McMurry, Thomas W. Chandler and Nathaniel Westerman, who all left the annual conference after 1845.¹⁷⁸ Other ministers, such as Joseph Williams, were listed in the Annals of Missouri Methodism as “going north.” Woodard explained that Williams was originally assigned to Keytesville in Chariton County in the northern part of the Boone’s Lick where he “was removed for meddling with slaves. (He was an abolitionist).”¹⁷⁹ Replacing him was William Caples, one of the rising stars of the Missouri Conference. He was able to repair the reputation of the church as he held “that Abolitionism was the deadliest sin in modern society.”¹⁸⁰ Though, a number of these men served the northern church in Missouri, such as Moses Evans.¹⁸¹ Another minister, Tennessean Abraham Still, who labored in northeastern Missouri prior to 1845, was the presiding elder in the western Platte Mission District when the northern annual conference was formed.¹⁸² Reuben Aldridge served under Still in the MEC after leaving the southern church after the schism.¹⁸³ Nelson Henry, a prominent minister in southeast Missouri, led a significant number of Methodists around Cape Girardeau into the northern church.¹⁸⁴

Lorenzo Waugh, however, was far less willing to move out of the state and fought the MECS through the late 1840s. He initially returned to his appointment on the Mill Creek Circuit.¹⁸⁵ Waugh’s refusal to join the MECS became well known to Thomas Wallace, the presiding elder of the Booneville Quarterly Conference. According to Waugh, at the second quarterly conference meeting in 1846 Wallace “announced that I [Waugh] must be put off from the circuit and my place supplied with a preacher who did belong to the M. E. Church South.”¹⁸⁶ Eventually the MECS expelled Waugh, but he continued his ministry under the auspices of the northern church.¹⁸⁷

Relations between the northern and southern Methodists in Missouri were anything but cordial as they finalized the state schism in the 1840s. The strife between contending Methodists did not dissipate once the actual division occurred. As was the case in the other Border States, both pro- and anti-slavery Methodist churches persisted in significant numbers. Each side fought one another for the souls and formal allegiance of ordinary women and men.¹⁸⁸ At their 1848 General Conference the MEC repudiated the Plan of Separation, which its annual conferences never approved in the first place, opening the door to its members to evangelize southern territories, such as Missouri.¹⁸⁹ The MECS General Conference, moreover, dispatched a delegate, Lovick Pierce, to the northern General Conference that year to establish fraternal relations between the two bodies. His offer was declined.¹⁹⁰ The resulting establishment of a northern annual conference in Missouri in 1848 helped lead to further conflict. Both the MEC and MECS annual conferences in Missouri engaged disputes over church property and waged verbal warfare with tracts and newspapers, and sometimes actual physical violence. The southern church, maintained its majority status in Missouri until the Civil War. The northern MEC, nevertheless, enjoyed some growth in St. Louis prior to the war.

Notwithstanding competition between the MEC and MECS, Methodists in Missouri extended their memberships in the few years following the 1846 schism. Missouri's southern Methodists organized into two annual conferences after 1846, the Missouri Conference, which was composed of congregations north of the Missouri River and the St. Louis Conference, which included the congregations south of the river. The southern Methodists had 21,362 members in their annual conferences, organized into 107 circuits and stations in 1850.¹⁹¹ German Methodists were allowed to join the northern Methodist Illinois Annual Conference instead of remaining with the South.¹⁹² Within the Illinois Annual Conference there were 1,185 German members in

eleven missions within Missouri. Adding to that, the northern Methodist annual conference had 4,283 members, including 191 African Americans organized in 35 circuits and missions.¹⁹³ The total of 26,830 Missouri Methodists constituted approximately 3.9 percent of the general population of 682,044. As the 1850 census did include accommodation numbers, 60,944 Missourians, or 8.9 percent of the total state population, could fit within the pews of the Methodist church.¹⁹⁴

By 1850, Missouri Methodists had established congregations in pre-schism strongholds and in more recently opened areas of settlement. In 1850, Methodism increased its presence in the Mississippi River counties, including St Louis County and in those of the central Boone's Lick. The Methodists established new churches in the northern and western plains regions of the state.¹⁹⁵ And they continued to have better success than the Baptists at building up new churches in market-oriented towns, those that cropped up along the rivers and those that arose, simply, as county seats far away from the major rivers.¹⁹⁶ The northern Methodists, on the other hand, flourished in areas of the state where pro-slavery sentiment was less profound.¹⁹⁷ German Methodists, also under the auspices of the North, were located throughout Missouri, along an axis that stretched from St. Louis to Weston. This included certain areas in the central parts of the state where there was a strong German presence.¹⁹⁸

Methodist numbers continued to increase in both the northern and southern Missouri churches during the 1850s. In that decade, the Methodists moved into some of the more recently settled areas in the western and southern areas of the state.¹⁹⁹ As both churches struggled for members they were able to build their infrastructures. There were 48,158 members in the southern annual conferences organized into 159 circuits and stations by 1860. That number included 3,974 African Americans.²⁰⁰ The northern Methodists continued to be constrained

largely to the St. Louis area, but they added some churches in the western parts of the state, doubling their influence over the decade.²⁰¹ The northern Methodists had 5,169 members towards the end of the 1850s within thirty-seven circuits and stations along with twenty-six buildings and eleven parsonages.²⁰² The German district, which was a part of the Illinois Annual Conference, had 645 members organized into nine circuits with nineteen buildings reported along with three parsonages.²⁰³ These German circuits were scattered throughout west and central Missouri.²⁰⁴ In all, the 53,972 Methodists in Missouri were 4.6 percent of the 1,182,012 people in the state. The 1860 census demonstrated that the Missouri Methodists had increased their seating capacity to 150,160 in 526 church buildings.²⁰⁵ Almost thirteen percent of Missouri's population could be seated at one time, a significant increase from 1850. Although the census statistics are far from perfect, it can be assumed that 481 of these buildings were under the control of the MECS while MEC congregations worshiped at the remaining forty-five. While the MEC had made significant progress in Missouri after the division, they were a mere drop in the bucket compared to the MECS. Even so, those who adhered to the MEC persisted in attempting to garner new membership from the opposition to the end of the antebellum period.²⁰⁶

Much more than their Baptist counterparts, southern and northern Methodists succeeded in establishing congregations in growing towns. While it is difficult to ascertain with certainty, the segment of the Methodist population in the state that resided in sizable towns quite likely exceeded, to some extent, the percentage of the total population of Missouri that did so. The percentage of individuals employed in commerce and manufacturing, in contrast to those employed in agriculture, ranged from 13% in 1840 to 18% in 1860. The town-dwelling work force comprised artisans, mechanics, and unskilled laborers – including variously whites, free blacks, and slaves. The river towns, including St. Louis, remained through the antebellum period

entrepôts for the trans-shipment of finished goods into the hinterlands and agricultural products and raw materials to distant ports rather than centers of mechanized manufacturing. Artisans and mechanics generally remained independent operators. Through to at least 1860, the towns of Missouri and the City of St. Louis did not see the emergence of a coherent industrial working class or the rise of industrial labor unionism. Under the circumstances, and notwithstanding their limited numbers, middle-class merchants, professionals, business men and their families tended to dominate most town-dwelling Methodist congregations.²⁰⁷

The southern Methodists in Missouri consolidated their gains and increased their influence through the 1850s. As had been the case from the earliest years of settlement, many newly established Methodist congregations could not immediately construct church buildings. After 1846, the majority of the new buildings enumerated in the census were constructed under the auspices of the MECS. The southern Methodists, furthermore, were able to gain title to most of the Methodist church property in the state after 1846. This forced northern Methodists to spend several years building up a new infrastructure in the state. The loss of the northern Methodists, furthermore, did not significantly undercut their membership base. In 1850, the General Conference of the MECS chose Centenary Methodist Church in St. Louis host its meeting. At that convention, elite ministers of the MECS Missouri annual conferences assumed a more active role in leading the denomination.²⁰⁸ The Missouri Republican, presented extensive coverage of the conference.²⁰⁹ A series of revivals in the 1850s brought in new pro-slavery members. Denominational papers, such as the St. Louis Christian Advocate, regularly included notices for revival meetings throughout the state. Dozens and sometimes hundreds of men and women converted to Methodism during these events. A revival in New Madrid County, situated in the southeastern part of the state, drew 371 new members in 1853. The New Madrid Methodist

congregation that organized this revival grew large enough in two years to sustain the building of a separate church for the African American members of the congregation, albeit under the control of the parent white church.²¹⁰ While the Methodist's second book publishing concern in the west was eventually located in Nashville, St. Louis received serious consideration for the honor.²¹¹ Those who pledged loyalty to the MECS made successful efforts to acquire new members to the end of the antebellum period.²¹² The prestige of the MECS in Missouri rapidly increased among Methodists, and a number of congregations grew rapidly during the 1850s.

The Presbyterian Schisms: National and State

The theological controversy among the Presbyterians that led to their initial antebellum schism turned powerfully on the question of how a person moved from an unregenerate or unsaved state into a regenerate or saved condition. The conservative Presbyterians that comprised the Old School by the early nineteenth century embraced a traditional form of predestination inherent to Calvinism: Adam's sin was transmitted to humanity, and thus they viewed humankind as totally corrupt. These Presbyterians had little interest in reform movements since, as a matter of faith at least, the individual could do nothing alone to advance his or her quest for salvation. On the other hand, the more liberal New School Presbyterians held that the individual was responsible for his or her own sins, given that Adam's original sin was not supposed to have been transmitted to the rest of humanity. Individuals could thus choose freely to change for the better, as could, by implication, societies in general. For that reason, New School Presbyterians were more inclined to participate in missionary efforts such as those carried out by the American Home Missionary Society and social reforms, including abolition. Many conservative Presbyterians saw these "heterodox ideas" seeping into their church as a

result of the 1801 Act of Union, a cooperative agreement between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists to evangelize the vast American frontier.²¹³

Finalized in 1838, the Presbyterian schism began at the 1837 meeting of the General Assembly and the annual national Presbyterian meeting. After failing to expel the New School synods during previous general assemblies, the Old School had a majority in 1837 and proclaimed the Act of Union “an unconstitutional act on the part of the assembly.”²¹⁴ While a committee composed of both factions could not determine which synods were “tainted” with New School theology, the entire General Assembly voted to expel the Synods of Utica, Geneva and Genesee in New York State, and the Synod of Western Reserve in Ohio.²¹⁵ The excluded synods, however, soon attempted to rejoin the national body. A convention of those synods at Auburn, New York in 1837 decried as illegal the decision of the General Assembly to exclude them.²¹⁶ They attempted to rejoin the body the next year on these grounds. The Old School moderator of the General Assembly, however, refused to recognize the commissioners from the four synods. Joined by almost half of the Presbyterian Church, these synods met in a separate General Assembly, finalizing the denominational fracture on a national level. There were now competing Old and New School general assemblies, each claiming to be the legitimate body.²¹⁷

In 1838 Presbyterians North and South chose sides and aligned themselves with either the Old School or New School general assemblies. As many areas in the North were not religiously homogeneous, new synods and presbyteries were created to serve the excluded members of both schools. Some congregations, while expressing outrage over the actions of the 1837 General Assembly, remained with the Old School.²¹⁸ In the South, that coalition continued to maintain its southern majority as it remained silent on the issue of slavery. As the northern New School was composed of a significant number of abolitionists, southern Presbyterians took the position that

they could never align themselves with that body. These men and women, moreover, did not actually subscribe to the liberal theology and reform commitments of the New School.

Exceptional were the Presbyterians in Kentucky as a minority there inclined toward New School understandings, leaving the majority with the rest of the church. There arose, nevertheless, a significant New School minority in the South even though eighty-five percent of New School members resided in the North. Some southerners attempted to adopt the liberal theology of the New School. But most southerners who sided with that wing of the Presbyterian Church did so not for theological reasons but only because they believed the four synods that had been expelled peremptorily in 1837 should have received a fair trial in the General Assembly. Most of the New School presbyteries in the South, in fact, had more in common with the southern Old School than their fellow New School Presbyterians in the North. Remarkably, many of these members remained in the New School until that branch of the denomination took a harsher stance against slavery during the 1850s.²¹⁹

The decentralized constitution of the New School General Assembly ensured that the national church would not officially condemn slavery and thus compel southern synods to withdraw. Many New School members could not bring themselves to expel the southern synods in light of what they perceived to have been their illegal expulsion by the Old School in 1837. A substantial number of New School Presbyterians, nonetheless, worked against their southern ideological brethren. Amid the turmoil among abolitionists over the victory of Democrat James Buchanan in the 1856 presidential election, the New School General Assembly officially condemned slavery in 1857. This forced the southern synods to form their own organization, the United Synod of the South in the months afterwards.²²⁰

The commercially-oriented river towns that shaped radically divergent attitudes toward slavery among Missouri Presbyterians were well established upon their entry into the territory. Presbyterianism reached Missouri when the polity was already well on its way to statehood. The first large-scale Presbyterian preaching in Missouri occurred in St. Louis in 1814. Two eastern Bible agents, Samuel J. Mills and Daniel Smith, visited the city. Salmon Giddings, who arrived in Missouri two years later, played an instrumental role in bringing Presbyterianism to the territory. Mills had trained at Andover Theological Seminary, where he was ordained as a Congregationalist minister. In 1812, he was commissioned as a missionary by the Connecticut and Massachusetts Missionary Societies. Smith received his orders from the Philadelphia Bible and Missionary Society. Like Mills, Giddings was an agent of the Connecticut Missionary Society, an organization functioning under the 1801 Act of Union, an agreement between the Congregationalists and Presbyterians to cooperate in order to more effectively evangelize the frontier.²²¹ The missionary society created by the act was, in many ways, a forerunner of the American Home Missionary Society (AHMS) and evangelical bond of union organizations like the American Tract Society. The missionary society sought to place literature in the hands of the frontier laity while sending educated ministers to evangelize them.²²² Giddings soon founded at least twelve churches in Missouri in St. Louis, St. Charles, and Washington counties from 1816 to 1818.²²³ Another missionary from the Connecticut Missionary Society, Timothy Flint, arrived in St. Louis in 1816. Unlike Giddings, Flint himself was not as well equipped for evangelization on the frontier and remained controversial throughout his career in Missouri.²²⁴

In the 1820s and 1830s, Presbyterians continued to be most successful in establishing congregations in the growing towns of Missouri. To some extent, this was a consequence of the organizational benefits stemming from the Act of Union. But it was also a result of the

distinctive ability of Presbyterian ministers and laity to draw the support of well-educated, urbane, middle class individuals.²²⁵ For instance, Hannibal, a town on the Mississippi River in Marion County, was one of the leading strongholds of the river-based market economy in the state. While Hannibal only had fifty residents in 1832, David Nelson established a Presbyterian Church there in that year that drew the support of the leading men in the growing town.²²⁶ Generally speaking, Presbyterians hoped to find or establish enclaves on the frontier and then built churches around these members, as Nelson did in Hannibal. While Presbyterians were successful in towns like St. Louis and Hannibal, they lagged behind the other evangelical denominations in the rural areas of the state. Adding to their numerical inferiority relative to the Methodists and Baptists in these places was the fact that the Presbyterians did not begin to establish their numbers in Missouri until almost two decades after their chief competitors. In any case, urban growth played a significant role in the gradual expansion of the church throughout the years leading up to the schism. The church constructed strongholds largely in the growing towns along the Mississippi River and along the Boone's Lick.²²⁷

By the 1830s Missouri Presbyterians had begun to chafe under the direction of the national church. Both the Missouri and national church leadership were beset with theological disputes resulting from the liberal renovations of New School Presbyterians, including their increasing emphasis on missions, benevolent initiatives, and social reform. Missouri Presbyterians, furthermore, were dependent on the AHMS for their church to grow. For this reason, they generally favored a continued affiliation with it regardless of increasingly contentious views within the church over growing criticism of slavery. Missouri Presbyterians often lamented what they perceived to be the usurpation by the Presbyterian General Assembly of missionary planning and activities.²²⁸

The Presbyterian Church in Missouri during the 1820s and early 1830s dealt with a variety of problems arising from the distinctive frontier situation in which it thrived and the growing criticism of slavery within the national church.²²⁹ Many rank and file Missouri Presbyterians held the view that the church should respect the property rights of slave holders. But the Missouri church was often desperate for ministers. Out of necessity, many New Englanders were employed to fill the state's pulpits. But these ministers nurtured profoundly anti-slavery views. Among these were David Nelson and Elijah Lovejoy, a minister from Maine who had finished at Princeton Theological Seminary.²³⁰

David Nelson's Marion College was soon thrust into the debate over slavery.²³¹ Nelson had adopted an ambitious plan to expand the college. The school enrolled eighty students in its first year, an impressive number for the time. While twenty-eight of the students were from Missouri, most were not. Nelson and co-founder William Muldrow recruited the first class largely from the vicinity of the college.²³² In recruiting visits to the East, Nelson also obtained eastern academics to constitute the entire faculty during his tenure as president. All of these men came from outside of Missouri.²³³

The increasing importance of slavery within the Presbyterian Church in Missouri forced changes at Marion College. Initially, local church members and residents tolerated the eastern faculty members at Marion, which remained under the auspices of the St. Louis Presbytery. But when it became apparent that many of faculty held anti-slavery ideas, Missouri Presbyterians purged the college of the pro-slavery professors.²³⁴ The turning point that led to their ouster occurred in 1835. That year the college hosted the Missouri Synod's annual meeting. Elijah Lovejoy, who was at then a Presbyterian minister and editor of the St. Louis Observer, offered a resolution at the meeting for the church officially to condemn the institution of slavery.

Lovejoy's resolutions had passed unanimously after he had offered them at the meeting of the St Louis Presbytery at Union, Missouri, earlier in the month.²³⁵ In a letter to his brother Joseph, Lovejoy recounted the ease with which his resolutions had passed at the St. Louis meeting when he explained that "we had a most harmonious session."²³⁶ The fallout from these resolutions and anti-slavery sentiment in Missouri would force the changes at Marion.

Unlike the presbytery meeting in Union, the synod meeting at Marion College was anything but harmonious. The faculty was receptive to Lovejoy's ideas, and many copies of his anti-slavery paper, the St. Louis Observer, were circulated at the convention. But the vast majority of Missouri Presbyterians recoiled at his formal resolutions against slavery.²³⁷ Recent events had increased pro-slavery sentiments in Missouri after five slaves had attempted to escape to Illinois a few weeks prior to the synod meeting. That a pro-slavery mob had accused two whites of aiding in the slaves' escape made matters worse.²³⁸ Lovejoy himself explained that, as a result of this event, "the excitement was rising in St Louis."²³⁹ Given that those residing outside of the St. Louis area had no interest in Lovejoy's anti-slavery ideas, his resolutions were doomed. Lovejoy recalled a lay elder who rose to speak at the meeting "full of excitement and alarm, and fuss, about slavery."²⁴⁰ According to Lovejoy, the elder argued that "we must disavow and denounce Abolitionism, and everything like it, or the Presbyterian Church would be destroyed in Missouri."²⁴¹ After a long debate, Lovejoy lost, with the elders having overwhelmed the ministers who were the strength of the anti-slavery coalition. Lovejoy, who felt betrayed over the loss of his resolutions, felt worse as he watched two New England ministers vote with the majority against him.²⁴² In the end, the synod voted to decry the evils of slavery and urge that slaveholders educate their slaves. At the same time, however, they proclaimed that

we view with the deepest feelings of pain and regret the unjustified course pursued by the Abolitionists on the subject of domestic Slavery, believing as we

do that the immediate freedom of all the Slaves in the country in their present condition would not only be ruinous to the same but also exceedingly injurious to themselves.²⁴³

To eliminate anti-slavery theology at Marion College, Missouri, Presbyterians forced the school to make several changes in late 1835. By the fall of that year, Nelson had been pressured to resign his presidency, and William Potts, a minister from St. Louis, had replaced him. A moderate pro-slavery man, Potts was a long-time friend of Lovejoy and also his former pastor. Notwithstanding the special connection, he had firmly cautioned Lovejoy to cease his public embrace of anti-slavery theology the year he took over the presidency of Marion, a warning that portended Lovejoy's 1837 murder at the hands of a pro-slavery mob in Alton, Illinois.²⁴⁴ In Potts' inaugural address, he alluded to the recent upheaval at the college over the slavery issue. He explained that "it is a principle of the mind to be jealous and watchful, where we love the most . . . it is natural that we should shudder at every wave of commotion that passes over the land."²⁴⁵ He still, nonetheless, hoped for the continued prosperity of the college as he explained that "we start in our own present labor, with a desire to benefit our fellow-citizens, and to be useful to the world."²⁴⁶

The efforts of Missouri Presbyterians to rid Marion College of its anti-slavery theological influences were evident in the roster of the college. Some of Nelson's friends, such as William Muldrow, remained as trustees. But the executive committee of the college was soon composed entirely of Presbyterians with conservative orientations.²⁴⁷ Forty-one of the seventy students attending the college in 1838 had been born in Missouri. Of the twenty-nine non-Missouri students, only eight were from non-slaveholding states, and six of the eight were in the higher ranks of the student body.²⁴⁸ While there were seventy students in 1838, the Panic of 1837 eventually finished the school, which had been experiencing financial troubles and increasingly

gone into debt to stay afloat.²⁴⁹ One student pointed out in 1840 that the economic difficulties the college experienced in the years following the Panic sabotaged his planned trip home to Nashville. According to him, “the College could not advance, or rather pay what would be necessary for my expenses.”²⁵⁰ Mired in debt, Marion College began its final term in May of 1843, with the property thereafter sold to the Missouri Masons.²⁵¹

Presbyterians across Missouri realized as never before the potentially divisive impact of New School Presbyterianism during the 1836 General Assembly meeting in Pittsburgh, which focused on the trial of well-known New School minister Albert Barnes. He had been convicted on ten charges of heresy for his liberal theological views by the Old School dominated Synod of Philadelphia and appealed the decision to General Assembly.²⁵² Presbyterians throughout the nation had followed the trial closely with great circumspection. Among those who had read about the case closely was Missourian Hiram Chamberlain, a commissioner (delegate) to the General Assembly who had been instructed by the Presbytery of Missouri not to vote on Barnes’ appeal.²⁵³ Chamberlain and Elijah Lovejoy, along with the Illinois commissioners and other three Missouri delegates, George Kerr, William Cochran and James Mahan, arrived late. Prior to their coming, the Old School had held a majority. But they lost their advantage when the Missouri and Illinois commissioners, except for Chamberlain, voted with the New School on the Barnes issue. The commissioners, including Barnes, unanimously voted with the New School on all other issues.²⁵⁴ Lovejoy had been looking forward to defending Barnes at the meeting of the General Assembly, which he viewed as an opportunity to demonstrate his knowledge of the case and his liberal theological views.²⁵⁵ Lovejoy publically condemned Chamberlain for helping to squelch Barnes’ appeal in his St. Louis Observer. Chamberlain himself felt compelled a few days later to

defend himself in the Missouri Republican.²⁵⁶ Another supporter of Chamberlain, writing under the pseudonym “TRUTH,” reiterated Chamberlain’s defense a few days later.²⁵⁷

The decisive role of the Missouri and Illinois delegates at the 1836 meeting of the General Assembly prompted Old School leaders to maximize support from slave state delegations in order to keep control of the national body. After the 1836 meeting, Old School leaders realized that the late-arriving delegates from Missouri and Illinois had given the New School a majority. Only with the southern delegates on their side could the Old School retain that advantage for themselves. Consequently, they soon decided to garner that support by guaranteeing their silence on the question of slavery. This commitment contrasted vividly with the stance taken by the New School, which included numerous members who fully embraced the abolitionist movement.²⁵⁸

While the Missouri delegations to the General Assembly redoubled their efforts to avoid open schism, they ultimately broke with that body when the national break came in 1838. Prior to the 1837 meeting, the Old School ministers called a series of conventions to ensure further their majority. Many southern commissioners attended the final meeting days before the General Assembly, the Philadelphia Convention of Ministers and Ruling Elders. But the Missouri Presbytery sent no delegates, unwilling to split the denomination over theology.²⁵⁹ Old School promises to remain silent on the slavery issue were not sufficient to placate the three ministers who represented Missouri as commissioners. Along with Chamberlain, William Wisner represented St. Louis and Harvey Hays St. Charles. Many, if not most, of the ministers in St. Louis and St. Charles held liberal views and opposed slavery. Consequently, Wisner and Hays were unmoved by the Old School promises of silence on slavery.²⁶⁰ The Missouri commissioners also protested what they saw as the illegal actions of the Old School. The Presbytery of Missouri

did not formally unite with the New School like the other synods. But their commissioners left the General Assembly meeting in 1838 in protest with the commissioners of the other southern presbyteries.²⁶¹

Many Missouri Presbyterians did not believe that the theological issues that drove the national schism were worth splitting the Presbyterian Church and worked to keep the unity of their synod. Hiram Chamberlain represented parts of the state outside of the Mississippi River counties that were more inclined toward the viewpoints of the Old School. He had, in fact, wavered in 1836 on the Barnes issue, reflecting the divisiveness in his presbytery. Fearing the specter of division in 1837, he had voted entirely with the New School faction, along the other two Missouri commissioners. Pastor of the St. Louis First Presbyterian Church and trustee of Marion College Artemas Bullard summed up the viewpoint of the majority of Missouri Presbyterians on the national schism when he proclaimed “Let’s stop this at the River.”²⁶² Other Missouri Presbyterian ministers, such as John Leighton, agreed. He explained in retrospect that the theological disputes were not as crucial to the church as many of the national leaders believed. Leighton argued that “those stirring men found theological debate altogether compatible with their pioneer work in the churches, and, were it proper, the names of many might be cited who were noted both in controversy and in evangelism.”²⁶³ Timothy Hill, a fiercely anti-slavery minister who joined the New School Synod after coming to Missouri in 1845, expressed similar sentiments when he asserted that if “the question had been left to the interests and wishes of the church . . . there would have been no division.”²⁶⁴ In the years following the national schism, Missouri Presbyterians attempted to send representatives to both the meeting of the Old School General Assembly as well as to the one put together by the

expelled New School synods.²⁶⁵ Both general assemblies subsequently attempted to claim the Synod of Missouri, but to little avail for several years.²⁶⁶

In the three years following the national schism, Old School and New School Presbyterians in Missouri maintained comparable numbers. In 1841 there were 2,212 members in fifty-four Old School congregations served by twenty-six ministers.²⁶⁷ The numbers reported to the New School General Assembly from Missouri are not complete as the Presbytery of Missouri reported nothing beyond the fact that it had seven ministers. If the numbers from the other two presbyteries are used, there were 1,923 New School Presbyterians in Missouri. The records do not indicate the number of ministers or congregations.²⁶⁸ From these reports, both the Old and New Schools had similar membership in Missouri after the schism. The Old School, nevertheless, seemingly had more ministers and congregations. Taken together, the two Presbyterian branches in Missouri had a total of 4,135 members or about one percent of the total state population in 1840. While African American members were included in these statistics, there were few black members of the Missouri Presbyterian Church and no independent congregations prior to the Civil War. Nationally, Presbyterianism had difficulty attracting black members since it generally appealed to more well-to-do Americans.²⁶⁹

By 1840, Missouri Presbyterians found it virtually impossible to maintain their unity. The Old School General Assembly was growing uneasy with the infrequency of regular meetings among members of the synod. It could not reach a quorum and even contemplated uniting with the Synod of Illinois.²⁷⁰ In October 1840, the St. Charles Presbytery met and became the first to split between the contending factions. The ministers voted nine to five in favor of the Old School. The Reverend William Cochran explained, however, that the New School still held the majority in many congregations within the St. Charles Presbytery. Cochran concluded that “the

Old School was a small body with but few feeble churches, all in infancy.”²⁷¹ The General Assembly officially received the Missouri New School Synod in 1843.²⁷²

The close linkage of the New School Synod in Missouri with anti-slavery theology soon spurred contention among the Presbyterian leadership in the state. The conflict arising over Nelson and Marion College, Lovejoy’s controversial anti-slavery resolutions, and his eventual expulsion from St. Louis reflected this trend. By the time Missouri Presbyterians formally divided in the early 1840s, many Presbyterians in the state faced the disturbing fact that the New School General Assembly contained a sizeable contingent of abolitionists. It was then almost impossible for conservative Missouri Presbyterians to side with that body or rest easy with New School ministers in their own synod.²⁷³ Missouri Presbyterians on both sides of the aisle attempted to mitigate their differences whenever possible. In a few short years, however, the slavery issue began seriously to cripple the New School in Missouri.²⁷⁴ Two pamphlets from 1842 demonstrate the extent to which anti-slavery agitation disrupted the body. In an attempt to take the slavery issue from the Old School, the New School circulated a pamphlet entitled A Declaration of Sentiments made by the Synod of Missouri, which argued that the Old School was “claiming and exercising the right to agitate the church upon the subject.”²⁷⁵ The members of the Old School felt compelled to print a retraction, which was entitled Review of “A Declaration of Sentiments made by the Synod of Missouri.” The authors of this pamphlet vehemently denied the rumors of anti-slavery agitation among the Old School leadership, illustrating how even the appearance of a connection with the anti-slavery movement was becoming anathema in Missouri.

The division between Old School and New School presbyteries in Missouri produced a struggle for possession of church records. While the New School supporters lost control of the St

Charles Presbytery, they still succeeded in seizing its organizational documents, deeds and bequests, correspondence, business records, and meeting minutes. The moderator of the presbytery, New Englander Ezra Styles Ely, ordered the clerk, Allen Gallaher, another New School man, to gather the records. Gallaher followed Ely's order and "with one sweep of his arm gathered all books . . . holding them tightly in his arms and with a great hickory staff in his hands and a countenance fierce enough for a fight."²⁷⁶ A number of Presbyterians subsequently attested to the fact that the St. Charles Presbytery was not the only one to experience conflict of this kind. The Old School leaders, however, were able to gain possession of the records in the Missouri Synod and the rest of the Missouri Presbyteries.²⁷⁷

Individual congregations in Missouri divided into Old School and New School camps, frequently in ways that involved heated contention between congregants and ministers. The leading members of the St. Charles Presbyterian Church voted twenty-nine to fourteen to align itself with the Old School. Its pastor, James Gallaher, however, sided with the New School and led a minority faction out of the church. In November 1842, Gallaher and this minority formed the Constitution Presbyterian Church and constructed a building shortly thereafter.²⁷⁸ The Bellevue Presbyterian Church in the southeastern Ozark Mountains town of Caledonia experienced a similar rupture. Their pastor, Thomas Donnell, wanted to join the New School notwithstanding the fact that the rest of the congregation voted in favor of joining the Old School. But Donnell finally relented and went with his congregation to the Old School to avoid a rift.²⁷⁹ The congregants of the Hannibal Presbyterian Church, however, split as did those in the St. Charles Church.²⁸⁰ Other congregations, such as the Dardenne Presbyterian Church in St. Charles County, voted almost unanimously to remain with the Old School.²⁸¹

Through the 1840s, Old School Presbyterians in Missouri were able to organize their efforts more effectively than their New School counterparts. Old School leaders in the state denounced the AHMS because of its efforts to control missionary activity in the national Presbyterian Church. But the Old School Missouri Synod organized a number of missionary efforts on its own beginning in the 1840s. These missions persistently suffered from a shortage of funds. But by working with the General Assembly in many instances, Old School Presbyterians continued to evangelize with considerable success across the state.²⁸² While the Old School General Assembly continued to refrain from denouncing slavery, this muted Old School criticism of New School abolitionists. New School Presbyterians, nonetheless, in the state saw their growth founder in the 1840s. Shortly after the Missouri schism, New School leaders made several concerted attempts to increase the strength of its synod. Artemus Bullard, influential pastor of the St. Louis First Presbyterian Church, suggested in 1844 that the synod establish a fund to help needy churches raise money for their own buildings. The synod went along with Bullard's suggestion.²⁸³ The New School understood the importance of missionary activity and sought to use Bullard's fund to further their evangelical efforts. Many of New School churches, especially the newer ones in the western part of the state, were small and dependent on monies from either the AHMS or the Missouri Home Missionary Society.²⁸⁴ While prospects for growth had seemed good for the New School in the early 1840s, problems began to develop after 1846 because of its relationship with the AHMS. The society was often tardy in paying the salaries of its missionaries. More problematic, the AHMS grew increasingly unwilling to send missionaries to a state like Missouri where slaveholders were congregational members in good standing. This was so notwithstanding the fact that in newly settled areas, especially in the western areas of the state, Presbyterians opposed to slavery often had little choice but to join Old

School churches and sit through services with slaveholders. At the same time, slaveholders sometimes were forced to do the same with anti-slavery New School congregations.²⁸⁵

Old School Presbyterians were able to increase their numbers in Missouri far more effectively than those adhering to the New School in the 1840s. By 1850, the Old School had 4,568 members in eighty-three congregations with fifty ministers.²⁸⁶ In less than ten years they had more than doubled their membership, adding twenty-nine new churches. The New School Presbyterians, on the other hand, counted 2,199 members in fifty-two churches with forty-two ministers. While there were 6,767 Presbyterians in Missouri who comprised just less than one percent of the Missouri population, the New School Presbyterians had only nominally expanded their numbers from earlier in the decade.²⁸⁷ The 1850 census suggests that they had approximately fifty-four church buildings with room for 18,241 people or 2.7 percent of the total state population, significantly more than their membership.²⁸⁸ Missouri's Presbyterian congregations were concentrated in the major towns situated along the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. And it seems quite likely that middle-class merchants, professionals, business men and their families, with and without slaves, constituted a substantially larger segment of these societies than was the case with town-dwelling Methodist congregations. Presbyterian societies adhering both to the New School and Old School thrived in St. Louis and St. Charles counties and in some of the towns developing in the western and northeastern plains. There were a handful of New School congregations in the river-towns situated along the Boone's Lick, but the Old School tended to dominate that region of the state. While the Old School held a monopoly in the few large towns that cropped up in the Ozark highlands of southeastern Missouri, the New School had developed a number of congregations in Springfield and other towns in the southwestern part of the state.²⁸⁹

Through the 1850s, the increasingly strident anti-slavery proclamations of the New School General Assembly produced a shuffling of membership among Missouri Presbyterians that further depleted the ranks of New School congregations in the state. Shortly after southern New School synods established the United Synod of the South in 1857 in reaction to the strong anti-slavery stance of the General Assembly, the Missouri New School synod and most of the New School presbyteries voted to remain independent of the new pro-slavery organization. But there was certainly no consensus on the question. In 1859 the Presbytery of Osage voted to join the United Synod after having delayed this decision over two years to allow individual congregants time to decide whether to remain with the New School or join the Old School. In 1857 the AHMS stopped sending missionaries to churches with slaveholders, further damaging fledgling New School congregations in the state. In 1859, what remained of the Missouri New School synod rejoined the New School General Assembly.²⁹⁰ By the late 1850s, most of the women and men who joined or remained in the New School synod in Missouri tolerated or even embraced the New School's anti-slavery message. After having reunited with the New School General Assembly, the Missouri New School synod was without not only the Osage Presbytery but a number of individuals who had decided to join Old School congregations in the late 1850s. The Old School was willing to receive any Presbyterians who were willing to abandon New School anti-slavery ideas.²⁹¹ This had been, in fact, the offer of the Old School Presbyterians in Missouri throughout the existence of New School churches in the state.²⁹² By 1860, Old School and New School denominations had constructed 127 church buildings with 47,050 seating accommodations.²⁹³ Old School Presbyterians had managed to continue increasing their numbers through the last decade of the antebellum period. In that year, there were 6,939 Old School Presbyterians in Missouri in 137 congregations within two synods.²⁹⁴ On the other hand, the New

School had only 776 members in eight congregations. They retained thirteen ministers, but three appear to have resided outside the state.²⁹⁵

Both Old School and New School adherents in Missouri remained desperate for ministers to fill the pulpits in newly-organized congregations, both in areas where they remained strong and in those they sought to evangelize. Through to the eve of the Civil War, Old School Presbyterians continued to build up congregations in St. Louis, newly-established county seats in the hinterlands, and river towns enmeshed in the emerging national market economy. They had particular success along the Boone's Lick and in the towns of newly-settled western Missouri near the border with Kansas, such as Liberty, Clay County, and Platte City, Platte County. The New School certainly lost membership in Missouri through the last decade of the antebellum period, and its congregations remained scattered thinly across the state. But they retained considerable strength in St. Louis and St. Charles and the rapidly growing town of Springfield. These were places where urbane, critical thinking about the morality of slavery could continue to flourish. In St. Louis, New School ministers and congregants openly remained committed to anti-slavery politics. Many remained affiliated with the Whig party and then sided with the Unionist liberal Democrats that coalesced in St. Louis after the demise of the Whigs in the mid-1850s.²⁹⁶

Conclusions

The development of Missouri as a trans-Mississippi Southwest Border State colonized by benevolent-minded Northeastern missionaries provided the basic demographic context spurring ecclesiastical ruptures over slavery in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches of the state beginning in the late 1830s. Evangelical contention over slavery in Missouri in the period 1837-1860 resulted from the expansion of the "Benevolent Empire" into a slaveholding polity situated in the trans-Mississippi Southwest. Equally important, these schisms were most virulent

when they pitted town-dwelling, middle-class Methodists and Presbyterians who supported slavery against their more liberal-minded, anti-slavery urban counterparts who had immigrated to the frontier from the Northeast and from Europe.

As was the case with their Methodist and Presbyterian counterparts, Baptist missionaries from further east first planted the seeds of their denomination in Upper Louisiana and Missouri. With most of those who joined the Baptists having migrated from the Upper South, the vast majority of Baptist congregations arose in largely rural villages and agricultural settlements. A number of bi-racial Baptist churches appeared in the rapidly-growing towns along the two major rivers of the state, and the distinctive urban setting of St. Louis produced a handful of independent African American Baptist churches. But in most cases, frontier isolation and institutional primitivism reinforced Baptist tradition that preserved congregational autonomy within voluntary and loosely-organized national associations. This situation rendered ineffectual the efforts of national Baptist associations headquartered in the Northeast to promote antislavery religious beliefs among their largely rural congregants in Missouri. The predominant rural residency, southern origins, and Democratic Party allegiance of most Missouri Baptists kept the denomination unified in the face of the national Baptist schism over slavery in 1845. Virtually all of its congregations abandoned the national Baptist associations and joined the pro-slavery Southern Baptist Convention (Southern Baptist Convention) at that time. Resentment of rising abolitionism in the city of St. Louis thereafter, however, powerfully spurred most rural white Baptists in the state to redouble their commitments to slavery.

Similarly to the Baptist and Presbyterian churches, the Methodist Episcopal Church worked informally through multi-denominational societies to advance the Benevolent Empire in the trans-Mississippi Southwest. But leaders of the Methodist Church effectively dispatched

missionaries to the West through the instrumentality of the MEC General Conference, its traditional national ecclesiastical structure that comprised conferences and circuits. With largely the same southern origins as the Baptists, most of the Methodists in Missouri were deeply committed to maintaining African American bondage. Yet Methodist congregations arose more evenly in both town and country than did Baptist societies, with a number of bi-racial Methodist churches arising in both contexts. Some white Baptists affiliated with the Democrat Party, while those with more middle-class orientations sided with the Whig party during its several decades of existence in the state. In keeping with the tradition by which local societies integrated themselves with the MEC General Conference, most Missouri Methodists joined the pro-slavery MECS on the heels of the national Methodist division in 1844. A substantial minority remained or later sided with the general conference of the MEC, especially those residing in St. Louis. Some congregations, however, ruptured over the question, leaving contending factions to reorganize and affiliate with the general conference of their choice. As was the case with the Presbyterians, the cosmopolitan environment of the city, which drew liberal-minded Northerners and European immigrants, provide fertile ground for the persistence of northern Methodism through to the end of the anti-bellum period.

As the efforts of the Reverend David Nelson demonstrate quite well, no denomination was more organized and systematic about dispatching missionaries to the trans-Mississippi Southwest than the Presbyterian Church. Allied initially with the Congregational Church of New England, the Presbyterians played the most aggressive role in organizing the multi-denominational effort to expand the Benevolent Empire into the trans-Mississippi West. Initially, at least, new Presbyterian congregations integrated themselves, in the traditional manner, with the Presbyterian General Assembly, the national ecclesiastical body comprising synods and

presbyteries that was dominated by clerics who preferred not to disrupt the institution of slavery in the South. Because of the distinctive tendency of Presbyterian churches to draw more well-to-do white members than ordinary ones, including slaveholders, African American membership remained minimal to the end of the antebellum period. As was the case with Methodist Church members, some Presbyterians supported the Democratic Party, but those with more commercial interests and middle-class bearings sided with the Whigs before the collapse of this party in the mid-1850s. By the early 1830s, the missionary efforts of Presbyterian ministers affiliated with the New School faction of the denomination facilitated the spread of its anti-slavery beliefs mostly among congregations situated in the growing towns of the state, including St. Louis before and after its emergence as a major city. The incongruence of this liberal insurgency with a largely rural white population committed to slavery and the conservative orientation of most town-dwelling Presbyterians drove a minority of anti-slavery Presbyterian congregations and presbyteries to separate from the Old School General Assembly in the early 1840s and affiliate with the newly-created New School General Assembly. Congregations divided over the question fragmented, leaving disparate factions to reorganize and affiliate with one of the larger ecclesiastical bodies. The cosmopolitan cultural setting in the rapidly-growing metropolis of St. Louis thereafter provided fertile ground for the anti-slavery message of the New School adherents and fueled continuing strife with their Old School counterparts through 1860.

Notes

-
- ¹ J. J. Marks, "Some Personal Remembrances of Rev. David Nelson," Minutes of the Semi-Centennial Session of the Session of the Synod of Missouri (St. Louis, 1882), 77.
- ² Ibid.
- ³ Ibid., 77-78.
- ⁴ Ibid., 75.
- ⁵ Ibid., 78.
- ⁶ Howard I. McKee, "The Marion College Episode in Northeast Missouri History," Missouri Historical Review, 36, no. 3 (April 1942): 299.
- ⁷ R. L. Holcombe, History of Marion County, Missouri, Written and Compiled from the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources. . . (St. Louis, 1884), 228-33.
- ⁸ Marks, "Personal Remembrances," 78.
- ⁹ Holcombe, History of Marion County, 230; Theodore Dwight Weld, American Slavery as it is: Testimony of A Thousand Witnesses (New York, 1839), 191.
- ¹⁰ Marks, "Personal Remembrances," 78.
- ¹¹ Ibid., 79. Kimball eventually donated land to the Mission Institute, an abolitionist institution in the Quincy area that Nelson would work at as well. Oleta Prinsloo, "The Case of the 'Died-In-The-Wool Abolitionists' in Mark Twain Country, Marion County, Missouri: An Examination of a Slaveholders Community's Response to Radical Abolitionism in the 1830s and 1840s" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Missouri, 2003), 199-201.
- ¹² Marks, "Personal Remembrances," 79.
- ¹³ Ibid., 79-81; Weld, American Slavery, 86.
- ¹⁴ Platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society and its Auxiliaries (New York, 1855), 3; David Grimsted, American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 3, 12-13, 17-18; Robert Peirce Forbes, The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 249-55.
- ¹⁵ Henry Tanner, The Martyrdom of Lovejoy: An Account of the Life, Trials and Perils of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy. . . (Chicago, 1881; reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1971), 55-58.
- ¹⁶ Richard Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 22-30.
- ¹⁷ Forbes, Missouri Compromise, 10, 35-40; William E. Foley, The Genesis of Missouri: From Wilderness Outpost to Statehood (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1989), 293-97.
- ¹⁸ Ezra H. Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church 2 vols., Rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1864), 2:435-37.
- ¹⁹ Richard J. Callahan, ed., New Territories, New Perspectives: The Religious Impact of the Louisiana Purchase (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 3.

²⁰ Mintz, Moralists and Modernizers, p. 53.

²¹ Steven Mintz, Moralists & Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers (Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 51, et seq.

²² Ibid. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "The Antimission Movement in the Jacksonian South: A Study in Regional Folk Culture," The Journal of Southern History, 36, no. 4 (November, 1970): 502-8.

²³ John A Ayabe, "Evangelicals and the Antimission Crisis: A Study of Religious Identity in the Central Mississippi Valley, 1820-1840," (Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, 2007), 2-6, 160-70, 185, 206-7. Although he does not deal heavily with non-religious concerns, Ayabe's dissertation is most likely the best work on the mission controversy in Missouri. Larry E. Davis's article on the dispute over missions in Missouri does not extensively analyze the controversy. Its strength is in its ability to spell out the major players in the Missouri. Larry E. Davis, "'A Malignant Warfare': The Anti-Mission Controversy in Missouri, 1818-1840 and Beyond," American Baptist Quarterly, 23, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 7-33.

²⁴ Moon describes the origins and activities of the Yellow River Primitive Baptist Association in Georgia during the period 1820-1840. He maintains that anti-mission sentiment among church members in the association drew on the key themes of modernity and republicanism and that contending understandings of benevolent missions and related activities produced schisms. David T. Moon, Jr., "Benevolence, Modernity, and Republicanism on the Georgia Frontier: The Yellow River Primitive Baptist Association, 1820-1840" Viewpoints: Georgia Baptist History 20 (2006): 37-58.

²⁵ For a discussion of the Missouri Baptists see R. S. Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists (Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1934) and J. Gordon Kingsley, Frontiers: The Story of the Missouri Baptist Convention (Jefferson City: Missouri Baptist Historical Commission, 1983). Frank Tucker gives a detailed history of the Missouri Methodists Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939 (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966). A discussion of the Missouri Methodist schism can be found in Hauser Winter, "The Division in Missouri Methodism in 1845," Missouri Historical Review, 37, no. 4 (October 1942) discusses the schism in the state. Finally, on the Presbyterians, see Joseph H. Hall, Presbyterian Conflict and Resolution on the Missouri Frontier. Lewiston/Queenston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1987).

²⁶ The Triennial Convention was created in order to pool Baptist resources for foreign missions. In the months leading up to its establishment, two prominent Baptist missionaries, Luther Rice and Adoniram Judson, had been attempting to raise funds for a trip Judson would soon make to India. With their help, several leading Baptists formed the convention in 1814. Located in Philadelphia it was eventually relocated to Boston. George Winfred Hervey, The Story of Baptist Missions in Foreign Lands: From the Time of Carey to the Present Date (New York, 1884), 190-94. The American Baptist Publication Society became the American Baptist Board of Educational Ministries in 1888.

²⁷ Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 169; William Warren Sweet, "Some Significant Factors in American Church History" Journal of Religion, 7, no. 1 (January 1927): 13-15; Donald G.

Mathews, Religion in the Old South, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 161-62; Mitchell Snay, Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 134-38; and John McKivigan, The War Against Pro-Slavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Churches, 1830-1865 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), 87. By the onset of the Civil War the Disciples of Christ were a strong denomination in Border States like Missouri. The Disciples requirement of only a brief statement of faith from its members, however, made it impossible for them to require a strong stance either in favor or against slavery. At the same time, according to David T. Bailey, the Disciples continued to remain in a 1820s mindset in that they did not strongly embrace the notions of reform that led to problems in the other evangelical churches over slavery. The Disciples lax organizational structure moreover, one that drew in a lot of former Anti-Missionary Baptists, also allowed them to avoid schism David T. Bailey, Shadow on the Church: Southwestern Evangelical Religion and the Issue of Slavery, 1783-1860 (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985), 176-77.

²⁸ Emmet Starr, History of the Cherokee Indians and Their Legends and Folk Lore (Oklahoma City, 1921), 256-57.

²⁹ S. G. Hillyer, Reminiscences of Georgia Baptists (Atlanta, 1902), 137-38; Robert G. Gardner, A Decade of Debate and Division: Georgia Baptists and the Formation of the Southern Baptist Convention (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995), 12-13; Mathews, Religion in the Old South, 162 and Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 169. In some sources the “s” is left off Reeves’ name. Northern Baptists dominated the ABHMS, regardless of the fact that there was greater Baptist strength in the South. Even with this northern dominance, there was no major dispute in the ABHMS over slavery until the mid-1840s.

³⁰ Mary Burnham Putnam, The Baptists and Slavery, 1840-1845 (Ann Arbor, Mi, 1913), 27-30.

³¹ Peter G. Mode, Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History (Menasha, Wisconsin: The Collegiate Press, 1921), 589; A. James Fuller, Chaplain to the Confederacy: Basil Manly and Baptist Life in the Old South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 219-27.

³² Arthur Warren Smith, “Early Baptist Missionary Leaders: I. Daniel Sharp,” The Baptist Missionary Magazine for September 1909, 89, no. 9 (September 1909): 337-8; Mode, Sourcebook, 591; Putnam, Baptists and Slavery, 16-17. Sharp, however, was not in favor of agitation against slavery.

³³ George B. Taylor, The Life and Times of James B. Taylor (Philadelphia, 1872), 151-52; Barnes, Southern Baptist Convention, 27.

³⁴ R. S. Duncan, A History of the Baptists in Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1888), 116.

³⁵ Many Baptists in the South wanted to wait for the Triennial Convention and the ABHMS to meet as a body before forming a new convention, even with Jeter and Taylor’s campaign. These Baptists, while upset over the actions of the national bodies, urged caution rather than fomenting a split. The editor of the Louisville Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer was among this number, hoping “our brethren in the South will pause and seek to God for wisdom before they take the

step, in this matter, which cannot be retracted.” While Missouri Baptists certainly read the paper, there is no evidence whether or not Missouri Baptists wanted to delay the schism because of the paper. Other Baptists, such as those on the board of the Tennessee Baptist Foreign Mission Society, wanted to stop the schism as well. Like the other southerners who opposed the Southern Baptist Convention’s formation, they contended that the decision of Sharp and the acting board still had to be confirmed by the entire Triennial Convention at its meeting in 1847. They held if the convention as a whole would adhere to the neutral policy on slavery that was put into force at the 1844 meeting, it was certain that the problem would be resolved. No separate organization would be needed in this case. Finally, it was argued by both papers that southwestern states, including Missouri, would not have time to send delegates to the proposed meeting in Georgia. Barnes, Southern Baptist Convention, 28, 311-13.

³⁶ Jeremiah Bell Jeter, Recollections of a Long Life (Richmond, 1891), 236; Barnes, Southern Baptist Convention, 28-32.

³⁷ Goen, Broken Churches, 112-16.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 92; Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1950), 309-10; Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 169.

³⁹ Gardner, Decade of Debate and Division, 50-51.

⁴⁰ Alberta D. Shipley and David O. Shipley, A History of Black Baptists in Missouri: National Baptist Convention, USA, INC. (Kansas City, Mo: Missionary Baptist State Convention of Missouri, 1976), 30-34.

⁴¹ Although he did not live in Missouri, Lyman Beecher was ardently concerned over the presence of Catholicism in Missouri and the West. He believed that the religious conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism would determine the success of the region. Lyman Beecher, A Plea for the West (Cincinnati, 1835), 12, 71.

⁴² Luther A. Weigle, The Pageant of America: American Idealism 10 vols. (New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 1928), 10:240.

⁴³ Only when he was about to return to his home across the Mississippi River in New Design, Illinois did Truteau order Clark to leave the territory. Clark was, however, only able to make occasional trips into Missouri. A native of Scotland, he had been drawn to John Wesley’s teaching but eventually left the Methodist Church, becoming a Baptist. A Brief Chronicle of the Rise and Progress of Baptist Development in Saint Louis Association from 1800-1922 (St. Louis, 1922), 19; Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 46-49. Born in Lincoln County in eastern Missouri, Duncan served in a number of pastorates in the central and eastern part of the state. He was also the Missouri agent for the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention during the 1870s and 1880s. Both his parents were from Virginia and were the children of successful small-time planters. Duncan’s father was a Baptist minister and schoolteacher. R. S. Duncan, The Life Story of R. S. Duncan (Kansas City, 1910), 15-22.

⁴⁴ Foley, Genesis of Missouri, 1, 26-31, 78-80.

⁴⁵ Dick Steward, Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 1-5, 94-99.

⁴⁶ Missouri's position at the western edge of the United States contributed to a decline in the number of people moving into the territory after 1810. There was a realistic fear that the British were going to destabilize the region and many settlers were apprehensive about moving into Missouri. The subsequent War of 1812 with Britain confirmed many of these fears and further hurt the overall development of the Missouri Territory. Foley, Genesis of Missouri, 198-99.

⁴⁷ Rufus Babcock, ed., Forty Years of Pioneer Life, Memoir of John Mason Peck D. D. Edited from His Journals and Correspondence by Rufus Babcock (Philadelphia, 1864; reprint, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965), 146.

⁴⁸ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 57.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 54; Joseph P. Leman, "The Jefferson-Leman Anti-Slavery Pact," Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society for the Year 1908 (Springfield, 1909), 75-76.

⁵⁰ Babcock, Memoir, 146. Peck's family was one of the exceptions, emigrating not from Tennessee or Kentucky but from Connecticut in 1817.

⁵¹ Foley, Genesis of Missouri, 238.

⁵² Christopher Phillips, Missouri's Confederate: Claiborne Fox Jackson and the Creation of Southern Identity in the Border West (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 22-25. For the purposes of this study, the ten counties in the Boone's Lick are Boone, Callaway, Carroll, Chariton, Clay, Cooper, Howard, Lafayette, Ray and Saline.

⁵³ Federal Census, Statistical View, 17901830, p. 27; University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Center, "Historical Census Browser," (2004, accessed 19 June, 2009); available from <<http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/histcensus/index.html>>.

⁵⁴ St. Louis Enquirer, 20 October 1819. A debate over the future of slavery within the United States, nevertheless, was touched off when Missouri sent its application for statehood to Congress in 1819. James Tallmadge, a New York congressman, introduced an amendment barring slaves from being brought into Missouri and manumitting all slaves at the age of twenty-five. With the proposed Tallmadge Amendment many southerners vehemently defended the institution during the debate over Missouri's admission to the union. This debate left many of Missouri's citizens very sensitized to national efforts to ban slavery not only during the fight over Missouri's statehood but for decades to come. By March of 1820 the essence of the Missouri Compromise was put into place when Congress determined that slavery would not be allowed in the territory from the Louisiana Purchase north of Missouri's southern border. As President James Monroe signed the Missouri Enabling Act, the citizens in the territory began to draft a constitution. Though, with their fears over the restriction of slavery, the Missouri delegates put forth a conservative document that restricted free blacks from entering the state. The constitution did grant universal manhood suffrage, but established a strong judiciary that was appointed for life and large salaries for the governor and judges. The renewed national debate that took place after Missouri's Constitution was forwarded to Congress with the provision restricting free blacks threatened further national problems. A second compromise was put in place, however, that restricted citizenship for African Americans and allowed for

Missouri's statehood. Foley, Genesis of Missouri, 293-97; Forbes, Missouri Compromise, 10, 35-40.

⁵⁵ Foley, Genesis of Missouri, 338-39 and Semi-Centennial Memorial Missouri Baptist General Association . . . (Columbia, Mo, 1885), 5. According to Duncan all but two of these leaders, who were from St. Charles County (west of St. Louis) were from the Baptist strongholds either in the Callaway County area or the northeastern part of the state. The local associations were groups of multiple churches that met either quarterly or annually for fellowship to accomplish any tasks that the individual churches could not complete individually. The associations held no power over the member churches. While the congregations would elect official messengers, if they could physically make the meeting, the associational meetings were open to the public as multiple sermons would be preached on each of the two or three days the association was in session. The Missouri Baptist General Association was composed of delegates selected by subordinate congregations. In many cases, however, the annual meetings of the General Association in the nineteenth century were sparsely attended with about fifty to seventy-five delegates. Similar to the local associations, there were public portions of the state-wide meetings. J. Gordon Kingsley, Frontiers: The Story of the Missouri Baptist Convention (Jefferson City: Missouri Baptist Historical Commission, 1983), 31-32, 35.

⁵⁶ Some historians have suggested that the anti-mission sentiment was always present in the minds of some Missouri Baptists and originated earlier than the late 1820s. Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists, 153.

⁵⁷ William Pope Yeaman, A History of the Missouri Baptist General Association (Columbia, Mo, 1899), 48-49. Originally from Kentucky, Yeaman began work in Missouri in 1870 and was an influential Baptist minister in the state.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*; Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 294. Boulware was born in Virginia but immigrated to Kentucky when he was four. He came to Missouri after becoming a Baptist minister. Settling two miles north of Fulton, in Callaway County, he continued his ministry primarily in the vicinity of his home at the Liberty, Providence and Middle River churches. Boulware continuously rejected the advances of Missouri society that were taking place around him, condemning what he referred to as "the new order of things." While in Kentucky, Boulware demonstrated his dislike for city life when he declined pastorates in Henderson, Georgetown and Cincinnati. Making his living as a farmer, he never accepted any money for his work as a minister. Stephens was born in North Carolina in 1787 and like Boulware, moved to Kentucky in 1815. Coming to Missouri in 1820, Stephens settled in Callaway County as well, becoming the minister at Cedar Creek. Also similar to Boulware, Stephens refused to accept any salary for his work throughout his career. *Ibid.*, 293-94, 98; George R. Howell and Jonathan Tenney, eds., Bi-Centennial History of Albany: History of the County of Albany, N.Y., From 1609 to 1886 (New York, 1886), 231.

⁵⁹ Missouri Historical Records Survey, Bethel Church Book: Minutes of the Proceedings of the Bethel Church, 1806-1867 (St. Louis, 1940), 53-54; Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists, 155-56.

⁶⁰ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 160-67.

⁶¹ I. M. Allen, The United States Baptist Annual Register, For 1832 (Philadelphia, 1833), 178. By 1830, the number of slaves had risen to 25,096 out of a total population of 140,455 with the percentage of slaves going from 15.3 to 17.9 percent. With their congregational autonomy, Baptist churches did not always report accurate figures, if they reported anything at all. For example, Allen, antebellum national Baptist statistician, when detailing Baptists in Missouri from 1834-35, agreed with this notion. His count revealed 7,831 Baptists in Missouri. But shortly after presenting the membership table in his Register he concluded that there were approximately 9,000 Baptists in the state. The Missouri General Association did not include a list of member churches within their minutes. During the 1840s they did provide lists of ministers, but since there were far more congregations than ministers, those lists only tell so much. The lists, moreover, do not always include the first names or location of the ministers and were discontinued after 1854. University of Virginia, “Historical Census Browser;” I. M. Allen, The Triennial Baptist Register. No. 2- 1836 (Philadelphia, 1836), 279; Minutes of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the General Association of United Baptists of Missouri, 1854.

⁶² Missouri Historical Records Survey, Bethel Church Book, 82; Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists, 155. Bethel church ceased to exist after 1867.

⁶³ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 930; Allen, Triennial Baptist Register, 1836, 279.

⁶⁴ It should be kept in mind that the membership numbers do not tell the whole story of religious participation. During the antebellum era the standards to join and remain a member of an evangelical church were somewhat high, leading to fewer men and women counted as actual members and children were often not counted. Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, “Turning Pews Into People, Estimating 19th Century Church Membership,” Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 25, no. 2 (April 1986): 180-86.

⁶⁵ The fact that the church books for individual congregations are full of members being disciplined for not adhering to this standard helps prove this point, as some potential members might not wanted to live up to the high standards of membership. Baptist Home Missions in North America . . . 1832-1882 (New York, 1883), 554-55; University of Virginia, “Historical Census Browser.”

⁶⁶ Although some of the descendants of the group still exist today, there are no more statistics provided for anti-missionary Baptists in Missouri after the Civil War. In 1876 it was estimated that there were 40,000 anti-missionary Baptists in the United States, less than half of the total Missouri Baptist population. The lack of proselytizing by the anti-mission Baptists had clearly taken its toll by the 1870s. Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 930-31.

⁶⁷ D. C. Bolton, History of the Baptists of Saline County Missouri (1911), 7.

⁶⁸ Allen, Triennial Baptist Register, 274-78; Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 57.

⁶⁹ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 57.

⁷⁰ Foley, Genesis of Missouri, 242-45.

⁷¹ Jeffrey S. Adler, Yankee Merchants and the Making of the Urban West: The Rise and Fall of Antebellum St. Louis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 13-17.

⁷² Baptist Development in St. Louis Association, 19-21; Allen, Triennial Baptist Register, 274.

⁷³ E. Brooks Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860 (Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1978), 15-23.

⁷⁴ Part of the reason for the decrease in the slave population's percentage in the overall population was that slavery was declining in importance in commercial centers such as St. Louis. University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser." In 1830 St. Louis County had 2,796 slaves out of a total population of 14,125. By 1860 the slave population had risen to 4,376 but the overall population was 190,524. Slavery was far from dead in Missouri, as slave prices continued to be quite high. R. Douglas Hurt, Agriculture and Slavery in Missouri's Little Dixie (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 219.

⁷⁵ The Boone's Lick ratio was similar to Tennessee and larger than Maryland and Kentucky. As slavery was still strong in other areas of the state, Missourians continued react strongly in favor of it through the Civil War. University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser;" Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 183-85; Douglas, Agriculture and Slavery, 273.

⁷⁶ Duncan, Life Story of Duncan, 151-52.

⁷⁷ Larry M. James, "Biracial Fellowship in Antebellum Baptist Churches," Boles, Masters and Slaves, 55.

⁷⁸ Mrs. Farrie L. Cole Sr., Mrs. Alvin E. Phillips, Mrs. Royce Moser, Mrs. Clarence M. Brumback, Mrs. Virginia Bailey and Mrs. A. P. Reichel, A History of the Lamine Baptist Association of Missouri 1872-1971 (Stover, Mo, 1971), 76-77.

⁷⁹ Allen, Triennial Baptist Register, 279-80; Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 755-6; Babcock, Forty Years of Pioneer Life, 90, 271. Peck was still affiliated with the ABHMS and worked in Missouri after the schism although he had relocated to Illinois.

⁸⁰ Dennis L. Durst, "The Reverend John Berry Meachum (1789-1854) of St. Louis: Prophet and Entrepreneurial Black Educator in Historiographical Perspective," The North Star: A Journal of African American Religious History, 7, no. 2, (Spring 2004): 42-43.

⁸¹ Babcock, Forty Years of Pioneer Life, 343-44; Baptist Home Missions, 302-6.

⁸² Allen, Triennial Baptist Register, 279-80; Duncan, History of Missouri Baptists, 756-57. Born a slave in Virginia Meachum was able to purchase his freedom. After moving to Kentucky and marrying a slave, Meachum followed her to Missouri when her owner moved. Working as a carpenter and a cooper, he was able to build a substantial fortune and was worth an estimated 25,000 dollars in the mid-1830s.

⁸³ Harry L. Watson, Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990; reprint, New York Hill and Wang, 2006), 229-30.

⁸⁴ Missouri Republican, 1 May 1844, p. 2.

⁸⁵ Benjamin Lundy and Julius Rubens Ames, The Anti-Texas Legion. Protest of Some Free Men, States and Presses Against the Texas Rebellion, Against the Laws of Nature and of Nations (New York, 1845), 2-3. In its pamphlet the organization listed John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster and the Liberator among its supporters.

⁸⁶ Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 150-55; Watson, Liberty and Power, 229-30.

⁸⁷ Kingsley, Frontiers, 31-32, 35.

⁸⁸ They did not leave any evidence of a detailed debate over the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention, though they were certainly aware of the schism. Nineteenth century Baptist historians R. S. Duncan and William Pope Yeaman did not record any large-scale debate in their histories of Missouri Baptists. Nor do twentieth century historians R. S. Douglass and J. Gordon Kingsley. Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 345; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 78-79, 315-18; Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists, 170-75; Kingsley, Frontiers, 65.

⁸⁹ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 897-98; Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1840, 4; William Wright Barnes, The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1953 (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954), 28.

⁹⁰ Missouri Republican, 22 May 1845, p. 2. As the Republican was a major paper it is reasonable to assume that stories it covered made it into other papers throughout the state.

⁹¹ Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1844-1866 (St. Louis), 11.

⁹² *Ibid.* W. Pope Yeaman, confirms the unanimity of the decision to join the Southern Baptist Convention. Yeaman, Missouri Baptist Association, 79-80.

⁹³ Baptist Home Missions, 341.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 553.

⁹⁵ Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association.

⁹⁶ J. C. Maple, Life and Writings of William Pope Yeaman, S. T. D., (Columbia, Mo, 1906), 117. Yeaman lived in Kentucky prior to coming to Missouri. He also briefly served in New York City. With the dawn of the second party system, Missouri was unified around the banner of Andrew Jackson, which many in the state saw as a continuation of their status as supporters of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Hart Benton, as Missouri's senator, was the master of state politics as his early support for Jackson won him high regards among the electorate. For instance, Benton himself could hardly contain his joy with Jackson's message to Congress immediately after his presidential reelection detailing the elimination of the national debt and the Second Bank of the United States as a depository for federal monies. Virtually all of the politicians in Missouri saw themselves as Jacksonians although there was a significant difference to what extent certain men in Missouri supported the Democratic policies during the 1830s. The pro-Jackson unanimity began to disintegrate by the end of the 1830s leading to the formation of a Whig Party. Many of the so-called "false Democrats" began to embody a political outlook that embraced Henry Clay's American System and the economic and internal improvements that were associated with it. By 1840, the Whig Party in Missouri was able to run candidates against the Democrats at most levels, even though they were nowhere close to being as successful as the Whigs were in their national victory that year. In a large sense the Whigs were not able to provide a completely contrasting platform to the Democrats in Missouri. While many in their leadership were highly educated and represented a middle class that found its strength in the river counties, the Whigs still were still composed of varying economic ranks. The Whigs, nevertheless, were stereotyped as St. Louis aristocrats, which hurt their standing among farmers outside of the city. Thus, the

party was little more than a political pressure group for most of their existence in Missouri. While many historians have regarded southern Baptists in the antebellum era as primarily Democratic voters, Richard Carwardine cautions that there were Whig strongholds in many southern states. Illinois, moreover, had a significant number of Whig Baptists. Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 75-77, 79, 94-95; Elbert B. Smith, Magnificent Missourian: The Life of Thomas Hart Benton (Westport, Ct: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1973), 142; Michael F. Holt, The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 561; Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 127.

⁹⁷ Paul E. McAllister, "Missouri Voters, 1840-1856: An Analysis of Ante-Bellum Voting Behavior and Political Parties," (PhD. Diss., University of Missouri, 1976), 97-98, 105-8, 220-22. McAllister did have some limited data on religious voting in Audrain, Lincoln, Morgan and Monroe counties. His data indicated that the Baptists voted with the majority of the county residents as there were both Whig Baptists in Audrain and Monroe and Democrats in Lincoln and Morgan.

⁹⁸ Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 28.

⁹⁹ Barnes, The Southern Baptist Convention, 311-13

¹⁰⁰ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 345; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 317-18.

¹⁰¹ Baptist Home Missions, 555; University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser." The census takers did make a number of errors. For instance, they tended to record smaller churches as Baptist when they were not. Finke and Stark, "Turning Pews into People," 184.

¹⁰² Baptist Home Missions, 555. Where the individual congregations were located in Missouri that these women and men attended is also somewhat difficult to decipher. Once again, I. M. Allen in preparing his national Baptist census had similar problems in determining some of the specific locations of the churches in certain associations. Allen, Baptist Register 1832, 176. Duncan's History of Baptists in Missouri, furthermore, tends to not always have a lot of details on certain churches that folded quickly after their establishment or were located in remote areas of Missouri.

¹⁰³ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹⁰⁴ W. R. Wiggington, Life and Labors of Elder W R Wiggington: An Autobiography State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, 2, 12-13, 19.

¹⁰⁵ Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 318-19.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 319-20.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*; Barnes, Southern Baptist Convention, 39-41.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 299; S. R. Riggs, "Memoir of Hon. Jas. W. Lynd," Minnesota Historical Society, Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society (St. Paul, 1880), 107.

¹⁰⁹ John Stevens, A Brief Historical Sketch of the Western Baptist Theological Institute: Exhibiting Its Establishment, Location, and Endowment . . . (Cincinnati, 1850), iii-vi, 96; Yeaman, History of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 299. Yeaman claimed that this division of the university's \$200,000 in funds between Ohio and Kentucky Baptists never

completely occurred. On the other hand, Lynd's son James moved to Minnesota shortly after coming of age in 1853. Among his jobs in Minnesota, James Lynd was the editor of the Henderson Democrat. But shortly before the 1860 election he switched parties and was eventually elected to the Minnesota State Senate as a Republican. Riggs, "Memoir of Lynd," 111-12.

¹¹⁰ William Crowell, The Church Member's Hand-book: A Guide to the Doctrines and Practice of Baptist Churches (Boston, 1850), i-iv.

¹¹¹ Crowell's paper was not popular in most parts of the state, and it failed in 1861. Yeaman, History of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 300-1.

¹¹² Smith, Magnificent Missourian, 188-89.

¹¹³ Jackson introduced a series of resolutions into the state senate in January of 1849 that would become known as the Jackson-Napton Resolutions. They were largely written by Jackson's mentor, William B. Napton. Napton was Benton's longtime political enemy and member of the Missouri State Supreme Court. He had been educated at Princeton and the University of Virginia but lived in the Boone's Lick county of Saline. Napton's resolutions proclaimed that "the right to prohibit slavery in any territory belongs exclusively to the people thereof, and can only be exercised in by them in forming their constitution for a State government." Harrison Anthony Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865 (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1914), 155. With this strong states' rights stance, they also declared that Missouri would support the South if there was a future conflict with any of the ideas espoused in the resolutions. Finally, the Missouri's representatives in Congress, such as Benton, were to abide by the Jackson-Napton Resolutions. *Ibid*; Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 164-69.

¹¹⁴ The anti-Benton Democrats were not able to replace him with one of their own, as Democrat turned Whig Henry S. Geyer won the seat after a last-minute compromise. In the end, the controversy led to a Whig triumph in the other aspects of the 1850 elections in Missouri. The Whigs won three of the five congressional districts and held the balance of power between the Democratic factions in the state legislature. Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 170-78; Holt, American Whig Party, 561.

¹¹⁵ During the 1850s, Missouri Baptists, along with the other denominations in the state, would have to deal with the Border War over the Kansas Territory. Originating in Illinois Senator Stephen A Douglas' quest to admit the territory west of Missouri and Iowa into the union, Douglas sought to use the notion of popular sovereignty instead of congressional mandate to determine the status of slavery in the territories. Instead of leading to the orderly settlement of Kansas and Nebraska, Douglas' Kansas-Nebraska Act led to a significant amount of violence, known as the Border War. The Border War was coupled with large-scale election fraud and national political problems. Americans in both the North and South came to the belief that their liberties were threatened if the other side prevailed. For that reason, pro-slavery Missourians became determined to succeed in Kansas. Seeing the concepts from the 1820s debate over their statehood once again thrust into the national realm, Missourians became alarmed with the work and condemnations of the abolitionists and other Free State supporters. But by the late 1840s,

Missourians had begun to adapt the mantra of being southerners, something that they had not done in part since the conception had not been fully created in the way it would be used during the sectional crisis. Even with their efforts to secure a pro-slavery government in Kansas, the territory eventually was dominated by the Free State movement as there were few southern emigrants to the territory as Missouri was too small to effectively settle the state. Only with the secession of the South at the start of the Civil War did Kansas become a state in 1861. The upheaval on the Kansas and Missouri border continued throughout the Civil War as both sides sought to take revenge on the other. Nicole Etcheson, Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 2-4, 219-20; Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 191-93.

¹¹⁶ The percentage of residents working in agriculture in 1820, 1840, and 1860 was 85%, 87%, and 82% respectively, and those working in commerce and manufacturing was in 1820, 1840, and 1860 15%, 13%, and 18% respectively. The foregoing figures are extracted from the decennial censuses taken regarding individuals working in agriculture, commerce, and industry in 1820 and 1840 and, for 1860, the total number of farms (with each farm correlating to one head of household) and the total number of individuals, men and women, working in manufacturing. University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹¹⁷ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 930.

¹¹⁸ Baptist Home Missions, 555; University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹¹⁹ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser." There were only fifteen counties that did not have a Baptist church within their bounds on the eve of the Civil War, all in the southern Ozark areas of the state that were still not heavily settled.

¹²⁰ John H. Wigger, Taking Heaven by Storm: Methodism and the Rise of Popular Christianity in America (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 13, 134-35, 139-41, 149-50; Charity R. Carney, Ministers and Masters: Methodism, Manhood, and Honor in the Old South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011), 114-25.

¹²¹ The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York, 1852), 209. The Methodist Discipline was the governing book of the Methodist Church, listing a variety of rules and beliefs.

¹²² Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1836 (Cincinnati, 1855), 426, 430, 442, 451, 475; Journal of the General Conference 1840, 41. The General Conference was the governing body of the Methodist Church. During the nineteenth century it met every four years and was comprised of ministers elected by the annual conferences – the subordinate regional or state-wide bodies.

¹²³ Richard J. Carwardine, "Methodists, Politics, and the Coming of the American Civil War," Nathan O. Hatch and John H. Wigger, Methodism and the Shaping of American Culture (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 2001), 312-13, 331-33.

¹²⁴ George Gilman Smith, The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew: Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. With Glances at His Contemporaries and at Events in Church History (Nashville, 1883), 229-30, 272-73, 308-9, 336-39, 340-42; Luther Lee, The

Debates of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, May 1844: To Which is Added a Review of the Proceedings of Said Conference (New York, 1845), 105. Andrew had two slaves by the 1830s. The first, Jacob, he inherited from his mother-in-law and sometimes accompanied him on his episcopal visits. The second, Kitty, was willed to him by a woman in Augusta, Georgia to be educated and sent to Liberia when she was nineteen. Upon reaching that age Kitty desired to remain in Augusta and could not be manumitted under Georgia law. After Andrew's first wife Amelia died, he remarried and his second wife, Leonora, was a slaveholder. Leonora Andrew's slaves became Andrew's as a result of Georgia law.

¹²⁵ Smith, Life and Letters of Andrew, 340; Lee, Debates, 8.

¹²⁶ Lee, Debates, 278-79, 282, 291, 297-99.

¹²⁷ Journal of the General Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848 (New York, 1848), 154-64.

¹²⁸ Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939, A Brief History (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966), 14.

¹²⁹ Ibid. 19-23; Holland Nimmons McTyeire, A History of Methodism: Comprising a View of the Rise of this Revival of Spiritual Religion in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century, and of the Principal Agents by Whom it was Promoted in Europe and America . . . (London, 1885), 498; D. R. McAnally, History of Methodism in Missouri: from the date of its introduction, in 1806, down to the present day. . . (St. Louis, 1881), 112-17. Owing to their meager salaries in the early days of the Methodist Church in the United States many ministers were forced to locate where they would cease to ride a circuit but maintain the right to preach in order to marry and make a living. During the later antebellum period many ministers, especially those living in towns, were able to marry and make a living, unlike their predecessors. Carney, Ministers and Masters, 70-75, 83, 85, 154.

¹³⁰ McTyeire, A History of Methodism, 496.

¹³¹ Ibid., 520.

¹³² John F. Marlay, The Life of Bishop Thomas A. Morris (Cincinnati, 1874), 78.

¹³³ Babcock, Forty Years of Pioneer Life, 92.

¹³⁴ Almer Pennewell, A Voice in the Wilderness, Jesse Walker, "The Daniel Boone of Methodism" (Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1958), 101-2, 108-9; Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 54-55.

¹³⁵ McAnally, Methodism in Missouri, 97, 242-43.

¹³⁶ D. R. McAnally, Life and Times of Rev. William Patton and Annals of the Missouri Conference (St. Louis, 1858), 159-62. McAnally was a minister of the MECS and editor of the St Louis Christian Advocate. Originally from Tennessee, McAnally was pro-slavery and a southern sympathizer during the war. Frances McAnally Blackburn Hilliard, Stepping Stones to Glory: From Circuit Rider to Editor in the Years in Between, Life of David Rice McAnally D. D. 1810-1895 (Baltimore: Gateway Press, Inc., 1975), 1-3, 85.

¹³⁷ Rev. S. R. Beggs, Pages from the Early History of the West and North-West... with Special Reference to the History of Methodism (Cincinnati, 1868), 55-57.

¹³⁸ W. S. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri: Containing an Outline of the Ministerial Life of More Than One Thousand Preachers, and Sketches of More Than Three Hundred (Columbia, Mo, 1893), 29-32. The author, Woodard, was a Missouri born minister that began to preach in 1850. He was chosen by Missouri Methodists to write the Annals of Methodism in Missouri as he was one of the leading ministers in the state. *Ibid.*, 5-7, 253. Circuits were a series of churches to which one minister was appointed. The minister would travel from church to church, usually on horseback in the early days of Missouri Methodism. A church that was large enough to have its own minister was referred to as a station. Quarterly conferences were the local units of the Methodist Church that met four times a year. They were comprised up to twelve circuits or stations. Both ministers and lay members attended the quarterly conferences which were overseen by presiding elders.

¹³⁹ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church For the Years 1773-1828 (New York, 1840), 483. The Methodists gave statistics for both their white and black members until the 1850s. At the same time, however, they organized their statistics into circuits so details on the specific congregations within those circuits cannot be discerned. Probationers, men and women that were in the process of joining the church, are included among the members.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 550.

¹⁴¹ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the years 1829-1839 (New York, 1840), 44-45.

¹⁴² University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹⁴³ Geographically, it is difficult to ascertain where the actual churches were since the minutes only list the circuits, which were made up of multiple congregations. Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1829-39, 44-45.

¹⁴⁴ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the years 1839-1845, (New York, 1845), 101-2. The annual conference also ran an Indian Mission District that was not included in the total statistics given in this chapter since the missions were largely outside of Missouri.

¹⁴⁵ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹⁴⁶ Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1839-45, 101-2.

¹⁴⁷ Daniel Wells, The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1860 (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 112.

¹⁴⁸ McAllister, "Missouri Voters," 97-98, 105-08, 220-22. In the counties the McAllister was able to ascertain the data from the Methodists were Whigs in the party's Audrain County stronghold and in Democratic Lincoln. They were, moreover, Democrats in Morgan and split their votes in Monroe, which were both Democratic strongholds.

¹⁴⁹ William Caples was a fervent state-rights Democrat, an ideology that it is heavily implied in some Methodist histories that he was not alone in holding. Marvin, The Life of William Goff Caples of the Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (St. Louis, 1870), 260, 280. On the other hand some ministers still desired to abjure politics. Bishop Joshua Soule, who often presided over the annual conference in Missouri, kept his politics so private that his

biographer told the legend that his family did not even know he was in favor of the South until half-way through the Civil War. Horace Mellard Du Bose, Life of Joshua Soule (Nashville, 1911), 271-72. Trusten Polk, who was the Democratic governor briefly before his election to the United States Senate in 1857, was a trustee and active class leader at the Centenary Methodist Church in St. Louis. Polk was elected governor in 1856 but resigned after being elected to the Senate. He was eventually expelled from the Senate as a Confederate sympathizer in 1862. W. V. N. Bay, Reminiscences of the Bench and Bar of Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1878), 409-14; Mr. and Mrs. Francis Emmett Williams, Centenary Methodist Church of St. Louis: The First Hundred Years, 1839-1939 (St. Louis, 1939), 24. Another Methodist minister, Elisha B. Headlee, became a member of the Arkansas state legislature as a Democrat after leaving the ministry. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 155.

¹⁵⁰ Missouri East Conference, United Methodist Church, Papers, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, Folder 13, 240-41. Jacob Lanius received a letter from a friend, J. F. Davis, in March of 1844 that was quite pleased with the turnout at a Whig campaign event in Fredericktown, a locality in the Ozark lead belt west of Cape Girardeau. James Andrew, who often presided at the annual conferences in Missouri was also a Whig, even voting for Constitutional Union candidate for president in 1860, John C. Bell. George Gilman Smith, The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew: Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. With Glances at His Contemporaries and at Events in Church History (Nashville, 1883), 436.

¹⁵¹ St. Louis Observer, 8 October 1835, p. 3. Annual conferences were regional meetings of the Methodist Church in a certain area. During the years leading up to the schism the state of Missouri was a single annual conference.

¹⁵² D. R. McAnally, History of Methodism in Missouri, 46, 372-73.

¹⁵³ Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Held in the City of Baltimore 1840 (Cincinnati, 1855), 124; Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 148. Comfort was originally stationed in St. Louis as the presiding elder of the district and was certainly an important minister.

¹⁵⁴ Luther Lee, The Debates of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, May 1844: To Which is Added a Review of the Proceedings of Said Conference (New York, 1845), 278-79, 282, 291, 297-99.

¹⁵⁵ McAnally, Patton, 8-9, 87. Patton was born in 1773 in Montgomery County in southwestern Virginia. He was from a wealthy family, well-educated and quickly worked his way up to the more prestigious stations and presiding elderships.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 221.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 220.

¹⁵⁹ With that report Missouri Methodists expressed their willingness to join a southern general conference if it was created and voted to send delegates to an organizational meeting of the new

southern church the next May in Louisville. *Ibid.*, 222; Winter, “Division in Missouri Methodism,” 47-48.

¹⁶⁰ Defendants Answer to Amended Bill, Record, Farrar v. Finney, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, p. 58.

¹⁶¹ Lee, Debates, 431, 448, 449.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 389. Browning was born in Maryland but spent time in Ohio and Pittsburgh as a Methodist minister. The majority of his active career was spent around St. Louis with some time as a missionary to the Indians. Browning continued to fill in throughout his eighties. Boyle was also born in Maryland and was a convert from Catholicism. Coming to Missouri from Pennsylvania, he spent the majority of his career in St. Louis and was one of the more celebrated men of Methodism in that city. Glanville was born in England and served at a variety of posts throughout Missouri, little was known of his life in the Methodist histories. Johnson was born in Virginia and served as an Indian missionary and as a minister in the Boone’s Lick while in Missouri. Linn was born in Virginia but was ordained a minister in Maryland. He spent a great deal of his career going between Louisville and various places in Missouri. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 39, 62-63, 167-68, 195-96, 198-99.

¹⁶³ Lee, Debates, 431.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 435. Green was originally from East Tennessee and fought in the War of 1812. Becoming a Methodist minister in 1817, he transferred to Missouri in 1823. As a presiding elder, he became one of the most well-travelled and revered ministers in Missouri Methodism until his death in 1847. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 51-56.

¹⁶⁵ Missouri East Conference, State Historical Society of Missouri, Collection 3595, Folder 1. Monroe, originally from Virginia, was one of the most highly regarded ministers in Missouri Methodism when he died in 1871. Spending the majority of his early decades in Missouri in St. Louis, either as the pastor of one of the major churches in that city or the presiding elder of the district, Monroe often represented his annual conference at the general conference. He was a presiding elder in the Boone’s Lick region and an agent for the church’s St Charles College during the latter stages of his career. Lanius, on the other hand, while born in Virginia, immigrated to Potosi, Missouri when he was a child. Originally learning the saddler trade from his father, Lanius became a minister at the age of seventeen in 1831, serving throughout Missouri until his death twenty years later. *Ibid.*, 44-51, 95-96; Jacob Lanius, The Journal of the Reverend Jacob Lanius: An Itinerant Preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church from 1831 A.D. to 1851 A.D. (Waynesville, Mo, 1963), 1-2.

¹⁶⁶ The St. Louis Missouri Republican covered Missouri responses to the national proceedings and the Andrew case in the general conference once its importance became evident. The paper, moreover, and certainly many others throughout Missouri, detailed the proceedings throughout the several days of the Louisville conference within its pages. Missouri Republican, 14 October 1845, p. 2; 12 June 1844, p. 2; *ibid.*, 6 May 1845, p. 2; *ibid.*, 9 May 1845, p. 2; *ibid.*, 10 May 1845, p. 2; *ibid.*, 12 May 1845, p. 2; *ibid.*, 13 May 1845, p. 2; *ibid.*, 14 May 1845, p. 2; *ibid.*, 20 May 1845, p. 2.

¹⁶⁷ Soule was originally a native of Maine and a descendant of a signer of the Mayflower Compact. A close friend of Bishop Andrew, Soule, who had labored extensively in the South, had become a southerner at heart and sought to work for the betterment of the region. Viewing the action against Andrew as unconstitutional, Soule was willing to preside over the conference at Louisville with Bishop Andrew and eventually joined the MECS. Du Bose, Life of Soule, 9-10, 184, 237, 240-43.

¹⁶⁸ Lorenzo Waugh, Autobiography of Lorenzo Waugh, (San Francisco, 1896), 13-14, 155.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 156.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, A Candid Statement of the Course Pursued by the Preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, in Trying to Establish Their New Organization in Missouri (Cincinnati, 1848), 7.

¹⁷¹ McAnally, Patton, 235.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*; Missouri Republican, 14 October 1845, p. 2.

¹⁷³ New Madrid Quarterly Conference Minutes, Missouri East Conference, State Historical Society of Missouri, Collection 3595, Folder 1307.

¹⁷⁴ Methodism in Southwestern Montgomery County, Missouri East Conference, *ibid.*, Collection 3595, Folder 177.

¹⁷⁵ Most of the membership joined the northern church as the Fourth Street Church prevailed in the lawsuit. See chapter two. Defendants Answer to Amended Bill, Farrar v Finney, pp 52, 58. The Green Street African Church also in St. Louis, however, was not willing to side with a pro-slavery body with 110 of its 117 black members wanting to remain with the MEC. This decision led to years of litigation between both churches over the property of the Green Street Church.

¹⁷⁶ Waugh, Autobiography, 156; Missouri Republican, 14 October 1845, p. 2.

¹⁷⁷ Jamison moved to Illinois and eventually relocated to California. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 98, 120. One of the leading Methodist ministers in Missouri according to contemporary historian W. S. Woodard, Jamison had served in some of the leading churches in St. Louis and Cape Girardeau during his fourteen year career as a Methodist minister.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 197-98, 207; Missouri Republican, 14 October 1845, p. 2. McMurry and Chandler had both originally come from Kentucky in 1842 where they were Methodist ministers. In Missouri, McMurry had served as a minister in the Jefferson City area (Missouri's state capital) and Chandler had been in Marion County. Westerman served as a junior minister in Booneville and Columbia in central Missouri.

¹⁷⁹ Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 190. After his removal from Keytesville, Williams served in the southwestern town of Springfield until the schism.

¹⁸⁰ Marvin, Caples, 65-67, 255. Caples was originally from Ohio and came to Missouri after becoming active in the Methodist church in that state.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 153, Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1849, (New York, 1849), 397.

¹⁸² Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 155; Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1849, 397. Originally from Kentucky, was appointed to a number of circuits in eastern and central Missouri until he joined the northern church, serving until his death in 1852.

¹⁸³ Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 146; Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1849, 398.

¹⁸⁴ Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 110. Henry was originally from Pennsylvania and came to Missouri in 1834. It is unclear who the other three ministers were that voted against joining the MECS. It is likely, nevertheless, that one was Walter Prescott, who served in Boone County.

¹⁸⁵ Though, unlike some of the areas that the other ministers were serving in, Waugh's Mill Creek Circuit, in all likelihood located around Morgan County Missouri, was not a big slaveholding area. This fact contrasted with other areas to the north in the Boone's Lick, such as the heart of the quarterly conference in Booneville. University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser." In 1850 Morgan County had 453 slaves while Cooper County, where Booneville was located, at 3091 slaves.

¹⁸⁶ Waugh, Autobiography, 158. Wallace was another of the leading preachers in Missouri. Originally from Virginia, he came to Missouri by way of Kentucky. While in Missouri he served in a number of capacities throughout the state. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 117-18.

¹⁸⁷ Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 120. Waugh eventually moved to California after his health began to decline in the fall of 1851. Waugh, Autobiography, 174-75.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 160-65.

¹⁸⁹ Journal of the General Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848 (New York, 1848), 154-64.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 21.

¹⁹¹ St. Louis Christian Advocate, 18 September 1851, p. 18.

¹⁹² Journal of the General Conference, 1848 (New York, 1848), 97; Journal of the General Conference of the Church, South, 1846, 1850, 101; Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 119, 126-28. Germans in Missouri were virtually unanimously anti-slavery. For that reason German Methodists were largely unwilling to follow a church that supported slavery and contained the words "Church, South" in its title. Throughout the antebellum period the attempts to the MECS to start German missions failed as a result of this phenomenon.

¹⁹³ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1850 (New York, 1850), 508-9, 525.

¹⁹⁴ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Throughout the South, nevertheless, the Methodists made an ambitious attempt to adjust to the challenges of placing churches in towns. While their success was initially mixed, they were eventually successful in some urban areas in the later antebellum era. Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians, 15-17.

¹⁹⁷ Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1850, 508-9. There were large concentrations of northern Methodists around St Louis and Hannibal. At the same time, they had significant numbers in the western part of the state. Besides a mission in Cape Girardeau, in the southeastern part of the

state, the only establishments not in those areas of the state were in Booneville and Versailles in the central part of the state and Gasconade County and Blackwater in the east-central and west-central regions respectively.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 525.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁰ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the Years 1858-1865 (Nashville, 1866), 202-3, 206-7.

²⁰¹ Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1857, 342-43. About a quarter of the northern Methodist population was in St. Louis, with one circuit still in Cape Girardeau. There was another district concentrated around Hannibal with another further north in the northeastern part of the state. Finally, there were two districts concentrated in the northwestern and western parts of the state. The Booneville and Blackwater circuits were no longer listed, though there is a chance they were absorbed into another circuit as the circuit and district names tended to change from year to year.

²⁰² Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Year 1857 (New York, 1858), 342-43. While additional statistics were included in the records of the annual conferences, the racial breakdown of the membership was no longer included by 1860.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 521.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 522. There were five circuits in the west- Oregon, St. Joseph, Weston, Westport and Lexington. At the same time, there were also five in the central part of the state- Florence, Jefferson City, Booneville and Brunswick.

²⁰⁵ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

²⁰⁶ Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 162-66.

²⁰⁷ The percentage of residents working in agriculture in 1820, 1840, and 1860 was 85%, 87%, and 82% respectively, and those working in commerce and manufacturing was in 1820, 1840, and 1860 15%, 13%, and 18% respectively. The foregoing figures are extracted from the decennial censuses taken regarding individuals working in agriculture, commerce, and industry in 1820 and 1840 and, for 1860, the total number of farms (with each farm correlating to one head of household) and the total number of individuals, men and women, working in manufacturing. University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 125-27.

²⁰⁹ Missouri Republican, 3 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 4 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 5 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 6 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 7 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 8 May 1850, p. 2; 10 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 11 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 12 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 13 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 14 May 1850, p. 2; *ibid.*, 15 May 1850, p. 2.

²¹⁰ "Revival Notice," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 31 August 1854, p. 10; Elmer Talmage Clark, One hundred years of New Madrid Methodism: a history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in New Madrid, Missouri (1912), 29; Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 127.

²¹¹ Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held in 1846 and 1850 (Louisville, 1851), 146, 157, 174-75.

²¹² Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 162-66.

²¹³ E. H. Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1864), 1:436-38; Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, From its Organization A. D. 1789 to A. D. 1820 Inclusive (Philadelphia, 1820), 212; Donald G. Mathews, Religion in the Old South, 163-64; Earl MacCormac, "Missions and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837," Church History, 32, no. 1, (March 1963): 32-33; George Marsden, The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), 79-80. The goal of the Act of Union was to allow the ministers of each church to function in the other's church to deal with clergy shortages on the frontier. The Presbyterians undertook a similar agreement with the Dutch Reformed Church in 1800.

²¹⁴ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the USA, 1829-1837 (Philadelphia, 1837), 420-21. A synod was a subordinate organizational body of the church composed of multiple presbyteries. A presbytery was made up of several dozen congregations.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 437-40. The committee was unable to come to a conclusion on which synods to expel since it was composed of Presbyterians on both sides of the schism. The actions of the General Assembly expelled the subordinate bodies that composed the synods as the vast majority of the congregations and ministers remained loyal to their particular synod.

²¹⁶ Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church, 2:532.

²¹⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1838-40 (New School) (New York, 1840), 635-644; Marsden, Evangelical Mind, 64-66. They were joined by the Synods of Michigan and Eastern Tennessee along with the majorities from the Synods of Albany, New York and Illinois and strong contingents in the states of New Jersey, Ohio, and Indiana.

²¹⁸ Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church, 2:533-52.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 537-41; Harold M. Parker Jr., The United Synod of the South: The Southern New School Presbyterian Church (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 25-28, 74-77; Ernest Trice Thompson, Presbyterians in the South 3 vols. (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1973), 1:394, 411.

²²⁰ Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 119; Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, with an Appendix, 1846 (New School) (New York, 1846), 162-63; Victor I. Howard, "Presbyterians, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and the Election of 1856," Journal of Presbyterian History, 49, no. 2 (Summer 1971): 155-56; Parker, United Synod of the South, 150-51, 177; Andrew E. Murray, Presbyterians and the Negro – A History (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1966), 117-18.

²²¹ Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church, 1:436-38; Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church 1789 to 1820, 212. The goal of the Act of Union was to allow the ministers of each church to function in the other's church to deal with clergy shortages on the frontier. The Presbyterians undertook a similar agreement with the Dutch Reformed Church in 1800.

²²² Richard Edwards, et al, Edwards's Great West and Her Commercial Metropolis, Embracing a General View of the West, and a Complete History of St. Louis (St. Louis, 1860), 598-99; James R. Rohrer, "The Connecticut Missionary Society and Book Distribution in the Early Republic," Libraries & Culture, 34, no. 1, (Winter 1999): 17-19; Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 3-4. The AHMS was a joint missionary organization between the Congregationalist and Presbyterian churches that continued to operate in Missouri until the 1850s.

²²³ John F Cowan, "Presbyterians and Presbyterianism," Walter Williams, A History of Northeast Missouri 3 vols. (Chicago, 1913), 1:120.

²²⁴ Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 7; John Ervin Kirkpatrick, Timothy Flint, Pioneer, Missionary, Author, Editor, 1780-1840: The Story of His Life Among the Pioneers and Frontiersmen in the Ohio and Mississippi Valley and in New England and the South (Cleveland, 1911), 149.

Although he worked for several years in the state, founding a church in St Charles, Flint and his family left Missouri in 1822.

²²⁵ Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians, 15.

²²⁶ Henry H. Sweets III, The Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church: A sesquicentennial History (Hannibal, Mo, 1984), 3.

²²⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix. A. D. 1830 (Philadelphia, 1830), 117-18. In 1830, the Presbyterians in Missouri were organized into one presbytery, the Presbytery of Missouri. It had seventeen congregations and only eleven ministers who served 605 members. Previously, the Missouri Presbyterian Church was too small to stand alone and was united with synods further east.

²²⁸ Absalom Peters, "A Brief Answer," in J. L. Wilson, et al, "Four Propositions Sustained Against the Claims of the American Home Missionary Society," A Brief Answer to an Official Reply to the Board of Missions of the General Assembly... (New York, 1831), 4; George M. Marsden, The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth Century America (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), 103. An example took place in 1830 a group of Cincinnati ministers publically criticized the AHMS which prompted a series of public exchanges between the ministers and the Corresponding Secretary of the society and future New School Presbyterian, Absalom Peters.

²²⁹ Minutes of the General Assembly 1800-20, (1815), 586; Extracts from the Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, AD 1818 (Philadelphia, 1818), 28-29, 31-32. While the national church condemned slaveholding by its members in 1815 and 1818, they did little more than recommend membership in the American Colonization Society as no further official action took place at the General Assembly meeting in subsequent years. The church was subsequently able to avoid major problems over slavery save some petitions presented to the General Assembly.

²³⁰ Lovejoy had been influenced by Nelson. Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 26; Paul Simon, Freedom's Champion: Elijah Lovejoy (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994), 19-20, 102.

-
- ²³¹ Marks, "Personal Remembrances," 76-78.
- ²³² First Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Marion College, Missouri 1835-36 (St Louis, 1836), 2-7. Of the eastern students, thirty-two were from Pennsylvania and New York and another six were from Ohio.
- ²³³ McKee, "Marion College Episode," 310.
- ²³⁴ Marks, "Personal Remembrances," 76-78.
- ²³⁵ Lovejoy, Memoir, 160-61.
- ²³⁶ Ibid., 161.
- ²³⁷ Merton L. Dillon, Elijah P. Lovejoy, Abolitionist Editor (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), 64.
- ²³⁸ Simon, Lovejoy, 35-6.
- ²³⁹ Lovejoy, Memoir, 161.
- ²⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ²⁴¹ Ibid., 161-162.
- ²⁴² Ibid., 162.
- ²⁴³ St. Louis Observer, 22 October 1835, p. 3.
- ²⁴⁴ Ibid., 162; Henry Tanner, The Martyrdom of Lovejoy: An Account of the Life, Trials & Perils of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy (Chicago, 1882), 29. Tanner provides a letter that testifies to the length of Lovejoy's friendship with Potts.
- ²⁴⁵ Rev. William S. Potts, The Inaugural Address of Rev. William S. Potts, President of Marion College (St. Louis, 1835), 3.
- ²⁴⁶ Ibid., 15.
- ²⁴⁷ Fourth Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Marion College, MO 1838-9 (St. Louis, 1838), 2.
- ²⁴⁸ Ibid., 4-6.
- ²⁴⁹ McKee, "Marion College Episode," 310-12.
- ²⁵⁰ Letter May 2, 1840, Marion College, MO to Mr. Woods, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Document s1163.
- ²⁵¹ McKee, "Marion College Episode," 317.
- ²⁵² Albert Barnes, The Missionary Enterprise dependent on the Religion of Principle for Success: A Sermon . . . Before the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at their Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting (Boston, 1844), 6; Arthur Stansbury, Trial of the Rev. Albert Barnes, Before the Synod of Philadelphia, In Session at York, October 1835, on a Charge of Heresy . . . (New York, 1836), 285, Appendix, 108-10.
- ²⁵³ Since Chamberlain arrived with instructions not to vote, his presbytery had surely been aware of the Barnes trial and could not come to a consensus on the case. The presbytery included most of the western two-thirds of Missouri which would have contained the least market-oriented Missouri Presbyterians. Chamberlain himself was originally a missionary assigned to Missouri. While he initially joined the New School, he switched to the Old School later in his career. Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

with an Appendix, AD 1836 (Philadelphia, 1836), 268; John B. Hill, The Presbytery of Kansas City and its Predecessors, 1821-1901, Historical Sketches and Statistical Matter (Kansas City, 1901), 132-33. The presbytery included most of the western two-thirds of Missouri which would have contained the least market-oriented Missouri Presbyterians.

²⁵⁴ Minutes of the General Assembly, 1836, 238, 268-79. No biographies of Kerr and Mahan have been uncovered to this point. Cochran, on the other hand, was originally from Pennsylvania and attended the Princeton Theological Seminary. Coming to Missouri as a missionary as a part of the AHMS, Cochran was associated with David Nelson and other New School Presbyterians. Although he was a member of the Old School when the reunion occurred after the Civil War, he initially joined the New School. A biographer mentions the fact that he often had to preach in the face of mob violence and was a friend of African Americans in Missouri. Hill, Presbytery of Kansas City, 144-46.

²⁵⁵ Dillon, Lovejoy, 76.

²⁵⁶ Missouri Republican, 5 May 1836, p. 2.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 12 May 1836, p. 2.

²⁵⁸ C. Bruce Staiger, "Abolitionism and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-1838," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 36, no. 3 (Dec 1949): 391-92; Goen, Broken Churches, 69-74.

²⁵⁹ Minutes of the Philadelphia Convention of Ministers and Ruling Elders in the Presbyterian Church in the United States Called by the Minority of the General Assembly of 1836 (Philadelphia, 1837), 4-6.

²⁶⁰ Minutes of the General Assembly Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with an Appendix, AD 1837 (Philadelphia, 1837), 412. Owing to the long distance to the General Assembly meeting, the absence of more delegates was somewhat common in the 1830s.

²⁶¹ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with an Appendix, AD 1838 (Old School) (Philadelphia, 1838), 36-37.

²⁶² Hill, "History of the New School," 54. Bullard was born in New England and studied at Amherst College and Andover Seminary, both in Massachusetts. Coming to Missouri as an agent of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, he eventually joined the New School. Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 112-13.

²⁶³ John Leighton, "Primitive Presbyterianism in Missouri," Minutes of the Semi-Centennial Session of the Session of the Synod of Missouri (St. Louis, 1882), 65.

²⁶⁴ Hill, "History of the New School," 54. Hill was originally from New Hampshire, of Puritan stock. After coming to Missouri he became one of the more notable ministers in the New School and in the northern Presbyterian Church after the war. Hill became a Republican in the 1850s. John Hill, Presbytery of Kansas City, 166-67.

²⁶⁵ Minutes of the General Assembly (New School), 1838-40 (New York, 1840), 644-45; Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School), 1838-50 (Philadelphia, 1850), 419-24.

²⁶⁶ Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 103-5.

²⁶⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix. A. D. 1842 (Old School) (Philadelphia, 1842), 127-29.

²⁶⁸ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, with an Appendix, 1843 (New School) (New York, 1843), 69.

²⁶⁹ Murray, Presbyterians and the Negro, 29-30, 46-47.

²⁷⁰ Minutes of the General Assembly in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School), 1840 (Philadelphia, 1840), 295.

²⁷¹ Rev. Dr. Cochran, "Historical Sketch of the Synod of Missouri," Minutes of the Semi-Centennial Session, 38. The Old School reorganized the presbyteries after the schism in Missouri which seems to verify Cochran's claims. Harvey Hays, who had voted for the New School at the meeting of the General Assembly in 1837, maintained his stance. William Cochran, who had done the same the year before, sided with the Old School.

²⁷² Minutes of the General Assembly (New School), 1843, 20.

²⁷³ Timothy Hill observed that there was a significant amount of anti-slavery sentiment in the Missouri New School Synod. In his words, "the slavery discussion always reached the New School Synod...very few of them wished to be understood as endorsing slavery." Hill, "History of the New School," 55.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 58.

²⁷⁵ Isaac Jones, et al, Review of "A Declaration of Sentiments made by the Synod of Missouri." (St. Louis, 1842), 3. No historians of Missouri Presbyterianism have been able to locate copies of the original pamphlet.

²⁷⁶ Timothy Hill, Historical Outlines . . . (St Louis, 1882), 22. Ely was born in Connecticut and came to Missouri from Philadelphia to work with Muldrow and Nelson in forming Marion College. Prior to coming to Missouri, Ely was the stated clerk of the Presbyterian General Assembly from 1825-35 and its moderator in 1828. The moderator was the chair of the General Assembly meeting while the stated clerk functioned as its secretary, overseeing its ecclesiastical administration. Allen Gallaher also was at Marion College as the principal of the preparatory school. Sweets, Hannibal Presbyterian Church, 43; Minutes of the General Assembly, 1838 (Old School), 406-7.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ "The Old Constitution Presbyterian Church," St. Charles Cosmos-Monitor, 11 September, 1918, p. 2.

²⁷⁹ T. C. Barrett, History of Bellevue Presbyterian Church. A Sermon Preached by Rev. T.C. Barrett in the Presbyterian Church in Caledonia, Mo., August 5th, 1877. From Psalm XLVIII: 12, 13. (Potosi, Mo, 1877), 9.

²⁸⁰ Cochran, "Historical Sketch," 39.

²⁸¹ Elizabeth Audrain Watson, Heritage and Promise: A Story of The Dardenne Presbyterian Church and Its Community (Chicago: Adams Press, 1977), 56.

²⁸² Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 115-17.

²⁸³ Bullard's fellow Presbyterians revered him. Timothy Hill explained long after his death that "no other man ever exerted so wide, so positive and so long continued influence over Presbyterianism in Missouri as he did." Hill, "History of the New School," 56.

²⁸⁴ Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 111, 114. The Missouri Home Missionary Society had been formed by the synod immediately after the schism in 1841 as a semi-autonomous organization to bolster the work of the AHMS within Missouri.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 114-15; Hill, "History of the New School," 57-58.

²⁸⁶ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with an appendix. A. D. 1851 (Old School) (Philadelphia, 1851), 39.

²⁸⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: with an Appendix, A. D. 1850 (New School) (New York, 1850), 406-8.

²⁸⁸ The 1850 census did not distinguish between Cumberland Presbyterians and the Old and New School Presbyterians. Overall, there were 125 church buildings with 44,820 seats reported in the census. The percentages of accommodations from both churches in the 1860s might provide some idea of the breakdown in 1850. By no means is this method a fool-proof way to determine how many churches had buildings in 1850, the Presbyterians themselves did not report the statistics. In 1860 there were ninety-eight Cumberland Presbyterian churches with room for 30,805 women and men. The Presbyterians, however, had 127 churches with 47,050 accommodations. This space was sufficient for just under four percent of the Missouri population. Percentage wise, the Cumberland Presbyterians had 43.5 of the church buildings and 40.7 percent of the accommodations. University of Virginia "Historical Census Browser."

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*; Evelyn Bates, "A History of the Presbyterian Church in Missouri to 1860," (M.A. Thesis, University of Missouri, 1939), 108.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 184-89; Hill, "History of the New School," 58-59.

²⁹¹ Hall, Presbyterian Conflict, 120.

²⁹² Many of those who did not want to deal with the views of the New School General Assembly on slavery had joined Old School congregations. Hill, Presbytery of Kansas City, 16.

²⁹³ While seating capacity could have accommodated four percent of the state's population, the denomination as a whole had less than one percent of the state within their membership. University of Virginia "Historical Census Browser."

²⁹⁴ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with An Appendix A. D. 1859 (Old School) (Philadelphia, 1859), 689-94.

²⁹⁵ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with An Appendix A. D. 1861 (New School) (New York, 1861), 623-24. Most likely as a result of the upheaval of the New School in the state, the third presbytery in Missouri, the Presbytery of Lexington, did not submit a report.

²⁹⁶ McAllister, "Missouri Voters," 97-98, 105-08, 220-22. The Presbyterian strongholds seem to be in the Whig counties. At the same time, however, the Old School was able to build up its membership in some Democratic strongholds. In the counties McAllister had religious voter data; the Presbyterians were pro-Whig in Democratic Lincoln County. Although there were no

Presbyterian churches in Audrain County, there were Presbyterian voters who voted with the majority Whig Party. They split their vote in Democratic Monroe County and there was no data in Morgan County where they did not have a church building in 1850. University of Virginia “Historical Census Browser.”

Chapter Two

Turmoils and Temporalities: White Women's Benevolence, the Slavery Question, and Church Property Disputes to 1860

When United States Army officer and Fort Osage Indian Factor George Sibley married young Mary Easton, he likely had no inkling of how much trouble the match would bring him decades later with St. Charles and St. Louis Presbyterians divided over the question of slavery. Born in Oneida County, New York, in 1800, Mary Easton was the oldest child of Rufus and Abigail Smith Easton. She moved with her family to St. Louis in 1804 and enjoyed a relatively privileged existence. President Thomas Jefferson appointed her father a judge in the new territory, and he served as the first postmaster of St. Louis, territorial delegate for Missouri to Congress, and the second attorney general of the State of Missouri from 1821 to 1826. Mary completed her education at a first-rate Kentucky boarding school before marrying George Champlin Sibley in August 1815.¹ Born in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, in 1782, George Sibley was the son of surgeon John Sibley and Elizabeth Hopkins Sibley. His father, who regularly corresponded with Thomas Jefferson about political matters, travelled frequently. So George Sibley spent his early childhood in Rhode Island with his mother's father, Samuel Hopkins. Grandfather Hopkins was a controversial Congregationalist minister known widely for formulating the "New Divinity," a set of doctrines grounded in the concept of "disinterested benevolence" that fundamentally spurred the rise of anti-slavery New School Presbyterianism.² But subsequent to moving with his parents to Fayetteville, North Carolina, in 1804, George completed his formal education with an eye toward preparing for a career in the mercantile business. After receiving a commission in the army and leading a famous expedition to improve relations with the Pawnee and Kansa tribes, Sibley was appointed United States Indian Factor at

Fort Osage in far western Missouri in 1808. In the coming years Major Sibley made friends with governor of the Territory of Missouri William Clark and Acting-Governor Frederick Bates.³

The marriage of Mary Easton and George Sibley was somewhat unusual from the outset. Mary was eighteen years younger than her new husband, who was a friend and business associate of her father. But George was smitten by her precocious qualities, remarkable intelligence, and her beauty. Following their marriage, she accompanied him to Fort Osage. George took great pride in his young wife's self-assured and independent spirit and her skill at dealing effectively with the Native Americans they visited. An accomplished horsewoman and musician, Mary instructed and delighted the children of the Great and Little Osage tribes at nearby Harmony Mission, founded in 1821 by the United Foreign Missionary Society of New York and supported by the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Dutch Reformed churches.⁴

After the Sibleys relocated to the town of St. Charles, Mary's turn to fervent evangelicalism began to cause headaches for George. For several years following the 1822 closure of Fort Osage and the factory system the couple remained on the farm they had kept near the post. George continued to speculate in land, but a failed attempt to start a fur-trading company left him heavily in debt by 1827. He then boldly took up the daunting and dangerous task of surveying and opening the Santa Fe Trail. But this did not do much to improve his financial difficulties. Mary returned to live with her parents in the town of St. Charles, and George joined her in 1829. Thereafter he began clearing part of a more than one hundred acre tract of land nearby that he had purchased in 1814. The Sibleys dubbed their budding farm "Linden Wood." While George went about building a dwelling house on the place, Mary taught her young sister, along with a few children from nearby families, in the Sibley town home. In late 1830, Mary seized upon the idea of opening a school at Linden Wood. By early 1831,

George had duly constructed a log cabin near the Linden Wood dwelling house for boarding twenty women to be taught by his wife at the new Linden Wood School for Girls. At about the same time, Mary befriended Margaret Lindsey and her husband Thomas, influential and well-to-do members of the St. Charles Presbyterian Church, and soon became intensely interested in religion. In spring 1831, she attended a series of revival meetings in St. Charles and St. Louis led by the Reverend William S. Potts, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of St. Louis, and the Reverend David Nelson from Palmyra. Mary soon made a solemn declaration of faith and was admitted to the Presbyterian Church. This was a step, however, that deeply disturbed George and Mary's close relatives, most of whom nurtured a rationalist and non-sectarian Christian faith. From their perspective, evangelicals were fanatics, improperly mixed social reform and religion, demanded far too much from followers, and made themselves a nuisance with overly aggressive proselytizing and religious bigotry. According to Mary's journal entry, her mother "would rather have followed her children to the grave than to see them become Presbyterians."⁵

In a few short years, Mary's newfound faith began to turn Linden Wood School from a promising institution that might help produce a suitable income for her and George into a marginally profitable enterprise with a questionable future. While Mary claimed to eschew sectarian strife, she eagerly entered the fray between New School and Old School factions at the St. Charles Presbyterian Church. She weighed in with a flare that was all too typical of her, usually in behalf of New School positions, voicing her opinions, advising church elders, and sometimes presenting them with ultimatums, in letters at least, cast in terms uncommonly aggressive for a lady. She drew George into the conflict. He dutifully complied, for example, when Mary insisted he play the role of neutral chair for a St. Charles Presbyterian Church committee charged with raising money for a new house of worship and divided by superheated

New School and Old School loyalties.⁶ She also brought fervent Presbyterianism to Linden Wood School, much to the dismay of the prominent parents who enrolled their daughters there. In addition to counseling her young charges about their personal and religious lives, Mary required them to attend divine worship on Sundays and daily prayer sessions, study the Bible, and listen to the sermons of visiting Presbyterian ministers, including not only the Reverend Potts but also controversial anti-slavery and anti-Catholic editor of the St. Louis Observer the Reverend Elijah Lovejoy.⁷ By early 1834, Mary was a regular contributor to his newspaper, inveighing against Jesuits and the evils of slavery, notwithstanding the fact that George owned six slaves and that most parents of her students were slaveholders.⁸ Mary's assertive, if not domineering, manner alienated evangelical women of her own rank, including those she and George hired to help her teach at Linden Wood School. She compounded her infamy in February 1834 by joining with several other women of the local Female Benevolent Society to set up a Sunday school for slaves, which further fueled rumors in St. Charles and St. Louis and drew editorial condemnation in the local newspapers.⁹

The situation reached something of a breaking point in fall 1837. Given George's early experiences with Grandfather Hopkins, he may well have been specially prepared to take a broad view of Mary's Presbyterian enthusiasm. He certainly loved Mary dearly. In any case, he ultimately accepted her conversion and gradually came around to at least supporting most of her causes. He also became increasingly involved with the St. Charles Presbyterian Church and even befriended the Reverend Lovejoy. But public pressure, including several mob actions, closed the St. Louis Observer and forced Lovejoy to leave St. Louis in 1836. Shortly thereafter George lost all patience with the New School reformer when he resumed publishing his newspaper just across the Mississippi River in Alton, Illinois, and openly avowed his commitment to

abolitionism. Exasperated with Lovejoy's increasingly toxic denunciations of slavery and slaveholders, George severed all ties with him. Lovejoy's infamous mobbing and murder on November 7, 1837, of course, ended the connection that he and Mary both had with the controversial minister. But with the national Presbyterian schism having hardened opinion in St. Charles and St. Louis against the anti-slavery New School, Mary's Linden Wood School had become decidedly unpopular.¹⁰ Believing in Mary's mission to educate young women at Linden Wood, George remained committed to the school, dividing his time between struggling to make it a success and his work as president of the Missouri Internal Improvements Association and as state railroad commissioner. But enrollments dropped, especially after a minority faction of New School members seceded from the St. Charles Presbyterian Church and the St. Charles Presbytery split between contending New School and Old School factions in October 1840.¹¹

Mary Easton Sibley remained unharmed at the time Slave Power minions murdered Elijah Lovejoy and also through the subsequent decade and a half when she continued to run Linden Wood School as before the tragedy. This fact highlights a commonly understood gender convention that prevailed in the larger patriarchal society in which she lived. Even in a predominantly pro-slavery venue like St. Louis, middle-class white women with close ties to prominent families and leading white men could engage in radical benevolent advocacy no less public and notorious than that engaged in by Lovejoy with little fear of facing harsh reprisals, much less physical attack or a lynch mob.

But the 1830s experiences of Mary Easton and George Sibley with the Linden Wood School also reveal several key gender and class dimensions of evangelical schisms and related church property disputes that arose in Missouri after 1837. In the major commercial towns of the polity, white middle-class evangelical women constituted a powerful force in newly-established

churches and in the operations of the Benevolent Empire. By virtue of the labor such women expended in behalf of churches and evangelical schools, they commonly had personal and legally cognizable interests in the property these ventures accumulated. And this was so regardless of common law rules that placed marital and institutional property exclusively in the hands of husbands and adult white male trustees. Legal ownership, possession, and control of the lands and buildings that church members used as places of worship and as schools were, furthermore, not always synonymous. This was particularly the case with George and Mary as a consequence of an unusually egalitarian, middle-class marital arrangement that shaped their affectionate and material relations. While George Sibley held formal legal title to the Linden Wood lands and buildings, the school belonged, for all practical purposes, to Mary. And all who dealt with her in regard to its day-to-day operations accepted this basic fact, including George.

At the least, Mary Easton Sibley's controversial administration of the Linden Wood School reveals how an enterprising middle class woman could circumvent common law property rules and ecclesiastical and secular gender prescriptions to advance her own benevolent agenda. George strongly preferred that Mary not transform Linden Wood School into an anti-slavery New School Presbyterian training ground, as did most of the Old School ministers, ruling elders, and congregants in the vicinity. But, like everyone else associated with the institution, George believed he had little choice but to accede to the preferences of his determined wife. Its success and value, at least in the first decade of operation, depended almost wholly upon Mary's willingness and ability to instruct and manage the daughters of the town-dwelling gentry who placed a high premium on her marital and family ties, intelligence, knowledge, and unusual strength.

Thesis

Intra- denominational and intra-congregational strife over African American bondage became most intense when it implicated the conflicting claims of urban middle-class congregants over church-owned property. While divergent views on the morality of slavery underlay evangelical strife, the determination of mutually antagonistic middle-class congregational factions to retain ownership of disputed church lands and buildings made congregational and denominational splits extraordinarily contentious and public altercations. Equally important, benevolent women in town-dwelling congregations had vital stakes in disputed church lands, buildings, and schools, and these women sometimes played key roles in such contests.

After the War of 1812, evangelical societies in the hinterlands and growing towns of Missouri set about acquiring real estate and buildings for their religious societies and denominational schools with notable zeal. In this way, a growing urban middle class registered its growing status and collective pride in developing religious institutions. To achieve their intertwined material and spiritual goals, middle-class evangelicals necessarily relied on denominational books of discipline and governance that distinguished spiritual matters from “temporalities” and that prescribed the rules by which church trustees, who legally owned church property, were to manage it for the benefit of society members. Such books, however, drew fundamentally upon a mix of Anglo-American common law rules and chancery rules of equity defining rights to ecclesiastical property.

Middle-class women played a primary role in the development of evangelicalism in the state, especially by virtue of their efforts to advance benevolent enterprises and the property they donated to religious societies and institutions as wives and mothers. Similarly to the secular law, church rules subordinated women to men in religious societies and denominational educational

enterprises. Missouri civil law tended to render legally invisible the substantial productive and reproductive labor of wives that generated the marital estates upon which husbands drew to endow religious societies and other evangelical institutions. But ecclesiastical authorities relied heavily upon this body of secular law to secure such donations.

Even in the absence of actual litigation, civil and ecclesiastical law fundamentally shaped the parameters of conflict among congregational and denominational factions divided over the morality of slavery. Middle-class evangelicals embraced a worldview that encouraged them to view the property they acquired for themselves and their religious societies as, primarily, a dispensation of Divine Providence. Congregations whose members reached unanimity in support of slavery after the national schisms, in both town and country, rarely split into factions contending for control and ownership of congregational property. Among middle-class Methodists and Presbyterians in the more cosmopolitan Mississippi River towns, such as Hannibal, St. Charles, and St. Louis, such strife fundamentally implicated the fate of congregationally-owned property. Claims to church property shaped these conflicts as much as religious ones. Middle-class women, as much as their adult male counterparts, had strong religious and material stakes in the outcomes of congregational and denominational strife. And middle-class women, at least, were commonly at the center of the action. A religiously-grounded predisposition on the part of divided co-congregants to avoid litigation over church property often permitted assertive majorities to appropriate ownership of disputed congregational property in its entirety and to the detriment of vanquished minorities. By the same token, conflict over the disposition of property used by churches and evangelical schools commonly divided houses of worship and also those of spouses, families, and larger religious communities. While the faith of

these men and women remained sincere, these conflicts played a preeminent role in the tension over the schism in all three denominations.

Literature Review

A number of legal and constitutional historians have identified church property ownership as a highly contentious question attendant on the process of disestablishment in the new United States.¹² Legal historian Steven K. Green shows that the Revolution and disestablishment generated a see-saw battle between liberals and conservatives over the power of congregations and denominations to organized under corporate charters or otherwise legally own church property.¹³ Green and constitutional historian Mark D. McGarvie, however, emphasize the importance of an 1815 ruling by the United States Supreme Court upholding the power of trustees to hold property for the benefit of religious societies.¹⁴

Historians Mark A. Noll, Richard J. Carwardine, and others have complicated the decades-old thesis emphasizing how pious, community-oriented evangelicals wedded to republican idealism in the early national era eagerly became acquisitive, property-conscious individualists infused with the spirit of liberalism and free market capitalism.¹⁵ Historian of American religion John H. Wigger points out that the quest of some Methodists for economic success and social status did not come without contention or a cost. As adherents became more educated, refined, and “respectable” after 1820, congregations abandoned many of the critical practices that had defined Methodism earlier. The all-important class meeting lost its popularity, congregational discipline flagged, and women found their roles more restricted. Hard-driving circuit riders increasingly became educated, town-dwelling clergymen. Enthusiasm and lay participation gave way to more staid and dignified ritual. And then there was the reaction of the so-called “croakers,” who lamented the new trends and wrote yearningly of a lost Methodist

golden age.¹⁶ On the other hand, Wigger, Steven Davenport, and Gordon Wood emphasize that antebellum evangelicals generally found their faith quite compatible with their efforts to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the emerging free market economy.¹⁷

Most historians focusing on the antebellum southern middle-class, including Daniel Wells, Frank Byrne, and E. Brooks Holifield conclude that evangelicals in this group generally found it rather easy to reconcile their quest for success, wealth, and salvation.¹⁸ Among other conclusions in this connection, Holifield maintains that the social ambitions of middle-class evangelicals in the towns and cities of the slave holding states produced a determination among them to construct well-situated and impressive church buildings that would serve as highly-visible emblems of their growing wealth, prestige, and power.¹⁹ Scholarship regarding antebellum benevolence suggests that its most active proponents in the South were members of an evangelical middle-class who energetically embraced free market capitalism and economic success.²⁰ Wells credits evangelical Christianity for helping middle-class women to achieve a more active and independent role in southern family life and society.²¹ Historians remain somewhat divided over the extent to which the benevolent activism of middle-class women in the slaveholding states provided them opportunities for collective advancement or to improve the region.²² But Historian Elizabeth Varon argues persuasively that the involvement of evangelical middle class women with benevolent activism in the antebellum South permitted them to play an active, distinct, and evolving role in the political life and party politics of the region.²³

The Evangelicals Obtain Real Estate and Build

The acquisition of church-owned land, town lots, and buildings was of relatively little concern to the ordinary men and women who flocked to the camp meetings and revivals that rapidly increased evangelical numbers during the early years of Anglo-American settlement in

Missouri. While some historians have emphasized too much the role of the camp meeting in the development of evangelicalism in the frontier West, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ministers in Missouri certainly organized such events through the antebellum period.²⁴ The early Hannibal Presbyterian Church was heavily indebted to the camp meeting for its early growth yet did not lay the cornerstone for its first building until 1839.²⁵ Many small frontier congregations such as this one were too destitute of cash to purchase property and often met in the homes of congregants or local schoolhouses. The Penno Baptist Church, a congregation situated on the Mississippi River in rural Pike County in the northern part of the state, offers another example of both phenomena. The seven men and six women who originally organized the church in 1819 first met in the home of John McCune since he and his wife Polly were both members. As the congregation grew members began to alternate meeting in McCune's home and a local schoolhouse.²⁶ In January of 1845, the Camden Point Baptist Church, in rural Platte County in western Missouri, had a protracted meeting that moved from house to house according to their records book.²⁷ Larger early congregations, such as the Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church in Greene County, situated in the Ozark highlands, possessed no elaborate church edifices or extensive tracts of land. Their buildings were little more than simple log cabins. After meeting in the homes of church members and a schoolhouse in their first year as an organized congregation, this congregation built a twenty by twenty foot log church in 1839.²⁸

While proceeding more slowly than their town-dwelling counterparts, the propertied gentry who led evangelical congregations in the hinterlands of Missouri also set about acquiring real estate and buildings for their village churches in the last decades of the antebellum period. The Penno Baptist Church, situated in Pike County, grew rapidly in the late 1820s and early 1830s, and another congregation, the Mt. Pleasant Church (Pike County), split off from it 1833.

The Peno Baptist Church folded in 1852 after a substantial number of its members had joined other congregations, a common occurrence among antebellum Missouri Baptists.²⁹ The Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church, also in Pike County, managed to fund a forty by sixty foot frame church in 1851. Previously they had met in a twenty-four by thirty foot log cabin that they had built only gradually in the 1830s.³⁰ Prior to becoming an anti-mission congregation, another Pike County Baptist church, Siloam, proclaimed in its rules of decorum that “It shall be the duty of all the male members to bear their proportionable [sic] part according to their worth in defraying all necessary expenses devolving the church.”³¹ Other churches in the rural Salt River Association, could not gather the resources to build frame structures until after 1840. The Blue River Baptist Association in western Missouri, which included the counties of Clay and Jackson, erected a handful of larger buildings at about the same time. Most of the churches in this rural association, however, worshiped in log buildings until the 1850s.³²

After the War of 1812, status-conscious middle-class Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in the rising river towns of Missouri turned to acquiring town lots and constructing buildings to facilitate the expansion of their churches. This was an effort that reflected their determination to spur the growth of commercial towns and their concerns with upward mobility, property ownership, and “respectability.” The urban development of the slaveholding states paled in comparison to that of the North. But towns throughout the South contained a significant middle class that interacted with the slave society and culture that prevailed in nearby rural areas. With its distinctive blend of slave-based agriculture and town-oriented commerce, a thriving middle-class emerged quickly in Missouri after the establishment of Anglo-American rule. These men and women embraced a booster mentality that sought to expand their towns as they hoped for a number of cultural and educational advancements within them. Included among the edifices

signifying refinement, civilization, and a venue attractive to outside investors were an impressive court house, a multi-story hotel, a theater house, and, ultimately, an accommodating train station. Town-dwelling leaders of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches subscribed strongly to these expressions of middle-class respectability and endeavored to construct impressive church edifices that further reflected these values and contributed to the expansion of their ranks. While the Presbyterians were surely more successful than their Baptist counterparts in this connection, the leadership of all three denominations worked persistently along these lines in the fledgling towns of Missouri. The ministers that led these congregations certainly sought to dispel a perceived excessive ambition for urban pulpits. But they, too, sought education, pastorates in flourishing towns, upward mobility, and the accomplishments that would qualify them to move among those belonging to the respectable classes.³³

Middle-class evangelicals acquired plots, pooled funds, and constructed edifices for the advancement of their churches most intensively in the towns and surrounding communities that flourished along the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. The Baptists lagged behind the other major denominations in the St. Louis through the 1830s. But only a year after meeting initially in a small room in a building on Main Street the First Baptist Church built a brick building by 1821. It was forty feet in the front and sixty feet deep, larger than many of the rural churches built in the 1840s and 1850s. After this church lost its building, the Second Baptist Church was formed in 1833 and a month later the remaining congregants from the older church joined. The new congregation bought a building that was formerly used by the Episcopal Church in 1837, which doubled its seating capacity. The Second Baptist Church had accumulated enough additional funds to finance the building of an ever larger church by 1848.³⁴ The Augusta Presbyterian

Church in Shamrock initially met in a schoolhouse after it was founded in 1846. The Callaway County congregation, however, was using its own building by 1849.³⁵

Methodists and Presbyterians in St. Louis and nearby St. Charles acquired new buildings much like the Baptists had done. The Methodists in the Fourth Street Church constructed a new house of worship in the early 1830s. The black Methodist church in that city, referred to as the African Methodist Episcopal Church, which was heavily dependent upon their prospering parent congregation, moved into a new building as well in 1834. Both churches were constructed of brick. The new edifice for the white congregation, at least, was far superior to its previous frame church.³⁶ The Centenary Methodist Church, which was set off from the Fourth Street Methodist Church as a separate congregation in 1839, earned the admiration of the town for the magnificent new church building its members funded and constructed in the early 1840s.³⁷ The First Presbyterian Church in St. Charles had accumulated enough resources by 1856 to construct a splendid new parsonage worth \$1700 with eight rooms, an attic, and a basement.³⁸

Middle-class Presbyterians in Hannibal accumulated extensive property in step with its rapid growth. The Hannibal First Presbyterian Church had decidedly humble beginnings. There were only ten congregants in the church upon its establishment in 1832, when there were only fifty residents in Hannibal itself. Seven of the ten church members, furthermore, lived outside of the infant town. Initially the congregants met at the home of Abner Nash, one of the church members. But the congregation quickly prospered. The rapid growth of the congregation after the mid-1830s, along with the town of Hannibal, facilitated improved church finances. Camp meetings in 1834 and 1835 produced fifteen and twenty-four new members respectively. By 1839, the congregation had accumulated funds sufficient to finance the construction of a new church building. Joshua Tucker, the first official pastor of the church in 1843, worked to

complete the structure. In the last several decades of the antebellum period, a number of energetic middle-class congregants – capable and successful businessmen and civic leaders – with considerable personal wealth fleshed out the ranks of the congregation. By 1859, the First Presbyterian church had gathered funds sufficient to complete the construction of yet another and much larger structure.³⁹

Hannibal Methodists secured church buildings with the same steady industry as the Presbyterians in the town. The first Methodist class met in Hannibal in 1832 when the town was little more than a rural village. The half-dozen member class, which was part of the Palmyra Circuit, formed its own church in 1835.⁴⁰ Through regular tithing and the occasional special donation, the congregation gathered a sum sufficient to erect its first building five years later, a spacious edifice capable of seating four hundred people. Known as the Fifth Street Church, it soon had membership affluent enough to attract notable ministers willing to serve as pastor, a status that its decision to side with the MECS in 1844 enhanced considerably. The 1844 schism generated a second Methodist church in Hannibal, situated on Sixth and Market streets, that chose to remain with northern Methodists after the schism. Notwithstanding the pressures from their pro-slavery brethren in the town, the MEC church gathered monies in 1853 sufficient to support the construction of a new church building made of brick.⁴¹

Methodists in Springfield, Missouri, demonstrate how town-dwelling, some evangelicals in Greene County gradually upgraded their facilities in step with rapid town growth and their entry into the middle-class. The Methodists that entered southwestern Missouri in and around what became the town of Springfield did so in humble circumstances as their denomination had little property. Like many other areas of the unsettled parts of the state, many of the local congregations were organized within the households of wealthier members. In that Greene

County settlement, the first class of Methodists was organized in 1831 at the home of William Fulbright. Desiring his fellow sectarians to have an actual house of worship the following year he designed, and built himself, the Kickapoo Meeting House for \$18. It was a log house with a crude pulpit and benches for pews. The structure, moreover, did not have an official deed as the land it was on had not been made available for purchase by the federal government. The lack of funding for Methodism in the greater Springfield area was also a problem for the ministers. One of the presiding elders of the region, Elijah Perkins, who had formerly served the Springfield Circuit, bemoaned the lack of contributions that he would receive when he preached. For instance, during one occasion in December of 1843 in his diary he wrote “and from a stout congregation, well-dressed, land and slave-owners, with other property, I did not get a cent. Oh! avarice; what hast thou done!”⁴² Like many of the other Methodist divines in rural Missouri, Perkins suffered from the meagerness of his denomination that had little in terms of property or wealth. His wife Elizabeth often lamented their family’s lack of finances. Earlier that year he missed the annual conference meeting as he lacked a suitable set of clothing.⁴³

Congregations like that in Springfield substantially augmented their property holdings as the town grew larger. In 1843 a frame church was constructed two blocks from the square. Five years later, the congregation had about 80 members, a sufficient number of worshipers that it was made a station, with its own preacher that it did not have to share with other rural churches on a circuit. With this growing property, the congregation made an important addition to the newly formed MECS after the schism. With their property, the newly formed denomination would have an important foothold in Greene County. Instead of having to deal with the lack of funds available for the clergy, ministers like Elijah Perkins could travel to the annual conference in St. Louis on a luxurious steamboat, no longer being embarrassed because of their want. Ten

years later, in 1858, the members constructed a brick edifice that was far more magnificent than any of its two predecessors. St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church South was valued at \$10,000 in 1883. In 1860, there were 207 congregants. This property, nonetheless, would be the focus of property troubles during the Civil War, as temporal concerns became crucial points in the schism.⁴⁴

In addition to garnering impressive church edifices, middle-class congregants combined their funds to establish and support denominational academies and colleges. "Benevolent" institution-building of this kind drew deeply on the can-do ethos of evangelical optimism that spurred the activism of antebellum voluntary associations.⁴⁵ Well-to-do congregants often contributed the initial lands and buildings. Church-affiliated founders frequently sold stock to secure additional capital or arranged for donations. In so doing, they depended upon subscriptions, or promises, to buy stock or make donations in future, to start up, endow, and expand church schools. Such efforts often pooled the contributions of wealthy congregants who were members of different local religious societies within a single denomination and those who held membership in societies affiliated with entirely different denominations. By virtue of their articles of incorporation, academies and colleges were, however, usually placed under the auspices of a single denomination. Donated land and gathered funds were, under the terms of the charters, typically placed in the hands of trustees.

Commitments to the perpetuation of a social and political order presided over by learned white men shaped the process by which evangelicals in Missouri established the vast majority of denominational colleges before the Civil War. These institutions were dedicated mostly to educating young men who hailed from the rural and town-dwelling gentry. In 1818, Roman Catholic Bishop of Louisiana and the Two Floridas William DuBourg garnered church money to

help establish the prestigious St. Louis Academy. But Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian congregations, their associations and conferences, and prosperous individual members supplied the bulk of funds and leadership for most of the state-chartered denominational colleges for young white men. Wealthy land owner William Muldrow and controversial Presbyterian minister David Nelson amassed the assets to establish Marion College, near Palmyra, in 1831.⁴⁶ George Collier donated the land to establish St. Charles College, a Methodist institution that the Missouri General Assembly incorporated in 1837. Through the 1850s, such schools cropped up also in the growing commercial towns along the Missouri River in the Boone's Lick. Members of the Missouri General Baptist Association spent the 1830s and the 1840s debating how best to form their own college. Baptist benefactor William Jewell of Columbia consequently donated to the association lands valued at \$10,000 to establish a Baptist college at Liberty, Clay County, on the western fringe of the Boone's Lick. William Jewell College, which opened in 1850. The state legislature chartered Presbyterian-funded Fulton College in Callaway County, which opened in 1851 and changed its name to Westminster College in 1853. The MECS transformed Howard High School in the town of Fayette, Howard County, into Central College for men in early 1855.⁴⁷ The first classes were held September 18, 1857, with one building on one acre of ground, 144 students, and three faculty members.⁴⁸ In the late 1840s, the Presbyterians chartered and endowed Richmond College in the town of Richmond, Ray County, situating it under the authority of the Presbyterian Synod of Missouri.⁴⁹

The development of a denominational college for white women in the town of Liberty, Clay County, demonstrates that funding and support for female seminaries generally took a back seat to similar efforts for young men. Evangelical education for youthful white women in Missouri partook of a larger concerted effort on the part of town-based communities to establish

academies, that is, schools that often combined secondary and college-level instruction. By 1830, the Missouri General Assembly had incorporated seven of these institutions. By 1860, it had chartered ninety more, with a substantial number of them maintaining denominational affiliations.⁵⁰ While most of these were founded for young men exclusively, more than a few appear to have been set up for young women. The origins and early development of Liberty Female Academy demonstrates how those who founded schools of this kind sometimes struggled to transform them into bona fide colleges. Situated in the town of Liberty, Clay County, bordering on Kansas, the Liberty Female Academy opened as an affiliate of Baptist-owned and operated William Jewell College in about 1849. Notwithstanding the hefty endowment for the young men attending newly-established William Jewell, Baptist leaders in the town of Liberty operated the female academy in the basement of the Liberty Baptist Church. Ecclesiastical oversight appears to have been less than optimal. Controversy arose locally in early 1851 over supposed irregularities involving church and academy funds. In March 1855, nonetheless, church leaders upgraded the school by incorporating it as Liberty Female College, commonly referred to thereafter as Liberty Baptist Female College. In August, 1856, the college, at last, erected a suitable classroom building for the exclusive use of the female students.⁵¹

As the establishment of Liberty Female College indicates, evangelical leaders turned to the Missouri General Assembly with unprecedented energy in the 1850s to obtain charters and to secure the real estate and improvements necessary for the establishment and colleges exclusively for young white women. In early 1853, George Sibley bequeathed and then, a year later, he and Mary Easton Sibley deeded to the Presbyterian Church their respective interests in the expansive St. Charles tract upon which Linden Wood School was situated for the purposes of establishing Linden Wood Female College, simultaneously acquiring a charter from the Missouri General

Assembly to do so.⁵² In 1851, the Disciples of Christ established Christian College, a school exclusively for women, in Columbia, Boone County.⁵³ In 1833, central Missouri Baptists had helped to found Columbia Female Academy. Twenty-three years later, Columbia town-booster, businessman, educator, state legislator, and Baptist congregant David H. Hickman played an instrumental role in helping to transform the academy into a full-fledged college. In 1857, Hickman and the leadership of the Little Bonne Femme Baptist Association won a legislative charter establishing Columbia Female Baptist Academy.⁵⁴ In August 1853, the Baptist Church in the town of Lexington, Lafayette County, purchased the assets of the Lexington Female Collegiate Institute and transformed it into the Baptist Female College of Lexington. Situated in a staunchly pro-slavery area of the western Boone's Lick, the college opened in September 1856 with 160 students.⁵⁵ In 1859, the MECS obtained a suitable deed of trust and legislative charter to establish Howard Female College in the town of Fayette, Howard County, which had begun as Howard Academy for Women in 1828.⁵⁶

Church and Civil (Secular) Law Relevant to the Ownership and Management of Church Property

To achieve their intertwined material and spiritual goals, middle-class evangelicals necessarily relied on denominational books of discipline and governance that prescribed the rules to be observed in obtaining and managing church property. These foundational works made the distinction between “temporalities” and matters spiritual. They set out articles of faith, the rules for ordination, and the structure of the church and outlines of church government in each case. The book for each denomination prescribed the duties of those belonging to the church, including variously the obligations of bishops, pastors, traveling ministers, exhorters, local preachers, elders, deacons, and ordinary congregants. The books also defined the duties of

church leaders for the acquisition and management of church-owned real estate, buildings, and funds. In so doing, they effectively sacralized defined duties relevant to the handling of church property. More than a few thoughtful Baptists worried that the appointment of lay trustees to handle church property, rather than pastors and elders, “departed from the Bible.” According to the Baptist Church Directory “these are appointments of expediency, and are not scriptural church officers.”⁵⁷ But the Directory recognized the distinction between spiritual and temporal concerns and that trustees were to hold property for the benefit of congregations. Consistent with the more hierarchical structure of the Methodist Church, its Discipline and Doctrines contained myriad rules and regulations for the management of “Temporal Economy.” While prescribing the authority and obligations of annual conferences, it also imposed duties on congregants, trustees, and stewards regarding the acquisition of church land, town lots, buildings, and parsonages, the construction of new church buildings, the maintenance of the ministers, support of the missions (including such efforts in behalf of slaves), the publication of books and periodicals, and the handling of donations to the church made by will or by deeds of gift.⁵⁸ The Constitution and Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church set out precisely the obligations of lay ruling elders to oversee church property, while also requiring that they comport themselves as the representatives of the congregants in the fulfillment of these duties. Other segments of the Presbyterian Constitution and Form of Government situated property ownership within the communion of saints, while also maintaining, as a matter of church doctrine that it was a sin to “take away, or infringe on title of property which each man hath, in his goods and possessions.”⁵⁹

Secular law in Missouri certainly adhered to republican principles that placed limitations on the power of the government to provide special support for churches or provide ecclesiastical

institutions special privileges for the acquisition and use of church property. The Declaration of Rights set out in the 1820 Constitution proclaimed that “no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience” and that “no person can ever be hurt, molested, or restrained in his religious profession or sentiments, if he do not disturb others in their religious worship.” In this connection, the Declaration held “that all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences” and “that no man can be compelled to erect, support, or attend any place of worship, or to maintain any minister of the gospel, or teacher of religion.” In keeping with this injunction, the Declaration maintained “that no preference can ever be given by law to any sect or mode of worship” and that “no religious corporation can ever be established in this state.”⁶⁰

Constitutional and early statute law in Missouri relevant to the civil rights of evangelicals and their educational institutions was somewhat equivocal. On the one hand, the Declaration held that “no person, on account of his religious opinions, can be rendered ineligible to any office of trust or profit under this state.” On the other, it maintained that “No person while he continues to exercise the functions of a bishop, priest, clergymen, or teacher of any religious persuasion, denomination, society, or sect, whatsoever, shall be eligible to either house of the general assembly; nor shall he be appointed to any office of profit within the state, the office of justice of the peace excepted.”⁶¹ Article VI of the 1820 Constitution, in reference to the powers of the General Assembly, held that “Schools, and the means of education, shall forever be encouraged in this state.”⁶² The 1824-25 Missouri General Assembly, as indicated above, recognized that denominational schools could obtain corporate charters and that designated trustees could hold legal title to real estate and other property of chartered seminaries, academies, and colleges for the benefit of these institutions. Such charters usefully facilitated the orderly

succession of title to such property – at a time when Democrats in the state voiced strong opposition to corporations as privileged, aristocratic institutions. The new legislation, however, mandated that no preference was to be given in the choice of trustees, professors, teachers, and students in denominational academies on account of religious opinions. The legislation also declared that the trustees, professors, and teachers were to refrain from enacting by-laws, ordinances, and regulations that “will or may in any wise control or interfere with the rights of free exercise of religious worship.”⁶³ Yet, by the mid-1840s, the Missouri General Assembly had declared explicitly that the property of religious societies was not to be taxed.⁶⁴

Elaboration of the laws relevant to freedom of conscience and the regulation of property dedicated to religious uses remained uneven at least to the end of the antebellum period. The 1845 session of the Missouri General Assembly, for example, declared that the state could no longer require a belief in a future state of rewards and punishments, a basic tenet of Christian faith, as a requirement to take an official oath.⁶⁵ In 1852, however, the Supreme Court of Missouri handed down its first decision holding that the state could promote public worship and Christian morals. In City of Hannibal v. Draper, with Judge William Scott writing the opinion, the Court held that the seller of a town lot could dedicate it by deed in perpetuity for the use of churches. According to Scott, “no argument is necessary to show that church purposes are public purposes, and that the inhabitants of a town have an interest in ground reserved for such use.”⁶⁶ For Scott, although the ruling of the Court favored the Christian religion in a manner that some Democrats with liberal inclinations deemed a contradiction with the state constitution, the court was willing to extend the protection to all other faiths.⁶⁷ The Missouri statutes, moreover, contained a series of Sunday laws proscribing work and amusements on the Sabbath to ensure that ordinary citizens could worship on that day if they so desired.⁶⁸ One of the more important

cases was decided in 1854, State v. Ambs. In that decision, the court unanimously upheld the conviction of Peter Ambs, who was cited for keeping his alehouse open on a Sunday in violation of state law.⁶⁹ Once again, with Scott writing the opinion, the Court rejected the arguments by the lawyers representing Ambs, Roswell M. Field, Christian Kribben and John Delafield, that the laws under which their client was convicted violated the establishment clause of the Missouri constitution. Instead, the court determined the Constitution was set forth to allow for the legal observance of the Sabbath. In keeping with most other state appellate courts at the time, Judge Scott held that the Missouri Constitution was “framed for a people whose religion was Christianity, who had long lived under, and experienced the necessity of laws to secure the observance of Sunday as a day of rest.” In the view of the Court, the statute in question did not support a particular denomination as a state church. Observance of the Sabbath simply promoted Christian morals and good citizenship.⁷⁰

The widely-accepted distinction between ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions shaped the way religious societies and secular tribunals dealt with church-owned and church-affiliated property. Denominational “judicatories” at the congregational level, and also to the highest ecclesiastical level in the case of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, exercised exclusive jurisdiction over spiritual matters. The rules for acquiring and managing church temporalities set out in the denominational books of governance and discipline recognized that secular tribunals ultimately had the authority to decide congregational disputes over such property. In every state of the Union, the temporal arrangements of churches, including their property rights, depended vitally on the secular legal system and its processes.

As in other states of the Union, the courts of Missouri employed a mix of Anglo-American common law rules and chancery rules of equity, or fairness, to adjudicate disputes

among denominational members over church property. Missouri adopted the common law of England statutorily in 1816. William Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England served as the primary reference for common law precedents in Missouri at least through the 1840s. The appellate court opinions of other states, increasingly systematized in comprehensive treatises, grew in importance thereafter. The common law articulated the basic rules regarding a donation or grant of property to a church. Common law courts viewed such a grant as, simply, a kind of contract. It entailed a sealed instrument containing a covenant, or promise, which bound the party who issued it. Under the circumstances, one might reasonably expect the Anglo-American legal culture that flourished in the United States in the first half of the nineteenth century to determine wholly the law relevant to church property in keeping strictly with the exigencies of free market capitalism. Under that law, courts increasingly enforced the explicit terms of contracts to convey real estate with growing vigor to promote regularity and predictability in business transactions.⁷¹ What mattered in the all-important realm of contract was the ability of two free agents to arrange a meeting of wills and come to a precise agreement. When disputes arose over non-performance or mal-performance, courts of law only had to rule on whether or not a contract had been entered into freely. Contract law and its underlying "will theory," ideally at least, looked only to the strict terms of the agreement between the parties.⁷² On the other hand, a persistent effort among lawmakers and jurists to perpetuate some traditional semblance of equity in the rules for holding and transmitting property also framed the evolution of rules relevant to church property. As indicated, trustees typically held legal title to property so conveyed only for the benefit of congregations. Trustees, consequently, had legal duties to beneficiaries that the adopted English law of chancery, or equity, was bound to protect. Chancery or equity jurisdiction, implemented by separate chancery courts in some states and by regular

courts of law in others, served as a virtual alternative system of jurisprudence.⁷³ Equity jurisdiction was designed to provide justice when the strict application of common law rules would do otherwise. By the same token, courts of equity could ignore such rules to achieve this goal.⁷⁴ Reliance on equity jurisdiction to adjudicate disputes over property held in trust for church congregations thus reinforced and gave meaning and effect to the temporal economy of churches, notwithstanding that the material relations of congregants were also enmeshed with market capitalism its associated common law.⁷⁵

Church trustees attending assiduously to their duties usually had to deal with matters decidedly mundane. Consider, for example, the ordeal of the First Baptist Church of St. Louis in about 1830. A recently-deceased trustee had omitted to fulfill his designated responsibility to file papers in the circuit court establishing a clear order of succession upon his death or the demise of any other of the trustees. This seemingly minor oversight ultimately allowed the town government to proceed quickly with plans to demolish twelve feet of the society's church building in order to enlarge the street. The congregation soon had little choice but to sell their ravaged house of worship to pay a large debt incurred thereby.⁷⁶ Take the 1854 predicament of Charles Emory and other trustees of an MECS congregation in rural Cape Girardeau County, situated on the Mississippi River in the southern part of the state. Local resident Richard Phillips had stealthily used his slaves to move their small meeting house to his own tract nearby in an effort to abate the noisy services held at the church, which he declared a nuisance. Emory and the other trustees faced the difficulty of dealing personally with the imperious Phillips and the ponderous decision of whether to collect able-bodied congregants to haul the building back to their own tract. Ultimately the trustees opted to bring a time-consuming and expensive trespass

action for money damages against the wealthy land owner, a case that ultimately rose to the Supreme Court of Missouri.⁷⁷

White Women's Benevolence

No discussion of the processes and institutional means by which evangelicals in Missouri acquired and managed their collectively-owned property, or their relationship to the church schisms, can afford to omit the critical role that women played in the development of evangelicalism and benevolence in the state. From the earlier years of missionary work in the region, women constituted the majority in most congregations and a powerful force for their expansion. Consider the observations of circuit riding Methodist minister Robert A. Austin, who tended a charge in Carrollton, Carroll County, in the relatively unsettled western part of the Boone's Lick in the mid-1850s. According to him, his bands and classes were composed exclusively, initially at least, of women and children. Much to his dismay, the men in the area typically spent their Sundays hunting or otherwise far away from church. But he took satisfaction from having later increased his adult male membership through the successful employment of time-tested revival methods.⁷⁸ Certainly Methodist circuit riders deserve credit for their arduous efforts. But the deep commitment of evangelical women to their local societies in early Missouri also went a long way toward building up their numbers, especially in rural villages and sparsely-settled frontier areas. As historian Christine Leigh Heyrman points out, wives, mothers, daughters, aunts, and grandmothers in Missouri had ready-made marital, family, and clan ties through which they could spread the Gospel and enlarge fledgling societies. The evangelism of such women undoubtedly produced intra-marital and family turmoil on occasion. Nonetheless, along with camp meetings, revivals, and the difficult ministries of circuit riders, their determined

efforts account for a substantial amount of the steady increase in congregational and denominational numbers.⁷⁹

The strong commitment of white women to church life undoubtedly figured importantly in the tendency of white men in Missouri to regard them as the living embodiment of religious truths. Those with southern orientations associated the antebellum ideal of “pure white womanhood” with evangelical understandings of female piety.⁸⁰ According to historian Frances Lea McCurdy, politicians in antebellum Missouri scored points with white male audiences by catering to such beliefs. Leading men infused their oratory with strong moral and religious overtones, a practice grounded in evangelical belief that the Bible was the inspired word of God. Reliance upon this ceremonial practice became common as ordinary white men in the state increasingly joined churches and also enjoyed growing electoral power after statehood and the election of Andrew Jackson to the presidency.⁸¹ Part and parcel of the religiously-underwritten oratorical approach was to render copious compliments to the virtue of white women. Politicians extravagantly praised such women, regardless of social rank, for possessing a number of hallowed attributes, which included bringing white men into the world, nurturing them to manhood, and instilling in them courage and patriotism. Equally important was to emphasize strongly, as one Fourth of July speaker put it in 1835, “the great moral force of woman over man.”⁸² Of all women, speakers honored the mother most, emphasizing her moral purity and love, her sacrificing deeds and words.⁸³ By the same token, political invective targeted any and all masculine behavior that dared to sully the sacred character of any white woman, especially in regard to her assigned reproductive role. Rarely overtly referencing the interest of men in policing the sexuality of their wives against the sexual encroachments of other men, speakers reserved as the worst condemnation of an elected official the charge that he had committed

adultery or fathered a child out of wedlock, sins on a par with financial dishonesty and cowardice.⁸⁴

Young women with gentle upbringings who endured the hardships of pioneer settlement in Missouri appear to have drawn much solace from their evangelical faith and considerations of Divine Providence. Consider Martha J. Wood, a young unmarried woman from Albermarle County, Virginia, who settled near relatives in the slaveholding Boone's Lick County of Saline, Missouri, with her sister Mary, her six children, and her brother-in-law Thomas H. Cobb in early May 1857. After having ferried across the Mississippi River in late April of that year, and having contemplated the many thousands who had had the advantage of steam boats to make the dangerous crossing, Woods wrote, "How these thoughts conspire to make us remember our own feebleness and entire dependence on the Mercies of God"⁸⁵ Following a day of travel through a "poor hilly part of the state with the roughest, most grotesque, looking set of ruffian settlers imaginable," Martha concluded that "the people seem to be nearly heathens as there are no churches to go to, and they spend the Sabbath visiting, hunting, or even in more vicious sport, as we passed some men pitching money on Sunday and from their red faces coarse behavior and horse laughter; looked as if the intoxicating draughts had passed freely"⁸⁶ About six weeks later, Martha wrote that she and her family had been "first dissatisfied with the country," but that now "we like [it] better." The continuing problem was rather simple: "The want of Church privileges is our greatest cross. Though we must do in this as in everything else, trust in God"⁸⁷

After having returned to Missouri in spring 1860 from a trip back to Virginia, Martha's difficulty with the illness and death of a close relative left its mark. According to Martha, she was "deeply depressed in spirits" and "suffering Mentally and bodily so that I can hardly support

under it.” Martha had arrived from Virginia only three week earlier, and, in her words, “what have I not endured since then! Non[e] but God knows. Just one week today my idolized nephew was dying, expecting every moment to be his last. Oh the agony of that day!” Martha wrote also that she “ought to try to bear my troubles better for the sake of the sorrowing ones around me, but the heart will ache on and no power of mine can stay it. My darling ceased to suffer tomorrow week I should try to submit to God’s decree.” In this context, she wrote, friends nearby seemed “very distant. None have been for several days, do they think we do not need a word of comfort or do they wish to shun such sorrows as ours? Oh may they never know from experience what such sorrow[s] as ours are is my prayer for Christ sake.”⁸⁸

To some extent, the evangelical faith of Martha Wood was of a quality that commonly helped single white women in Missouri meet the difficulties of life and, in particular, make the extraordinarily arduous efforts that a patriarchal southern Protestantism often demanded of them. Historians Carla Wall and Barbara Oliver Korner aptly point out that Martha Wood’s diary “reveals that her faith in God’s guidance sustained her in the trials of life” and helped her to meet the “selfless duty that often fell to unmarried women of tending the sick and less-fortunate relatives.” Southern society assigned to women the critical role of “sustainers of the family.” Motherhood “was a high and sacred calling” in a white, male-dominated society that limited women’s options for self-fulfillment.” Martha Wood had no children of her own. But the feelings she expressed about the illness and death of her favorite nephew exemplify the caring role that southern patriarchy and evangelicalism assigned to women in general – a role that “might mean sacrificing her own desires and emotional needs.”⁸⁹

Additional insights into the difficulties of Martha Wood can be gleaned by taking to account her situation on a trans-Mississippi Southwest frontier that was experiencing unusually

complicated and rapid economic transformation. By early 1859, Martha and her family had moved to the town of Arrow Rock, Saline County's most important Missouri River port and a busy point of embarkation for travelers bound for Santa Fe. In February of that year, Thomas Cobb prepared to begin operating the Arrow Rock Hotel, completing the preparations in late April or early March. As a town-dweller linked to a lucrative family enterprise, and a bona fide member of its middle class, Martha continued to conceive of the successes of her family and their and difficulties in terms of the working out of God's divine plan. According to her diary entry at about that time, "We have moved twice and have made many acquaintances, had some joys and many sorrows but in them all we have great right to be thankful to Divine Providence. And in one of my blessings have I more right to be grateful, than that our dear Mother has been spared to come see us and spend the Winter" ⁹⁰ Certainly women with southern orientations continued through the antebellum era to place a high premium on the customary expectation that they be devoted mothers and family caregivers. But, as discussed earlier, antebellum Missouri was not situated in the Deep South, and its development entailed a distinctive mix of yeoman homesteading, slave-based agriculture, and commercial enterprise, including the rise of a coherent middle class in the river towns where commerce and industry proliferated. It is well established that middle-class culture in the early national and antebellum periods tended to ameliorate the most inequitable features of traditional household patriarchy. Such middle-class views undoubtedly also shaped Martha's understandings of her faith, her emotional needs, and her decision to tend to her beloved dying nephew. ⁹¹

The 1847 diary of Susan B. Vanarsdale suggests rather well the moral compass of a young, unmarried Missouri woman who defined herself and conceived of her life in terms of middle-class norms, evangelical rectitude, and benevolent service to others. Vanarsdale was born

on a farm near Harrodsburg, Kentucky, in 1824. Her father, Peter and mother Charity, opposed slavery and moved the family of nine to the town of Carrollton, Illinois, in 1836. In early 1845, friends of the Vanarsdales invited Susan to move to the town of Mexico, Audrain County, situated north of the Missouri River in the slaveholding Boone's Lick, to set up and teach a subscription school. This was a common practice among unmarried young women of the town-dwelling gentry and, from the view of fathers and mothers, intended to be a brief interlude before marriage. Susan boarded with several families, a practice that served as a chaperoning and support system designed to ensure a young single woman's reputation for virtue. She assiduously attended church meetings, sometimes those of the Cumberland Presbyterians and, at others, those of the local Baptist association. Susan had strict views about the behavior deemed proper for a young woman of her class and religious orientation. She frowned on dancing and gambling. And, perhaps, her firm moral rectitude played some role in unraveling a romantic relationship that had been very meaningful to her. She believed she had little choice but to rebuff the advances of one suitor, Mexico physician Louis Nathaniel Hunter, whom she actually loved. The problem, which grieved her deeply, was that Dr. Hunter had attempted to be physically intimate with her on one occasion – which Susan interpreted as a clear sign that he had no respect or love for her at all.⁹²

In the context of her difficulty with Dr. Hunter, Susan was thankful but also dissatisfied with having succeeded in meeting the standards that evangelical middle-class society prescribed for its young, unmarried women. On Sunday, July 11, 1847, she decided not to attend the meeting of the Cumberland Presbyterians in Mexico but took the time, instead, to write at length in her diary. According to the entry for that day, her home at Mr. White's was "as pleasant as can be," her life "has not been a monotonous one," and she had "more than realized the fondest dreams of my youthful days." Others had come to esteem and praise Susan highly for her

“intelligence and moral worth,” and some of her “most intimate acquaintances have called me talented,” although she took these comments as flattery. “I have received much for which I should be thankful, kind friends have ever been around my way, Christian parents who brought me up in the fear of the Lord; education and manners which have secured for me the good will and respect of all, there is no one in the world whom I wish ill, nor do I know that I have an enemy; yet what avails all this to me now.”⁹³

In the same entry, Susan indicated more directly her thoughts and feelings about the social expectation that she marry a member of her own class, the frustrations brought on by the failure of a suitable marriage partner to appear, and a tendency to interpret these developments as a difficult-to-accept dispensation of Divine Providence.

As for Romance, I am fully satisfied with it. [M]any have sought to win my heart and hand, Lawyers, Doctors, Preachers, etc., and more than one has gone partially deranged because they could avail nothing. I have never received a proposal that I felt the least inclined to accept; if I were a Roman Catholic, I would now certainly enter a nunnery, for the world has no charms for me; but no, this is wrong. I have a great work to do, to stand in my lot and wait my Father’s time”⁹⁴

In the coming weeks, Susan conveyed once again an outlook framed by feelings of being disappointed with her situation, involvement in church life, and a sense that Providence had dealt her an unusually difficult hand. On July 20, 1840, Susan expressed her disapproval of the bulk of her earnest suitors in a witty and somewhat humorous poem, which opened with the lines, “Old Widowers – how much they swarm around / Like birds on summer’s day.” The poem closed with an injunction for them to desist and “let young men have a chance.”⁹⁵ Her entry for Sunday, August 12, 1849, was even more telling: “Went to the Baptist Association ten miles from town at the Prairie church. A very large congregation there. Heard five sermons Wrote a long piece of poetry last week. ‘A Fancy Sketch, Irena.’ It is little else than my own experience” The

opening verse of the poem summed up Susan's mood succinctly: Why sits Irena thus apart / With wearied look and saddened heart? / Why wanders from the crowd away / To spend in solitude the day?⁹⁶ On Sunday, September 16, 1849, Susan returned to the theme of her unsatisfactory fate:

Dr. McConnell gave offense by preaching about church discipline. He also spoke of the sin of murmuring against Providence, to which my conscience pleads guilty. I cannot but ask why I have to endure so much Emaline and I talked almost all night. I told her of what had passed between L. [Hunter] and myself. She could hardly believe, and it does seem to me yet as if I must have been dreaming⁹⁷

The 1860 diary of Elvira Weir Scott conveys palpably the sensibilities of a married white woman with Protestant middle-class understandings of her domestic obligations as both a caring mother and slave mistress. Born in Indiana in 1821, Elvira Ascenith Weir married John P. Scott, also from Indiana, in about April 1844. The couple relocated the next month to Miami, Missouri, a river port town situated on the Missouri River in Saline County. Two years later, John went into the dry goods business, and the Scotts had two daughters in 1845 and 1855, Hebe and Eva ("Pet"). By the time Elvira began keeping her diary in early 1860, she and John were the owners of several slaves. Her entries convey the interests and outlook of a genteel, town-dwelling woman deeply concerned with matters of faith and, apparently, quite comfortable with slavery. On Sunday, January 29, 1860, which she described as "a clear and beautiful day," Elvira wrote that she did not go to Sunday school because she did not feel well. Instead, according to her, "I read in the Bible" and concluded that the "more I read & improve myself on the subject, the more I am convinced that the Episcopal Church has greater claim to being the true church that the Apostles set up on earth than any other in existence." Her wish for the coming year was "to live a better life than ever before" and "to read my Bible & Prayerbook daily." On the following

day, she wrote that she had “passed the day pleasantly” by practicing on the piano and beginning to learn “The Child’s Wish,” a popular poem conveying the simple desire of a child to go to heaven carried in the August 1856 edition of The Child’s Paper, a periodical published by the American Tract Society. With equal satisfaction, it seems, Elvira wrote that she had “finished a pair of stockings for Belle,” her slave woman, and “took tea” with “Mrs. A.” She concluded with the comment that “there are times when it does not seem much trouble to do right” and duly recorded that she had “read three chapters in Ecclesiastes.” A week later, Elvira thanked God that she had “been able to pass through the entire week without being angry or speaking harshly to anyone, although I have been severely tempted. What a pleasant thing is a clear conscience! I have read in my Bible every day this week & have sought earnestly to do right”⁹⁸

Elvira Weir also committed to her diary in early February 1860 concerns about her daughters that were solidly grounded in well-established evangelical middle-class understandings about the proper ordering of the home and childhood development. On this occasion, Camilla, a friend of Elvira’s older daughter, Hebe, was staying over the night, but the two had “gone to dancing school” for the evening. This was a situation, however, that had left Eva, ten years younger than Hebe, feeling extremely let down about not having been included in the outing. According to Elvira, “It goes to my heart to see Pet so disappointed about [not] going.” Apparently Eva had been allowed to attend the “dancing school” on an earlier occasion. Under the circumstances, Elvira seemed especially to commiserate with her: “I feel sorry that she ever went at all, but know that it is best at her age to keep her from such places. It takes her mind off her studies. But that is not the greatest consideration: dancing parties, conducted as they are here, will not improve her mentally or morally.” Elvira wrote further that Pet simply could not understand fully why “she is . . . thwarted in her inclinations now.” The predicament appears to

have been as difficult for Elvira as for Eva: “It is painful to me to cross her” But she comforted herself with the idea that she had made the correct decision. Having, it seems, embraced fully the middle-class view of childhood as a distinct and critical phase for the development of character, Elvira explained that “nothing but a sense of duty compels me to do it. Oh! For wisdom to guide my children aright, for strength & grace to live daily before them as a consistent Christian, keeping in subjection every evil passion” Last Elvira invoked the middle-class ideal of a beneficent domestic sphere, the maintenance of which was imperative for inculcating proper Christian morals in a child of impressionable years: “[I]f we strive to make home Eden-like, if we govern our little ones with no less kindness but more firmness, if we live so that every night we can feel that our peace is made with God: what a happy New Year this one will be – shall we not try?” Of course, the year didn’t end that happily for most Missouri slaveholders.⁹⁹

Middle-class white women in St. Louis were the earliest foot soldiers and organizers of benevolence in Missouri. Its advance across the state was a thoroughly evangelical middle-class project that arose primarily in St. Louis shortly after the War of 1812. The Sunday school, Bible Society, and temperance movements in Missouri all originated in the town in the three year years that followed the war. Organized campaigns against gambling and other kinds of irreligion also arose there in that period. The reverends John Mason Peck, Timothy Flint, Salmon Giddings, and other missionaries not only established new churches but helped to generate the local enthusiasm for these voluntary efforts. On the other hand, white middle-class women in St. Louis commonly provided the bulk of the often arduous labor of physically delivering charitable resources to the poor and needy, distributing Bibles and tracts, and actually teaching Sunday school. Women in St. Louis, furthermore, formed autonomous female auxiliaries of the American Bible Society

even as they enthusiastically contributed their time and labor to the benevolent causes organized and led by ministers and adult male laity. In 1818, for example, St. Louis churchwomen established a charitable society for orphans. In 1824, they organized the St. Louis Female Charitable Society, which banded together for the purpose of “relieving the poor of every description in the city.”¹⁰⁰ By that time, the Missouri Bible Society in St. Louis included a women’s auxiliary, which specialized in distributing Bibles to the destitute.¹⁰¹ The volume of benevolent labor provided by white women in St. Louis increased in the 1830s and to the end of the antebellum period in step with the steady increase in the number of evangelical churches in the city.¹⁰²

Middle-class church women placed an extraordinarily active, if not predominant role, in expanding the reach of benevolence into the hinterlands of the state. Small town and village churches targeted the gamut of misconduct that St. Louis ministers Timothy Flint, John Mason Peck, and other trans-Mississippi Southwest missionaries condemned forcefully in their sermons and other publications. While the temperance movement originated in St. Louis, it quickly spread westward along the Missouri River corridor. Temperance tracts reached the Boon’s Lick in 1818, the very year organized temperance activism arose in St. Louis itself.¹⁰³ Middle-class congregants in the growing towns along the Missouri and Mississippi rivers followed the lead of middle-class benevolent activists in St. Louis and mobilized to establish voluntary associations, including local Bible, tract, and Sunday school societies, temperance organizations, and auxiliaries of national organizations such as the General Union for Promoting the Observance of the Christian Sabbath.¹⁰⁴ Congregations and temperance activists in the river towns of the Boon’s Lick and in Cape Girardeau, a Baptist stronghold, seem to have been especially eager to attack the blight of hard liquor in the 1830s.¹⁰⁵ As had been the case initially in St. Louis, town-

dwelling church women generally did most of the leg work. They played a principal role in establishing the first church-based philanthropic organizations and mite societies in the port towns along the Missouri and Mississippi rivers beginning in the late territorial period.¹⁰⁶ The oldest American Tract Society auxiliary in the state was the St. Charles Female Auxiliary, which was formed in 1830. Susan Platt, an acquaintance of Mary Easton Sibley, served as its treasurer and principle contact.¹⁰⁷ Beginning in the 1830s, benevolent women plied Bibles and temperance tracts throughout the county seats and river towns of the Boon's Lick. In 1841, church women in Marion County combined to form the Palmyra Auxiliary of the American Bible Society.¹⁰⁸ In the 1840s and 1850s, town-dwelling church women across the state taught Sunday school, distributed tracts, and campaigned with special vigor against intemperance, helping to generate dozens of legislatively-chartered local temperance societies in the process.¹⁰⁹

While evangelical middle-class women in antebellum Missouri certainly did not organize en mass to effect radical changes in socio-economic and political relations, there were undoubtedly a few who chipped away at the bulwarks of traditional patriarchal power. In the French and Spanish colonial periods in Louisiana, private schools for young ladies had emphasized graceful accomplishments rather than the more demanding intellectual labor required of young men, that is, the study of Greek and Latin, the classical literature in these languages, higher mathematics, modern political philosophy, law, and rhetoric. Before and for several decades after the American takeover up Upper Louisiana, female academies typically offered needlework, art courses, reading and writing in French and English, history, and instruction in morals and manners. School mistresses and masters conceived this curriculum, of course, as befitting the future domestic endeavors of the students as wives and mothers. The most notable antebellum challenger to patriarchal education in Missouri was Mary Easton

Sibley. It appears as though Mary carefully paid polite lip service to the patriarchal dictate that women should not speak publicly but rather attend dutifully to their assigned role. But her combativeness and outspokenness in the company of both women and men at Linden Wood and in other venues suggests that she honored these time-worn injunctions as often in the breach as otherwise. Swept up in evangelical moral and social reform, Mary instituted a new regimen for the young ladies at Linden Wood School in 1833 that departed substantially from that which their well-to-do parents expected. Simply put, Mary made her students tackle difficult academic subjects and put them to work, in keeping with the egalitarian manual labor philosophy popular among reform-minded northerners. Her aim was, according to her diary, to terminate

That pernicious system of education so common especially in slave countries, which turns upon the world thousands of my sex helpless dependent creatures, mere Doll babies dressed up for exhibition, decorated with external accomplishments . . . but of no manner of use either to themselves or their fellow creatures, when called upon to take their stations in society as wives, mothers & heads of families.¹¹⁰

By the late 1820s, leading men in Missouri were struggling to adapt to an expanded role for at least well-educated, elite and middle-class women. In 1828, for example, one St. Louis editor railed against the outrageous conduct of Frances “Fanny” Wright, who had dared to venture out of her proper sphere by speaking repeatedly at important public venues.¹¹¹ Part of the problem, undoubtedly, was that the controversial Nashoba Community the Scottish-born lecturer, feminist, and abolitionist had recently established in west Tennessee for the education and liberation of African American slaves was situated only a few hundred miles down the Mississippi River from St. Louis. Support for separate education of the sexes continued to receive broad public support in the 1830s. But as the work of historian Christie Anne Farnham reveals about the slaveholding states as a whole, young women in private schools and academies in Missouri increasingly

studied the same subjects as young men and routinely participated in the activities of literary societies, which often entailed public speaking.¹¹²

In the late 1820s, a handful of benevolent women joined the short-lived St. Louis chapter of the American Colonization Society, which drew substantial support from the embattled anti-slavery minority in the town. Friends of the multi-denominational society met initially in March 1825 at the Fourth Street Methodist Episcopal Church to take into consideration the advisability of establishing a St. Louis chapter of the national organization. The assemblage elected Presbyterian minister Salmon Giddings chairman and then appointed Giddings and Methodist minister James Keyte, a native of England and a partner with John O'Fallon in the mercantile business, to draft a constitution. At an 1827 meeting of the society, the St. Louis Missouri Republican reported that a number of “respectable ladies and gentlemen” were in attendance. As was the custom of the society, ministers and other leading men from the vicinity delivered the speeches and transacted the formal business of the meeting. After the usual series of opening addresses, the prime question for discussion was whether there were, in fact, any free blacks, either in Missouri or Illinois, who were willing to migrate to Liberia.¹¹³ Under suspicion locally for having a membership that included those with abolitionist sympathies, the St. Louis society was slow to get off the ground. It met next, and for the last time, in 1830. In attendance, along with a number of liberal-minded St. Louis political leaders, were the Reverend Salmon Giddings and Baptist minister James Mason Peck, who actively opposed slavery.¹¹⁴ The St. Louis chapter of the ACS crumbled in the face of growing pro-slavery public opinion in the town. Middle-class evangelical women appear to have had played a subordinate role in the brief life of the local society. But the mere willingness of these women to join the society and appear at its public

meetings, as was the case with the men of the chapter, required a considerable amount of determination and courage.

Middle-class evangelical women organized independently to raise funds to support local religious societies and augment their property holdings. The Centenary Methodist Church of St. Louis, for example, was deeply beholden to its women's auxiliary for the financing of its first infrastructure expansion. In early 1840, the white women of the church combined to establish the Female Centenary Society, which put on its first fair in May of that year. Contributors to the St. Louis Missouri Republican lauded these enterprising women for their autonomous fundraising efforts, which had played a major role in financing the acquisition of the property for and construction of the new church building that was the talk of the town.¹¹⁵

Evangelical middle-class women routinely donated property to local religious societies in their capacity as wives. The transactions by which the Fourth Street Methodist Church of St. Louis initially acquired various lots and church buildings demonstrate quite well this common practice. The Fourth Street Church, parent society of the Centenary Church and the first bi-racial Methodist society to be established in the town, first benefitted from the generosity of Sally Massey Piggot and her husband Isaac, a local Methodist minister. On March 5, 1822, they deeded to the trustees of the Fourth Street Church its first frame building on the corner of Fourth and Spruce.¹¹⁶ In about 1830, congregant Caroline Schutz O'Fallon and her husband John, nephew of William Clark, influential businessman, and St. Louis political leader, donated and together deeded to the trustees a well-situated lot on Fourth Street upon which the congregation soon erected an impressive edifice.¹¹⁷

Evangelical women in Missouri commonly helped produce the property that they and their husbands donated to religious societies and other evangelical institutions. In her seminal

study of the antebellum South Carolina low country, historian Stephanie McCurry demonstrates rather clearly that white women in the yeoman class, along with other household “dependents,” including the children wives bore and raised, provided much of the labor which supplied the economic and political independence of yeomen farmers.¹¹⁸ The productive and reproductive labor of women certainly helped to generate the household income and marital property of yeomen and planters in the rural precincts of antebellum Missouri. By the same token, such efforts helped produce the marital property such men sometimes donated to religious societies and other evangelical institutions, either in the form of tithes or conveyances of real estate. The labor of white women in the state, however, also provided a good bit of the material resources and operating room with which their husbands became established members of the middle class. Especially after the War of 1812, Missouri society featured an extraordinary degree of upward socioeconomic mobility and opportunity in growing towns. White men on the make commonly began their middle-class careers with incomes derived from productive farms, and it was common practice for such men to continue these operations when they moved to town to pursue professional and other white collar occupations. The time, energy, and opportunity for such rural and town-based efforts depended critically on the production and reproduction of wives, daughters, sons, and other household dependents. By the same token, such labor provided the wherewithal by which enterprising white men acquired title to the land, town lots, and improvements that they and their wives sometimes donated to local religious societies and schools.

Benevolent Gifts and the Ecclesiastical and Civil Law

Through the antebellum period, Missouri legislators ameliorated a number of the most inequitable features of the received English law of marriage and divorce affecting the donations

that spouses made to local churches and other evangelical institutions. The law of husband and wife instituted in Missouri in 1807 was grounded in the patriarchal principles set out in the centuries-old English common law of coverture. Legislative records suggest that lawmakers in the state, well into the antebellum period, sometimes ridiculed proposals for improving the marital rights of free women. In 1847, one legislator jokingly moved that a woman's petition for an unusual legislative divorce be referred to the tobacco committee rather than the judiciary committee, which was the ordinary practice.¹¹⁹ But through the antebellum era, legislators in Missouri modulated its law of marriage, marital property, and judicial divorce in ways that reflected liberalizing trends in domestic relations law that were occurring contemporaneously in many states of the Union, changes which placed importance on middle-class companionate marriage ideals.¹²⁰ New measures provided a wife the means to obtain a court injunction to restrain a husband who wasted and misused the separate property she had brought into a marriage. Grounds for judicial divorce expanded to permit women to divorce abusive and irresponsible husbands who squandered marital property of any kind. Lawmakers articulated more elaborate rules for alimony, maintenance, and child support and expanded the right of women to obtain custody of young children in keeping with the enlightened "best interests of the child" doctrine.¹²¹ These developments comport quite well with the findings of legal historian Mark M. Carroll in his study of antebellum Texas. According to Carroll, such changes, especially in the area of marital property law, occurred not only in the northern states but also in the slaveholding polities of the trans-Mississippi Southwest. While retaining a number of traditional patriarchal prerogatives, the frontier law relevant to husbands and wives pragmatically subsumed increasingly reciprocal and egalitarian standards for middle-class domestic relations to bring it in line with the marital exigencies and expectations of arduous pioneer settlement.¹²²

Under Missouri law, wives had substantial legal rights to the property that they and their husbands donated to local churches and other ecclesiastically-affiliated organizations. No less the case in middle-class households than in rural ones, when a woman brought separate real estate into a marriage, persistent patriarchal law placed all powers of its management in the hands of her husband. A man legally owned all money, movable property, and real estate resulting from his own efforts and the labor of wives, children, and other household “dependents.”¹²³

Not untypical among the states of the Union, however, the legal regime adopted by the Missouri legislature also recognized the capacity of a free woman to retain and acquire substantial property after marriage. Before wedding, she could place substantial moveable property and real estate in the hands of a trustee, typically an adult male relative, to be used exclusively for her benefit and that of her children during the marriage. Prospective spouses rarely employed this device. But even in the absence of such a trust, ultimate legal ownership of separate real estate that a woman brought into a marriage remained with her; she was entitled to it after divorce from or the death of her husband.¹²⁴ By pre-marital agreement, prospective spouses could establish for a wife an estate in the lands and tenements owned by her husband at the time of marriage and subsequently acquired by him, commonly known as a “jointure,” to take effect on his death and to continue during her life.¹²⁵

Of considerable importance for the purposes of this discussion, was the common law right of a widow to dower, which granted to her one-third the lands her deceased husband had legally owned at the time of and through the marriage for the duration of her life.¹²⁶ Mainstream common law in the United States did not allow a wife dower in real estate to which her husband had initially acquired legal title as a trustee, a rule that the Missouri Supreme Court only had occasion to adopt shortly after the Civil War.¹²⁷ In cases where prospective spouses had set up a

jointure before marriage, the law permitted a widow to elect, or choose, whether to avail herself of the estate provided by that agreement or the estate provided by dower.¹²⁸ But given that jointures were relatively rare, widows usually claimed dower rights to marital property, a practice that generated a plethora of lower-court litigation and Missouri Supreme Court rulings before the Civil War.¹²⁹

Missouri law imposed a number of procedural requirements on the process by which women and their husbands donated real estate to local religious societies and other evangelical institutions. As in many other states, Missouri statute law required the signature and authorization of both spouses to convey by deed real estate to which a husband held legal title. Included was an acknowledgment by the wife that she had voluntarily agreed to relinquish all dower claims to such lands. As an added protection for wives, presumed to be especially vulnerable to the coercion of a husband, the law required that she acknowledge her relinquishment before an official outside of the presence of her husband.¹³⁰ Missouri statute law similarly required the signature of both spouses for the wife to convey by deed the separate real estate she had brought into a marriage. The required signature and presence of the husband, in theory, protected his wife from the deceit and coercion of the prospective buyer. The requirement that she verify her conveyance outside the presence of her husband, theoretically, protected her from overreaching and duress on his part.¹³¹

As the venture of Mary Easton and George Sibley at Linden Wood School demonstrates rather well, assertive evangelical women could play the primary role in shunting marital property legally owned by husbands to local religious societies and evangelical schools. Leading and ordinary white men in antebellum Missouri generally applauded the moral superiority of their wives, their special station in this regard, and their religious commitments. Under the

circumstances, it seems quite likely that more than a few middle-class white women had little difficulty persuading husbands to donate marital property, if only in the form of tithes, to evangelical enterprises. It also seems very probable that such women sometimes independently tithed with money they acquired from family members, their own labors, or that their husbands allotted to them on a routine basis in the form of an “allowance” or “pin money.” Such practices would comport rather well with the argument made by legal historian Laura Edwards in her study of the Carolinas to about 1840s that married white women in the slaveholding states commonly possessed and controlled substantial personal property and real estate notwithstanding “law on the books” focusing on “ownership” that declared this impossible.¹³²

Missouri law tended to render legally invisible, or otherwise obscure, the substantial labor and property that evangelical women willingly contributed as wives and mothers to local religious societies and other evangelical institutions. A husband and father who regularly tithed at church donated money that the Missouri law of marriage recognized as his exclusively. But the labor of his wife and any children of their marriage, including daughters, commonly helped to produce a substantial segment of such donated funds. Given the generally strong commitment of white women in the state to the churches of which they were members, it seems unlikely that they often objected strenuously to this particular exercise of patriarchal prerogative. Procedural safeguards intended to prevent wives from being unjustly stripped of their separate property and dower lands undoubtedly made real estate transactions more reliable and predictable in an increasingly capitalistic free-market economy. They certainly drew reinforcement from the determination of nineteenth-century lawmakers in Missouri and elsewhere to accommodate increasingly egalitarian and companionate marital ideals favored especially by the middle class. Such requirements, inherently, reflected persistent patriarchal power and related gender norms,

as a matter of fact, in both town and country. But their adoption also suggests that, when a married couple in Missouri donated real estate to a local religious society, evangelically-affiliated educational institution, or other benevolent enterprise, wives knowingly, if not willingly in most cases, departed with their dower or separate property, or both, for the benefit of these organizations.

No less than the modulated common law of Missouri, evangelical church rules subordinated women to men within congregations. Historian Christine Leigh Heyrman shows that pious white women in Missouri and other states within the emerging Bible Belt often spoke at meetings, led prayer, and served as exhorters before ministers and influential laity began to sacralize and enforce household and slaveholder patriarchy after about 1820.¹³³ As historian Nancy Isenberg emphasizes, the high estimation that antebellum white men generally maintained of the special piety of white women did not translate into equality of opportunity for them within local societies or larger church hierarchies. It is well established that, by the 1830s, ministers, elders, and other adult male leaders in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches denied free and un-free women official positions of leadership and responsibility. Leading men in each denomination confined the extent to which women could assume important clerical and lay positions or publicly profess their faith.¹³⁴ This was certainly the case in Missouri in the last four decades of the antebellum period. In that period, all three of the major evangelical churches in the state excluded women from not only the ministry but also other important lay posts, such as warden, sexton, steward, and trustee of church property.¹³⁵

Evangelical church rules effectively channeled funds and property produced and donated by women congregants into the hands of the white men who led congregations. Adult female congregants not only supplied a substantial amount of the labor required to implement

benevolent outreach, they did so as unremunerated volunteers. Such efforts provided cost savings and redounded to the benefit of congregational coffers and those of evangelical schools and other denominational and multi-denominational organizations. Church women also garnered substantial property for congregations by recruiting husbands, adult male relatives, and other men who, as members, regularly tithed. In addition to their own tithing, evangelical women combined with their husbands to donate marital property, including sometimes the separate property they brought into marriages, but, more commonly, their dower interests in the real estate to which husbands held legal title. Under well-established rules in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches, white men – that is, trustees, building committee members, wardens, and sextons – ultimately took legal ownership or managed all of these assets, and, in some case, both. Certainly church rules and the civil law required these men to manage all of this property strictly for the benefit of their congregations, including women members. But decision-making power in this connection remained, ultimately and exclusively, with the white adult male leadership.¹³⁶

Ecclesiastical authorities in Missouri certainly relied heavily on the civil law relevant to marital property to secure the donations of real estate made by women and their husbands to local religious societies and evangelical schools. After all, deeds conveying real estate that was also marital property were not valid unless they conformed to the law regulating such transactions. The Baptist Church Directory and The Constitution and Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church made no explicit references to such requirements. But that part of the Methodist Doctrines and Discipline entitled “Temporal Economy,” included a separate section setting out the forms to be used by those devising property to the church and spouses donating or otherwise deeding property to it. The basic deed of settlement was serviceable for the most

common kinds of marital property donation – that of a wife’s separate property and that of the marital estate legally owned by the husband. Included was specific language by which a wife relinquished her separate property, life estate under a pre-nuptial jointure agreement, or dower rights, as well as spaces for the signatures of both spouses. Also included in the standard form was a separate acknowledgement for the wife, including a space for her signature and that of the civil official who examined her outside the presence of her husband.¹³⁷

The Providential View of Good Fortune

Middle-class evangelicals in Missouri appear to have resolved or easily learned to ignore any fears they may have had that their success, influence, and wealth might lead them into the sin of “mammonism.” Ministerial admonitions against mammon worship at the local level in Missouri, especially among Baptist and Methodist clerics, certainly continued to the end of the antebellum period.¹³⁸ The earnestness with which bishops at the highest level of Methodist leadership continued to enjoin such waywardness can be found, for example, in the Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church and of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, after 1845, books which were widely disseminated to ministers and laity in Missouri and elsewhere.¹³⁹ But Methodist doctrine, as well as evangelical teaching in general, also allowed that devout Protestants might well acquire substantial wealth without lapsing into Godlessness. Middle-class evangelicals in Missouri, in fact, appear to have commonly taken the view that their efforts to be successful and wealthy were not necessarily inconsistent with sincere Christian devotion and salvation. As in the Northeast, middle-class men and women in the commercialized precincts of the state embraced the evangelical prescriptions for industry, thrift, and self-control that were the hallmark of the so-called “Protestant work ethic.” Church books of discipline, denominational catechisms, and sermons commonly set out these virtues as important moral and

religious obligations. The free-market economic principles of the Whig Party powerfully reinforced such beliefs in Missouri, especially in those areas of the state where commerce and the river trade flourished. As historian Jeffrey Adler emphasizes, the constant flow of Protestant “Yankee merchants” into St. Louis through the period brought religiously-infused pro-capitalist impulses to Missouri with special force.¹⁴⁰

Evangelicalism offered more than the assurances of the Protestant work ethic to permit middle-class church-goers in Missouri and elsewhere to adopt a positive self-image of piety and substantial property-holding. Evangelical understandings of Divine Providence were not inexorably configured to mesh with the quid-pro-quo contractual framework of emerging free-market capitalism. Certainly the common view of Providence allowed that God might reward, on earth, those who were virtuous. But evangelicals of any station and rank could make the distinction between the sin of avarice and the simple good fortune that God might choose to bestow on any individual, even in the absence of extraordinary merit. Ample biblical verse and basic theological commentary maintained that, in this fallen world, some were to be rich and others poor, some mighty and others weak and dependent. And it was well understood that the Almighty often worked in unfathomable ways.¹⁴¹

Undergirding the providential view of good fortune was the orthodox Protestant moral philosophy commonly taught in the very kind of institution that George Sibley sought to establish at Linden Wood with his 1853 bequest. Among other things, this mix of rational natural theology and scriptural exegesis emphasized a hierarchy of social relations, related duties and rights, and power that obscured emerging conceptions of socioeconomic class. Eighteenth-century Anglican clergyman Samuel Clarke and Scottish Presbyterian theologian Frances Hutcheson developed the rudiments of orthodox Protestant moral philosophy that held sway in

the United States before the Civil War. Its principles certainly underwrote middle-class understandings of industry, thrift, and self-control. But this body of thought and sentiment also encompassed a centuries-old organic understanding of society. In this view, the social organism comprised a complex network of relations between equals and between those who governed and those who were to be governed. Moral obligations ordained by God and revealed by scripture, reason, and conscience defined and regulated these relations. Central to this “moral science” was the idea that obligations and rights varied in accordance with what was “fitting” for those ensconced in specific relational pairs, including God and one of his human creatures, civil magistrate and citizen, master and servant, husband and wife, and parent and child. By the same token, this framework entailed moral duties that existed between individuals who, by divine dispensation, had unequal amounts of natural endowments, opportunity in life, social status, property, liberty, and power.¹⁴² Those with advantages, capacity, and wealth were to be kind and charitable to the disadvantaged, poor, and dependent, who were, in turn, generally obligated to obey and be grateful.¹⁴³ By the end of the antebellum period, Old School Presbyterian academies and colleges in Missouri commonly advanced the schema by assigning relatively recent texts authored by orthodox Presbyterian theologian Archibald Alexander of Princeton and also treatises by eighteenth-century Anglican theologians Richard Whately, William Paley, and Joseph Butler.¹⁴⁴

Evidence suggests that middle-class evangelicals in Missouri perceived the property their churches and institutions accumulated as, primarily, the fortunate dispensation of Divine Providence. As discussed, church-going women and men often unselfishly donated monies and real estate to build up their local societies and denominational academies and colleges. For them, impressively-built houses of worship and well-endowed schools were a point of collective hope

and pride. That part of the 1853 will in which George Sibley bequeathed his Linden Wood estate to help establish Linden Wood Female College reveals rather succinctly this common understanding. Sibley conceived of individuals wealthy enough to make monetary contributions to the new institution to be, simply, fortunate beneficiaries of God's mysterious grace – and also under a moral obligation to share their worldly goods with those less fortunate. In his words, while also writing for Mary Easton Sibley, “we do hope and trust that those Christians who are so well able (in God's good providence) to set up the proposed School, as it is fit it should be set up, will ere long manifest their sense of Christian duty by supplying all pecuniary means--”¹⁴⁵

Conflict over Slavery and Evangelical Property Disputes

Congregations whose members reached unanimity on the question of slavery after the national schisms in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches, not surprisingly, rarely ruptured into factions contending for control and ownership of congregational property. Certainly congregants in all three denominations looked with trepidation upon the prospect of realigning with new national or regional organizations. That these developments implicated the contentious moral issue of slavery made such changes disturbing to most even as an abstract proposition. In rural villages, where Methodists and Baptists were far more numerous than Presbyterians, co-congregants undoubtedly had varying opinions about the morality of slavery and whether that question was one that ecclesiastical authorities should decide. But congregants were usually of one mind about the official position they would take on the question of whether their society, as a whole, would retain or change its affiliation with a larger ecclesiastical body. For congregants such as these, at worse, denominational fracture entailed mostly the unpleasantness of losing ecclesiastical connections with their northern brothers and sisters. The disposition of church property to which these congregants held title simply did not figure

significantly into their responses to larger denominational conflicts – or in their assessment of how their collective decision as a local society would dispose them toward their neighbors and relatives. The situation was similar for congregants in the commercial river towns that flourished in slaveholding areas along the Mississippi River south of St. Louis and along the Boone’s Lick of the Missouri River to the western border of the state. In these areas, a pro-slavery consensus prevailed among town-dwelling middle-class congregants. Similarly to the situation in the rural countryside, congregational unity focused the heated passions of middle-class church members against their anti-slavery denominational counterparts further north and east and mostly outside the state – and made considerations of congregationally-owned property only a minor consideration.

In Mississippi River towns such as Hannibal, St. Charles, and St. Louis, strife among Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian women and men co-congregants over slavery fundamentally implicated the fate of congregationally-owned property. Among the cosmopolitan middle-class members of these urban congregations, especially Methodists and Presbyterians, opinions about the morality of slavery were strongly felt and unusually diverse. These co-congregants certainly had to decide whether or not to align or not with new regional and national denominational organizations. But, unlike the bulk of their counterparts in areas of the state where sentiment in favor of slavery was more homogenous, contending factions here also had to decide whether to remain unified as a single congregation or go their separate ways. Intra-congregational conflicts certainly stemmed from sincere desires to be on the correct side of the moral and theological question of African American bondage. But they also arose from practical considerations of self-interest turning on the question of how, in the event a society split, congregationally-owned property should be allocated between contending factions. Women and men who had tithed

regularly and contributed to the life of the church had a vital stake in this question, as did women and men who had donated real estate and money to found a church or subsequently improve its situation. At best, such conflicts could result in a fair division of congregational property peacefully and respectfully negotiated. In the worst case scenario, one segment of a congregation could demand exclusive ownership of all congregationally-owned property while an opposing faction could take the same uncompromising position – generating an impasse that could disintegrate into a highly personal and vindictive power struggle.

Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian co-congregants in Missouri at odds over the question of slavery after their respective denominational schisms did not, it seems, usually resort to litigation to settle disputes over control and ownership of church property, at least not before 1860. Readily available records suggest that litigation between such factions was rare, at least before the Civil War.¹⁴⁶ Evangelical leaders generally expressed considerable unease with the prospect of church officers going to law over such disputes. Denominational leaders, in fact, typically wanted to avoid property disputes at all costs. The books of governance and discipline prescribing rules and procedures for trustees, wardens, and ministers for the acquisition and management of church property made that abundantly clear. This position is evident, for example, in a section of the Baptist Directory, which declared that going to law in this way “was severely censured by the Apostle [Paul], and deserves to be made a cause of discipline in every church.” Ministers routinely enjoined their ordinary congregants not to sue other members.¹⁴⁷

Even in the absence of actual litigation, civil and ecclesiastical law fundamentally shaped the parameters of conflict among congregational and denominational factions divided over slavery. Certainly most religious societies in that state that were afflicted with internal dissension over the slavery issue managed to defuse their conflicts without disputes over church property

informally. But secular and religious law relevant to church property constituted a central dynamic of intra-denominational and intra-congregational disputes among those that did fragment. This was especially true in the case of town-dwelling religious societies. Middle-class factions divided over the slavery question commonly struggled with unrelenting energy to secure at least what they perceived to be their fair share of congregationally-owned property and, in some cases, all of it. Combatants invariably had no choice but to take into account the rules of church and secular law that they knew were enforceable in courts to engage their factional opponents.

The legal interests of evangelical middle-class women in the marital property they commonly deeded with their husbands to church trustees could place such women at the center of congregational and family strife over the moral question of slavery. Take, for example, the predicament of Mary Kingston Tabor. In 1834, Mary and her husband Joseph Tabor, a trustee and minister for the St. Louis Fourth Street Methodist Church, executed a title bond, or promise, to deed to the African Methodist congregation affiliated with the Fourth Street Church their one-half interest in a lot on Green Street upon which the African congregants had built a separate house of worship for themselves.¹⁴⁸ The other one-half interest belonged to John and William Finney, Joseph Tabor's business partners and fellow Fourth Street trustees. Mary, however, was the maternal aunt of the two sisters married to John and William Finney. She, Joseph, and the Finney brothers were also somewhat bound together by virtue of their national heritage. All four, it seems, were immigrants from Ireland.¹⁴⁹ In September 1846, much to the consternation of the Finney brothers, both of whom strongly supported slavery, anti-slavery stalwarts Mary and Joseph, with the latter acting in his capacity as trustee for the Fourth Street Church, deeded to the free black men acting as trustees of the African Church their one-half interest in the Green Street

property. Previously warm and cooperative family relations cooled considerably, while Mary was left torn between loyalty to her abolitionist husband and loyalty to her nieces and their pro-slavery spouses.¹⁵⁰

To some extent, the predisposition of divided co-congregants to avoid litigation over church property permitted assertive majorities to retain ownership of its entirety and to the detriment of vanquished minorities. Amid the schism that enveloped Missouri Presbyterians in 1841, and after fully debating the issue of separation, the majority of the First Presbyterian Church of Hannibal decided to adhere to the New School, while the minority of Old School adherents determined to go their own way. The minority, twenty-four members plus a ruling elder David R. Downing, formed a church – that is, withdrew from the majority, left them with the lands and buildings, aligned with the Palmyra Presbytery of the Old School, the Second Presbyterian Church, and raised funds for their own lot and building. Another ruling elder, John M. Nelson, joined the new church in 1845. The combatants parted ways, it appears, without litigation. Demands by the congregants of the breakaway Second Presbyterian Church of Hannibal that they be compensated for their regular monetary contributions to the church treasury largely fell on deaf ears. Consequently, the Second Presbyterian Church experienced severe financial problems from its founding. The victorious majority had managed to retain possession and control of virtually all of the valuable church property.¹⁵¹

As in Hannibal, an aggressive congregational majority in St. Charles co-opted all of the property owned by the society and at the expense of a seceding minority faction. The First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles split on whether to join the General Assembly of the Old School or that of the New School twenty-nine to fourteen when they voted in April of 1840 during the early stages of the Missouri Presbyterian disintegration. James Gallaher, the pastor of

the church, however, left with his family and a number of congregants. In September of 1841 the schism was complete in the view of the Old School members of the First Presbyterian Church. They “agreed by unanimous vote that who went with the Rev. Ja[me]s Gallaher and had not returned should (according to order of presbytery) no longer be considered members of this church.”¹⁵² In the end, twenty members left the First Presbyterian Church to join the New School either in St. Charles or elsewhere. Gallaher also brought with him his wife and six children as they set up another church in November of 1842 in an old building on Main Street in St. Charles. The new church was called the Constitutional Presbyterian Church, a reference to the fact that the New School envisioned itself as continuing to follow the Presbyterian constitution after their illegal expulsion from the General Assembly in 1837.¹⁵³ While the schism did not terminate some continuing movement of members between the two congregations, the Old School-dominated First Presbyterian Church retained virtually all of the church-owned property, while forcing the expelled New School members into debt to survive.¹⁵⁴ The First Presbyterian Church was able to erect a large brick parsonage in 1856, and their property remained substantial. The Constitutional Church, however, was compelled to borrow six hundred dollars in 1845 to erect its own church structure. Given that the Old School congregants paid \$1,700 for their parsonage, it seems fairly clear that the victors in the intra-congregational struggle had managed to appropriate the bulk, if not all of the funds held by the church before it ruptured.¹⁵⁵

Church authorities with control of a school firmly secured by a deed of trust could usually manage ministerial strife within their own ranks over the moral question of slavery without spurring property disputes or other disruptions. Even so, persistent differences of opinion within reconfigured denominations could still create problems. Consider, for example, the difficulties the MECS Missouri leadership faced while attempting to establish a school principal

in a new academy it had set up in the staunchly pro-slavery venue of Howard County. In 1835, well-to-do Methodist laymen William Swinney dedicated the land upon which the residents of the town of Fayette, Howard County, sought to establish Howard College. Swinney owned a large plantation called “Sylvan Villa,” worked by slaves, and several tobacco factories in the nearby the town of Glasgow. Efforts by Fayette town boosters to obtain a charter to transform the college into the new University of Missouri failed when their Columbia counterparts won the bid. Sometime in the latter part of 1846, Swinney conveyed to the MECS by deed of trust the tract and existing building of the defunct Howard College, including the stipulation that the new institution to be established would be run strictly as an MECS operation. While also working to found a new college in the town of Liberty, Clay County, the southern Methodist leadership in the state soon dispatched recently-ordained Methodist minister Nathan Scarritt, an experienced school master from Illinois, to take charge of the situation in Fayette. The Reverend Scarritt and his brother-in-law, William T. Lucky, promptly set up Howard High School, which included both a department for women and men. The American Bible Society named Scarritt its agent at the school in October 1846. The MECS Missouri Conference and school trustees soon after appointed him the principal of the men’s department, while allowing Lucky to take charge of the women students. But the arrangement did not hold. The Reverend Scarritt had certainly been ordained an MECS minister. But he was also a stout anti-slavery man and, as well, a strong Unionist. As was the case with more than a few anti-slavery Methodist ministers who sided with the MECS after the 1845 Methodist schism, Scarritt took the view that the institution of slavery was primarily a matter of social relations and civil government and beyond the spiritual purview of the church. But his moral opposition to slavery, alone, made him not at all a good fit for the vast majority of the residents in Howard County, the premier pro-slavery, anti-Benton

Democratic stronghold of the state by the late 1840s.¹⁵⁶ Within eighteen months, MECS authorities and school trustees had eased Scarritt out of his high-profile position as principal of the male department, replacing him with the Reverend William T. Davis, a solid southern Methodist.¹⁵⁷

Middle-class evangelicals who had legally obligated themselves to endow church schools suddenly caught up in the uncertainty of schism could rather easily avoid making their promised donations. Consider, for example, the imbroglio involving pro-slavery Methodist merchant William Finney and the trustees of St. Charles College, chartered by the MEC in February 1837. Along with his brother John, Finney had pledged \$1,000 in November 1836 to help set up an endowment for the college, which had been primarily funded by wealthy benefactor George Collier. The subscription included a promise to pay the new school interest on the sum for ten years and then the entire principle at the end of the period. Given his staunch support of slavery and animus toward the northern wing of the Methodist Church, Finney had grown skeptical about his subscription after the struggle ensued in 1844 between the MEC and the newly-formed MECS for control of Methodist churches and institutions in both St. Louis and St. Charles. He was bound by law to make his principal payment of \$1000 in November 1846. But when the due date rolled around Finney decided he didn't want to risk his money on a school that the MEC might soon take over. So he simply omitted to make the payment, a step that would later, however, cause him considerable difficulties with his MEC opponents.¹⁵⁸

As the 1853 decision of the Sibleys to endow Linden Wood Female College suggests, the Presbyterian schism that played out in St. Charles had done little to improve the viability of Mary Easton Sibley's struggling academy. According to historian Mary Ellen Rowe, George Sibley had tried gently to rein in his wife's tendency to make provocative public pronouncements

regarding slavery and had done all he could to minimize the consequential damage when he failed.¹⁵⁹ Enrollments at Linden Wood School, however, continued to decline after the St. Charles Presbyterian Church and the St. Charles Presbytery fractured into opposing factions in October 1840. At that point, a hefty segment of the New School clerical leadership in the vicinity openly opposed slavery. Mary and George closed Linden Wood School in 1841 while the schism within the St. Charles Presbyterian Church reached its grim culmination in September of that year. They re-opened the school in 1842, but it continued to falter. Certainly economic distress in the region attendant on the nationwide depression following the Panic of 1837 figured in this development, as did the ongoing challenge of keeping teachers at Linden Wood who could meet Mary Sibley's uncompromising standards and tolerate her overbearing personality. Equally problematic, however, was Mary's well-established reputation as a Presbyterian anti-slavery activist, which persisted amid rapidly-growing public resentment of New School abolitionism in both St. Charles and St. Louis. In fall 1844, George ran for a seat in the Missouri Senate but met with defeat. At about the same time, it seems, Mary came to see the wisdom of playing a less high-profile role at Linden Wood. Thereafter she acted only in the capacity as chief administrator. But she continued to monitor closely and advise the young ladies at the school about their private lives and religious bearing. Only ten students enrolled in the spring 1848 term, which brought staffing and financial difficulties to crisis proportions.¹⁶⁰

The Sibley solution, as indicated, was formally to affiliate Linden Wood with the Old School Presbyterian Church and re-organize it as a full-fledged college for women. In 1841 and 1847, the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church had adopted resolutions outlining a program for establishing new Presbyterian grammar schools, academies, and colleges across the country. By early 1851, Mary and George had begun to lay pragmatic plans to take

advantage of this ambitious agenda to save Linden Wood. On February 24, 1853, they and the leaders of the Presbytery of St. Louis succeeded in having the Missouri General Assembly incorporate the school as Linden Wood Female College. It would appear that, by placing the school under the auspices of the now thoroughly Old School-dominated St. Louis Presbytery, either Mary or George, or both of them, sought to quell adverse public resentment of the notorious New School anti-slavery orientation of the school.¹⁶¹ Mary undoubtedly understood that to place the college under the auspices of the recently-formed New School presbyteries of St. Charles or St. Louis would have sealed the doom of the institution. In any case, George was, at this point, about seventy-one years of age and seriously ill. His family and associates considered him virtually an invalid. And he appears to have wanted very much to rectify the situation quickly.¹⁶² On March 11, 1853, he rewrote his will. In it, he bequeathed the whole of his Linden Wood estate in trust to the fifteen members of the new Linden Wood Female College Board of Directors, which comprised three Presbyterian ministers and twelve influential Presbyterian men, some of whom were well-established elders. George also took special care to include a declaration that “my said beloved wife Mary E. Sibley shall continue in the full possession of same for and during her natural life to use and enjoy the same together with all rents and products that may accrue therefrom”¹⁶³ With this provision, George provided Mary a life estate in all the bequeathed Linden Wood property, implicitly in lieu of her dower right to a life estate in only one-third of the property.

George carefully crafted safeguards against any attempts by the Linden Wood directors to abuse his generosity. Evidencing this was the addendum to his will, signed also by Mary and witnessed by Old School minister, member of the board, and clerk of the St. Louis Presbytery Samuel B. McPheeters. According to the addendum, the college was assured that, upon George’s

death, the school would receive no less than 120 acres of Linden Wood land, valued at about \$30,000. This acreage would include “all the present improvements, buildings, gardens, orchards, and fields” as well as several platted lots that might be sold or leased to raise needed cash. The proviso also declared that the actual amount conveyed “may not improbably extend to one hundred & fifty acres.”¹⁶⁴ Also establishing themselves as important founders with a donation of \$5000 were Linden Wood board member, Presbyterian elder, prosperous St. Charles County farmer, and native of Pennsylvania Samuel Stewart Watson and his wife Mary Lewis of St. Charles.¹⁶⁵ On February 6, 1854, the Sibleys jointly covenanted and bound their executors, administrators, and heirs to deed Linden Wood Female College their respective interests in the property. But this conveyance would include only “title to as many acres of land at Linden Wood as may be “amply sufficient” for the purposes set forth in the March 1853 will.¹⁶⁶ Mary thus effectively promised, in the event that she survived George, to relinquish a life estate in Linden Wood property that might range from 120 upwards to 150 acres. The amount of acreage ultimately conveyed would depend on the preferences of the four individuals George named to execute his will in probate proceedings. This group included Mary E. Sibley, her brother Alton R. Easton, and two members of the Linden Wood Board of Directors, lawyer and former St. Louis clerk of court Archibald Gamble and James S. Watson of St. Charles, brother of board member Samuel Watson. George was sick, old, and feeble but not demented. He intended to leave Linden Wood Female College an ample minimum amount of well-developed acreage that might, however, be enlarged should the school proceed as directed. By the same token, he intended to leave Mary an ample amount of leverage should the board of directors dare to displease her – delimited, however, by the majority decision-making power constituted by the three men, including her brother, also appointed to execute the will.

Quite naturally, the St. Louis Presbytery agreed to take responsibility for Linden Wood Female College and, in future, appoint directors who would run it in accordance with the general guidelines set out by George Sibley in his will. Among other things, the school was to “use the Bible as a primary textbook, and the directors were to maintain a school “in which the whole system of instruction & discipline shall be based on the religion of Jesus Christ as held & taught in the confession of faith & catechism of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, adopted by the Gen’l Assembly of said church in the year of our Lord, 1821” For good measure, George declared that instruction shall “be always under the general control & supervision of the Presbytery of St. Louis of the Old School of the Presbyterian Church.”¹⁶⁷

It seems virtually certain that the arrangement of ecclesiastical power established at Linden Wood Female College and its new mode of operation were not at all satisfactory to Mary Easton. Notwithstanding her views on the matter, George had been adamant about making the college, forever, an Old School Presbyterian institution. The growing local reaction to abolitionism, especially after Missouri “border ruffians” and anti-slavery Kansas settlers began shedding blood in spring 1854, further energized the Old School majority in the St. Louis Presbytery against their anti-slavery critics. The Board of Directors of Linden Wood Female College, which opened officially on September 6, 1857, selected the Reverend Abraham V. C. Schenk, native of Brunswick, New Jersey, the first president of the college. At thirty-five years of age, Schenk had finished his education under the likes of conservative Old School Presbyterian ministers Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and Samuel Miller at Princeton Theological Seminary. Specializing in Metaphysics and Sacred Literature, Reverend Schenk took a firm scriptural stand against making the morality of slavery a matter of Presbyterian faith. “Aunt Mary,” however, continued to embrace New School opinions and oppose African

American bondage. With her usual energy, she campaigned relentlessly to raise funds for the new college. But President Schenk and the Linden Wood Board of Directors gingerly eased her out of any role that might entail direct contact with the students. The professors avoided her.¹⁶⁸ Perhaps most galling to Mary was the 1860 arrival of the Reverend Robert P. Farris, who became pastor of St. Charles Presbyterian Church in that year. Born a native of St. Louis in 1826, the son of an eminent lawyer, and a graduate of Yale, Farris had been one of the pro-slavery stalwarts initially appointed to the Linden Wood Female College Board of Directors.¹⁶⁹ After Farris settled into St. Charles with his wife, Eliza Bowen, he took over the editorship of the staunchly Old School and pro-southern St. Louis Presbyterian.¹⁷⁰

Less than two years after the opening of Linden Wood Female College, George and Mary were at odds with its board of directors. George had every intention of leading a quiet life after setting up the school. But his health rapidly declined. Mary, at the relatively-youthful age of fifty-six, acted in his stead as a member of the all-important college building committee. Ambitious board plans for a commodious new classroom and administration building, laid in May 1856, prompted her to keep a close watch on the other members. She boldly intervened in attempts to ensure the project kept strictly within the guidelines she and George had prescribed. Amid lavish ceremonies on July 4, 1856, Linden Wood board members and St. Louis Presbytery dignitaries laid the corner-stone. One year later the fine, new three-story school building was complete.¹⁷¹ But the way the board had gone about the project and subsequent expansion initiatives left George, and presumably Mary, not at all happy. Their complaints appeared unmistakably in a stern letter George wrote on June 3, 1859 to President of the Board John Jay Johns, son of an eminent Virginia planter, eight-year resident of St. Charles, and a slave holder who had been an elder in the Presbyterian Church for almost two decades.¹⁷² According to the

letter, the members of the board were guilty of having bargained, sold, and “frittered away” too much of the bequeathed Linden Wood land to finance the new school building, the construction of other edifices, and the payment of ordinary operating expenses and miscellaneous debts.

Language in George’s original bequest declared unequivocally that the directors might sell some of the Linden Wood real estate, at least the platted lots, for the use and benefit of the college.

But, somehow, the directors had gone wrong. According to George

The devise was not made, or ever for a moment intended to be made, to Build, but to aid in the Endowment” of the College. Not to erect Edifices and their appendages. Nor to aid in the payment of any debts that may be contracted but of the purpose, “And no other,” Any perversion or alienation of this fund or any part of it, from that object, may work the forfeiture of your title, and the consequent loss of the whole property. This ought to be carefully guarded against.

To reiterate the point, George also made reference to a supplemental covenant to deed, which he and Mary had executed on July 4, 1856 – the very day the directors and St. Louis presbyters had gloriously laid the corner stone for the new classroom and administration building: “The 120 acres of Land conveyed by this Deed, with all its rents, revenues, & avails . . . accruing, shall never in any manner, or under any pretense whatever, either in whole or in part, be diverted or alienated from the proper benefit, service & behalf of the College”¹⁷³

Mary Easton Sibley very likely relished having combined with her seventy-seven-year-old husband to place her pro-slavery Old School nemeses on the Linden Wood Board of Directors between a rock and a hard place. Quite clearly, she and George had snatched away the gleaming prospect that they might, ultimately, enlarge the Linden Wood “donation” to 150 acres. And George’s threat was potent. After all, legal title to the increasingly valuable real estate would not vest in the board of directors until George died and Mary and her three co-executors had probated the will. President Johns undoubtedly knew full well that George could revoke his

bequest at any time. And Mary was certainly lucid, knowledgeable, and willful enough to assist the old man with such a revision. To say the least, this would have opened a huge can of legal worms for the St. Louis Presbytery, the Linden Wood Female College Board of Directors, and others who had contracted to pay, or had already paid, for Linden Wood lots and tracts that the Board of Directors had necessarily conveyed only contingently.

Conclusions

Intra- denominational and intra-congregational strife over African American bondage became most intense when it implicated the conflicting claims of urban middle-class congregants over church-owned property. While divergent views on the morality of slavery underlay evangelical strife, the determination of mutually antagonistic middle-class congregational factions to retain ownership of disputed church lands and buildings made congregational and denominational splits extraordinarily contentious and public altercations. Equally important, benevolent women in town-dwelling congregations had vital stakes in disputed church lands, buildings, and schools, and these women sometimes played key roles in such contests.

The experiences of George and Mary Easton Sibley with the establishment of Linden Wood Female College certainly highlight the fact that middle-class evangelical women played a role in the endowment and advancement of benevolent enterprises no less vital than that of their male counterparts. The successful efforts of the Sibleys to save the school from extinction also underscores the fact that middle-class evangelical women and men, as spouses, sometimes built up the property and value of denominational educational institutions to promote their own religious preferences. In the case of Mary and George, it is not at all clear that they were of one mind on this point. But their venture was, nonetheless, somewhat distinctive, given that they both sought to spur the higher education of young women – a commitment that departed substantially

from the customary practice of church and denominational leaders in Missouri to support most energetically educational institutions for young men.

The formal process by which George and Mary endowed Linden Wood demonstrates that wives, whether under the law of dower or that relevant to other life estates, usually possessed legally cognizable property interests in the lands and buildings that they and their husbands donated to ecclesiastical organizations. That George alone had the legal power to bequeath the Linden Wood real estate, however, punctuates the fact that husbands legally owned the improvements that benevolent wives commonly made to their lands. Secular law concerning marital property and ecclesiastical rules similarly subordinated even influential middle-class women such as Mary and channeled property resulting from the productive and reproductive labor of wives into the hands of husbands, fathers, and adult male church trustees. Yet her extraordinary efforts to establish Linden Wood Female College as she saw fit also demonstrate that a strong-willed and intelligent woman could sometimes make patriarchal “law on the books” work for her. More important, for the purposes of this chapter, the efforts of George and Mary to establish Linden Wood Female College demonstrates the larger pattern in which middle-class evangelicals who had built up church institutions in places like St. Charles could see their mutual efforts and, to some extent, their domestic unity, fall prey to the factional turmoil attendant upon the evangelical schisms over slavery that arose in the state after 1837.

Church land and edifices were a relatively minor concern among the ordinary residents who attended camp meetings and revivals in newly-settled Upper Louisiana and Missouri. But after the War of 1812, middle class Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians turned to constructing churches and denominational academies with remarkable energy. The churches and denominational colleges with the most impressive grounds and buildings arose in St. Louis and

in the towns that flourished in the slave-holding counties along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. This effort certainly reflected their determination to encourage the growth of commercial towns and one that expressed their strong yearnings for upward mobility, property ownership, and social respectability. But it also registered their deeply felt commitment to religious life and constituted for them a point of collective hope, satisfaction, and pride. A providential view of personal and collective good fortune predisposed them to view such material acquisitions as a dispensation of God's grace.

Methodists and Baptists comprising congregations in the rural regions of the state generally subscribed to relatively homogeneous views in favor of slavery. For rural congregations, as well as for middle-class congregations in the towns situated in the slaveholding Boone's Lick, intra-congregational strife over congregationally-owned property did not punctuate their responses to the schisms that erupted within all three of the major denominations in the period 1837-1846. These congregants had the luxury of abandoning larger denominational affiliations, if they so chose, or concentrating their ire on far away anti-slavery co-denominational opponents further north and east.

But in places like Hannibal, St. Charles, and St. Louis, where more liberal-minded church members more often opposed slavery, conflict among middle-class co-congregants about the question placed the fate of congregationally-owned property squarely in the balance. Intra-congregational splits became far-reaching. Contributions of property by women and men co-congregants in an expelled or seceding faction could be irretrievably lost. Given the constitutional imperatives of religious freedom, church-owned temporalities fell within the jurisdiction of the secular law. Chancery rules of equity, or fairness, defined the rules by which trustees were to manage the property they legally owned for the benefit of congregations. Most

of the intra-congregational strife that arose among Methodists and Presbyterians in St. Louis, St. Charles, and Hannibal before 1860 never entered the courts. But secular and ecclesiastical rules relevant to church property fundamentally shaped them. Such conflicts divided not only houses of worship but also those of husbands and wives, families, and larger communities of believers.

Notes

¹ Kristie C. Wolferman, The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley: Pioneer of Women's Education in Missouri (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 1-33.

² Hopkins was an early opponent of slavery on religious grounds. In 1776 he published a pamphlet entitled A Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the Africans, showing it to be the Duty and Interest of the American States to emancipate all their African Slaves (1776). See also A Discourse upon the Slave Trade and the History of the Africans (1793).

³ There John established his own newspaper, the Fayetteville Gazette. Elizabeth Hopkins died in 1790, when George Sibley was eight years old. John married a widow, Mary W. Winslow. In Fayetteville, George Sibley received his education and apprenticed as a bookkeeper in the counting house of John Winslow. Charles T. Jones, George Champlin Sibley: The Prairie Puritan (Jackson County Historical Society, 1970), 33–35.

⁴ Wolferman, The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley, 34-74; Mary Ellen Rowe, "Mary Sibley: Genteel Reformer," in Yvonne Johnson, ed., Feminist Frontiers: Women Who Shaped the Midwest (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2010), 21-24.

⁵ Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 25-26; Sibley journal, 4-7, Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society; Wolferman, The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley, 75-87. Lawrence O. Christensen, William E. Foley, Gary R. Kremer and Kenneth H. Winn, eds., Dictionary of Missouri Biography (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 698-99.

⁶ Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 27; Sibley journal, 7-12, 18-19, Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society; and George C. Sibley, "The Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, MO, Its Recent History and Disturbance," *ibid.*

⁷ Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 27-28; Sibley journal, 47-48, 80, 87, 90, Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society; William Russell to George Sibley, July 10, 1831; George C. Sibley to William Russell, May 23, Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society.

⁸ According to historian Mary Ellen Rowe, "Mary expressed no personal sense of guilt on this matter, nor any condemnation of her family, friends, and acquaintances; the evil of slavery was an abstraction, or something that happened off at a distance in the Deep South." Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 28-30; Charles Van Ravensway, St. Louis, An Informal History of the city and Its People (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1991), 265-67; Sibley journal, 34, 62-67, 73, 77-78, 84, 92, Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society. Wolferman, The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley, 88-116; Lawrence O. Christensen, William E. Foley, Gary R. Kremer and Kenneth H. Winn, eds., Dictionary of Missouri Biography (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 698-99.

⁹ Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 31.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 31-34.; Joseph C. and Owen Lovejoy, Memoir of the Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy; Who was Murdered in Defense of the Liberty of the Press, at Alton, Illinois, Nov. 7, 1837 (Freeport, NY, 1838; reprint, Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), 160-61; Paul Simon, Freedom's Champion: Elijah Lovejoy (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press,

1994), 27-30, 35-36; Merton L. Dillon, Elijah P. Lovejoy, Abolitionist Editor (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), 64; Henry Tanner, The Martyrdom of Lovejoy: An Account of the Life, Trials and Perils of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy . . . (Chicago, 1881; reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1971), 95.

¹¹ Over the next few years, New School Presbyterian advocacy of abolitionism began to generate public resentments and declining memberships. Rev. Dr. Cochran, “Historical Sketch of the Synod of Missouri,” Minutes of the Semi-Centennial Session of the Session of the Synod of Missouri (St. Louis, 1882), 38, 58; Rowe, “Mary Sibley,” 31.

¹² Legal historians Leonard W. Levy, Edward L. Bond, and Thomas E. Buckley agree that a prime feature of church establishments in British North America was the legislative award of legal and property rights to officially approved churches. Colonial assemblies also granted lands to established churches for the construction of meeting houses and parsonages. Such holdings served as important sources of income for the established churches. Leonard W. Levy, The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment (New York: Macmillan, 1986), 1-24; Edward L. Bond, Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony: Religion in Seventeenth-Century Virginia (Macon, Ga. : Mercer University Press, 2000), 130-31; Thomas E. Buckley, Church and State in Revolutionary Virginia, 1776-1787 (University of Virginia Press, 1977), 10-12.

¹³ The initial basic question was whether the Protestant Episcopal churches were to retain their former property rights. According to Green, the issues demanded special attention as the Virginia State Assembly dealt with the question of disestablishment. The assembly had passed a law in 1776 recognizing the rights of the Anglican Church to its lands and other property. Twelve years later, it enacted a bill that formally incorporated the new Protestant Episcopal Church, a measure that also gave it the power to manage its own holdings. After the Virginia Assembly passed Jefferson’s Act for Establishing Religious Freedom (1786), however, it repealed the incorporation statute in the face of complaints by dissenting religious societies that corporate privileges smacked of establishment. Of considerable importance, however, the same statute also included a proviso authorizing all religious societies to hold property through trustees selected by congregants. Amid the hue and cry raised by Jeffersonian Republicans over the repressive legislation of the Federalists during the Quasi-War with revolutionary France, the assembly rescinded the law. Steven K. Green, The Second Disestablishment: Church and State in Nineteenth-Century America (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 221-22.

¹⁴ The Episcopal Protestant Church brought a lawsuit challenging the Virginia law that had divested it and other churches of this legal prerogative. The case came before the United States Supreme Court in Terrett v. Taylor (1815). Justice Joseph Story, who routinely championed government support of Protestant religion, held for the church. While questioning the power of the Virginia assembly to repeal church ownership rights granted by a valid law, the decision rested on the holding that religious societies were to be treated no different from other organized social entities. Religious societies, through duly appointed trustees, held rights to property ownership and management that the civil law was bound to recognize and protect. Both McGarvie and Green emphasize that treating the formerly privileged churches as private entities

marked a major step toward disestablishment. Terrett v. Taylor, 13 U.S. 43 (1815); Green, The Second Disestablishment, 222; Mark D. McGarvie, One Nation under Law: America's Early National Struggles to Separate Church and States (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004), 174-75.

¹⁵ Perhaps one of the most well-known early monographs emphasizing the shift is Paul E. Johnson, A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978). Johnson maintained that members of a newly-formed middle-class, at least in Rochester, New York, to about 1837, embraced evangelical religion primarily to stake out their claims as respectable members of society. He seems to suggest that concerns about salvation and spiritual uplift were of relatively little importance. Instead, Johnson emphasizes that middle-class women and men embraced evangelical moral values and habits of industry that would ensure socioeconomic success and rein in the unruly behavior of an increasingly-independent and unruly laboring class. Johnson's interpretation comports with scholarship, which arose in the 1960s, arguing that evangelical reformers before the Civil War sought primarily to control the so-called "dangerous classes," especially in growing urban places. Clifford S. Griffin, "Religious Benevolence as Social Control, 1815-1860" Mississippi Valley Historical Review 44, no. 3 (1957): 423-44; David J. Rothman, The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971; Aldine Transaction; Revised edition, August 1, 2002); Susan Ryan, The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); Ronald G. Walters, American Reformers, 1815-1860, New York: Hill and Wang, 1978; Revised Edition 1997. Perhaps one of the most widely-read monographs making the case that early evangelicals jettisoned their more pietistic habits for free market advantages is Charles Sellers's The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). Historian of American religion Mark A. Noll aptly points out that money was "close to the heart of all significant developments in the history of American Protestants between the War of Independence and the Civil War." Mark A. Noll, ed., God and Mammon: Protestants, Money, and the Market, 1790-1860 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 3.

¹⁵ But Richard J. Carwardine, a specialist in the same field, maintains that scholarship emphasizing a seismic cultural shift among nineteenth-century evangelicals in the United States from suspicion of free market capitalism to avid support of the new economic order may well make too much of the plethora of middle-class writings and publications from the period without taking into account sufficiently popular working-class culture and people of faith who were less prone to record their thoughts on the question, such as common farmers, laborers, and mechanics. In this regard, Carwardine criticizes one of the first major works to posit the links between Protestants and the rising market economy, Sellers The Market Revolution. Richard Carwardine, "Charles Sellers's 'Antinomians' and 'Arminians': Methodists and the Market Revolution," in Mark A. Noll, ed., God and Mammon: Protestants, Money, and the Market, 1790-1860 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 75-98. Some historians have

countered the older school of interpretation with work that emphasizes the positive and distinctive accomplishments of elite and middle-class evangelical women who engaged in benevolent activism. Susan M. Ryan, "Charity Begins at Home: Stowe's Antislavery Novels and the Forms of Benevolent Citizenship" American Literature 72, no. 4 (Dec. 2000): 751-88. Some historians point out how female benevolence before the Civil War proved to be quite different from that of the male evangelical leadership. Julie Roy Jeffrey, The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement, The University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Vanessa McNamara, "The Evolution of Nineteenth-Century Women's Benevolence Work in South Carolina, Charleston: A Case Study" Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association (2009): 58-66; Dorothy G. Becker, "Isabella Graham and Joanna Bethune: Trailblazers of Organized Women's Benevolence" Social Service Review 61, no. 2 (June 1987): 319-336. See also Lori D. Ginzberg, Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-century United States (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

¹⁶ John H. Wigger, Taking Heaven by Storm: Methodism and the Rise of Popular Christianity in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 5-8, 87, 124, 174-80, 188-90. Other historians emphasize that evangelical ministers and laity in antebellum United States actively sought to combat the morally degrading effects of capitalism with evangelical teachings and a refurbished moral philosophy that embraced the basic tenets of natural and, sometimes, revealed religion. In this interpretation, at least some ministers and laity strenuously opposed the new economic system and what they perceived to be its moral shortcomings. Historian Steven Davenport highlights a group of evangelical "contrarians," ministers who were thoroughly pessimistic about the market revolution and worried about its impact on the well-being of individuals, especially the impoverished. Contrarians, such as Old School Presbyterian layman Stephen Colwell, used the New Testament to lambast the problems they saw in the new economic order. According Davenport, "pastoral moralists" saw some benefits in antebellum capitalism but had qualms about the market's ability to corrupt Christians. They worried about financial speculation and unrestrained self-interest – both long-standing concerns among those who associated republican government with Christian virtue. Davenport, Friends of the Unrighteous Mammon. Historian Mark S. Schantz reveals that the American Tract Society, a critical bulwark for the Benevolent Empire, made a concerted effort, over decades, to distribute printed materials designed to combat the lust for "mammon." Mark S. Schantz, "Religious Tracts, Evangelical Reform, and the Market Revolution in Antebellum America," Journal of the Early Republic 17, no., 3, (Fall 1997): 425-67.

¹⁷ Wigger emphasizes that the Methodist Church in the United States, before 1820 at least, enlarged its membership as it did because it was remarkably successful at adapting to the prevailing religious culture in which that denomination flourished. The enthusiastic spirit of early Methodists was lay-oriented, egalitarian, and entrepreneurial. In this view, Methodism comported with the socioeconomic ambitions of "middling people on the make" – skilled artisans, shopkeepers, and small planters. The effect of Methodist rhetoric extolling equality, the

virtue of labor, and the improvement of ordinary people was to spur hundreds of thousands of Americans to seek salvation and the almighty dollar. Wigger, Taking Heaven by Storm, 5-8. Davenport writes about a number of “clerical economists,” such as Baptist divine and moderate anti-slavery moral philosopher Francis Wayland, who sought to reconcile economics with their faith. Relying on natural philosophy, they held that capitalism was a divine mechanism and economist Adam Smith’s so-called “invisible hand” was in fact the hand of God. Steven Davenport, Friends of the Unrighteous Mammon: Northern Christians and Market Capitalism, 1815-1860 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008). Gordon Wood holds that evangelical religion played a positive role in the development of American capitalism. Its basic articles of faith encouraged people to pursue their self-interest while restraining their selfishness. Gordon Wood, “The Enemy is Us: Democratic Capitalism in the Early Republic,” Journal of the Early Republic 16, no.2 (Summer 1996): 293-309.

¹⁸ In a book-length study that does not systematically distinguish rural and middle-class forms of evangelicalism, historian Kenneth Moore Startup maintains that southern ministers commonly expressed their abhorrence for the greed and individual acquisitiveness that seemed to overspread the nation in the antebellum period. Kenneth Moore Startup, The Root of All Evil: The Protestant Clergy and the Economic Mind of the South (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1997), 1-7. But Daniel Wells and historian Frank Byrne conclude that town-dwelling middle-class evangelicals in the South typically found little inconsistency with a fervent faith and the pursuit of success and material wealth. Wells show that many middle-class professionals and merchants in the South who hewed to evangelicalism were able to reconcile what they heard on Sunday with their livelihoods. He also documents cases in which southern ministers also made a living in the commercial sector. Jonathan Daniel Wells, The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1861 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 71-75. Byrne similarly concludes that the religious views of southern merchants were generally in line with those of their northern counterparts. At the same time, however, they remained supportive of African American bondage. Frank J. Byrne, Becoming Bourgeois: Merchant Culture in the South, 1820-1865, (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky), 2006. Historian of American religion E. Brooks Holifield argues that southern middle-class evangelicals, as well as Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ministers, viewed property ownership and prosperity as prime indicators of God’s favor among a class of people who believed strongly that the hand of Providence rewarded his faithful and punished sinners in the temporal world. In this view, the fact that some individuals enjoyed success, wealth, and influence while others did not comported entirely with the divine and natural order of social distinctions, hierarchies, and relations prescribed by Scripture and underwritten by the rational Protestant moral philosophy to which the educated classes in the towns and cities of the antebellum South and North staunchly adhered. E. Brooks Holifield, Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture 1795-1860 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1978), 11-12, 15, 22, 28-32, 34, 153-54.

¹⁹ Town life produced a booster mentality among the members of this class, one that evinced a spirit of improvement and eagerness to engage in campaigns to promote investment, growth, and new institutions that would reflect their energy, refinement, and intelligence. Lawyers, doctors, school teachers, and ministers worked hard, if not systematically, to enmesh themselves in a web of extensive voluntary associations, including debating clubs, literary societies, churches, lending libraries, and exclusive neighborhoods. A growing consciousness of social position infused the church life of middle-class town-dwellers with concerns about external trappings. Urban congregations virtually advertised their pre-eminence by acquiring centrally-located town lots upon which they could build expensive church edifices of brick and stone wrought variously in fashionable Gothic and Grecian styles. Holifield, Gentlemen Theologians, 8-12

²⁰ Historian John Quist demonstrates that benevolence was not restricted to the antebellum North but also arose in the antebellum South. Quist refutes the conclusion that evangelical benevolence societies were active primarily in the North after the War of 1812. In Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, at least, slaveholding “professionals” organized Bible and Sunday school societies and avoided the stigma of being associated with abolitionists. John W. Quist, “Slaveholding Operatives of the Benevolent Empire: Bible, Tract, and Sunday school societies in Antebellum Tuscaloosa, Alabama” Journal of Southern History 62, no. 3 (August 1996): 481-527; Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998), 1-17. Historian Daniel Wells argues that a coherent, self-conscious, town-dwelling middle class of southerners emerged in the antebellum period whose members were staunch evangelicals deeply committed to benevolent activism. As did their northern counterparts, evangelical town-dwellers in slaveholding states worked tirelessly to advance the Benevolent Empire, embracing simultaneously, the basic principles of free market capitalism and the institution of slavery. As in the industrial North, middle-class evangelicals in the slave-holding states formed voluntary associations and embarked on numerous reforms, short of anti-slavery and radical feminism. Wells, Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 10-11, 69-70, 85-87, 96, 98.

²¹ Middle-class church leaders and editors common expressed deep resentment of the hunger for “fashion” and “luxury” that prevailed among members of the planter class and the role that its members assigned to women as mere polished adornments skilled at dance, dressing finely, and carrying on entertaining casual conversation. Taking cues from their northern counterparts, middle class evangelical leaders in the South advanced a new role for women – one that stressed the imperative that women receive a formal education in the arts and sciences that was no less complete than the training commonly provided middle class men. These activists stress the importance of women’s active participation as partners with their husbands in the marital relationship and the important domestic duties they were to fulfill. Middle class evangelicals in the South also emphasized the important roles women were to play in society at large. A majority certainly hewed to the same notions about separate spheres and republican motherhood that vitalized northern thoughts on gender roles. But middle-class evangelical leaders encouraged women to pursue interests outside the family – particularly in the area of teaching and literature.

Wells, Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 77-78. What's more, this transformation in secular and religious thought about the role of southern middle-class women resulted in their active development of careers outside the home as teachers, writers of political essays and fiction, editors, partners with their husbands in the mercantile trade, and, to a lesser degree, as independent business owners and operators. In all these ways middle class women blurred the boundaries of traditional gender roles. Wells, Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 11; Ryan, Cradle of the Middle Class, 116-126; Blumin, The Emergence of the Middle Class, 192-229.

²² Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Jean Friedman, Barbara L. Bellows, and Stephanie McCurry, among others, maintain that benevolence, including that advanced by southern women, did little to alter the patriarchal social relations preferred by southern slaveholders. In this interpretation, women's benevolence never moved beyond charity to the poor into advocacy or reform activities. These activists believed, simply, that the voluntary societies would help teach southerners to control their passions and comply with prevailing civil laws. Barbara L. Bellows, Benevolence among Slaveholders Assisting the Poor in Charleston, 1670-1860 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993). Jean Fagan Yellin and John C. Van Horne, eds., The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994). Gail S. Murray, "Charity Within the Bounds of Race and Class: Female Benevolence in the Old South" South Carolina Historical Magazine 96, no. 1 (Jan. 1995): 54-70. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 61-66, 232-35; Jean E. Friedman, The Enclosed Garden: Women and Community in the Evangelical South, 1830-1900 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); Stephanie McCurry, Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 188-89. Historians Suzanne Lebsack, Anne Firor Scott, Frederick A. Bode, and John W. Quist, however, suggest that evangelical voluntary associations in southern towns and cities provided middle-class white women the means to exercise moral authority, promote the solidarity of women, exercise moral authority, and wield public influence. Suzanne Lebsack, The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860 (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984), 143-44, 194-236; Anne Firor Scott, Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 19-20, 195; Frederick A. Bode, "'A Common Sphere': White Evangelicals and Gender in Antebellum Georgia," Georgia Historical Quarterly 79 (Winter 1995): 775-809; John W. Quist, "Slaveholding Operatives of the Benevolent Empire: Bible, Tract, and Sunday School Societies in Antebellum Tuscaloosa County, Alabama," Journal of Southern History 57 (August 1996): 481-526.

²³ Short of voting, office-holding, and public speaking, such women used petitions to legislatures, voluntary associations, political campaigns, public reports, appeals, essays, and novels to make public their political views. In this interpretation, middle-class women's participation in evangelical, benevolent activism was one of several key strategies by which they challenged the doctrine of separate spheres and advanced a conception of female civic duty.

Middle class women's benevolent activism, ranging from work on behalf of local charities to participation in national moral-reform societies, undergirded their initial claim to a political role. Carried out in the spirit of voluntarism and harmony, the distinction between politics and benevolence turned out to be very difficult to maintain. Elizabeth R. Varon, We Mean To Be Counted: White Women and Politics in Antebellum Virginia (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 2-3, 10-70, 182-83.

²⁴ These camp meetings and the work of itinerant missionaries had a leveling effect within evangelicalism in the United States, especially in rural Missouri. Even the supposedly elitist Presbyterians employed the camp meeting to expand their congregations. Nathan O. Hatch, The Democratization of American Christianity (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 49-55; Wigger, Taking Heaven By Storm, 96-97.

²⁵ Henry H. Sweets III, The Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church: A Sesquicentennial History (Hannibal, Mo: Presbyterian Church of Hannibal, 1984), 4.

²⁶ Wiley Jones Patrick, The History of the Salt River Association, Missouri (Columbia, 1909), 25; R. S. Duncan, A History of the Baptists in Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1888), 212-13.

²⁷ Betty R. Murray, editor, Gone and Forgotten, Pleasant Grove Cemetery and Church, Camden Point, Missouri, Researched and compiled by Lu Durham and Irma Miller (Platte City, Mo: Platte County Historical Society, 1994), 3. The congregation changed its name to Pleasant Grove Baptist Church in June of 1845.

²⁸ Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church Minutes, 1838-1870, Greene County, Missouri, Greene County Archives and Records Center, Office of the County Clerk, Springfield, Mo, 7-9.

²⁹ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 213.

³⁰ Patrick, History of the Salt River Association, 62-63.

³¹ Siloam Church Record Book One, 1832-1857, 9.

³² Marshall Louis Mertens, Blue River Baptist Association, Missouri (Kansas City, Mo, 1947), 25. On the other hand, the Mt. Pleasant Church in Greene County did not begin construction of a larger building until 1880. Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church, p. c.

³³ Wells, Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 7-12; E. Brooks Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860 (Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1978), 11-25.

³⁴ Baptist Development in the St. Louis Association, 19-21.

³⁵ Callaway CO. Missouri, Augusta Presbyterian Church, Shamrock, Missouri, 1846-1953: Admissions, Dismissals, Baptisms, Burials in the Augusta Cemetery, 24-25.

³⁶ The African Church eventually sold the property for \$50,000. Amendment to the Bill, Record, Farrar v Finney, p. 50; William Hyde and Howard L. Conard, editors, Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference 4 vols. (New York, 1899), 2:755, 3:1463.

³⁷ Centenary Methodist Church of St. Louis, The First Hundred Years, 1839-1939 (St. Louis, 1939), 21-32; Missouri Republican, 22 June 1841, p. 2.

³⁸ With the eight room house with an attic and basement the congregation was able to sell their old parsonage the next year. First Presbyterian, St. Charles, Session Minutes, 50-51.

³⁹ Jane Clemens, the mother of Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain) joined the church on February 18, 1841. His older sister, Pamela, had joined eleven days before her mother and he attended Sunday school at the church from that point onward. While the church's membership was diverse, some of the ruling elders were influential men in Marion County. One elder, John M. Nelson, was a self-educated farmer and businessman that originally came with his wife Matilda from Maryland. Another, Massena Garrard, served as a commissioner in an 1839 attempt by Marion County to improve its roads and bridges. D. J. Garth was the owner of a tobacco factory that when it burned in 1852 cost \$7000. The building built by the First Presbyterian Church in 1859 was worth \$16,000 by the 1880s. R. L. Holcombe, History of Marion County, Missouri, Written and Compiled from the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources... (St. Louis, 1884), 219, 653, 893-99, 903, 980; Sweets, Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church, 3-4, 17, 63; J. Hurley Hagood and Roberta (Roland) Hagood, The Story of Hannibal (Hannibal, Mo: Standard Printing Company, 1976), 24. The original members were Abner O. Nash, D. K. Nash, Matilda P. Nash, Pamela P. Jones, Theodosia Inskiep, Tabitha Inskiep, Elizabeth Brown, Almyra Church, David Bills and Emily Stewart.

⁴⁰ Hagood, Story of Hannibal, 24.

⁴¹ Holcombe, History of Marion County, 981-82. Jacob Lanus, Enoch Mather Marvin, William G. Caples and William Leftwich were among the ministers of the southern church in Hannibal. Holcombe's History mentions that the congregation's records are not complete as quarterly conference records for the Hannibal station only begin in 1870. Missouri East Conference United Methodist Church, Records, 1836-1984 State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts Collection – Columbia, University of Missouri, C3727, f. 265.

⁴² W. S. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri: Containing an Outline of the Ministerial Life of More Than One Thousand Preachers, and Sketches of More Than Three Hundred (Columbia, Mo, 1893), 201.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 200-01; R. I. Holcombe, History of Greene County Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1883), 801-02.

⁴⁴ Holcombe, History of Greene County, 802; Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri, 202-03.

⁴⁵ John W. Quist, Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1998), 1-17; John W. Kuykendall, Southern Enterprise: The Work of Evangelical Societies in the Antebellum South (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1982), 3-29, 65-77; Fred J. Hood, Reformed America: The Middle and Southern States, 1783-1837 (University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1980), 1-7; Anne C. Loveland, Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800-1860 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), 159-74.

⁴⁶ R. L. Holcombe, History of Marion County, Missouri, Written and Compiled from the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources. . . (St. Louis, 1884), 228-33.

⁴⁷ Under the direction of the MECS annual conference of Missouri, Methodist ministers Nathan Scarritt and David Rice McAnally did the leg work to obtain a charter for Central College on March 15, 1855. Richard A. Seaton, ed., History of the United Methodist Churches of Missouri (St. Louis: Missouri Methodist Historical Society, 1984), 50, 62, 399-400.

⁴⁸ The Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South elected C. W. Pritchett president of Central College in Fayette in September 1859. Liberty Weekly Tribune, September 30, 1859, p. 1, c. 5. Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 846-53, 863; Columbia Female Baptist Academy (sometimes referred to as the Columbia Baptist Female College) would become Stephens College in about 1870 after James L. Stephens endowed the college for \$20,000. It was selected by the general association for their state female school the same year. Perry McCandless, A History of Missouri. Volume II 1820 To 1860 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1971; 2000 rpt.), 198-200. DuBourg lived in St. Louis from 1818 to 1822. He was responsible for doing a great deal in building up the Catholic Church in the city after it had been decimated after the Spanish left Missouri

⁴⁹ Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church to the General Assembly (Philadelphia: Published by the Board, 1854), p. 43.

⁵⁰ By 1855, the St. Louis Presbytery, for example, had established the Desperes Institute in St. Louis County and the Washington Academy in the town of Washington, Franklin County. Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church to the General Assembly (Philadelphia: Published by the Board, 1855), p. 19.

⁵¹ In June 1855, S. A. Ringo sold the college to J. T. Davis and J. K. Bird, who began running the college with their wives. In February 1856, President Davis announced plans for the construction of a new classroom building, to be completed in August of that year. In August 1860, J. S. Tombs purchased the building. Liberty Weekly Tribune, January 28, 1848, p. 2. c. 1; August 30, 1850, p. 2, c. 2; February 7, 1851, p. 2, c. 3; February 28, 1851, p. 2, c. 1; September 9, 1853, p. 2, c. 1; March 16, 1855, p. 2, c. 1; June 22, 1855, p. 3, c. 1; June 29, 1855, p. 3, c. 1; February 29, 1856, p. 2, c. 1; July 11, 1856, p. 6, c. 1; February 4, 1859, p. 1, c. 7; April 22, 1859, p. 2, c. 1 & 2; April 24, 1860, p. 2, c. 4.

⁵² Rowe "Mary Sibley," 34; "An Act to Incorporate Lindenwood Female College," Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society.

⁵³ See McCandless, A History, 199.

⁵⁴ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 846-53, 863; Columbia Female Baptist Academy (sometimes referred to as the Columbia Baptist Female College) would become Stephens College in about 1870 after James L. Stephens endowed the college for \$20,000. It was selected by the general association for their state female school the same year. McCandless, History of Missouri. Volume II, 198-200.

⁵⁵ Liberty Weekly Tribune, August 22, 1851, p. 2, c. 6; August 3, 1855, p. 2, c. 6; October 3, 1856, p. 1, c. 6; September 23, 1859. Several others may or may not have been affiliated with a church. These include, the Platte City Female College, organized in about 1850 in Platte County, bordering on Kansas in northwest Missouri, organized the Platte City Female College in about

1850. Liberty Weekly Tribune, August 27, 1852, p. 2, c. 1; August 7, 1857, p. 2, c. 1 & 5; March 2, 1860, p. 1, c. 5. Also included is the Richmond Female College, established in the town of Richmond, Ray County, situated on the Missouri River in the western part of the state. By September 1853, its first new classroom building was complete. Liberty Weekly Tribune, September 30, 1853, p. 1, c. 6.

⁵⁶ Liberty Weekly Tribune, September 30, 1859, p. 1, c. 5.

⁵⁷ Edward T. Hiscox, DD, The Baptist Church Directory. A Guide to the Doctrines and Discipline, Officers and Ordinances, Principles and Practices, of Baptist Churches . . . (New York, 1864), 27. Unlike the Methodists, the congregationally autonomous Baptist churches did not have a universal church book. The Southern Baptist Convention did not officially adopt a confession of beliefs when it was formed in 1845, instead they left that matter up to the lesser associations or congregations. Many of these books, however, were based in part on an earlier confession produced by the Philadelphia Baptist Association beginning in 1724. The Philadelphia Association rooted theirs largely on the London Baptist Confession of 1689, which was a lightly edited version of the Presbyterian Westminster Confession. Another popular local book was published by the Charleston Baptist Association. W. J. McGlothlin, Baptist Confessions of Faith (Philadelphia, 1911), 294-95, 298-99; Mark Noll, America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 21.

⁵⁸ The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York, 1854), 169-214.

⁵⁹ The Presbyterian assemblies, furthermore, were to remain entirely ecclesiastical entities and were not to “posses any civil jurisdiction, nor inflict any civil penalties.” The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: Containing the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Directory for the Worship of God . . . (Newark, 1829), 116, 350, 353.

Illustrating the importance of these confessions was the fact that the First Presbyterian Church in St Charles voted in June of 1852 that every family in their congregation should be supplied with a copy per a request from the general assembly. First Presbyterian Church, St. Charles, Missouri, Session Minutes, 1840-1864, State Historical Society of Missouri, C1365, p. 31.

⁶⁰ Mo. Const. of 1820, art. XIII, § 4-5, 18. These provisions are set out in full as follows: “That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no man can be compelled to erect, support, or attend any place of worship, or to maintain any minister of the gospel, or teacher of religion; that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no person can ever be hurt, molested, or restrained in his religious profession or sentiments, if he do not disturb others in their religious worship.” Mo. Const. of 1820, art. XIII, Declaration of Rights, § 4. “That no person, on account of his religious opinions, can be rendered ineligible to any office of trust or profit under this state; that no preference can ever be given by law to any sect or mode of worship; and that no religious corporation can ever be established in this state.” Mo. Const. of 1820, art. XIII, Declaration of Rights, § 5.

⁶¹ Mo. Const. of 1820, art. XIII, § 4-5. “That no person who is religiously scrupulous of bearing arms can be compelled to do so, but may be compelled to pay an equivalent for military service

in such manner as shall be prescribed by law; and that no priest, preacher of the gospel, or teacher of any religious persuasion or sect, regularly ordained as such, be subject to militia duty, or compelled to bear arms.” Mo. Const. of 1820, art. XIII, Declaration of Rights, § 18.

See also Mo. Const. of 1820, art. III, § 13, which held that “No person while he continues to exercise the functions of a bishop, priest, clergymen, or teacher of any religious persuasion, denomination, society, or sect, whatsoever, shall be eligible to either house of the general assembly; nor shall he be appointed to any office of profit within the state, the office of justice of the peace excepted.” Clerical disqualification, however, was a common occurrence throughout the United States as the influential Virginia state constitution proscribed it as a result of social tensions surrounding disestablishment in the state. William M. Hogue, “The Civil Disability of Ministers of Religion in State Constitutions,” Journal of Church and State 36, no. 2, (1994): 329-35.

⁶² “Schools, and the means of education, shall forever be encouraged in this state; and the general assembly shall take measures to preserve, from waste or damage, such lands as have been, or may hereafter be, granted by the United States for the use of schools within each township in this state, and shall apply the funds, which may arise from such lands, in strict conformity to the object of the grant, and one school, or more, shall be established in each township as soon as practicable and necessary, where the poor shall be taught gratis.” Mo. Const. of 1820, art. VI, § 1.

⁶³ Laws of the State of Missouri (1825), vol. 2, “Academies,” pp. 71–88.

⁶⁴ Mo. Rev. Stat. §91-9, (1845), 627.

⁶⁵ Mo. Rev. Stat. (1845), §125-6-7, (1845), 762; *Ibid.*, §147-2 (1845), 928.

⁶⁶ The City of Hannibal v. Draper, 15 Mo. 639.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 634-40.

⁶⁸ Mo. Rev. Stat., § 47-28-32 (1845), 404-5.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, §83-6 (1845), 584-5; State v Ambs, 20 Mo. 214-21 (1854). See also Mark M. Carroll, “Religion, Public Morals, and the Supreme Court of Missouri, 1821-1860,” Paper presentation at Forty-sixth Annual Missouri Conference on History, Capitol Plaza Convention Center, Jefferson City, Missouri, 22 April 2004, 4-5, 9-10.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 216. The belief that Christianity was part of the common law was reflected initially in seventeenth century English decisions and virtually all states of the Union accepted this principle to the end of the antebellum period. Stuart Banner, “When Christianity was Part of the Common Law,” Law and History Review 16, no. 1 (1998), 27-40.

⁷¹ Historians have contended vigorously over the extent to which the developing nineteenth century Anglo-American law of property and contract sacrificed a concern for equitable outcomes to the imperatives of capitalism. Legal historian Morton Horwitz contends that this transformation allowed men of commerce to gain power and wealth at the expense of ordinary people. Beginning in about 1780, businessmen and their lawyer allies sought to rework the law in ways that eliminated many traditional notions of essential justice and thereby allowed them to magnify their fortunes. Laws that in the colonial era had derived from customs of fair dealing

were replaced by a rigid legal system that exalted the interests of corporations and capitalists. Instead of protecting the community, overly-technical law was now used to facilitate the concentration of economic power. Industrial capitalists and businessmen were able to employ lawyers who could mold transactions on uneven terms with less legally skillful ordinary folk. In this view, judges were no longer willing to throw out contractual agreements because of their unevenness as they had in the colonial era – the buyer of products was presumed to know what he or she was purchasing under the doctrine of caveat emptor. According to Horwitz, this regime provided advantages to manufacturers and those who sold goods at the expense of less knowledgeable laborers and purchasers of finished products. 2 Blackstone Commentaries 295; Morton J. Horwitz, The Transformation of American Law, 1780-1860 (Cambridge and London, Harvard University Press, 1977), 31-47; Morton Horwitz, “The Rise of Legal Formalism,” American Journal of Legal History 19 (1975): 251-53.

⁷² Kermit L. Hall and Peter Karsten, The Magic Mirror: Law in American History, 2d ed. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 119, 140-41; J. Willard Hurst, Law and the Conditions of Freedom in the Nineteenth century United States (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956), 5-18; Horwitz, “Rise of Legal Formalism,” 251-53.

⁷³ English secular courts had exercised jurisdiction over such property since the sixteenth century. The basic approach to adjudicating property disputes was thus set out in the Anglo-American common law. In tandem with statutes modulating it, the common law provided an array of rules that defined and regulated property rights, contracts, and conveyances. As did authorities in other economically-diverse regions of the United States, circuit courts in Missouri enlisted an Americanized common law designed to advance market capitalism. When disputes arose over non-performance or mal-performance, judges increasingly based their rulings on whether the parties to a contract had entered into it freely. Contract law and its underlying “will theory,” ideally at least, looked only to the strict terms of the agreement between the parties. Hall and Karsten, The Magic Mirror, 119, 140-41; Hurst, Law and the Conditions of Freedom, 5-18; Horwitz, The Transformation of American Law, 160-210; “The Rise of Legal Formalism,” 251-53. Because the property of churches was typically held in trust for its members, however, American courts employed Anglo-American rules of equity to adjudicate disputes arising among church members over such holdings. Trustees typically held legal title to property only for the benefit of congregations and denominations. Thus they had legal duties to beneficiaries that the adopted English law of equity, originally exercised by courts of chancery, was bound to protect. For many centuries, a prime purpose of chancery jurisdiction had been to provide fairness when the strict application of common law rules would do otherwise. By the same token, American courts sitting in chancery could ignore such rules to achieve this goal. The legislature for the Territory of Louisiana, in which Missouri was included, established chancery jurisdiction in 1810. The Missouri Constitution of 1820 created a Court of Chancery separate from the Missouri Supreme Court. While the General Assembly abolished it several years later, as in many other American jurisdictions, Missouri judges thereafter blended rules of equity and law. W. J. Hamilton, “The Relief Movement in Missouri, 1820-1822,” Missouri Historical Review 22, no. 1

(October 1927): 81-82; Henry P. Dart, “The Colonial Legal Systems of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas,” American Bar Association Journal 12 (1926): 481; William Wirt Blume, “Chancery Practice on the American Frontier: A Study of the Records of the Supreme Court of Michigan Territory, 1805-1836,” Michigan L Rev. 59, no. 1 (November 1960): 49-96.

⁷⁴ More than a few legal historians argue that that the nineteenth century Anglo-American law of contract and property did not systematically produce economic injustice. These scholars maintain that new notions of contract functioned well with the post-revolutionary republican rhetoric about the popular basis of law and beliefs in upward mobility, individual initiative, and opportunity. They maintain, furthermore, that the American judiciary was willing to protect certain public rights and abided by the “taught legal tradition” of English common law courts that placed a premium on due process and justice. During the antebellum period, furthermore, judges were never able completely to blend theory and practice and, as a result, did not always mechanically enforce contracts. They still injected their own beliefs about traditional justice into their readings of such agreements. Especially in the South and Midwest, judges commonly nurtured egalitarian predispositions as did the growing ranks of evangelicals who brought their moral standards into the marketplace and courts. While law was certainly important in American society, many did not experience its full penetration into their lives and continued to deal fairly with one another. According to James Willard Hurst, the father of American legal history, nineteenth century American law was a creative instrument not just in the hands of judges and other legal professionals but a wide range of ordinary citizens. In this conception, law was not merely a product of material relations but also a reflection and cause of less tangible ideological and social forces, such as belief in God and acculturated commitments to the public good, which promoted humanity and fairness in economic exchange. According to Hurst, in the decades after the American Revolution, judges transformed the law in a way that abandoned colonial mercantile strictures and permitted the emerging market economy to flourish. Elimination of antiquated rules concerning land conveyances, such as primogeniture and entail, released entrepreneurial energy. Precise rules of contract permitted businessmen to better predict economic outcomes and calculate their transactions more readily to produce profit, economic growth, and employment. Hall and Karsten, The Magic Mirror, 140-41; Hurst, Law and the Conditions of Freedom, 5-6.

⁷⁵ Regarding the capacity of religious societies, in general, to hold property, see Pawlet v. Clark, 13 U.S. (9 Cranch) 292 (1815); Goesele v. Bimeler, Fed. Cas. No. 5,503 [5 McClean, 223] (1851), judgment affirmed, 55 U.S. (14 How.) 589 (1852); Miller v. Chittenden, 2 Iowa 315 (1856); Tucker v. St. Clement’s Church, 5 N.Y. Super. Ct. 241 (1849); Morgan v. Leslie, Wright, 144 (Ohio 1832); Miller v. Lerch, Fed. Cas. No. 9,579 [1 Wall. Jr. 210] (U.S. 1848). In reference to the mode by which religious societies could acquire property see Inhabitants of Fourth Parish in West Springfield v. Root, 35 Mass. 318 (1836). In reference to acquiring property by adverse possession, see Harpending v. Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, 41 U.S. (16 Pet.) 455 (U.S. 1841); Camp v. Camp, 5 Conn. 291 (1824); Curd v. Wallace, 37 Ky. 190 (1838); Inhabitants of Second Precinct in Rehoboth v. Carpenter, 40 Mass.

131 (1839); Humbert v. Trinity Church, 2 Wend. 587 (N.Y. 1840); People v. Trinity Church, 22 N.Y. 44 (1860); Macon v. Sheppard, 21 Tenn. 335 (1841).

Regarding property obtained by devise, see Greene v. Dennis, 6 Conn. 293 (1826); State v. Bates, 2 Har. 18 (Del. 1835); Murphy v. Dallam, 1 Bland, 529 (Md. 1829); White v. South Parish in Braintree, 54 Mass. 506 (Mass. 1847); Brown v. Landon, Smith, 178 (N.H. 1807); Jackson v. Hammond, 2 Caines Cas. 337 (N.Y. 1805); King v. Rundle, 15 Barb. 139 (N.Y. 1852); Trustees of Quaker Soc. v. Dickenson, 12 N. C. 189 (1827).

For trusts settled by grant or devise for the benefit of a religious society, see Antones v. Eslava's Heirs, 9 Port. 527 (Ala. 1839); Burrows v. Holt, 20 Conn. 459 (1850); Attorney General v. Town of Dublin, 38 N. H. 459 (1859); Trustees of Associate Reformed Church v. Trustees of Theological Seminary at Princeton, 4 N. J. Eq. (3 H. W. Green) 77 (1837); Beaver v. Filson, 8 Pa. 327 (1848).

Regarding the rights and powers of ecclesiastical authorities to control, use, and dispose of church property held in trust, see Langdon v. Plymouth Congregational Society, 12 Conn. 113 (1837); Alexander v. Slavens, 46 Ky. 351 (1853); Baker v. Fales, 16 Mass. 488 (1820); Miller v. Gable, 2 Denio. 492 (N.Y. 1845); Skilton v. Webster, Brightly, N. P. 203 (Pa. 1850).

In reference to the power of trustees to erect, build, rebuild, or repair church edifices, see Tilden v. Metcalf, 2 Day. 259 (Conn. 1806); Voorhees v. Presbyterian Church of Village of Amsterdam, 8 Barb. 135 (N. Y. 1849); Wagner v. Episcopal Church, 9 Rich. Eq. 155 (S. C. 1857). All of the Supreme Court of Missouri decisions dealing with the right of religious societies to hold personal and real property, the modes of acquiring such property, and the nature of related trust arrangements came after the Civil War. See Draper v. Minor, 26 Mo. 290 (1865); Boyce v. Christian, 69 Mo. 492 (1879); First Baptist Church v. Robberson, 71 Mo. 326 (1879); Keith & Perry Coal Co. v. Bingham, 97 Mo. 196 (1888); Fulbright v. Higginbotham, 133 Mo. 668 (1896); Bushong v. Taylor, 82 Mo. 660 (1884).

⁷⁶ A Brief Chronicle of the Rise and Progress of Baptist Development in Saint Louis Association from 1800-1922 (St. Louis, 1922), 20.

⁷⁷ Transcript, Charles W. Emory, et al. v. Richard Phillips, et al., Missouri Supreme Court Case Files, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri; Emory v. Phillips, 22 Mo. 499 (1856).

⁷⁸ R. A. Austin Papers, Collection 2118, State Historical Society of Missouri, p. 8. For a detailed discussion of this phenomenon in the post-bellum South see Ted Ownby, Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920 (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 129-33, 148-59.

⁷⁹ Christine Leigh Heyrman, Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt (Chapel Hill and London (The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 170-77.

⁸⁰ Anya Jabour, Scarlett's Sisters: Young Women in the Old South (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 1-21; Victoria E. Bynum, Unruly Women: The Politics of Social and Sexual Control in the Old South (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 35-58.

-
- ⁸¹ Frances Lea McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit: Speechmaking on the Missouri Frontier (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1969), 52.
- ⁸² John B. Gordon, Fourth of July Address delivered at Columbia, Missouri, Columbia Missouri Intelligencer and Boon's Lick Advertiser, July 11, 1835, p. 1; McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 52-53.
- ⁸³ J. W. Morrow, "Eulogy of Andrew Jackson," Jefferson City Jefferson Inquirer, July 31, 1845, p. 1; McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 53.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 85-86.
- ⁸⁵ April 22, 1857, Diary of Martha J. Wood, Missouri State Historical Society; "Martha J. Wood," in Wall and Korner, Hardship and Hope, 64, 58- 71.
- ⁸⁶ April 27, 1857, Bollinger County, Missouri, Diary of Martha J. Wood; Wall and Korner, Hardship and Hope, 65.
- ⁸⁷ June 13, 1857, Saline County, Missouri, Diary of Martha J. Wood; Wall and Korner, Hardship and Hope, 66.
- ⁸⁸ Arrow Rock, April 16, 1860, Sabbath Morn, Diary of Martha J. Wood; Wall and Korner, Hardship and Hope, 70.
- ⁸⁹ Wall and Korner, Hardship and Hope, 58-59. The authors rely, to some extent on Sally G. McMillen, Motherhood in the Old South: Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Infant Rearing (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990).
- ⁹⁰ March 22, 1859, Arrow Rock, Saline County, Missouri, Diary of Martha J. Wood; Wall and Korner, Hardship and Hope, 68.
- ⁹¹ Legal historian Michael Grossberg, for example, demonstrates that legal changes in the United States during the nineteenth century developed in step with new middle-class family ideals, which generally diminished male authority, increased women's and children's rights, and fixed more clearly the state's responsibilities in family affairs. Michael Grossberg, Governing the Hearth: Law and Family in Nineteenth-Century America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 3-31.
- ⁹² "Susan B. Vanarsdale (1824-1856)," in Carla Wall and Barbara Oliver Korner, eds., Hardship and Hope: Missouri Women Writing About Their Lives, 1820-1920 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1997), 29.
- ⁹³ Sunday, July 11, 1847, Diary of Susan B. Vanarsdale, Missouri State Historical Society; Wall and Korner, "Vanarsdale," 30.
- ⁹⁴ Sunday, July 11, 1847, Diary of Susan B. Vanarsdale; Wall and Korner, "Vanarsdale," 30.
- ⁹⁵ July 20, 1849, Diary of Susan B. Vanarsdale; Wall and Korner, "Vanarsdale," 40.
- ⁹⁶ Sunday, August 12, 1849, Diary of Susan B. Vanarsdale; Wall and Korner, "Vanarsdale," 40.
- ⁹⁷ Sunday, September 16, 1849; Diary of Susan B. Vanarsdale; Wall and Korner, "Vanarsdale," 41-42.
- ⁹⁸ The Child's Paper, vol. 5, no. 8, August 1856, p. 32; Sunday, January 29; Saturday, January 30; and Thursday or Saturday, February 4 or 6, A Diary of the Civil War on the Missouri Border, Donald W. Riddle ed., State Historical Society of Missouri; "Elvira Scott," in Carla Wall and

Barbara Oliver Korner, eds., Hardship and Hope: Missouri Women Writing About Their Lives, 1820-1920 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1997), 86-87, 83-99.

⁹⁹ Monday, February 8, 1860, A Diary of the Civil War on the Missouri Border, Donald W. Riddle ed., Western Historical Manuscripts Collection, Columbia; “Elvira Scott,” in Carla Wall and Barbara Oliver Korner, eds., Hardship and Hope: Missouri Women Writing About Their Lives, 1820-1920 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1997), 87, 83-99; Grossberg, Governing the Hearth, 3-31, 234-53; Mary P. Ryan, Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865 (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 83-105; Stuart Mack Blumin, The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900 (Cambridge University Press, 1989), 138-92.

¹⁰⁰ J. Thomas Scharf, History of Saint Louis City and County, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts, 1983), 2:1701-1702, 1710, 1717-1718, 1755; James Neal Primm, Lion of the Valley: St. Louis, Missouri, 1764-1980, 3rd ed. (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1998), 95-96; George B. Mangold, “Social Reform in Missouri 1820–1920,” Missouri Historical Review 15, no. 1 (1920): 191-213; William E. Foley, The Genesis of Missouri: From Wilderness Outpost to Statehood (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1989), 271, 277; Windell, “The Background of Reform on the Missouri Frontier,” 160-168; McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 167-168.

¹⁰¹ Missouri Intelligencer (Franklin), 18 September 1824; Windell, “The Background of Reform on the Missouri Frontier,” 155-83, 160-168.

¹⁰² George B. Mangold, “Social Reform in Missouri 1820–1920,” Missouri Historical Review 15, no. 1 (1920): 191-213; Marie George Windell, “Reform in the Roaring Forties and Fifties,” Missouri Historical Review 39 (April 1845): 291-319.

¹⁰³ Scharf, History of Saint Louis City and County, 2:1701-1702, 1710, 1717-1718, 1755; James Neal Primm, Lion of the Valley: St. Louis, Missouri, 1764-1980, 3rd ed. (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1998), 95-96; George B. Mangold, “Social Reform in Missouri 1820–1920,” Missouri Historical Review 15, no. 1 (1920): 191-213; William E. Foley, The Genesis of Missouri: From Wilderness Outpost to Statehood (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1989), 271, 277; Windell, “The Background of Reform on the Missouri Frontier,” 160-168; McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 167-168.

¹⁰⁴ Marie George Windell, “The Background of Reform on the Missouri Frontier,” Missouri Historical Review 39 (1945): 160-163; McCandless, History of Missouri. Volume II, 190–226; Dick Steward, Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 79–91.

¹⁰⁵ Leslie Gamblin Hill, “A Moral Crusade: The Influence of Protestantism on Frontier Society in Missouri,” Missouri Historical Review 45 (October 1950): 16-34.

¹⁰⁶ Foley, The Genesis of Missouri, 271.

¹⁰⁷ Twentieth Report of the American Tract Society, 1845, 157.

¹⁰⁸ Forty-Sixth Report of the American Bible Society, 1862, Appendix 20.

-
- ¹⁰⁹ George B. Mangold, "Social Reform in Missouri 1820–1920," Missouri Historical Review 15, no. 1 (1920): 191-213; Marie George Windell, "Reform in the Roaring Forties and Fifties," Missouri Historical Review 39 (April 1945): 291-319.
- ¹¹⁰ Diary of Mary Easton Sibley, 46-52, 58-59, Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 29.
- ¹¹¹ St. Louis Missouri Republican, May 17, 1824, p. 4; Frances Lea McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit: Speechmaking on the Missouri Frontier (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1969), p. 29.
- ¹¹² McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 29; Christie Anne Farnham, The Education of a Southern Belle: Higher Education and Student Socialization in the Antebellum South (New York and London: New York University Press, 1994), 68-96.
- ¹¹³ St. Louis Missouri Republican, May 17, 1827, p. 3.
- ¹¹⁴ Scharf, History of Saint Louis, 2:1757; See McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 167-168.
- ¹¹⁵ Centenary Methodist Church of St. Louis, The First Hundred Years, 1839-1939 (St. Louis, 1939), 21-32; Missouri Republican, 22 June 1841, p. 2.
- ¹¹⁶ St. Louis Christian Advocate, January 18, 1871, p. 2.
- ¹¹⁷ William Hyde and Howard L. Conard, eds., Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis, 4 vols. (New York & Louisville, 1899), 3:1463.
- ¹¹⁸ Stephanie McCurry, Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, & Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 37-91.
- ¹¹⁹ Jefferson City Jefferson Inquirer, February 2, 1847, p. 1; McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 113.
- ¹²⁰ The best socio-cultural and legal description of emerging middle-class companionate marriage norms in the first half of the nineteenth century can be found in Michael Grossberg, Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth-Century America (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 3-31.
- ¹²¹ Secs. 1-7, Ch. 31, Laws of a Public and General Nature, of the District of Louisiana, of the Territory of Louisiana, of the Territory of Missouri, and of the State of Missouri, Up to the Year 1824, 2 vols. (Jefferson City: Lusk & Son, 1842), vol. 1, pp. 90-92. In Lewis v. Lewis, 5 Mo. 278 (1838), the Missouri Supreme Court held that charges of infidelity made by a husband without any just causes constituted "personal indignities" warranting a divorce. Secs. 1 and 6, Ch. 53, Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri (St. Louis: J. W. Dougherty, 1845), p. 426.
- ¹²² Mark M. Carroll, Homesteads Ungovernable: Families, Sex, Race, and the Law in Frontier Texas, 1823-1860 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), xi-xx.
- ¹²³ Sec. 3, Ch. 68, Revised Statutes of Missouri (1845), p. 529.
- ¹²⁴ Sec. 10, Ch. 53, *ibid.*, p. 426.
- ¹²⁵ Sec. 18, Ch. 39 (July 4, 1807), Laws of a Public and General Nature, 1:131; Secs. 12-15, Ch. 54, Revised Statutes of Missouri (1845), p. 432; Sec. 8, Ch. 185, *ibid.*, p. 1079.
- ¹²⁶ Secs. 1-5, Ch. 54 (June 18, 1808), Laws of a Public and General Nature, 1:187-88.

¹²⁷ Dower was highly favored by the common law of England. The right of a widow to a life estate in one-third of all the lands held by her husband at the time of his death extended to real estate held by him in trust for a beneficiary, or cestui que trust. Courts of law routinely upheld dower claims to such trust estates. Those with an equitable title to a departed husband's property, however, began resorting to courts of equity to enjoin such widows from so proceeding. Chancellors resisted such bills into the early 1700s. Charles H. Scribner, A Treatise on the Law of Dower, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1867) 1:392; Gilbert's Chancery Reports, "Uses," 11, 172 (England and Wales, 1705-1727). But as complex property transactions became more commonplace through the eighteenth century, English chancery courts began to side with beneficiaries and hold that the widow of a deceased trustee was not entitled to a dower interest in the trust estate. Scribner, The Law of Dower, p. 392; Noel v. Jevon, 2 Freem. 43 (1678) and Bevant v. Pope, 2 Freem. 71 (1681) (Freeman's Chancery Reports, England and Wales, 1660-1706); Casborn v. English, 2 Eq. Cas. Abr. 728 (Equity Cases Abridged, England and Wales, 1667-1744); Hinton v. Hinton, 2 Ves. Sr. 634 (Vesey Senior's Chancery Reports, England and Wales, 1741-1756). It appears as though the Connecticut Superior Court of Errors, in summer 1816, was among the first high benches in the United States, if not the first one, to adopt the rule. Fish v. Fish, 1 Conn. 559 (1816). See also Goddard v. Prentice, 17 Conn. 546, 555 (1846). The Court of Appeals of Kentucky did so in 1821, and the supreme courts of Maryland, South Carolina, Arkansas, Alabama, Ohio, New York, and Maine had done so by 1860. Herron v. Williamson, 6 Litt. 250 (Ky. 1821); Stevens v. Smith, 4 J. J. Marsh. 64 (Ky. 1830); Dean v. Mitchell, 4 J. J. Marsh. 451 (Ky. 1830); Cowman v. Hall 3 Gill & John. 398 (Md. 1831); Robison v. Codman, 1 Sumner 121, 129 (Fed. Cir. Ct. 1831); Stanwood v. Dunning, 2 Shep. 290 (Maine 1837); Lawson v. Morton, 6 Dana 471 (Ky. 1838); Derush v. Brown 8 Ohio 412 (1838); Coster v. Clarke, 3 Edw. Ch. 428 (N.Y. 1840); Germond v. Jones 2 Hill 569 (N.Y. 1842); Cooper v. Whitney, 3 Hill 101 (N.Y. 1842); Bartlett v. Gouge, 5 B. Mon. 152 (Ky. 1844); Crittenden v. Johnson, 6 Eng. R. 94 (Ark. 1850); Firestone v. Firestone, 2 Ohio State R. 415 (1853); Edmondson v. Welsh, 27 Ala. 578 (1855); McNish v. Pope, 8 Rich. Eq. 112 (S. C. 1856); Emory Washburn, A Treatise on the American Law of Real Property, 2 vols. 2nd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1864), 1:163, §14. Only during Reconstruction, however, did the Missouri Supreme Court have occasion to rule on the question, holding that the dower of a wife did not extend to property held in trust by her husband, whether or not she had notice of the trust estate at the time of marriage. White v. Drew, 42 Mo. 561 (1868).

¹²⁸ Secs. 4-6, "An act concerning dower" (December 13, 1822), Laws of the State of Missouri, (1825), 1:333-34.

¹²⁹ Collier v. Wheldon, 1 Mo. 1 (1821); Stokes v. O'Fallon, 2 Mo. 82 (1828); Griffith v. Walker, 3 Mo. 191 (1833); Hamilton v. O'Neil, 9 Mo. 11 (1845); Rankin v. Oliphant, 9 Mo. 289 (1845); Lecompte v. Wash, 9 Mo. 551 (1846); Kemp v. Holland, 10 Mo. 255 (1846); Gentry v. Woodson, 10 Mo. 224 (1846); Kennerly v. Missouri Ins. Co., 11 Mo. 204 (1847); McClanahan v. Porter, 10 Mo. 746 (1847); Burris v. Page, 12 Mo. 358 (1849); Riley v. Clamorgan, 15 Mo. 331 (1851); Riddick v. Walsh, 15 Mo. 519 (1852); Wells' Guardian v. Moore, 16 Mo. 478

(1852); Roberts v. Stoner, 18 Mo. 481 (1853); Caldwell v. Bower, 17 Mo. 564 (1853); Logan v. Phillipps, 18 Mo. 22 (1853); Link v. Edmondson, 19 Mo. 487 (1854); Duhring v. Duhring, 20 Mo. 174 (1854); Hornsey v. Casey, 21 Mo. 255 (1846); Reaume v. Chambers, 22 Mo. 86 (1855); Lee v. Lindell, 22 Mo. 202 (1855); Rogers v. Woody, 23 Mo. 548 (1856); McFarland v. Blaize's Adm'r, 24 Mo. 156 (1857); Welch v. Anderson, 28 Mo. 293 (1859); Pemberton v. Pemberton, 29 Mo. 498 (1860).

¹³⁰ Secs. 1-3, Ch. 47 (July 7, 1807), Laws of a Public and General Nature (1842), 1:178-79; Secs. 31-33, Ch. 32, Revised Statutes of Missouri (1845), pp. 224-25.

¹³¹ Secs. 34-41, *ibid.*, pp. 225-26.

¹³² Laura Edwards, The People and Their Peace: Legal Culture and the Transformation of Inequality in the Post-Revolutionary South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 3-25.

¹³³ Heyrman, Southern Cross, 161-69, 178.

¹³⁴ Nancy Isenberg, Sex and Citizenship in Antebellum America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 77.

¹³⁵ In the words of historian Mary Ellen Rowe, evangelical Protestantism in Missouri “rested fundamentally on the same patriarchal religious and social values that shaped mainstream culture. Within or outside of the evangelical movement, a woman’s identity was largely defined for her.” Rowe, “Mary Sibley,” 22

¹³⁶ An authoritative 1850 Baptist directory declared unequivocally that women members were to have no voting rights and that they were enjoined by scripture to obey their husbands. The offices of deacon, elder, bishop, and pastor were reserved for men.

William Crowell, The Church Member’s Hand-Book: A Guide to the Doctrines and Practices of Baptist Churches (Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1850), pp. 42-45. Deacons were to take exclusive charge of the temporal concerns of the church. Samuel Jones, A Treatise of Church Discipline and a Directory. Done by Appointment of the Philadelphia Baptist Association (Philadelphia, 1798), p. 15

The Presbyterian Church recognized the Fifth Commandment as authority for assigning the relations of inferiors and superiors. Men only were to be preachers, as were ruling elders, deacons, pastors, and bishops. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Containing the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Directory for the Worship of God, Together with the Plan of Government and Discipline, as Amended and Ratified by the General Assembly at their Session in May, 1821 (Elizabethtown, New Jersey: Marvin Hale, Abraham Paul Printer, 1822), pp. 237-38, 280-82, 242, 249, 366. Deacons were charged with the “management of the temporal affairs of the church,” which included taking collections and distributing monies to the poor. *Ibid.*, p. 350-51. The Methodist Church, as late as 1844, required that women and men sit apart during divine worship and that band societies be composed either of all men or of all women members. In the singing of hymns, the women were to sing their parts alone. The prescribed wedding vow required a bride to promise to obey, serve, love, honor, and keep her new husband in sickness and health. No promise to obey was required

of a groom. Language referring to bishops and other ministers, including circuit preachers, as “he” make it fairly clear that these officials, as well as presiding elders, deacons, stewards, and class leaders were to be men. The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York: G. Lane & C. B. Tippet, 1844), pp. 28, 46, 83, 93, 123, 172.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 173-79.

¹³⁸ Among other sins warranting church discipline, Baptist congregations in Missouri, for example, penalized the wearing of costly apparel and prizing too much the accumulation of wealth. *Baptist Minutes and Pamphlets, 1820-1850*, St. Louis Mercantile Bank and Library, St. Louis, Missouri. See also Hill, “A Moral Crusade,” 16-34.

¹³⁹ Set out in “Part Second. The Temporal Economy of the Church” in the 1844 MEC Doctrines and Discipline was the following cautionary language: “[L]et all our churches be built plain and decent; but not more expensive than is absolutely unavoidable; otherwise the necessity of raising money will make rich men necessary to us. But if so, we must be dependent on them, yea, and governed by them. And then farewell to the Methodist discipline and doctrine too.” Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1844), p. 170. This same language was set out, verbatim, in The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1856), pp. 206-07.

¹⁴⁰ Jeffrey S. Adler, Yankee Merchants and the Making of the Urban West (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 61-90.

¹⁴¹ A. J. Valpy, ed., Paley’s Moral and Political Philosophy . . . Carefully Adapted to Schools of Both Sexes (Philadelphia: Uriah Hunt, 1835), 69-103, 109-11, 117-18; Francis Wayland, The Elements of Moral Science (1835; Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1856), 229-57, 367-86; Jasper Adams, Elements of Moral Philosophy (Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, 1837), 233-53, 271-88.

¹⁴² Eighteenth-century moralists such as Samuel Clarke and Frances Hutcheson wrote in reaction to the so-called “voluntarists,” thinkers such as Rene Descartes and Thomas Hobbes, who had held that the moral bases for individual duty was derived from either arbitrary divine commands or prudential human decisions. In the view of many scholars, Clarke was the prince of the rationalists. In his 1704 Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God, Samuel Clarke attempted to demonstrate the errors of atheism and the voluntarists since God’s relationship with the world established morality directed from the divine will. According to Clarke, therefore, virtue was a fitting behavior since it functioned within this network of relations as morality was the offspring of understanding which determined a choice in a particular situation. This work introduced a new moral language which pointed to an order which the rational self conformed too. Samuel Clarke, A Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God, the Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation . . . (1704; reprint 1823), 1-10, 56-57, 157-218. The Earl of Shaftsbury in his 1699 essay “Inquiry Concerning Virtue” demonstrated the proper balance of passions that would benefit society. Eighteenth-century Scottish theologian Frances Hutcheson expanded upon Shaftsbury’s points to argue for a moral sense that promoted the public good. Frances

Hutcheson, A System of Moral Philosophy, 2 vols. (Glasgow, 1755). Scottish Enlightenment thinker Thomas Reid usually gets credit for most effectively advancing Scottish common sense and moral sense philosophy. But Anglican Bishop Joseph Butler, in fact, first articulated the idea that an inherent moral sense implied the obligation, or duty, for one to act in accordance with moral precepts so discerned. Thomas Reid, An Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Sense (Edinburgh, 1764); Joseph Butler, Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel – to which are added Six Sermons Preached on Publick Occasions, 4th ed. (London, 1749). In any case, for Reid, Hutcheson, and Butler the moral sense, or conscience was an inherent capacity to tell right from wrong – a far different view from that of John Locke and David Hume, who, following in the footsteps of Descartes and Hobbes, discounted the idea that human beings possessed an inherent ability to discern moral truth. For Reid, Hutcheson, and Butler, human beings could discern moral truth from other sources, such as observation of the natural world, revelation (scripture), miracles that proved God’s existence by contradicting the laws of nature and providence, and the intervention of God into the natural world to reward or punish people. Peter H. Nidditch, ed., John Locke: An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 68-71; Charles W. Hendel, ed., David Hume: An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: The Library of Liberal Arts Published by Prentice Hall, 1995), 40-42, 50-53; Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians, 129-34. Francis Hutcheson and his compatriot John Witherspoon, who became president of the College of New Jersey in 1768, powerfully imprinted the forgoing understandings of the relations and of moral duty in Presbyterian theology and related moral philosophy. John Witherspoon, Lectures on Moral Philosophy, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: William W. Woodward, 1822). Witherspoon’s articulation of moral philosophy presupposed and affirmed the traditional hierarchical view of society and its relations. Beginning in the mid-1830s, however, pro-slavery ministers in the antebellum South modulated this framework to include explicitly the relation of master and slave and used this reformulated body of thought to augment their scriptural defense of human bondage. Holifield, Gentlemen Theologians, 127-34. See discussion in Chapter Four.

¹⁴³ Baptist theologian Francis Wayland of Brown University produced one of the first influential American renditions of Protestant moral philosophy articulating this hierarchical and organic conception of social relations in 1835. Francis Wayland, The Elements of Moral Science (Boston, 1843), 14-15.

¹⁴⁴ See, for example, the report of the faculty at Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, entitled “Departments of Instruction and Government,” presented to its Board of Directors in June 1860, in M. M. Fisher & John L. Rice, eds. History of Westminster College, 1851-1903 (Columbia: E. W. Stephens, 1908), p. 73 et seq. Texts assigned at Westminster College for studies in sacred literature, metaphysics, and the natural and moral government of God included Archibald Alexander, Outlines of Moral Science (New York: Charles Scribner, 1852); Archibald Alexander, The Evidences of Christian Religion (1831), which can be found in volume one of an anthology of treatises, without editorial attribution, entitled The Evidences of Christian Religion,

2 vols. (Philadelphia: Kay, Jun. & Co., 1831); Richard Whately, Introductory Lessons on Morals and Christian Evidences (Cambridge, Eng.: John Bartlett, 1857); William Paley, Natural Theology: or, Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity (London: Printed for J. Faulder, 1809); Joseph Butler, Religion, Natural and Revealed to the Constitution and Course of Nature to which are Added Two Brief Dissertations (London: Knapton, 1736). J. A. Hollis was hired specially to teach “moral science” at Columbia Baptist Female College. Liberty Weekly Tribune, July 17, 1857, p. 2. c. 6.

¹⁴⁵ Addendum to the Last Will and Testament of George Sibley, in Reminiscences, p. 51.

¹⁴⁶ This assessment is based on county court of common pleas and circuit court records and case files of the General Court of the Territory of Louisiana, the Territory of Missouri, and the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, 1805-60, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri. [Hereafter MSA] The selected local venues and associated trial court records for inclusive years are as follows: St. Louis Court of Common Pleas, Court of Quarter Sessions, Circuit Court, and Criminal Court, 1805-60; Cape Girardeau Common Pleas, Court of Quarter Sessions, and Circuit Court, 1806-50; Ste. Genevieve Court of Common Pleas, Court of Quarter Sessions, and Circuit Court, 1805-18; Washington County Circuit Court, 1814-1854; Cooper County Circuit Court, 1818-1845; Madison County Circuit Court, 1818-60; Boone County Circuit Court, 1820-33; Saline County Circuit Court, 1821-60; Platte County Circuit Court, 1839-49; Mississippi County Circuit Court, 1845-60; Oregon County Circuit Court, 1845-60; Stone County Circuit Court, 1852-1860; Webster County Circuit Court, 1855-60; Phelps County Circuit Court, 1857-60. The trial court minute books and case files for the counties and periods referenced above are either on microfilm at the MSA, Jefferson City, or available only at the MSA, St. Louis. For each of the counties and periods, except for St. Louis County, 1836-60 and Howard County, 1831-60, see also the Missouri Judicial Records Database, MSA, at <<http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/judiciary/allcourts/default.asp>>.

For Missouri Supreme Court case files, see Missouri Supreme Court Historical Database, MSA, at <<http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/judiciary/supremecourt/>>. See also Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri (St. Louis, 1860), vols. 1-34.

¹⁴⁷ Adler, Yankee Merchants, 97. It references I Corinthians 6: 6 in this regard.

¹⁴⁸ Exhibit J. T., No. 1, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 29

¹⁴⁹ James Essex, “Glimpses of the Past,” Missouri Historical Society Journal 1 (June 1934): 7; “John Finney, “William Finney,” and “James C. Essex,” in Howard Louis Conard, ed., Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri (St. Louis:, Haldeman, Conard & Co., 1901).

¹⁵⁰ Exhibit J. T., No. 2, *ibid.*, pp. 30-32; Testimony of Joseph Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 131.

¹⁵¹ First Presbyterian and Second Presbyterian continued to exist side by side until they reunited in 1873. Joshua Tucker, while not the pastor in 1841, was still serving the church. He was aligned with the majority of the New School congregation at that time. To some extent, the financial struggles of the Second Presbyterian Church stemmed from the relatively small membership of the congregation. By 1847, it had collected sufficient cash to erect a modest brick

building that was serviceable for regular meetings. The building was improved sufficiently so as to allow the members to use the basement for their services by 1847. The main part of the building was useable in 1850 although it was still somewhat primitive in appearance. Sweets, Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church, 11-12. As was the case with the First Presbyterian congregation, capable and successful businessmen and civic leaders in Marion County comprised the membership of Second Presbyterian Church. John Fry, one of the founders of the church, served as the Marion County Coroner and Sherriff during the Civil War after his predecessor in the latter position left the union. Interestingly enough, Fry, a native Kentuckian, was the brother-in-law of noted New School minister John Leighton. Virginian Moses M. Fuqua was one of the partners of the Kanawha Salt Works, an early business trust and leading salt manufacturer in what is now West Virginia. Fuqua came to Missouri in the 1830s and eventually settled in Marion County, joining the Second Presbyterian Church. Holcombe, History of Marion County, 439, 894, 926, 993.

¹⁵² First Presbyterian, St Charles, Session Minutes, 2-3.

¹⁵³ First Presbyterian Church, St. Charles, Missouri, Membership List, 1818-1849, Western Historical Manuscripts, C1364, pp. 3-10; "The Old Constitutional Presbyterian Church," St. Charles Cosmos Monitor, 11 September 1918, p. 2; Justin Watkins, "The Church on Main Street: The History of the Constitutional Presbyterian Church," at <http://preservationjournal.org/properties/North/220-226/The%20Church%20on%20Main%20Street.pdf>, 1, accessed 19 December, 2009.

¹⁵⁴ Shortly after Christmas in 1851 three members from the Constitutional Church, Marie Louisa Barron, Susan Cummins and Jane Cummins, were allowed to join the First Presbyterian Church. And in September 1848 a female member of the First Presbyterian Church listed as M. A. Smith asked to join a New School congregation in Portsmouth, Ohio. On the other hand, the session, the judicatory body of the congregation, was only willing to grant her a certificate that verified that she was in good standing, rather than the approving letter of dismissal normally given to those that wished to change cities and join another church. Smith wanted to break ranks, and church elders saw to it that she would not easily make the switch. These reaffiliations notwithstanding, the membership of the First Presbyterian Church remained relatively stable. This was particularly evident during the Civil War, during which the congregation continued to meet regularly. The Constitutional Church was not as lucky as it disbanded shortly after the war, a demise apparently related to continuing strife over the question of slavery and sectional loyalty. First Presbyterian, St Charles, Session Minutes, 20, 30, 60-69; First Presbyterian, St Charles, Membership List, 10-12; Watkins, "Church on Main Street," 1-2.

¹⁵⁵ First Presbyterian, St. Charles, Session Minutes, 2-5, 50-51; "The Old Constitutional Presbyterian Church," 2.

¹⁵⁶ Nathan Scarritt was born in Edwardsville, Illinois. He moved to Alton, Illinois in 1826 where he worked on the family farm until age sixteen. Scarritt attended McKendree College, a Methodist institution in Lebanon, Illinois, where he worked for his tuition and board. He graduated in 1842. For three years, he taught school in Waterville, Illinois. In 1845, he moved to

Fayette, Missouri. Nathan Scarritt Family Papers, KC0248, Missouri State Historical Society Manuscripts Collection, University of Missouri-Kansas City; Liberty Weekly Tribune, October 15, 1846; October 17, 1847, p. 2, c. 6; September 10, 1847, p. 2, c. 1; Harrison Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1914), 131-32.

¹⁵⁷ Liberty Weekly Tribune, July 21, 1848, p. 2, c. 1; October 22, 1852, p. 4, c. 1. Rather curiously, the Howard High School burned to the ground in early 1854. *Ibid.*, February 3, 1854, p. 2, c. 1. In September 1847, the MECS set about securing subscriptions for a college in Liberty, Clay County, which had been endowed by the MECS. Liberty Weekly Tribune, October 1, 1847, p. 2, c. 1.

¹⁵⁸ William Finney v. The St. Charles College, Missouri Supreme Court Case Files, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri; Finney v. St. Charles College 13 Mo. 266 (1850). See also State ex rel. Pittman v. Adams, 44 Mo. 570 (1869) discussed in chapter five.

¹⁵⁹ Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 31.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 32; Wolferman, The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley, 88- 117-130.

¹⁶¹ Rowe "Mary Sibley," 34; "An Act to Incorporate Lindenwood Female College," Lindenwood Collection, Missouri Historical Society.

¹⁶² Wolferman, The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley, 131-46.

¹⁶³ Last Will and Testament of George C. Sibley, in Reminiscences of Lindenwood College, p. 50.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁵ Bryan and Rose, History of the Pioneer Counties of Missouri, 191. As of 1850, Watson owned \$20,000 of real estate, which comprised, basically, the farm that his father Archibald Watson, Sr., had established in 1820 four miles south of the town of St. Charles. Schedule I, Free Inhabitants in District No. 78 of the County of St. Charles, Manuscript Census Records, 1850.

¹⁶⁶ Deed of George and Mary Sibley, in Reminiscences of Lindenwood College, p. 51.

¹⁶⁷ Last Will and Testament of George C. Sibley, in Reminiscences of Lindenwood College, p. 50.

¹⁶⁸ Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 33-37.

¹⁶⁹ Hyde, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 2:731; Col. James M. Rice, Peoria City and County Illinois 2 vols. (Chicago, 1912), 1:156-57; First Presbyterian Church, St. Charles, Missouri, Session Minutes, 1840-1864, Missouri State Historical Society, C1365, 59; Minutes of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School), 1854 (Philadelphia, 1854), 499, 659.

¹⁷⁰ Old School Presbyterians established the St. Louis Presbyterian in 1843 edited by the Reverend Ebenezer Thompson Baird 1852-54 and then by the Reverend Nathan L. Rice beginning in 1854. Scharf, History of Saint Louis, 1:947.

¹⁷¹ Rowe, "Mary Sibley," 33-37; Wolferman, The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley, 131-46; History of St. Charles County, Missouri (1765-1885): Written and Compiled from the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources, including a History of Townships, Towns, and Villages (St. Louis: National Historical Publishing Co., 1885; rev. ed. Locust Grove, Oklahoma: Patria, 1997), Chapter 12, St. Charles Township, pp. 298-447

¹⁷² President of the Board of Directors of Linden Wood Female College on 3 June 1859: John Jay Johns, son of an eminent Virginia planter, a former planter himself, a slave holder, and had been an elder in the Presbyterian Church since twenty-one years of age. He was born in Buckingham County, Virginia on 19 June 1819. He married Catherine A. Woodruff in Oxford, Ohio on 21 August 1840, who died in 1846. He married Jane Amanda Durfee in St. Charles, Missouri, on 3 November 1847. Johns had a large family of thirteen children, and he was an elder in the Presbyterian Church from the time he was twenty one years of age. A History of the Pioneer Families of Missouri, with numerous sketches, anecdotes, adventures, etc., relating to Early Days in Missouri (St. Louis: Bryan, Brand & Co., St. Louis Missouri, 1876), 124, 149, 281.

¹⁷³ George Sibley to John Jay Johns, June 3, 1859, in Reminiscences, at p. 52.

Chapter Three

Church Property Litigation, Liberty of Conscience, and the Ordeal of African Methodists in St. Louis: Farrar v. Finney (1855)

In October 1846, the men and women of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in St. Louis met to consider whether they would remain with the Methodist Episcopal Church (MEC) or align with the recently-formed Methodist Episcopal Church, South (MECS). Amid growing conflict over the question of slavery within the national Methodist Church, its General Conference had adopted a Plan of Separation that provided for the withdrawal of the southern Methodists and the creation of their own ecclesiastical government. The Plan provided that each Border State congregation would have the right to determine for itself by a vote of the majority with which of the two churches it would affiliate. After the southern conferences had organized the new MECS in May 1845, the trustees of the all-white Fourth Street Methodist Church, whose quarterly conference exercised nominal authority over the African Church, informed the black congregants that they could retain their house of worship only if they voted to join the southern Methodists. Throwing caution to the wind, and putting at risk a decade-and-a-half of patient efforts to achieve formal congregational independence within the MEC, the black congregants voted decisively, by a 110 to 7 margin, to remain affiliated with the northern church.

What seemed to the black congregants a legitimate opportunity to establish their society independently as one of the few northern Methodist churches in Missouri suddenly buckled under the weight of an institutional entanglement deeply rooted in the intertwined legal and ecclesiastical imperatives of African American bondage. The upper echelons of the MEC in Missouri had, for more than fifteen years, appointed white ministers to preside over the black congregation.¹ And civil disabilities for African Americans under Missouri law had prompted the

members of the African Methodist Church to leave title to its lot and building in the hands of trustees belonging to the Fourth Street Church, even after the members of the African Church had begun worshiping separately from the white congregation and governing themselves in the early 1830s.² The members of the Fourth Street Church, furthermore, had voted 206 to 44 some weeks before the October 1846 vote of the African Church to join the MECS. The white trustees were determined that the African Church do the same.³ After the black leadership refused to hand over the keys to the Green Street house of worship, the white trustees changed the door locks and “advised” the black congregants to vacate the premises. The Fourth Street trustees did not resort to physical violence because the African Church congregants complied with their dictates. But the Fourth Street trustees had, nonetheless, taken full advantage of the influence and power available to leading white men in a slave society. Assisted by a sympathetic MEC minister, a former trustee of the Fourth Street Church deeply committed to the abolition of slavery, the trustees of the African Church defiantly filed suit to obtain title to their property and litigated Farrar v. Finney all the way to the Missouri State Supreme Court in 1854 – and, in doing so, laid bare the inexorable imperatives of African American bondage in a Border State more torn over its morality than any other in the Union.⁴

Thesis

The St. Louis Circuit Court case Farrar v. Finney (1855), which culminated in the Missouri Supreme Court, reveals that intra-congregational conflicts over church property among Methodists became especially heated when they pitted independently-minded urban slave and free black congregants against all-white pro-slavery congregational factions. As did civilly and ecclesiastically disempowered white women, African American congregants, both men and women, had substantial spiritual and material stakes in the bi-racial churches they helped to

build. The high court of Missouri, however, discounted informal bi-racial church customs for handling the affairs of virtually-independent black congregations and ignore rules of law and equity to safeguard the material interests of pro-slavery church-goers. Equally important, highly-publicized litigation battles over church property ratcheted up tensions between contending pro- and anti-slavery congregants and ordinary residents in the state.

Farrar v. Finney most obviously reveals the plight of ordinary African American congregants caught between anti-slavery Methodist ministers who repudiated the Plan of Separation in 1848 and pro-slavery MECS clerics determined to have the civil courts validate it. Close examination of the case also shows the extent to which intra-congregational strife over the morality of slavery became most intense when it implicated conflicting factional claims to church property. It also highlights how such conflict was especially heated when litigation pitted all-white and all-black congregational factions against one another in a slaveholding metropolis chock full of European immigrants and northeasterners who adamantly opposed African American bondage.

Bold legal arguments made by the African Methodists combined with the political pressures of pro- and anti-slavery partisanship to pose a fundamental dilemma to the courts called upon to adjudicate the African Church claims to its Green Street house of worship. Relying on equitable principles relevant to trusts, the African Methodist Church claimed title to its lot and meeting house by arguing a history of de facto ecclesiastical independence that directly challenged longstanding Methodist Church authority over its black congregations in the slave states. The African Methodists also advanced its claim to ownership by arguing alternatively that the withdrawal of the southern Methodists and the Fourth Street Church from the MEC constituted an unauthorized secession that forfeited to the African Church all title and

interest in the Green Street property – effectively calling on the courts to adjudicate the legality of the secession of southern Methodists from the national Methodist church.

Equally important, highly-publicized litigation battles over church property, such as Farrar v. Finney, occurred almost exclusively in the slaveholding Border States of Missouri, Kentucky, and Virginia. This contention in Missouri ratcheted up tensions between contending pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals and between non-church-goers divided on the moral question of slavery. Evangelical strife and litigation in the Border States spurred high-profile judicial pronouncements, print commentary, and other public disputation that shaped the parameters of national debate and radically increased sectional tensions.

After a protracted multi-year ordeal, a pro-slavery Missouri Supreme Court rejected the appeal of the black congregants in Farrar v. Finney on warrantless technical grounds in a decision that was thick on legal niceties but very thin on fundamental justice. The outcome revealed a basic flaw in the equitable trust under the terms of which African American congregations depended upon the benevolence of white trustees to protect their property – and the limits of related informal practices by which all-white superintending Methodist churches ordered their temporal and spiritual relationships. Farrar v. Finney also demonstrates that the struggle over slavery spurred egregious violations of religious liberty heretofore unexamined by historians focusing on church-state relations in the antebellum period.

Literature Review

Scholarship on African American Methodism in the early national and antebellum periods frames quite well the conflict between the African Methodist Church and the Fourth Street Church. Focusing on antebellum urban venues North and South, this body of work reveals a persistent struggle by African Americans for congregational autonomy and the conflicted

relationships they sustained with ambivalent white co-religionists. Historians such as Richard S. Newman, Will Gravelly, and Gary B. Nash show that the refusal of Richard Allen and others in Philadelphia to tolerate overt racial discrimination helped spur the founding of the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) in 1816, the first fully independent black denomination.⁵ In her study of slave missions and black churches in the antebellum South, historian Janet Duitsman Cornelius reveals that statutes in most Border States of the Upper South, including Missouri, authorized and spurred the rise of urban-based, ecclesiastically-independent black churches, typically AME and Baptist societies that broke away from larger white-dominated congregations. Cornelius and historian J. Gordon Melton innovatively examine the bids for autonomy made by the majority of black Methodists, free and un-free, who remained within the MEC and MECS to the end of the antebellum period.⁶ While certainly revealing the tensions between white Methodist authorities and black members, Cornelius emphasizes that, within missions to the slaves and black churches in the cities, African American women and men “could make their own religious choices and lead their own religious services, either independently or under nominal white control.”⁷ Melton stresses more the ambivalence of white Methodists in urban venues toward their black brothers and sisters who chose to remain affiliated with the MEC. Of considerable importance, his study reveals how their contention with white Methodist authorities for control of black congregational property and the appointment of black ministers often constituted the key dynamic of conflict in northern and Border State urban settings. Struggles of this kind, he shows, had spurred black Methodists led by Richard Allen to form the independent AME in 1816.⁸

Legal historians Christopher Tomlins, Bruce Mann, and others have articulated the concept of legality to convey how ordinary people, across genders, races, and ethnicities in

colonial America employed law and legal discourses to achieve their own ends and in ways that often departed from and conflicted with formal legal rules and the practices of courts.⁹ Legal historian Laura Edwards similarly describes the persistence of informal “local law” in the Carolinas at least through 1840. She shows that slaves and free blacks routinely asserted rights to property short of formal “ownership.” Often with the support of owners or other white benefactors, African Americans actually possessed and managed property and otherwise engaged in transactions, claims the formal law on the books did not recognize.¹⁰

Assessment of the outcome in Farrar v. Finney and its significance heavily implicates the work of constitutional and legal experts studying contemporary church property disputes. This ample scholarship demonstrates that American judges who decided such cases in the early national and antebellum periods substantially modified the received law of Great Britain to reflect American commitments to freedom of religion. Kent Greenawalt, Justin M. Gardner, and Troy Harris, in particular, have provided much needed knowledge in this area.¹¹ Mark P. Strasser adds significantly to the enquiry with a close investigation of the only major ruling by the United States Supreme Court on the ecclesiastical constitutionality of the national Methodist schism, Smith v. Swormstedt (1853).¹² These scholars argue that American judges widely rejected the “implied trust” theory adopted by Great Britain in the second decade of the nineteenth century. Under this doctrine, when contending factions of a congregation connected with a hierarchically-structured church vied for ownership of property held in trust for its benefit, chancery courts decided in favor of that faction whose articles of faith, discipline, and beliefs about church government comported most with those of the original donor. Courts inferred such views from the beliefs subscribed to by the donor and recipient congregation when the gift was made. For disputes over land, courts generally looked to an original deed of trust, typically construing its

language with the presupposition that donors intended the property to advance the religious beliefs, practices, and forms of government accepted by the denomination at the time of the grant. American courts, however, generally decided such contests with an approach that deferred to church authority. In the case of congregations that were independent from any larger ecclesiastical body, such as those of Baptists and Congregationalists, majority-rule became the standard. Changes to articles of faith, discipline, and government so instituted did not vitiate donations in trust to such a congregation.¹³ In the case of societies connected to larger church bodies, such as those of Presbyterians and Methodists, the courts usually abided by the determinations of their highest judicatories. Civil courts placed disputed congregational property in the hands of that faction recognized by the highest authority within the denomination or the one whose creed and government was accepted by it.¹⁴ In Watson v. Jones (1871), the United States Supreme Court would declare that the deference doctrine duly recognized the need for a separation of church and state and thus advanced the basic ideals of religious liberty. In the view of the Court, the doctrine of implied trust involved far too much entanglement of civil tribunals with ecclesiastical matters.¹⁵

Evolution of a Virtually Independent Black Congregation

The distinctive geographic setting of St. Louis provided the conditions in which the African Methodist Church could organize and flourish with an amount of autonomy uncommon in the rural precincts of Missouri or the Deep South. The legal strife that erupted between the black congregants of the congregation and the white leaders of the Fourth Street Church in 1846 derived from the distinctive development of frontier Missouri and its major entrêpot, the metropolis of St. Louis. While African Americans suffered a number of social, civil, and political disabilities in the city, they enjoyed substantially more personal liberty than did slaves and free

blacks in rural Missouri and the Deep South. In the plantation districts of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, for example, planters and overseers exercised close supervision over the vast majority of blacks, who labored as field workers and moved within circumscribed slave neighborhoods only with permission and typically far from large towns or cities. After the War of 1812, however, St. Louis featured a thriving African American population, free and enslaved, whose work largely centered on the river trade. In this context, free blacks and bonded African Americans, who plied various crafts, mixed freely in public spaces with the Anglo-Americans and French Creoles of the town. In 1835, roughly ten percent of the population was enslaved, and free blacks comprised about three percent of it. As the population of the city began to boom in the 1830s, authorities stiffened regulations targeting the liberty of African Americans, especially after Presbyterian minister Elijah P. Lovejoy began editorializing against slavery in his newspaper, The Observer. But slavery was a dying institution in the city by the late 1840s, notwithstanding the fact that St. Louis remained the site of a busy regional slave market. The African American community comprised only five percent of the St. Louis population by 1850, and this percentage fell three more points in the following decade, with a slight majority holding free status at that time. Immigration from both the eastern United States and Europe dwarfed the black population and pushed the population of the city to 160,000 in 1860, which made it a far ethnically- and culturally-complex social setting than that which prevailed in the rest of the southern-oriented state. The liberal-minded German immigrants who constituted almost half of St. Louis by 1850 resented African bondage and provided a fertile field for both abolitionism and African American freedom of movement and initiative.¹⁶

Legal restrictions on African American worship ultimately undercut the autonomy of societies like the African Methodist Church. But these measures evolved only slowly in Missouri

and St. Louis relative to the rest of the Cotton Kingdom. In plantation regions further South, beginning in the 1820s, Methodist and Baptist ministers established slave missions only in step with the often grudging permission of planters, who kept a careful watch against Sabbath-day preaching that even hinted at black liberation. It is well established that slave missions in the countryside and on plantations provided little freedom for their congregants, who were closely monitored by whites. The suppression of African American challenges to the institution of slavery was also the primary purpose of legal restrictions increasingly placed on black worship in the 1820s and 1830s across the South.¹⁷

From the American takeover of Upper Louisiana in 1804 through the late 1840s, no city ordinance or territorial or state statute proscribed the independent religious worship of slaves and free blacks in St. Louis. The 1825 Missouri slave code and subsequent revisions through 1860 explicitly allowed slaves to travel and attend “divine services,” at least with a pass. Laws regulating slave patrols, in 1855, maintained that that any slave found at an unlawful assembly was to receive “any number of lashes, at the discretion of the patrol, not exceeding ten, or, if taken before a justice of the peace, such slave shall receive any number of lashes, at the discretion of the justice, not to exceed twenty.” But another section maintained that “This act shall not be so construed as to prevent or affect any slave, directly going to, or returning from, divine worship on the Sabbath day.” As sectional tensions over slavery deepened after the abolitionist postal campaign in 1835-37, white leaders attempted to restrict the personal liberty of blacks within the City of St. Louis, including the adoption of new laws regulating black religious assemblies. In 1836, St. Louis proscribed African American religious worship after 9 p.m. in the winter and 10 p.m. in the summer, while requiring slaves to obtain a pass from their owners to attend evening services. In August of 1843, the St. Louis Board of Aldermen revised their

ordinances to require African Americans to obtain permission from the mayor to hold a religious gathering. The mayor was then to notify the captain of the city guard to ensure neighboring residents were not disturbed. Shortly after the October 1846 initiative of the African Methodist Church to establish its independence, a group of St. Louis citizens successfully petitioned the Missouri General Assembly to enact a statute restricting the right of both slaves and free blacks to worship independently. The February 1847 act forbade meetings of Negroes or mulattoes “for the purpose of religious worship, or preaching,” conducted by black preachers or ministers, unless a constable, marshal, police officer, or justice of the peace was present. According to section two, “No meeting or assemblage of negroes or mulattoes, for the purpose of religious worship or preaching, shall be held or permitted where the services are performed or conducted by negroes or mulattoes, unless some sheriff, constable, marshal, police officer or justice of the peace, shall be present during all the time of such meetings or assemblage, in order to prevent seditious speeches, and disorderly and unlawful conduct of every kind.”¹⁸

When the African Methodist Church voted in October 1846 to remain with the MEC, autonomous African American churches had thrived in the City of St. Louis for years. Former slave from Virginia John Berry Meachum established the first independent Baptist Church in St. Louis in 1822. John Berry Meachum purchased his freedom in Virginia and relocated to St. Louis in 1815, working thereafter with white Baptist missionary from New York John Mason Peck to bring religious instruction to the slaves of the town. As in other Upper South Border States where independent black congregations were not prohibited by law, the First African Baptist Church exercised the prerogative of separating from its white branch in 1822. It remained under white supervision until about 1825, when Meachum, a successful cooper and carpenter,

was ordained and took charge of the church. He personally held title to the property of his congregation, notwithstanding the civil disabilities that both free blacks and slaves faced.¹⁹

The AME established its first congregation in 1840, and black Baptists organized a second church in Saint Louis in 1847. The St. Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) was founded in 1840. It was the second independent black church in St. Louis. The founding minister was Reverend William Paul Quinn, who was from Honduras. The original location was at Eleventh and Green (now Lucas Avenue) streets.²⁰

The black AME and Baptist churches steadily drew new members, free and enslaved. By 1860, there were at least six separate black religious societies in St. Louis. They included the Colored MEC Society of Wesley Chapel, established in 1858. Three of these black societies, as indicated, were ecclesiastically independent. As was commonly the case in large southern cities, the others remained formally situated under the auspices of a nearby white society of the same denomination – but they typically worshipped apart and governed their own affairs, generally with the cooperation of ministers, white or black, appointed by denominational authorities. Commonly in the antebellum South, white churchgoers set up semi-independent congregations of black co-religionists who worshipped separately from whites (sometimes in the same building at a different time, sometimes in a separate building) but remained technically part of the same congregation. The precise arrangement differed from community to community and from denomination to denomination. Whether under the auspices of a white parent congregation or not, the relatively cosmopolitan atmosphere of metropolitan St. Louis ensured that black congregations exercised a degree of autonomy that was uncommon in the rural precincts of Missouri and other slaveholding states.²¹

The African Methodist Church came into existence shortly after Missouri statehood while St. Louis was still a fledgling river town of only several thousand people. In cooperation with Virginia-born Methodist missionary Jesse Walker, slaves and free blacks organized the first society of the Methodist Episcopal Church in St. Louis in 1820. Drayman Jonathan Duncan was instrumental in this regard. Born in 1795, he was emancipated in the St. Louis Circuit Court by Kentuckian Robert Duncan in November 1822 “in consideration of the love and affection” and “the faithful services and attention to me of the said Jonathan.”²² In that same year, the black and white Methodists of St. Louis began to worship together once a week in a frame building a newly-formed white Methodist society had acquired on Fourth Street. According to the Reverend Jesse Walker, ninety-five whites and thirty-two African Americans, bonded and free, convened at the frame church on Sundays.²³ The white leadership, however, required the black congregants to occupy the gallery. Led by Duncan, who served as exhorter, they began meeting the rest of the week in a different building on Gully Street in 1825.²⁴ According to trial testimony of Daniel Lloyd, a member of the Fourth Street Church, the black congregants “had, from the beginning, James Farrar, a coloured man who was a head man and did their preaching.” Born in 1796, Farrar was the slave of prominent St. Louis physician Bernard G. Farrar and his wife Nancy, who emancipated him on April 8, 1836 in consideration of his “faithful services.”²⁵

The white and black Methodists in St. Louis ceased worshipping together entirely in about 1830. It seems rather clear that the uninhibited style of worship common among black Methodists figured prominently in this development. In the estimation of Lloyd, “the blacks appeared to be quite an annoyance to the whites There was a disposition at times manifested by the leading members among the whites to get rid of the connection in consequence of the blacks being sometimes noisy and troublesome.”²⁶ A timely charitable donation helped the white

congregants to obtain their wish. One of the leading citizens and benefactors of St. Louis, John O'Fallon, whose wife Caroline was a member of the Fourth Street Church, donated to it a lot worth \$500 at Fourth and Washington streets. The white congregants soon began to meet in a new house of worship built on that lot. At about the same time, the African American congregants ceased gathering at the Gully Street meeting house and began convening at the frame church, which they promptly purchased from the Fourth Street Church trustees.²⁷

The black congregants, quite likely, relished the separation at least as much as the white women and men of the Fourth Street Church. The leadership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Missouri, as in the slaveholding Border States of Maryland, Kentucky, and Tennessee, favored the policy of preventing black congregations from obtaining full ecclesiastical autonomy even when they became financially self-supporting and owned their own buildings.²⁸ But the physical separation of the African Methodist Church from the white Fourth Street church congregation provided the black congregants new opportunities to manage their own affairs. According to Daniel Lloyd, after the Africans began worshipping apart from the Fourth Street congregation in 1830, the whites exercised "no control over them." The Fourth Street Quarterly Conference began supplying them with white preachers in about 1834.²⁹ But African Church class leader George Bushey, a successful businessman and future city councilman, testified that the black members and the white preacher in charge cooperated to handle all of the financial affairs of the society as early as 1835.³⁰ The African Methodist Church membership filled all the lay leadership positions in the church. The Methodist Doctrines and Discipline, which included articles of faith, constitutional principles, and rules and procedures, certainly allowed African Americans to serve as exhorters, stewards, and trustees. In addition to Duncan, James Farrar served as exhorter, a post that authorized them both to preach.³¹ Whether officially recognized by

the Fourth Street leadership or not, a number of black men, including Duncan and Farrar, acted as stewards and oversaw collections and performed other services customarily associated with this office.³²

Constituting a critical component of the African Methodist Church leadership were the free black men who acted as trustees. By late 1846, this cadre included not only James Farrar but also Lewis Jones and Ralph Harrison.³³ Emancipated by St. Louis businessman Ramsey C. Jones on September 7, 1845, Lewis Jones, at age thirty-two, was the youngest of the African Church trustees ultimately to litigate on behalf of the African Church in Farrar v. Finney. According to the Reverend Joseph Tabor, a perspicacious and influential Fourth Street trustee from 1830 to 1843, Jones was “the most efficient man among them.”³⁴ Ralph Harrison had been the slave of soon-to-be-embattled free-soil United States Senator of Missouri Thomas Hart Benton and his wife Elizabeth. The Bentons manumitted Harrison on July 6, 1843, in consideration of his having attended James McDorsee, the father of Elizabeth, in Virginia “during his last and long illness.” According to Senator Benton, Harris was about forty years of age in 1843 and a “sober, honest, industrious and capable man”³⁵

Led by experienced and responsible black men, several of whom had close ties to prominent white leaders in the St. Louis community, the African Methodist Church raised its own funds with collections, paid its own expenses, and generally compensated the white ministers sent to them. The African Methodists were, in the estimation of Daniel Lloyd, “prosperous and successful,” and their congregation “grew large,” especially after relocating to their Green Street house of worship in about 1834.³⁶ According to Gershom Perdue, an Ohio Quaker minister passing through St Louis in 1841, the black church had close to 300 men and women and an operating Sunday school.³⁷ In September 1844, the Africans sent a memorial to

the Fourth Street Quarterly Conference asking for assistance to purchase yet another “lot of ground and the erection of another church.”³⁸

Notwithstanding the physical separation and rapid growth of the African Methodist Church, its members chafed under the oversight of the Fourth Street Church and began making bold demands for official ecclesiastical autonomy. According to George Bushey, beginning in about 1835, the black church members and the “the preacher in charge,” the Reverend George Smith, “could not get along . . . They differed.” The black congregants asked Smith himself to obtain from the Fourth Street Church Quarterly Conference “a white recording steward . . . to take charge of the books and money,” a post that Bushey filled for the next five years or so.³⁹ Beginning in 1838, the African Church began to withhold regular pay from Smith. And on August 2, 1838, the Reverend William M. Parker petitioned the Fourth Street Church Quarterly Conference in behalf of the African Church to make the black society a “separate charge.” The quarterly conference deemed this “inexpedient” and denied the request. In response to the motion of the Reverend Silas Comfort on December 18, 1838, however, the Fourth Street Quarterly Conference “resolved that the colored people shall not be served by Bro. Smith as their preacher but shall transact all matters of Discipline and finance independent of the white people for the time being until the next annual conference.”⁴⁰ The 1839 Missouri Annual Conference declined to set off permanently the African Church under the governance of its own quarterly conference. But in the years 1840 and 1841, according to Bushey, the African Church altogether “refused to have a white preacher and applied to the Presiding Elder to grant them the privilege of obtaining for themselves a colored preacher.” They succeeded in this effort, thanks to the efforts of the Reverend Charles B. Parsons, bringing in a black minister from Louisville, Kentucky, who was, in the estimation of Bushey “a very active smart man.”⁴¹

After the Methodist Episcopal Church General Conference adopted a Plan of Separation in May 1844 to appease its discontented white southern membership, Fourth Street Church leaders dealt ambiguously with a black congregation increasingly eager to strike out on its own. The white MEC leadership appears to have viewed the experiment in black African Methodist Church pastoral leadership either as a failure, a threat, or both. They imposed upon the African Methodist Church, once again, the objectionable oversight of the Reverend George Smith. On September 20, 1844, however, the black congregants memorialized the Fourth Street Church Quarterly Conference, asking that the official African Church ministerial charge be left vacant in the coming year and that the black church be attached to the Centenary Church, which had been set off from the Fourth Street Church as a separate charge in 1839.⁴² To this the Fourth Street Quarterly Conference agreed. And in response to a motion made by the Reverend Wesley Browning in December 1844, it “Resolved that the Presiding elder of the District be respectfully requested by and with the consent of the Bishop to set off the Coloured Society now in connection with this charge, as a separate charge to itself.” The Fourth Street Quarterly Conference further resolved on January 7, 1845, to form a three-member committee to meet with a similar group from the Centenary Church “to draft a proper representation to the Hon. Bernard Pratte Mayor of the City in regard to our colored Brethren.”⁴³

The Legalities of (Dis)possession

The equitable rights of the African Methodists to the Green Street house of worship of seized by the Fourth Street trustees come into crisper focus if one takes into account carefully, as a threshold consideration, the substantial material contributions that black congregants routinely made to their bi-racial churches. African Americans, free and bonded, commonly worshiped with whites in their church buildings and, in these cases, constituted a sizeable segment of such

mixed-race congregations. Free blacks scraped together earnings to make donations to church coffers and building funds. Town-dwelling slaves who “hired their own time,” or rural slaves who raised money for themselves by growing produce and crafting finished goods for sale in local markets, made donations to their churches from extraordinarily dear personal resources. The bulk of their labor augmented the property of their owners. The labor contributions of enslaved men to white “households,” whether as domestic workers, field hands, or mechanics, fundamentally augmented the property of white slaveholding patriarchs who donated property to evangelical congregations. The contributions of slave women to household production and reproduction, and to farming operations, did the same.

In mixed-race congregations, African Americans had an important stake in the outcome of disputes between factions. Disputes over church property under established civil and church rules formally constituted legal contests between white household and church patriarchs whom the law recognized as owners. But, in fact, these contests also constituted disputes for control and ownership of church property that African American women, men, and children, free and enslaved, had substantially produced with their own labor.

The complicated string of real estate deals, deeds, oral promises, and unwritten agreements that ultimately undercut the property claims of the African Methodist Church began shortly after the white Methodists acquired their first building in St. Louis. On March 5, 1822, they purchased from Methodist minister Isaac Newton Piggot and his wife Sally an aged twenty-eight-by-thirty frame building on Fourth and Spruce streets.⁴⁴ The black congregants purchased their Gully Street house of worship from Joseph Duncan about three years later. Duncan kept legal title, holding it in trust for their benefit. After the white Methodists moved into a newly-constructed house of worship on Fourth Street in about 1830, the trustees of the Fourth Street

Church offered to sell their abandoned frame church to the African Americans.⁴⁵ Duncan repurchased the Gully Street building from the black Methodists, thereby providing them the \$300 they needed to close the deal. Given growing civil disabilities that made it difficult for even a free black man to protect rights of contract and property, the African Church left title to the frame church with the white Fourth Street Church trustees after paying the purchase price of \$300. But no record was made explicitly setting out the trust arrangement. The white trustees thus maintained the legal title to it.⁴⁶ After having procured the assent of the black Methodists, the Fourth Street Church trustees sold the old frame building to prominent businessman Samuel Wiggins for \$500 in early 1832.⁴⁷ The deed Wiggins received from the Fourth Street Church trustees specified that, for two years, the building was to be reserved as a “house of worship . . . for the use of the Methodist Episcopal Church.” Wiggins, the white trustees, and the African Church agreed informally to permit the black congregants to occupy the building during that period.⁴⁸ Under the terms of the deed, the Fourth Street Church was entitled to “all the seats and the pulpit now in the said house of worship for the use of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church.”⁴⁹ Informally, however, Wiggins, the Fourth Street leadership, and the black congregants agreed that the African Church would ultimately receive the seats and pulpit. They further agreed that the conveyance to Wiggins was made on the condition that the Fourth Street Church would purchase a lot and erect a building for the African American congregation for their use after the expiration of the two-year lease set out in the deed to Wiggins. The Quarterly Conference of the Fourth Street Church, the supervisory body under which all Methodist congregations in St. Louis were situated, ratified all of these agreements and understandings on February 7, 1832.⁵⁰

The sale of the old frame church to Wiggins set in motion the transactions that would leave the black congregants a highly-problematic legal claim to their lot and meeting house. MEC minister Joseph Tabor and Irish-born businessmen William and John Finney, Fourth Street Church trustees all, purchased the lot on Green Street for the black congregants on December 3, 1832. The deed that William Slater executed to Tabor and the Finney brothers, however, included no language stipulating that the property was to be held in trust for the use of the black congregation or any other Methodist congregation.⁵¹ But under the terms of the February 7, 1832, agreement, both African and white leadership understood that the brick building on Green Street was constructed for the black congregants. To pay for this building and the lot on which it stood, the white trustees used the \$300 they had received from the African Americans in payment for the old frame church, an additional \$300 raised by the black congregants, the proceeds from the sale of the pews and pulpit left in the frame church, and a contribution of at least \$20 from the white congregation.⁵² Of substantial importance, Tabor executed a title bond on February 11, 1834 that promised to convey the Green Street property “to the trustees of the Methodist Church . . . for the use of the African church.”⁵³ The Finney brothers, however, did not sign this document.⁵⁴

The unilateral action of Fourth Street trustee and anti-slavery MEC minister Joseph Tabor on behalf of the African Methodist Church recognized the dilemma the black congregation might face should it seek complete ecclesiastical independence. Certainly Tabor revealed his deep sympathy with the black congregants and recognized their property rights when he executed the February 1834 title bond. By the fall of 1846, Tabor was locked in a fierce battle with the MECS ministers of the Fourth Street Church and their counterparts across St. Louis. Immediately after the white men and women of the Fourth Street Church voted to join the MECS Tabor began to

organize the city's pro-MEC minority into a new congregation, the Ebenezer Chapel.⁵⁵ On September 10, 1846, the intrepid reverend acted unilaterally once again in behalf of the African Church when he deeded his half interest in the Green Street property to its black trustees – Farrar, Harrison, and Jones. Having informed them that the African Church was “a separate and distinct body” from the Fourth Street Church because it had joined the MECS, also Tabor crafted a deed recognizing that the black church had the prerogative, under the 1844 Plan of Separation, to align itself with the MEC or MECS.⁵⁶ Needless to say, Tabor knew their preferences in advance and certainly executed the deed without the approval of the Finney brothers.⁵⁷ In this extraordinary context, the Fourth Street trustees attempted a month later to leverage a pro-MECS vote in the African Church with a threat to deny the black congregants possession of their lot and house of worship.

The imbroglio over the Green Street property featured the complete breakdown of a customary “legality” by which the leaders of a de facto separate black society had generally managed its own affairs under the nominal supervision of a larger white congregation. Similarly, from the early 1830s through mid-October 1846, the black leadership of the African Methodist Church and the white Fourth Street trustees interacted within the framework of a distinctive legality that ordered their relationships, including transactions involving church property and the possession and use of that property. All involved understood that the Africans were, as a practical matter, a separate congregation after about 1830. Black and white congregants, often-sympathetic Methodist ministers, and cooperative white class leaders operated on this presupposition – while dutifully maintaining the ecclesiastical fiction that the black members were viable constituents of the larger Fourth Street congregation and its quarterly conference. In doing so, they shared a cross-racial understanding of unwritten rules grounded in church custom

and idiosyncratic legal concepts that ordinarily provided the black women and men of the church considerable certainty and freedom of action regarding their temporal and spiritual affairs. In several vital respects, this practice flew in the face of formal MEC rules and well-established principles of contract, property, and trusts. The use of customary informal modes of acquiring and managing property, nonetheless, shaped and reflected the material relations of black and white church-goers much more than the fiction of ecclesiastical unity or the secular law. As J. Gordon Melton has demonstrated, such informal modes of interaction concerning church property were common in bi-racial urban congregations across the North and South, where relatively autonomous black societies thrived under the supervision of nominal white ecclesiastical oversight.⁵⁸ In October 1846, however, the Fourth Street Church trustees egregiously breached the customary ethic and informal rules of the legality that had ordered their relationship with the African Church. And they did so in an officious way that only highlighted the de facto separateness of the women and men of the church.

After the Fourth Street trustees expelled the African Methodist Church members, the pro-MEC black congregation relocated and survived with a majority of its members. For several years, it seems, a small segment of the African Church adhered to the Fourth Street Church and continued to convene in the Green Street location. This fact helps explain the repeated averments of the Fourth Street trustees in their pleadings and briefs that they had kept the disputed meeting house open to black church members.⁵⁹ The MECS attempted to reestablish the black congregation under its own auspices, even providing \$300 in 1848 to support a mission for about fifty African Americans in the city.⁶⁰ The remnants of the African Church who had decided to remain with the Fourth Street Church after October 1846 disappeared from the MECS roles after 1851.⁶¹ Because the Methodist schism decimated the northern Methodists in Missouri, St. Louis

records for the MEC in 1846 and 1847 remain fragmentary. The MEC Missouri Annual Conference did not reorganize until about 1848. But the African Church certainly persisted under its auspices. Most of the African Church members convened at the “Stone House” of physician Bernard G. Farrar for several years after their expulsion from the Green Street building. Obviously, Dr. Farrar was willing to extend the benefits of patronage to his former slave, James Farrar, and the black Methodists with whom he had joined. By December 1848, the MEC had set off the black society as an independent charge, and the African Church convened its first quarterly conference at that time.⁶²

Going to Law: Jurists and Arguments in the St. Louis Circuit Court

Having been forcibly excluded from their Green Street meeting house, and having no other viable recourse, the trustees of the African Methodist Church hired lawyers and resorted to the civil courts. Filing suit in the St Louis County Circuit Court in November 1848, the African Church trustees brought their bill in equity before Judge Alexander Hamilton, one of the most eminent jurists in St. Louis. Hamilton, an Episcopalian, was born in 1814 in Philadelphia to a notable family and had immigrated to St. Louis in his twenties. His peers regarded him as one of the leading attorneys in Missouri when Governor John Edwards, a Democrat, appointed him circuit judge in the mid-1840s. Nurturing a bookish bent, Hamilton was one of the founders of the St. Louis Law Library. He often referred to a specific page of an opinion or treatise from memory when discussing fine points of doctrine. After Hamilton’s death in 1882, St. Louis Judge Thomas Gantt declared that “his familiarity with the great questions of constitutional and municipal law, questions involving the titles to land . . . was extraordinary.”⁶³ Lawyers and politicians in St. Louis and across the state generally regarded Hamilton as in sympathy with

slave freedom suits. This was a predilection he clearly demonstrated when he presided over both the 1847 and 1850 state-level trials in Dred Scott v. Emerson, the second of which resulted in a jury verdict in favor of Scott and his wife Harriet.⁶⁴ After the state adopted popular election of judges the following year, the citizens of St. Louis voted to retain Hamilton in his judgeship, partly on the weight of the controversial outcome and otherwise as a consequence of his reputation for unimpeachable integrity. On the other hand, his tightly-wound moral scruples often spurred him to decide cases with a painstaking adherence to the letter of the law, a tendency that did not bode well for litigants relying on innovation to succeed.⁶⁵

A number of well-known and highly-talented lawyers represented Farrar, Harrison, and Jones through their protracted ordeal. The irrepressible Reverend Tabor assisted the black trustees with their selection of attorneys and otherwise through the litigation.⁶⁶ Alexander Field and David Hall, who had represented Dred and Harriet Scott before Judge Hamilton, filed the initial bill for the African Methodist Church trustees.⁶⁷ After Hall died in April 1851, the black trustees retained John Dillard Cook, former judge of the Missouri Supreme Court from Cape Girardeau, who was then serving in St. Louis as United States Attorney for the District of Missouri.⁶⁸ Before Cook passed away in 1852, he filed the amended bill of complainants and, basically, set the parameters of their arguments.⁶⁹ The African Church trustees retained the firm of Delafield, Leslie, and Barretts in early 1853, shortly before the case went to trial in the April term of that year.⁷⁰ John Delafield was a skilled courtroom lawyer and had argued before the Supreme Court of Missouri on numerous occasions.⁷¹ Often taking the lead in the case was native of Vermont Miron Leslie, an accomplished litigator and former partner of Roswell Field, another St. Louis lawyer who had represented the Scotts in Judge Hamilton's court. Leslie had ably represented the state of Missouri more than a few times.⁷² He was, furthermore, one of a

handful of state senators to vote against the notorious Jackson-Napton resolutions passed by the Missouri General Assembly in 1849, which declared that Congress lacked the power to prohibit slavery in newly-acquired territories.⁷³ On the other hand, Leslie was prone to imbibing spirits on the job, a practice that impaired his performance in the courtroom and damaged his professional standing with the judiciary.⁷⁴

The Fourth Street trustees also employed some of the leading attorneys in the state. The lawyers representing the African Methodist Church trustees faced the firm of Henry S. Geyer, Trusten Polk, and Benjamin B. Dayton. Born in New York and an 1838 graduate of Union College, Dayton enjoyed a reputation as a devoted student of the law and a man of exemplary personal habits.⁷⁵ Often dubbed the “father of Missouri law,” Geyer had drafted the first comprehensive code of statutes for the state in 1825. The Missouri bar generally regarded him as one of the greatest lawyers of the era. He had served for years in the Missouri General Assembly and became the Whig pro-slavery United States Senator from Missouri in 1851 shortly after concluding his representation of defendant Irene Emerson before Judge Hamilton in the Dred Scott cases. Geyer thus replaced Thomas Hart Benton, the leading Democrat in the trans-Mississippi southwest after his militant opposition to the Jackson-Napton resolutions and westward expansion of slavery had alienated from him most of the Democrats in the state.⁷⁶ A member of the Centenary MECS congregation, Fourth Street Trustees lawyer Trusten Polk was a Yale graduate from Delaware and had been a leading St. Louis attorney for over a decade, having served as city counselor and St. Louis delegate to the state’s 1845 constitutional convention. Polk was a staunch, pro-slavery, anti-Benton Democrat and would go on to serve as governor of Missouri in 1857 and, thereafter, as the United States Senator from Missouri before becoming a colonel in the army of the Confederate States of America.⁷⁷

The specific relief requested by the complainants was for the court to declare that the Fourth Street trustees held the Green Street property in trust for the African Methodist Church and to order Fourth Street trustees John and William Finney to convey their interest in the property to Farrar, Jones, and Harrison in trust for the African Church. During the pleading phase of Farrar v. Finney, the African Church lawyers scrambled to assay workable theories of the case, twice amending their original bill. They grounded the essential justice claim of the lawsuit, of course, on the virtually undeniable fact that the Fourth Street Church trustees had misappropriated a lot and church building for which the free black and enslaved members of the African Church had undoubtedly paid extraordinarily hard-earned money. The African Church lawyers sought to provide Judge Hamilton as many possible rationales as fairness-based equity jurisprudence could sustain. In keeping with recently-adopted rules for alternative pleading, they marshaled arguments variously and boldly drawing on the law of trusts, ecclesiastical property disputes, the Methodist Episcopal Church Doctrines and Discipline, and the ponderous possibilities that the contentious 1844 Methodist Church Plan of Separation presented.

As a first argument, the African Methodist Church maintained that, as a completely-autonomous society for more than a quarter of a century, its title to the Green Street lot and house of worship was grounded in a trust arrangement with the leaders of the Fourth Street Church. This argument turned vitally on the African Church claim that it had been a separate, independent, and self-governing society long before the 1845 Methodist schism or the October 1846 vote, indeed, from the time the black church established itself in 1820.⁷⁸ The African Church emphasized that, after the Fourth Street trustees sold the frame church in 1832, they were obligated to use the funds thus obtained to provide a meeting house for the black congregants. Quarterly conference records showed that all involved understood that this payment, and the

contribution by the African Church of an additional \$300, secured the Green Street lot and building for the black women and men of the church. According to the complainants, this obligation arose either as a “constructive trust” by operation of law or as a “resulting” trust by virtue of the intentions of the parties – that is, the African Church congregants and leadership, the Fourth Street trustees, and the white ministers comprising the Fourth Street Quarterly Conference.⁷⁹ In essence, the African Church relied on equitable principles of resulting and constructive trust to claim title to its lot and meeting house, while also arguing a history of de facto ecclesiastical independence that challenged longstanding Methodist Church authority over its black congregations in the slave states.⁸⁰

The African Methodist Church lawyers stressed the importance of the 1834 title bond executed by the Reverend Tabor, which most authoritatively reflected the trust arrangement.⁸¹ Under the circumstances, the Fourth Street trustees had no right to exclude the black congregants from the Green Street house of worship. By doing so, the Fourth Street Church trustees had purposely disregarded their obligations. For the court to order the white trustees to convey the Green Street property to the African Church was the appropriate and only available remedy.⁸²

The African Methodist Church also maintained that, as an independent Methodist society, it was entitled to vote under the 1844 Plan of Separation, even if it had been coerced into doing so. It should be noted here that neither the Plan nor its framers indicated in the least that it was to have this effect. Available evidence strongly suggests that no subordinate black Methodist society in the slaveholding states, other than the African Church, sought to take advantage of the Plan in this way.⁸³ But the success of the African Church constructive-resulting trust argument did not ultimately depend on whether the court accepted the validity of the Plan or not – only

upon whether the court recognized the ecclesiastical independence of the African Church from its organization through October 1846.

The African Methodist Church argued alternatively that it was entitled to ownership of the Green Street property because the withdrawal of the southern Methodists and the Fourth Street Church from the MEC constituted an unauthorized secession that forfeited to the African congregation all title and interest in that property.⁸⁴ To put it another way, the African Church argued, in the alternative that, by virtue of the Fourth Street Church having unilaterally withdrawn from the MEC in 1845, its trustees were not qualified to retain title to the Green Street lot and house of worship. Under well-established MEC rules, only members of that denomination could hold property in trust for congregations affiliated with it.⁸⁵ The Green Street property belonged to them and to any white Fourth Street congregants who had remained with the pro-MEC faction. This argument did not depend upon a finding by the court that the African Church had been an independent society before October 1846. But it could only succeed if the court determined that the 1844 Plan of Separation was invalid under MEC constitutional law – a controversial legal question that continued to be litigated in other jurisdictions through the trial-court phase of the case.⁸⁶ The African Church lawyers thus emphasized the September 1846 deed with which Joseph Tabor had conveyed to the black trustees, in keeping with the supposed forfeiture, his one-half interest in the Green Street property.⁸⁷ Complainants insisted it was incumbent on the court to order John and William Finney to transfer their interest in the Green Street property to the trustees of the loyal MEC membership – Farrar, Jones, and Harrison.⁸⁸

By the time Farrar, Jones, and Harrison filed their bill, defendant Fourth Street trustee William Finney had become something of an old hand at litigation connected to the growing denominational strife over slavery and resulting from the schism in the Methodist Church. As

discussed in a previous chapter, along with his brother John, Finney had pledged \$1,000 in November 1836 to help set up an endowment for St. Charles College, chartered in February 1837. Finney had, with a “subscription,” promised to pay the new school interest on the sum for ten years and then the entire principle at the end of the period. After the struggle ensued in 1844 between the MEC and the newly-formed MECS and the African Methodists affiliated with his own Fourth Street Church had voted to side with the MEC, Finney refused to make his principal payment of \$1000 in November 1846.⁸⁹ Trustees for the St. Charles College sued him for breach of contract to recover the unpaid interest. In his answer to the suit, Finney claimed that he had subscribed initially in response to assurances from Collier and other organizers that the school would be placed under the influence and control of the “Methodist Episcopal Church” – but that the 1837 articles of incorporation had included no such stipulation. In contractual terms, Finney claimed reliance to his own detriment and a failure of consideration on the part of school authorities. The trustees of the college, which included future governor of and United States senator from Missouri Trusten Polk, amended the charter in February 1847 to place selection of trustees and management of the school in the hands of the Missouri MECS annual conference. But Finney continued to refuse payment, as a matter of personal honor it seems, and faced a second suit brought by the trustees in August 1848 for the unpaid principle and accrued interest. The Supreme Court of Missouri, however, was not predisposed to give much credence to Finney’s legalistic hair-splitting. With controversial pro-slavery Episcopalian Judge James H. Birch writing for the Court, it recognized that, as a practical matter, one or both Methodist annual conferences had, in fact, exercised control of St. Charles College since its founding. The decision thus ignored the split in the Methodist Church, discounted Finney’s exacting application of contract law, and highlighted the fact that statutes purporting to insure freedom of religious

opinion in denominational colleges incorporated by the state allowed church authorities to manage such institutions directly and according to their own lights.⁹⁰

In Farrar v. Finney, counsel for defendants argued that the black congregants were, simply, members of the Fourth Street Church who had made ordinary donations to pay for a Green Street lot and house of worship entirely owned by that church. They insisted that the African Methodist Episcopal Church of St. Louis had never existed as an institution separate from the Fourth Street Church. Geyer and Dayton claimed repeatedly that “no such society was organized or in existence in St Louis.”⁹¹ They maintained consistently that the African American congregation was merely a subsidiary mission whose members the Fourth Street Quarterly Conference had allowed to hold their own meetings. They denied, moreover, that Jonathan Duncan was either a free man or even a Methodist, thus laying a foundation for their allegation that his 1825 purchase of the Gully Street lot had been invalid under both Methodist rules and Missouri law, which denied slaves the right to own property.⁹² They averred that African Church representatives had, in fact, never requested the Fourth Street Church leaders to construct a church building on Green Street for the black congregation.⁹³ Defendants denied, furthermore, that the Fourth Street trustees had ever compelled the black congregation to vote pursuant to the 1844 Plan of Separation so as to secure their Green Street house of worship. The African Church was not an independent society and, therefore, had no right to take a separate vote. By the same token, the 206 votes cast by the Fourth Street members in favor of joining the MECS constituted a decisive majority over the 110 votes cast by the black congregants to remain with the MEC. Under the Plan of Separation, whose validity defense counsel presumed, the black members had no choice but to accept the outcome. The defendants disingenuously maintained, furthermore, that they had kept and continued to keep the Green Street building open to the black congregants

and that the Fourth Street trustees had not forcibly seized it as Farrar, Jones and Harrison had alleged.⁹⁴

The seemingly straightforward defense set out by defense counsel only thinly cloaked the determination of the Fourth Street trustees to crush the legal challenge of the African Church. Their claims, after all, constituted a fundamental threat to the customary MEC system through which white ministers and lay trustees superintended black societies in slaveholding jurisdictions. This was a policy that MECS had already perpetuated by the time the litigation began and one they had every intention of continuing indefinitely.

As a consequence of less-than-conscientious lawyering and the dire misfortune that befell several attorneys working the case, Farrar v. Finney came on for trial over five years after the suit began – at which time the African Methodist Church complainants had recovered substantially from the loss of the Green Street property. Geyer, Dayton, and Polk took almost a year and a half to answer the initial bill. After David Hall died in April 1851, Lewis Jones submitted an affidavit in support of a motion to reset the trial date because case preparations were in disarray. According to him, the deceased had not kept his word that he was giving “strict attention” to the case and Alexander Field had paid “little or no attention thereto.” The passing of newly-hired counsel John D. Cook in 1852 caused further delay. But by 1850 the women and men of the African Church numbered 155. The African Society continued to worship at physician Bernard Farrar’s “Stone House” through 1851, during which time Lewis Jones continued to serve as trustee.⁹⁵ Beginning some time in 1852, however, the black congregation convened at a new church that it paid for and erected on Seventh Street above O’Fallon Street, with the Reverend John Anderson serving as official MEC pastor.⁹⁶ Not only Lewis Jones but also Ralph Harrison continued there to be active leaders of the African society. And by early

1853, MEC Bishop Beverly Waugh had ordained James Farrar a deacon and he continued to lead the African Church.⁹⁷

Because chancery proceedings necessarily dispensed with trial by jury, counsel for complainants trained their arguments on Judge Hamilton at the bench trial in April 1853. The legal incapacity of the African Methodist Church trustees to testify because of their race certainly damaged their case. This was especially so given that the Fourth Street trustees made strenuous and successful efforts to restrict the introduction of other evidence supporting the African Church claims, rather obviously a design to delimit the record in the event of an appeal. But, to his credit, Judge Hamilton did allow into evidence testimony and records showing all of the financial transactions associated with the purchase of the Green Street lot and the construction of the edifice, including records demonstrating clearly that the black congregants had contributed virtually all of the funds. He also allowed into evidence the 1834 title bond that the Reverend Tabor had executed, as well as the deed Tabor issued to the complainants in September 1846. But Fourth Street Quarterly Conference records from 1831 through 1844, introduced by the defendants, showed all too plainly the continuing official subordination of the African Church to the larger body. Abundant evidence, including reluctant admissions on the stand by the Reverends Tabor and Anderson, showed that the Missouri Annual Conference had never authorized a separate quarterly conference, official stewards, or official trustees for the black church. Judge Hamilton, it seems, could only give credence to MEC policy in slaveholding states and MECS policy that prohibited the establishment of independent black societies capable of owning congregational property. Such a step, all the ministers confirmed, occurred as a consequence of a formal decision made by an annual conference on the recommendation of a Bishop, presiding elder, or quarterly conference. With no meaningful discussion of his reasoning,

Judge Hamilton decreed that the Green Street property was to be held in trust for the use of the black congregants affiliated with the Fourth Street Church – but that all title and interest in the property was vested in the Fourth Street trustees.⁹⁸ Delafield, Barretts, and Leslie moved for a new trial, contending that the court had impermissibly excluded evidence vital to their case, while improperly admitting defense evidence damaging to it. Judge Hamilton denied this motion in the adjourned term of the court in October 1853, and the complainants appealed to the Missouri Supreme Court.⁹⁹

The bill of exceptions filed by appellants highlights the extent to which Judge Hamilton refused to recognize the customary “legality” that had fundamentally ordered the relationship of the African Methodist Church and the Fourth Street Church leadership. As was typical, the bill averred categorically that the decree of the trial court was against the weight of the evidence and the law. The bill maintained that Judge Hamilton had excluded evidence critical for illuminating the independence of the African Church and the binding obligations imposed on the Fourth Street trustees by the alleged constructive/resulting trust.¹⁰⁰ The eighty-five page document set out in precise detail all of the evidence so excluded. This included the testimony of class leader George Bushey tending to show that the Fourth Street trustees had been present at the February 7, 1832 Fourth Street Church Quarterly Conference meeting that had ratified all of the informal agreements and transactions regarding the acquisition of the Green Street lot and planned construction of the house of worship on it.¹⁰¹ Excluded was his testimony holding that the African Church had been “regularly organized as a separate society” and had, in this independent capacity, purchased the Green Street lot and paid for the construction of the house of worship on it.¹⁰² The court excluded the testimony of the Reverend Tabor as to whether Fourth Street trustees John and William Finney knew about or approved the 1834 title bond recognizing that

the Green Street property was to be held in trust for the use of the African Church.¹⁰³ Judge Hamilton also ruled out of order the testimony of both Tabor and Bushey maintaining that the Doctrines and Discipline of the MEC did not prescribe any particular mode or process for the establishment of an independent Methodist society or for the setting off of a subordinate society from a superintending charge.¹⁰⁴ In this connection, the court repeatedly refused to allow into evidence the 1832 and 1844 editions of the MEC Doctrines and Discipline.¹⁰⁵ By the same token, Judge Hamilton excluded the testimony of Tabor as to “what was, in point of fact, the position of the African Methodist Episcopal Church relative to the Fourth Street Church.”¹⁰⁶ Last, according to the appellants, Judge Hamilton erred by allowing into evidence Fourth Street Quarterly Conference records from October 1846 through September 1848 regarding its mission to the black congregants still affiliated with that church.¹⁰⁷

Sleight of Hand:

Appeal to the Missouri Supreme Court

On appeal, the African Methodist Church lawyers continued to maintain, against all odds, the trial judge should not have excluded vital parol evidence showing the independent status of the African Church decades before the events of October 1846 and the existence of a constructive-resulting trust in favor of the African Church.¹⁰⁸ They continued to insist that title to the Green Street property should be awarded to the black congregants because the white trustees of the Fourth Street Church had, out of misguided religious zeal, flouted their obligations under the terms of the trust. Delafield and Barretts made the point in their brief with biting wit: “The only substantial defense is the odium theologicum – That the negroes paid for their property is hereinbefore shown. That it is withheld from them is only because they would not quit their

original organization and join the church south . . . a principle of action worthy of an earlier age than this – and inconsistent with Equity and liberty. Will our Courts sanction such a course?”¹⁰⁹

On the other hand, the African Methodist Church lawyers substantially amplified their lower-court argument that had drawn into question the very legitimacy of the MECS and the authority of the Fourth Street trustees to retain the Green Street property. The briefs filed by appellants articulated much more explicitly and forcefully the far more contentious alternative argument made at trial: Title to the Green Street property should be placed with the African Church because the trustees of the Fourth Street Church were, after joining the MECS, members of a denomination different from that with which the African Church was affiliated. Implicit in this argument was the proposition that the Fourth Street Church had, by unilaterally withdrawing from the MEC, forfeited its right to hold property in trust that had been originally conveyed only for the benefit of MEC members. The sole authority referenced by appellants for this assertion was the 1844 decision of the New York Court of Chancery Kniskern vs. The Lutheran Churches of St. Johns and St. Peters. According to the statement of the case prepared by Delafield and Barretts, this decision “is where all the questions involved in this case are fully discussed and decided.”¹¹⁰ Their brief filed in the Missouri Supreme Court on March 16, 1854, reiterated this claim almost word-for-word. In reference to Kniskern, the appellants maintained further “that case was pari passu with this, except that we have a stronger trust, owing to the civil disability, originally of the blacks, their payment of the money, the disability subsequently removed, the fraudulent effort to deprive their trustees of their title deed, to forcibly deprive them of their property, and retain their money. . . .”¹¹¹

While denying any errors of fact or law at trial, counsel for the Fourth Street trustees sought to cast the Reverend Tabor as the nefarious moving force behind the supposedly

misguided efforts of the African Methodist Church to obtain title to the Green Street property. According to appellants, only in response to the initiative of Tabor did the black members attempt to set themselves up as an independent congregation and “attach themselves to the M. E. Church North, & withdraw themselves from the jurisdiction of the Church South and the St. Louis Conference.” At the fateful October 1846 meeting, they emphasized, “Tabor was present aiding and abetting in its objects and proceedings, & advocating the claims of the Church North & urging an adherence to it by the . . . blacks.” After misinforming and persuading the African Americans to elect a board of trustees “Tabor conveyed his portion of the said church property to said trustees.”¹¹²

In March 1855, the Missouri Supreme Court rejected the appeal of the African Methodist Church on procedural grounds. Writing the opinion in Farrar v. Finney was Judge John F. Ryland, the protégé of staunch free-soil Unionist Democrat Thomas Hart Benton. Ryland declared that the Court could not take the appeal because the required bill of exceptions had not been timely filed in the trial court. Indeed, the 1845 Missouri code of practice required that a bill of exceptions be presented and signed by the trial judge no later than the end of the term in which the trial took place, unless opposing counsel consented to a subsequent filing. The actual trial of Farrar v. Finney concluded in the April 1853 term of the St. Louis Circuit Court, and Judge Hamilton did not sign the bill of exceptions until February 15, 1854. Citing four prior rulings of the Court, Judge Ryland maintained that “this court has decided over and over again that the Bill of Exceptions cannot be signed at a subsequent term without the consent of the counsel of the opposite party.” Counsel for the Fourth Street trustees had objected strenuously to the late filing and adamantly refused to provide the requisite consent.¹¹³ Ryland declared, with apparent regret, that “reluctant as this court is to see the causes pass off on other grounds than

such as settle the merits of the controversy either in faith or law; yet we deem it of the highest importance to the continuity at large that there would be uniformity in the sessions in regard to matters of practice.”¹¹⁴

The dismissal of the appeal in Farrar v. Finney was not, in fact, nearly as unavoidable as Judge Ryland’s opinion suggested. At the end of the trial in April term 1853, Judge Hamilton had continued the proceedings to the October 1853 adjourned term. After signing the final decree and denying complainants’ motion for a new trial on October 15, 1853, he granted counsel for the African Methodist Church permission to file their bill of exceptions on the first day of the regular November 1853 term (November 21st) because of the extraordinary volume of material to be included in the bill and because the adjourned term was to end only seven days later. The trial record does not reveal exactly when the appellants filed their bill. But a notation that Judge Hamilton appended to the record shows that he signed it toward the end of the November term “with all possible dispatch,” albeit in mid-February 1854.¹¹⁵ Ryland’s opinion omitted to mention the fact that a revision of the Missouri code of practice in 1845 allowed a bill of exceptions, for the first time, to be filed after the conclusion of a trial – as indicated, as late as the end of the term in which a trial took place. The two substantive decisions that Ryland cited to support the dismissal in Farrar v. Finney, in fact, dealt with the issue under the pre-1845 rule. The 1845 procedural change was, furthermore, entirely in keeping with the liberalization of American law to reduce the number of legitimate actions dismissed for want of adherence to antiquated common law forms and procedural technicalities.¹¹⁶ Equally important, none of the four rulings of the Supreme Court referenced by Judge Ryland dealt with a post-term filing formally authorized by a trial judge. Ryland’s opinion, similarly, did not address at all the contention made by Miron Leslie that to deny a trial judge the power to extend the filing date of

a bill of exceptions beyond a statutorily prescribed period of time was wholly incompatible with equity and the exigencies of justice – especially when it was, before the expiration of that period, “physically impossible to reduce the exceptions to writing in form.”¹¹⁷ Nor did Ryland’s opinion take into account at all Leslie’s contention that appellate courts should reasonably presume a bill of exceptions to have been timely filed if signed by the trial judge – or a recent New York Supreme Court decision, upon which Leslie relied in his brief, that affirmed this rule.¹¹⁸ Of course, neither appellants nor the Missouri Supreme Court had any way of knowing in 1854 that thirty-one years later the Missouri General Assembly would further amend the code of practice explicitly to allow a trial judge, regardless of appellee non-consent, to authorize an appellant to file his bill of exceptions after the term in which a case was concluded.¹¹⁹ But knowledgeable jurists in St. Louis could not have easily avoided the conclusion that the Missouri Supreme Court had dismissed the African Church appeal with only questionable justification.

The Larger Framework of Ecclesiastical and Civil (Secular) Law

The actual merits of the appeal sought by Farrar, Jones, and Harrison implicated an expansive body of judge-made antebellum law dealing with the adjudication of church property disputes that did not consistently feature a strict “wall of separation” between church and state. Property-related disputes stemming from church schisms in antebellum America turned critically on the way clerics and middle-class laity meshed religious and legal understandings of church-owned property with developing contract law and the English tradition of equity judgment.¹²⁰ The law of equity American courts employed to adjudicate church property disputes adhered to republican and constitutional principles that respected the right of religious bodies to govern their spiritual and temporal affairs as much as possible. Secular courts agreed that ecclesiastical

judicatories were the best judges of what constituted breaches of church doctrine and governmental rules and that such determinations were final. Numerous state appellate court decisions illuminate these principles.¹²¹ In a ruling that deferred to the decision of synodical authorities to excommunicate a breakaway congregational faction, the South Carolina Equity Court of Appeals in Harmon v. Dreher (1841) held that republican principles required secular courts take such ecclesiastical decisions as they found them, reserving to the civil courts only the power to try rights to church property.¹²² The 1842 Kentucky Supreme Court decision Shannon v. Frost similarly ratified the excommunication of a dissenting faction, which the Court deemed entirely a spiritual matter beyond its purview. That finding, however, also undergirded its holding that the excommunicated group had no legal rights to the disputed church property in question.¹²³

On the other hand, controversial legal action attendant on the 1837 Presbyterian national schism brought into public view with unprecedented power the difficulties courts faced when called upon to exercise secular jurisdiction over temporalities and, at the same time, maintain a separation of church and state. The 1838 quo warranto proceeding in Commonwealth v. Green arose in Philadelphia on the initiative of Old School members newly elected by the Presbyterian General Assembly to serve as officers of an affiliated church corporation holding substantial amounts of church property. The Old School trustees laid claim to their corporate offices against the competing claims of the previously-elected trustees from the four New School synods of Utica, Genesee, Geneva, and the Western Reserve, which the Old School adherents had contentiously ejected from the Presbyterian General Assembly the year before. The Old School trustees charged their New School counterparts with usurping the trustee offices. The New School trustees took their appeal to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 1839.

The underlying bone of contention among Old School adherents had been New School advocacy of its doctrine of individual perfection and related social reform activism, advanced most prominently by influential divines such as Samuel Hopkins, Nathaniel W. Taylor, and Charles Grandison Finney. Most problematic in this regard was the divisive New School initiative to abolish African American bondage. New School adherents strenuously maintained that the Old School majority of the Presbyterian General Assembly had passed the 1837 acts ejecting the four New School synods only to squelch this radical theology and its related reform agenda.

With Chief Justice John Bannister Gibson writing the opinion, the Court emphasized that its corrective jurisdiction extended only to the legal corporation and the temporalities owned by it and not to the theological coherence, fairness, or justice of the previous decisions of the General Assembly, a separate unincorporated society. The Court nonetheless maintained that it could properly take cognizance of the question of whether the new trustees of the church corporation had been selected according to the laws and customs of the church. In determining that question, the Court examined Presbyterian rules of discipline and government, as well as the agreements between Presbyterians and Congregationalists that had constituted the decades-old Act of Union (1801), which had led to the formation of the four New School synods. According to Justice Gibson the acts “excinding” the New School synods had been simply ordinances of dissolution, passed in keeping with the established processes and legislative rules of the General Assembly. With this finding, the Court affirmed the election of the new corporate trustees and their property rights.¹²⁴

A law of equity that authorized secular courts to decide whether the decisions of the highest judicatory of a church adhered to its own constitution drew Chief Justice Gibson, quite

likely, more deeply into the Presbyterian controversy than he preferred. The New School trustees claimed that the judicial conclusions in Commonwealth v. Green regarding Presbyterian laws and customs, invoked to uphold the ejection were, in fact, erroneous and inconsistent with the constitution of the church.¹²⁵ Many throughout the country held that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court co-opted the authority of the Presbyterian General Assembly to uphold a schism that was fundamentally the result of ecclesiastical conflict over the morality of slavery.¹²⁶ In the view of interested parties across the country, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court co-opted the authority of the Presbyterian General Assembly to uphold a schism that was fundamentally the result of ecclesiastical conflict over the morality of slavery.

The 1844 Plan of Separation that initiated the 1845 split of the Methodist Episcopal Church marked the beginning of a protracted dispute that ultimately spurred federal court intrusion into its ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Dr. William Capers of South Carolina, an ordained minister and editor of the Southern Christian Advocate, offered a set of resolutions in behalf of the southern annual conferences that included an explicit authorization for a “division” of the church requiring the vote of all annual conference members. However, a committee of nine rejected these resolutions and returned instead a “Plan of Separation” that was substantially different.¹²⁷ The Plan stipulated that, should the southern annual conferences decide to separate, their classes, societies, and annual conferences on the northern border of the slave states were to decide, by a vote of the majority in each case, whether to affiliate with the MEC or with the new southern Methodist church. The Plan also stipulated that the members of all the annual conferences were to vote on a proposed alteration to the Sixth Restrictive Rule, set out in the Doctrines and Discipline, to facilitate an allocation to the southern church of property and funds associated with the denominational Book Concern, held by MEC trustees. The Sixth Rule

prohibited the General Conference from conveying this property, valued at about \$1,000,000 in 1844, to anyone other than the retired MEC “supernumerary and superannuated preachers” in the “traveling connection” or their families.¹²⁸ With bi-sectional support, the General Conference adopted the Plan on June 8, 1844. But in the coming months the required three-fourths majority required to alter the Sixth Restrictive Rule never materialized. More than a quarter of the annual conference membership simply voted down the proposed alteration, with virtually all who voted this way affiliated with northern conferences. On May 1, 1845 at a meeting convened in Louisville, the southern annual conferences promptly voted to form their own ecclesiastical organization, denominating it the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The MEC refused to recognize the new church, and the MEC officers in charge of the incorporated book concern refused to convey any of its stock or funds to the appointed MECS commissioners.¹²⁹

In May 1848, the MEC General Conference at Pittsburgh had ample evidence to declare that the “fundamental conditions” of the Plan of Separation had “severally failed.”¹³⁰ According to the leadership of the General Conference, it had approved the Plan with the presupposition that the southern and northern delegations would continue to negotiate to achieve a resolution of the issues raised by the act of the General Conference concerning Bishop Andrew. The southern annual conferences, however, had abandoned such efforts almost immediately after adoption of the Plan.¹³¹ Second, the Plan “depended upon the due observance by the Church South, and all its societies and members, of the jurisdictional line of division.”¹³² But southern Methodists had not restricted their organizational activities to those societies and annual conferences on the northern border of the slave states that had voted to side with the new MECS. The southern conferences had, as a consequence of these encroachments, separated from the MEC with no authorization from its General Conference. Third, the membership of all the annual conferences

had never adopted by a three-quarters majority vote the resolution altering the Sixth Restrictive rule required to authorize an allocation of the Book Concern property to the southern conferences. A valid separation and rights to a share in the Book Concern property, MEC authorities argued, were contingent on approval of the constitutional alteration.¹³³

The MEC also maintained that the Plan of Separation was unconstitutional on its face insofar as it seemed to authorize contingently a division or separation of the southern annual conferences. According to MEC leadership, the General Conference adopted the Plan only to meet the emergency that might arise if the southern conferences declared their separation. The Plan did not authorize a division – but only sought to impose some order on the restructuring of church jurisdiction that might be required if the southern annual conferences unilaterally withdrew.¹³⁴ The northern Methodists maintained that since the General Conference had become an elective, representative body in 1808, it possessed no inherent powers other than those conferred upon it by the church constitution adopted at that time – that is, by the Doctrines and Discipline, the included Six Restrictive Rules limiting the power of the General Conference, and the associated Proviso setting out the required process for amending any of those rules. And the delimited grant of authority did not include the power to divide or dissolve the church.¹³⁵ According to the formal resolutions adopted at the 1848 meeting, “the practical workings of the so-called ‘Plan’ were incompatible with the great constitutional provisions contained in [the] Book of Discipline,” and the General Conference determined “the whole and every part of said provisional ‘Plan,’ so called, to be null and void.”¹³⁶

Last but certainly not least, MEC delegates maintained that the MECS had no legal or equitable claims to Book Concern property because the separation of the southern conferences had been both unauthorized and unconstitutional. The voluntary and unilateral withdrawal of the

southern conferences constituted a “secession,” they maintained, resolving further that the MEC “cannot, consistently with her discipline, deliver any part of her funds to another church, alien in organization, though the same in faith, to be administered among them.”¹³⁷ Only through a connection with the church, in and through its organization, in a mode pointed out by its organic law, could an individual be entitled to any portion of the fund.¹³⁸

It ultimately fell upon the federal courts to adjudicate the property dispute of the MEC and MECS. After the 1848 MEC General Conference repudiated the Plan of Separation, negotiations to divide the property of the Book Concern, situated primarily in New York City and Cincinnati, were off the table. The lucrative business was firmly in the hands of trustees affiliated with the northern Methodists. But the MECS desperately needed a portion of the property from the incorporated book and tract enterprise in order to establish its own publishing operation.¹³⁹ The southern Methodists turned to the courts to get what they deemed to be their fair share of property and funds held by the MEC trustees. They filed twin bills in the summer of 1849 in the United States circuit courts for the districts of New York and Ohio.¹⁴⁰ The prime question in the two suits was whether the formation of the MECS had stemmed from an illegitimate secession from the national Methodist Church or an authorized division by church authorities that the secular courts were bound to respect. If ecclesiastically proper, the MECS would be entitled to its share of funds from the book concern. But if the courts determined that the MECS had withdrawn illegitimately from the national church, they would receive nothing.

The federal courts declared legitimate the Methodist national schism and upheld the property claims of the MECS. The first ruling to so hold came in the 1851 decision Bascom v. Lane, which dealt with the New York branch of the Book Concern. While presiding over the circuit court for the district of New York, United States Supreme Court Justice Samuel Nelson

declared that the MEC General Conference, as a sovereign body, was fully empowered to authorize the southern conferences to establish their own church, which it did in May 1845. The separation, furthermore, constituted a legitimate division of the MEC, which created two wholly new churches. The beneficiaries of the MEC Book Concern, that is, the traveling preachers of both churches who had built up the fund with their own contributions, were thus entitled to their individual shares. Because the division of the MEC was constitutional, however, its officers were authorized and required to allocate a pro-rata share to the southern Methodist commissioners. Justice Nelson discounted almost entirely the fact that a majority of three-fourths of the annual conference membership had not approved the allocation as required by the Plan of Separation and the included alteration to the Sixth Restrictive Rule of the Methodist Doctrines and Discipline.¹⁴¹ On the other hand, the circuit court for the district of Ohio dismissed the bill of the MECS commissioners, and they appealed to the United States Supreme Court. In Smith v. Swormstedt, the MECS received a unanimous decision in its favor during the December 1853 term of the Court. None other than Justice Samuel Nelson, now sitting on the high bench rather than presiding on circuit, wrote the opinion. The arguments of the MEC and MECS in this case were essentially the same as those that each body had advanced in the circuit court of New York – as was the decision of Justice Nelson: the Plan of Separation was valid according to Methodist doctrine and rules of government, as was the MECS upon its organization at Louisville. According to Justice Nelson, “two separate and distinct organizations have taken the place of the one previously existing.”¹⁴² The Methodist Church was thus legitimately divided, and neither division of the church lost its interest in the common property.¹⁴³

That pro-slavery Whig President John Tyler of Virginia appointed Justice Nelson, a New Yorker, to the United States Supreme Court in 1845 may have had something to do with the

opinions he penned in favor of the MECS. That Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, author of the majority opinion in Dred Scott v. Sanford (1857), assigned Nelson the task of writing the unanimous opinion in Smith v. Swormstedt further allows for the possibility. Justice Nelson, in fact, would concur with the majority in the controversial 1857 decision. According to legal historian Mark Graber, the Taney Court was deeply committed to safeguarding the rights of southerners to property in their slaves in accordance with a policy of intersectional cooperation dating back to the 1787 constitutional convention, one that required a consensus among southerners and northerners on any change to federal law affecting slavery.¹⁴⁴

In any case, the Circuit Court of New York and the United States Supreme Court employed a delimited equity jurisdiction over church property disputes to decide fundamental issues of MEC governance reserved exclusively to the church by its own constitution and, in theory, Anglo-American legal principles. Legal historian Mark P. Strasser concludes that, in Smith v. Swormstedt, Justice Nelson rendered a decision that was precisely wrong on just about every important question of ecclesiastical and secular law. In his view, Nelson erroneously concluded that the MEC General Conference was a sovereign body after 1808, rather than merely a representative one with only delegated powers. Nelson's conclusion that the power of the General Conference was limited only by the Six Restrictive Rules was unsound. By such logic, the General Conference could have, with no approval by its constituency, dissolved the church and established a radically different organization – or implemented myriad other fundamental changes not explicitly forbidden by the Six Rules.¹⁴⁵ Strasser maintains further that the holding by Justice Nelson that the General Conference could divide itself at will ignored a well-developed body of Anglo-American law maintaining that civil courts were to defer to the highest judicatory of a church on matters of ecclesiastical laws and issues concerning church

constitutions.¹⁴⁶ The General Conference was such a judicatory and, before it adopted the Plan, had determined not to divide the MEC because of constitutional strictures. It resolved at its 1848 meeting, before the litigation began, that the Plan of Separation had been unconstitutional and was only adopted to deal with the looming problem of restructuring its jurisdiction should the southern conferences decide to secede.¹⁴⁷ Evidence in the record showing that the MEC had authorized the separation of the Canada Annual Conference from the MEC in 1828 hardly constituted church “usage and practice” demonstrating the power of the General Conference to divide the church, as Justice Nelson concluded. None of the church members involved in that separation had believed that it did so or that the separation dissolved the MEC and created a new church in its place. The separation of the single Canada conference had been effected by mutual consent and by explicit General Conference resolutions authorizing it. These resolutions, furthermore, had required that the membership of all the annual conferences approve, by a three-fourths majority, an alteration of the Sixth Restrictive Rule to allow an allocation of the MEC book concern property to the separating conference. This constitutionally-required provision was, in essential respects, identical to the very one that Justice Nelson dismissed in Swormstedt as a mere technicality. According to Strasser, the ruling in Swormstedt “was undermined by both the history of the church and by the considered opinions of the church members themselves.”¹⁴⁸

Courts that entangled themselves in ecclesiastical questions when they were adjudicating congregational property disputes in Border States such as Missouri, Kentucky, and Virginia often did so because the law encouraged this kind of involvement. While they set out important basic principles, judicial decisions dealing with the property claims of divided national church organizations provided only general guidelines for identifying the property rights of embattled congregants. To deal with such disputes, trial courts could only look to the equity decisions

rendered by the highest appellate court of their own states or those of other states, which was more typical. Available rules of decision essentially turned on whether a congregation was organically incorporated into a larger ecclesiastical body with authoritative judicatories or not.¹⁴⁹ As indicated initially, the deference doctrine generally prevailed in cases that involved contending factions of a congregation connected to a hierarchically-structured church. But the deference doctrine did not ensure that judges could steer clear of having to make ecclesiastical pronouncements. They, rather than higher church judicatories, typically had to decide which congregational faction adhered to the beliefs and forms of government accepted by the larger body to which it was attached.¹⁵⁰ Most judges, furthermore, were much more interested in abiding by the intent of those who had conveyed property to congregations in trust than in maintaining a strict separation of church and state. When charitable individuals donated property to a congregation, whether by a deed of trust or otherwise, courts generally awarded disputed property to the faction affiliated with the denomination of the donor that subscribed to the articles of faith, discipline, and governance prevailing in that denomination at the time the donor made his or her gift. And this was so regardless of whether a faction was in the majority or minority or whether it was independent or organically connected to a larger church.¹⁵¹ Many judges took the view that the majority of an independent congregation could not divert property held in trust to a denomination different from that of the donor or to doctrines fundamentally opposed to the characteristic beliefs and forms of its denomination, even in the absence of an express trust to that effect. The British theory of implied trust, which gave primary effect to the intent of donors, thus persisted.¹⁵² Equally troublesome was the minority of judges who employed that doctrine to decide disputes among congregants affiliated with larger ecclesiastical bodies.¹⁵³

The most authoritative appellate decision purporting to employ the deference rule for the adjudication of a property dispute between Methodist congregants in the southern Border States was Gibson v. Armstrong. That 1847 ruling of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky that commandeered and misused the ecclesiastical authority of the MEC no less than did the Supreme Court six years later in Smith v. Swormstedt. Like local Presbyterian societies, which had organic ties to a larger ecclesiastical body, Methodist congregations erupted in conflict over church property with particular force in the Border States when the MEC fractured over the question of slavery. Congregations in these precincts were often substantially divided on the issue. Gibson was a case of first impression across the land, dealing directly with such a conflict. The litigation began when trustee John Armstrong of the Methodist Church in Maysville, Mason County, brought a bill in equity against more numerous trustees and officers of the church who had aligned themselves with a congregational majority that had voted to join the MECS. The majority faction had excluded Armstrong and his minority group from the meeting house, even though Armstrong and the trustees who opposed him had originally been deeded the lot on which the meeting house had been constructed. At trial, Armstrong argued that the 1844 Plan of Separation contravened MEC rules for church government and was thus invalid as a matter of ecclesiastical law. Defendants claimed that they and their faction had decided the question strictly in keeping with the Plan, which they maintained was entirely consistent with church rules and the valid determinations of the MEC General Conference. The Mason Circuit Court, in what became widely known as the “Maysville Church Case,” reached a verdict that dissatisfied complainants and defendants. It ruled that both segments of the divided congregation had a right to use the church building in question. The Court of Appeals of Kentucky, however, reversed the lower court. Writing for it was Chief Judge Thomas A. Marshall, a native of Kentucky,

distinguished graduate of Yale, nephew of Chief Justice John Marshall, and consistent defender of slavery.¹⁵⁴ In the most elaborate opinion of his judicial career, Judge Marshall held that the Methodist General Conference had instituted the Plan of Separation according to the doctrines and governing rules of the MEC. According to Judge Marshall, the deeds made to the trustees of particular MEC congregations were presumed to have been made upon the understanding that the General Conference had the authority to change the form of church organization without working any forfeiture of property rights so conveyed. Where a congregation determined by a majority to adhere to the southern division, the Court was bound to adhere to that division. In his words, “the immutability of the church is not made a condition of the enjoyment of the property granted.”¹⁵⁵ Marshall held further that a congregational majority also possessed the authority to exclude from the pulpit any minister affiliated with the division of the church that it had rejected and to receive into the pulpit one of its own.¹⁵⁶

In Brooke v. Shacklett, Carter v. Wolfe (1856), the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia followed Gibson v. Armstrong and Smith v. Swormstedt. This case involved a majority of congregants who had voted to join the MECS. With an opinion penned by Judge William Daniel, a staunch Democrat and native of Virginia, the decision upheld the claims of the majority faction. The decision affirmed the power of the MEC to divide itself and, implicitly, approved the 1844 Plan of Separation. Judge Daniel addressed only curtly the chief complaint of the losing faction: The seceding MECS congregants had adopted articles of faith about the morality of slavery that contravened those set out in the MEC Doctrines and Discipline and, by the same token, ran roughshod over the intent of those who had donated the property in question. Judge Daniel dismissed this argument out of hand, discounting entirely the relevance of the implied

trust doctrine upon which it rested. According to him, there was “no dispute between the parties about any matter of religious faith. The doctrines of the two parties are identical.”¹⁵⁷

The implied trust doctrine figured critically, however, in another authoritative decision affecting southern Border State property litigation between Methodist congregational factions divided over slavery. This was the case upon which the appellants in Farrar v. Finney staked their all – the 1844 New York ruling in Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches. The dispute had its origins in a 1789 grant of land to the trustees of St. Johns and St. Peters churches, which comprised a single congregation. According to the grant, the land was conveyed to the trustees “for the common use and benefit of the said Lutheran congregation forever.”¹⁵⁸ The two churches joined the Hartwick Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1830, which was a part of the Lutheran General Synod of the United States. In 1837, however, a majority of elders and congregants from the two churches voted to withdraw from the Hartwick Synod and join with several other breakaway Lutheran churches to form the Franckean Synod, an anti-slavery Lutheran organization that explicitly rejected any organic connection to the former. The Franckean Synod, furthermore, abandoned numerous principles of the Augsburg Confession, the essential doctrines of the Lutheran faith adopted in the sixteenth century. A minority of congregants from both churches opposing these steps filed their bill in the New York Court of Chancery. Omitting to take into account any determinations on the question made by the Lutheran General Synod, Assistant Vice Chancellor Lewis H. Sandford decreed that both societies had formally severed themselves from that larger and authoritative ecclesiastical body. Both churches had become independent congregations capable of deciding, by a vote of the majority in each case, their preferred religious doctrines. But they were not, according to the court, entitled to retain the property granted in 1789. According to Sandford, the St. Johns and

St. Peters churches had withdrawn without authorization from the Evangelical Lutheran Church, rejected the Augsburg Confession, and adopted fundamental articles of faith inimical to those of the established church. In forming their own denomination, they forfeited all title to the land and funds donated to it in trust before the secession. Central to this holding was the equitable principle that courts were to give full effect to the intent of a charitable donor of property to a congregation, whether he or she had executed a deed of trust or made money contributions for the purchase of land, the construction of edifices, or for other church purposes. To make this determination, they were to infer the intent of a donor from the articles of faith, discipline, and government to which he or she and other members of the recipient congregation adhered at the time the donation was made.¹⁵⁹

Similarly, a widely-publicized Virginia decision generated by the Methodist schism highlights vividly how judicial employment of the implied trust doctrine could help Border State courts in the Upper South strip seceding MECS factions of their right to congregational property. It illustrates that Chief Judge Marshall's 1847 ruling in Gibson v. Armstrong did not ensure that congregational property disputes between MECS and MEC factions in Border States other than Kentucky would always resolve in favor of voting majorities. An appellate opinion in one state did not constitute binding precedent for courts in another state, only important authority that might be ignored or followed. The 1850 Fauquier County Circuit Court decision in Digges makes this point. The congregational conflict, widely known as the "Warrenton Church Case," stemmed from the deed of trust that Jacqueline Marshall conveyed in October 1844 to the trustees of the Clift Methodist Episcopal Church in Warrenton, Virginia. The deed, which conveyed both a parcel of land and a church building, included the stipulation that if the church was not used by a Methodist minister and congregation within five years, the property was to

revert to Marshall or her heirs. A majority of the congregation voted in 1845 to join the MECS, and the trustees promptly excluded the appointed MEC minister from the church. Sitting in chancery, Judge John Webb Tyler relied heavily on the implied trust doctrine to reach his decision in Diggs. According to him, the exclusion of the northern Methodist minister and the majority decision of the church to join the southern Methodists voided the grant from Marshall. In the words of Judge Tyler, “the co-trustees of Complainant have not properly executed the trusts of the deed mentioned by closing the doors of the church against the regularly appointed minister of the M. E. Church.”¹⁶⁰ In the estimation of the judge, the affiliation of the church with the MECS and exclusion of the MEC minister fundamentally transformed the church into another denomination. And this was so, he maintained, regardless of the MEC Plan of Separation. Citing several influential New York decisions, including Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches (1844), the Court held that the intent of the grantor was the prime and controlling consideration. According to Judge Tyler, when such deeds set out no specific articles of faith, “the intent of the donor will be deduced from the tenets, doctrine and discipline of the congregation, avowed and practiced by its professors and worshippers at the time of the donation, and the property will be appropriated to such church and to none other.”¹⁶¹ This ruling comported perfectly with numerous appellate decisions dating back decades holding that an unauthorized secession by a faction of an organically-connected congregation entailed a loss of all rights to church property.¹⁶²

Implications of Farrar v. Finney in Context

Given the geographical situation of Missouri as a slaveholding Border State, its residents showed keen interest in the high-profile litigation over Methodist Church property that arose in the years following the MEC Plan of Separation. The St. Louis Christian Advocate, the prime

pro-slavery Methodist newspaper in Missouri, discussed in detail the litigation in Bascom v. Lane and Smith v. Swormstedt. After the New York case was decided in 1851, the paper proclaimed “the agony is over! The world will now see who were in the right and who were in the wrong.”¹⁶³ For the next two weeks the Christian Advocate devoted several columns to discussion of the litigation, even reprinting verbatim language from the opinions. The Advocate energetically expressed the hope that the New York decision would legitimize the MECS sufficiently to deter those adhering to the MEC to vacate and refrain from entering Missouri and all other Border States.¹⁶⁴ By virtue of the decisions, moreover, the MECS secured funds sufficient to set up a publishing operation in Nashville and a major book and tract depository in St. Louis. This soon served well the missionary purposes of the annual conferences of the MECS in Missouri precisely at a time when print warfare between northern and southern Methodists in the state reached its most intensive phase.¹⁶⁵

The Reverend Joseph Tabor weighed in with the Supreme Court of Missouri during the pendency of Farrar v. Finney with notable flair. Apparently undaunted by the very real threat that pro-slavery mobs posed to high-profile abolitionists in Missouri, Tabor presented to the judges a scrapbook containing a number of newspaper articles, handbills, and writings discussing the national Methodist Church schism and related litigation. Among these items was a newspaper piece on Gibson v. Armstrong, carefully limned with marginalia and supplemented extensively with hand-written commentary. Another set out, verbatim, the opinion rendered by Fauquier County, Virginia, Circuit Court Judge John Webb Tyler in Digges v. Trustees of Clift Church in which he had stripped the pro-slavery majority of its Methodist congregants of their church building and land because they had violated the implied trust established by the original deed to the church while still affiliated with the MEC. The scrapbook also included an editorial Tabor

had published under the pseudonym “JUSTICE” and another entitled “1845 Manifesto,” which he had authored with George Bushey and others. Both essays argued strenuously against the legitimacy of the MECS.¹⁶⁶

The refusal of the Missouri Supreme Court to decide Farrar v. Finney on its merits, however, brought the case to an abrupt and discreet close. Contributors to the northeastern Missouri Hannibal Messenger rejoiced over the ruling in Brooke et al v. Shacklett, Carter et al v. Wolfe in early July 1856.¹⁶⁷ But major newspapers in the state paid little attention to the failed effort of Farrar, Harrison, and Jones to vindicate the property rights of the African Methodist Church in the Missouri Supreme Court. The decision in Farrar v. Finney was never published in the Missouri Reports. The composition of the Court alone suggests that pro-slavery sentiments, if not anxieties about abolitionism, affected the outcome and prompted the quiet sweeping of it under the political rug. Included on the high bench at the time, in addition to John Ryland, were Whig jurist from the slaveholding “Boone’s Lick” of central Missouri Abiel Leonard, a recent addition to the Court with pro-slavery leanings. Also included was William Scott, whose opinions in 1852 and 1854 had expressed a palpable enthusiasm for state-supported Christianity. But Scott was a pro-slavery stalwart. In 1852, he had written the majority opinion in Scott v. Emerson, which had denounced abolitionists, denied Dred Scott his freedom, and overturned decades of freedom suit precedents.¹⁶⁸ Rejection of the African Church appeal on procedural grounds certainly relieved the Court from having to decide a thorny case that required either clear acceptance or rejection of the controversial pro-slavery decisions Gibson v. Armstrong, Bascom v. Lane, and Smith v. Swormstedt. Given that the fundamental purpose of chancery jurisdiction was to provide fairness when a blind adherence to common law rules would do otherwise, the inflexible and unreasonable determination to of the Missouri Supreme Court to

dismiss the case on a supposed procedural irregularity against the wishes of the trial judges certainly made the outcome questionable.¹⁶⁹

St. Louis Methodists, not surprisingly, responded variously to the outcome in Farrar v. Finney. In the following years, Methodist minister and editor of the St. Louis Christian Advocate David R. McAnally denounced with special vehemence anti-slavery Methodists who sued their pro-slavery co-congregants for church property.¹⁷⁰ In an 1858 edition of a book on Missouri Methodism written by McAnally, a prime consequence of the decision in Farrar v. Finney was that “the colored membership in the City of St. Louis was almost entirely alienated from the Church.”¹⁷¹ Indeed, the 1858 minutes of the St. Louis MECS Annual Conference listed only forty-one black members in the entire City of St. Louis.¹⁷² Minutes for the Missouri MEC Annual Conference in the same year, however, showed that the African Church, still under the leadership of the Reverend James Farrar at their new house of worship on Seventh and O’Fallon, had accumulated at least \$5,500 worth of real estate and improvements.¹⁷³

While Farrar, Harrison, and Jones did not prevail in the courts of the white man, their contentious legal claims brought into play new case law relevant to the property disputes of Border State Methodists in ways hardly anticipated by the judges who had rendered the decisions articulating it. All of the relevant high court rulings across the country before that time and to the end of the antebellum period dealt with strife among white congregants. The legal claim of African Methodist Church trustees that they, rather than the Fourth Street trustees, held title to their Green Street lot and meeting house constituted an extraordinarily bold assertion of collective will on the part of the African Americans. Their action raised the ire of white evangelicals who resented this showing of black independence. And this courageous initiative, alone, draws into question traditional historical understandings of the evangelical schisms over

slavery 1837-45 that largely situate African American church members as uninvolved players in those conflicts little concerned about their outcomes.¹⁷⁴

Farrar v. Finney demonstrates that a local, informal legal culture, or “legality,” constructed by black Methodists and white Methodists to order their relationships, could easily fail to provide justice in white courts. This was especially so when whites – and not civilly-disabled and ecclesiastically-delimited blacks – could turn to their advantage the formal legal rules that the informal set of arrangements ordinarily circumvented and ignored. Neither law nor equity, it seems, could take cognizance of this customary, bi-racial legality for ordering church property transactions and the possession and use of church property.

Appellate court rulings upholding the legitimacy of the MECS undercut the case of the African Methodist Church in Farrar v. Finney much more than they bolstered it. The claim of the African Church to ecclesiastical independence before October 1846 was insupportable as a matter of Fourth Street Church Quarterly Conference records. In light of this, neither the Plan of Separation nor the rulings in Gibson v. Armstrong, Bascom v. Lane, or in Smith v. Swormstedt could provide the black congregants such independence or a right to vote whether to remain with MEC or affiliate with the MECS. By the same token, the constructive-resulting trust they argued as the basis of their property claim could only benefit the Fourth Street congregation as a whole, just as Judge Alexander Hamilton ruled.

Entirely meritorious, however, was the alternative African Methodist Church argument that the Fourth Street Church, by seceding from the MEC along with the rest of the MECS, had forfeited its right to hold the Green Street property in trust for the pro-MEC black society. By the time the African Church filed its suit in November 1848, the MEC had utterly repudiated the Plan of Separation and declared the formation of the MECS an unauthorized secession. Under

longstanding rules of equity, members of a congregation organically-connected to a larger ecclesiastical body that seceded were disqualified from retaining ownership of property originally donated for the benefit of those remaining members of the original denomination. Grounded in the doctrine of implied trust, the decision of Vice Chancellor Lewis H. Sandford of the New York Court of Chancery in Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches essentially affirmed this long-standing rule in the case of a congregational schism that was, in every salient aspect, analogous to that which divided the women and men of the African Church from the Fourth Street Church congregants who had seceded from the MEC. Under the Doctrines and Discipline and well-established principles of equity set out numerous prior appellate opinions, it was incumbent on the Missouri courts to recognize the African Church claim grounded in this rationale.¹⁷⁵

Judge Alexander Hamilton, quite likely, believed he had little choice but to deny the African Methodist Church claims to ecclesiastical independence and their related case built on equity principles relevant to constructive and resulting trusts. He certainly must be credited with at least attempting to advance the politically-charged case to the Missouri Supreme Court for review. His final decree did not indicate one way or the other whether he followed Gibson v. Armstrong or Bascom v. Lane to render his decision in favor of the Fourth Street trustees. It, nonetheless, disregarded MEC General Conference declarations repudiating the Plan of Separation and well-established law, set out in Kniskern and earlier appellate decisions, that entirely validated the African Church forfeiture argument.

It seems quite likely that, had the Missouri Supreme Court actually decided Farrar v. Finney on the merits it would have ruled in favor of the Fourth Street trustees. It is difficult to imagine that the pro-slavery Court would have done anything other than follow the holdings in

Gibson v. Armstrong, Bascom v. Lane, and Smith v. Swormstedt. Again, those decisions provided more than sufficient authority to approve the affiliation of the Fourth Street Church with the breakaway MECS and grant it title to the disputed Green Street property. With an ample array of decisions declaring that the 1844 Plan of Separation authorized the departure of the Fourth Street Church and the MECS from the MEC, the high court could have easily, and with the widespread appearance of legitimacy, dismissed Kniskern and other appellate decisions that denied seceding organically-connected congregational factions rights to church property. Adherence to the rule of deference upon which the pro-MECS decisions supposedly rested, rather than upon the implied trust rule, furthermore, would have cast such a decision as thoroughly republican and in keeping with hallowed principles of religious freedom and separation of church and state. But the refusal of the high court to decide Farrar v. Finney on less than satisfactory procedural grounds wrongfully denied the African Methodist Church their hard-earned day in the highest court of the state.

Farrar v. Finney underscores how courts that adjudicated church property disputes over the question of slavery violated religious freedom in ways that historical scholarship on church-state relations has generally overlooked. Historical enquiry into that question in antebellum America has generally focused on state action that promoted Christian morality or suppressed public behavior that reform-minded evangelicals deemed sinful.¹⁷⁶ But such infringements pale in comparison to the direct judicial assaults on ecclesiastical autonomy that shaped the litigation and outcome in Farrar v. Finney – whether decisions made in the name of republican “deference” or in the name of “implied trust” and the sacred intention of a charitable property donor. The New York Court of Chancery in Kniskern did not obviously flout Evangelical Lutheran Church articles of faith or constitutional rules of government. Vice Chancellor Sandford refereed the

theological disputes and related property claims of warring Lutheran synods with considerable skill. But the court in that case, nonetheless, co-opted the supreme judicatory role of the Evangelical Lutheran Church General Synod when it declared the St. Johns and St. Peters congregations unorthodox and, ecclesiastically, *ultra vires*. As in Kniskern, the decisions in Gibson v. Armstrong, Bascom v. Lane, and Smith v. Swormstedt constituted valid law. But the various state and federal courts that played Consistory in the latter three cases, while purporting to adjudicate on the principle of deference, utterly disregarded both Methodist constitutional law and well-established rules of equity that should have determined that the MECS had simply seceded from the national Methodist Church and forfeited all property donated earlier to its constituent churches for the use of MEC members.

The determinations of the St. Louis Circuit Court and the Missouri Supreme Court in Farrar v. Finney encroached on the religious liberties of the African Methodist Church congregants in ways more reprehensible than did the appellate decisions that provided the authority with which to decide it. Lawmakers in Missouri and St. Louis certainly violated the religious freedom of African Americans, free and bonded, with police measures that restricted their religious assemblies. But white authorities could at least invoke republican constitutional theory allowing governmental restraints on individual liberty to promote the welfare of the people, including public safety, to rationalize such measures.¹⁷⁷ Such rationalizations, however, could not underwrite the decisions that denied the African Church title to their Green Street lot and meeting house. The decisions of both the St. Louis Circuit Court and the Missouri Supreme Court authorized, without justification, the Fourth Street trustees to deny forcibly the black congregants their place of worship, misappropriate their property, and penalize the expression of religious sentiments, concerning slavery or otherwise, that had motivated the black Methodists to

affiliate and remain with the MEC in the first place. And to the extent the Missouri courts refused to restrain the unwarranted seizure, they, too, trampled on both the religious liberties and rights of free speech guaranteed to the black congregants under the 1820 Constitution of Missouri, which declared “all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God” and “that every person may freely speak . . . on any subject.”¹⁷⁸

Conclusions

The St. Louis Circuit Court case Farrar v. Finney (1855), which culminated in the Missouri Supreme Court, reveals that intra-congregational conflicts over church property among Methodists became especially heated when they pitted independently-minded urban slave and free black congregants against all-white pro-slavery congregational factions. As did civilly and ecclesiastically disempowered white women, African American congregants, both men and women, had substantial spiritual and material stakes in the bi-racial churches they helped to build. The high court of Missouri, however, discounted informal bi-racial church customs for handling the affairs of virtually-independent black congregations and ignored rules of law and equity to safeguard the material interests of pro-slavery church-goers. Equally important, highly-publicized litigation battles over church property ratcheted up tensions between contending pro- and anti-slavery congregants and ordinary residents in the state.

Close examination of Farrar v. Finney reveals much about the socio-cultural and political dynamics of antebellum congregational schisms centered on the brewing sectional conflict. First, the case highlights the extent to which such intra-congregational strife became most intense when it implicated claims to church property made by factions divided over the morality of African American bondage. Second, it demonstrates that, when one such faction comprised free blacks and slaves and the other influential middle-class whites, the secular legal system pulled

out all the stops to ensure an outcome that comported with the maintenance of both white supremacy and slavery. Last but not least, Farrar v. Finney demonstrates that these dynamics were especially pronounced when such litigation arose in a slaveholding Border State more torn over the question of African American bondage than any other polity in the Union -- and, especially, in St. Louis, a thriving metropolis chock full of European immigrants and northerners who adamantly opposed African American bondage.

Farrar v. Finney demonstrates, most obviously, that the Methodist schism involved much more than the interests of white clerical leaders and white congregants. Ordinary African American congregants found themselves caught between anti-slavery Methodist ministers who repudiated the Plan of Separation in 1848 and pro-slavery MECS clerics determined to have the civil courts validate it. More than any other case litigated in the late antebellum period, Farrar v. Finney reveals the extent to which adjudication of church property disputes arising from congregational strife over slavery were deeply intertwined with the fundamental socio-economic, religious, and racial dynamics that drove the larger sectional conflict.

Equally important, highly-publicized litigation battles over church property, such as Farrar v. Finney, occurred almost exclusively in the slaveholding Border States of Missouri, Kentucky, and Virginia. This contention in Missouri ratcheted up tensions between contending pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals and between non-church-goers divided on the moral question of slavery. Evangelical strife and litigation in the Border States spurred high-profile judicial pronouncements, print commentary, and other public disputation that shaped the parameters of national debate and radically increased sectional tensions.

Relying on equitable principles of resulting and constructive trust, the African Methodist Church in Farrar v. Finney claimed title to its lot and meeting house by arguing a history of de

facto ecclesiastical independence that challenged longstanding Methodist Church authority over its black congregations in the slave states.¹⁷⁹ The African Church also advanced its claim to ownership by arguing alternatively that the withdrawal of the southern Methodists and the Fourth Street Church from the MEC constituted an unauthorized secession that forfeited to the African Church all title and interest in the Green Street property.¹⁸⁰

The bold arguments of the African Methodist Church combined with the political pressures of pro- and anti-slavery partisanship, posed a fundamental dilemma to the courts called upon to adjudicate the African Church claims – the St. Louis Circuit Court and the Missouri Supreme Court. To acknowledge the claims of the African Church would garner the praise of the substantial anti-slavery minority that prevailed in St. Louis but expose the Missouri courts to the stern condemnation of pro-slavery partisans in the city, the rest of the state and in other slaveholding polities. The St. Louis Circuit Court avoided the dilemma by denying the African Church claims and punted the case for thorough review to the Missouri Supreme Court in 1854. A year later, however, a pro-slavery Missouri Supreme Court rejected the appeal of the black congregants on warrantless technical grounds and thus entirely avoided the onerous task of deciding the merits of the case. The outcome was, to say the least, thick on legal niceties but very thin on fundamental justice.

The outcome certainly highlights a basic flaw in equitable trust doctrine in cases where African American congregations ensconced in slave states typically depended almost totally upon the benevolence of white trustees to protect their property. By the same token, it reveals the actual limits of a cross-racial “legality” by which autonomous African Methodist societies and the leaders of all-white superintending Methodist churches customarily ordered their temporal and spiritual relationship in ways that law on the books did not recognize. The case also

demonstrates the determination of pro-slavery Methodist Church leaders and jurists to pacify a black urban population increasingly susceptible to abolitionist influences and the strenuous anti-slavery activism of white MEC ministers.

Examination of Farrar v. Finney in socio-cultural and institutional context also reveals that the national struggle over slavery spurred egregious violations of religious liberty heretofore unexamined by historians focusing on church-state relations in the antebellum period. State and federal decisions that shaped the litigation and outcome in Farrar v. Finney co-opted the authority of denominational judicatories to determine their own rules, forms of government, and articles of faith – a right, in theory at least, reserved to each under widely-accepted American law grounded in republican and constitutional principles. But the refusal of the St. Louis Circuit Court and the Missouri Supreme Court to recognize the legitimate claims of the African Methodist Church to their Green Street lot and house of worship violated the religious liberties of the black congregants in a fashion far more reprehensible. Foundational commitments to a separation of church and state thus collapsed under the pressures of sectional politics in the late antebellum period.

Notes

¹ Amendment to the Bill, Transcript of the Record, Farrar, et al. v Finney, et al., Supreme Court of Missouri case file, Missouri State Archives [MSA], Jefferson City, Missouri, pp. 51-52. See case file detail in Missouri Supreme Court Database, MSA, at <http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/judiciary/supremecourt/detail.asp?rID=6625>.

² Answer of Defendants to Amended Bill, Record, Farrar v Finney, pp. 45, 56, 61; Exhibit, Joseph Tabor, No. 1, *ibid.*, p. 29; Bill, *ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

³ Amendment to the Bill, *ibid.*, pp. 51-52; Exhibit, Joseph Tabor, No. 1, *ibid.*, pp. 30-32.

⁴ The Fourth Street Church trustees were John Finney, William Finney, John Dritcher, Hugh Lee, Hugh Miller, John Baker, John Smith, and James Essex. Bill, *ibid.*, pp. 1, 5.

⁵ Richard S. Newman, Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers (New York: New York U. Press, 2008); Will Gravely, "You must not kneel here," Christian History 18.2 (1999): 34-37; Wesley Roberts, "Rejecting the 'Negro pew,'" Christian History 14, no. 1 (1995): 35-38; Gary B. Nash, "New Light on Richard Allen: The Early Years of Freedom," William & Mary Quarterly 46, no. 2 (April 1989): 332-340; H. Lee Cheek, Jr., "Original Diversity: Bishops Allen, Asbury and Black Methodism," Methodist History 35, no. 3 (April 1997): 188-191; Charlotte A. Haller, "'And Made Us to Be a Kingdom': Race, Antislavery, and Black Evangelicals in North Carolina's Early Republic," North Carolina Historical Review 80, no. 2 (April 2003): 125-53.

⁶ Janet Duitsman Cornelius, Slave Missions and the Black Church in the Antebellum South (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1999), 69-102, 48, 50-53, 59, 65, 67, 178; J. Gordon Melton, A Will to Choose: The Origins of African American Methodism (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 175-182.

⁷ Cornelius, Slave Missions, 107-08, 114.

⁸ Melton, A Will to Choose, 38, 46, 47, 68, 83, 92, 94-102, 143, 155-174; J. Gordon Melton, "African American Methodism in the M. E. Tradition: The Case of Sharp Street (Baltimore)," North Star: A Journal of African American Religious History 8, no. 2 (January 2005): 1; Liam Riordan "Passing as Black / Passing as Christian: African-American Religious Autonomy in Early Republican Delaware," Pennsylvania History 64 (1997 Special Issue): 207-229.

⁹ Christopher Tomlins and Bruce H. Mann, eds., The Many Legalities of Early America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

¹⁰ According to Laura Edwards, ordinary people, including slaves and free blacks, ordered their relationships in ways that deviated substantially from law on the books but in keeping with local preferences and needs. Magistrates and district courts did not administer a unitary body of law grounded in commitments to due process and individual rights. Local custom and recognized the rights of slaves to possess and control property, notwithstanding legal rules that declared this impossible. Laura Edwards, The People and Their Peace: Legal Culture and the Transformation of Inequality in the Post-Revolutionary South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

¹¹ Cameron W. Ellis, “Church Factionalism and Judicial Resolution: A Reconsideration of Neutral-Principles,” Ala. Law Review 60., no. 4 (2009): 1001-1029; Natalie L. Yaw, “Cross Fire: Judicial Intervention in Church Property Disputes after Rasmussen v. Bunyan,” Mich. St. Law Review (2006): 813-39; Ashley Alderman, “Where’s the Wall?: Church Property Disputes within the Civil Courts and the Need for Consistent Application of the Law,” Ga. Law Review 39 (2005): 1027-1064; Arlin M. Adams and William R. Hanlon, “Jones v. Wolf: Church Autonomy and the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment,” Pa. Law Review 128, no. 6 (June 1980): 1291-1339; Alan R. Friedman, “Church Property Dispute Resolution: An Expanded Role for the Courts after Jones v. Wolf?” Geo. L. J. 68 (1980): 1141-68. See also Joseph M. Dawson, “The Meaning of Separation of Church and State in the First Amendment,” Journal of Church and State 50, no. 4 (2008): 677-81; Frank Way, “Religious Disputation and the Civil Courts: Quasi-Establishment and Secular Principles,” Western Political Quarterly 42, no. 4 (1989): 532-543; John Witte Jr., “Facts and Fictions about the History of Separation of Church and State,” Journal of Church and State 48, no. 1 (2006): 15-45.

¹² Mark P. Strasser, “When Churches Divide: On Neutrality, Deference, and Unpredictability,” Hamline Law Review 32 (2009): 427-75; Greenawalt, “Hands Off!,” 1843-63; Justin M. Gardner, “Ecclesiastical Divorce in Hierarchical Denominations and the Resulting Custody Battle over Church Property: How the Supreme Court Has Needlessly Rendered Church Property Trusts Ineffectual,” Ave Maria Law Review 6, no. 1 (2007): 253-63; Troy Harris, “Neutral Principles of the Law and Church Property in the United States,” Journal of Church and State 30, no. 3 (Summer 1988): 515-531.

¹³ Shannon, et al. v. Frost, et al., 3 Monroe 253 (Ky., 1842); Smith v. Nelson, 18 Vt. 511 (1846); Hadden, et al. v. Chorn, et al., 8 B. Monroe 70 (1847); Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches (1844), 1 Sandford’s Chancery, pp. 439. G. H. Parmele, “Determination by the civil courts of property rights between contending factions of an independent congregational church,” ALR, 1st series (1920), 108, et seq.

¹⁴ Gibson, et al. v. Armstrong, 7 B. Monroe 481 (Ky., 1847); Harmon v. Dreher, 2 Speer’s Equity 87 (S.C., 1843); Den & Day, et al. v. Bolton, et al., 7 Halstead 206 (N. Jersey, 1831); Ferraria v. Vasconcelles, 23 Illinois 456 (1860); and German Reformed Church v. The Commonwealth Ex rel. Seibert, 3 Barr 291 (Penn., 1846). The foregoing decisions rejected several important English precedents, including Craigdallie, et al. v. Aikman, et al., 3 English Reports 601 (House of Lords, 1813); Craigdallie II, 4 English Reports 435 (House of Lords, 1820); Attorney-General v. Pearson, 36 English Reports 135 (Chancery, 1817); Foley v. Wontner, 37 English Reports 621 (Chancery 1820); Attorney-General v. Pearson II, 58 English Reports 848 (Vice-Chancellor’s Court, 1835); Galbraith v. Smith, 15 Shaw 808 (Scottish Court of Sessions, 1837). See discussion in Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 727 (1871). See also Parmele, ALR, 123-30.

¹⁵ Watson v. Jones, 722-30.

¹⁶ Anthony E. Kaye, Joining Places: Slave Neighborhoods of the Old South (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 1-50. Maximilian Reichard, “Black and White on the

Urban Frontier: The St. Louis Community in Transition, 1800-1830,” Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 33, no. 1 (1976): 3-17; Mary E. Seematter, “Trials and Confessions: Race and Justice in Antebellum St. Louis,” Gateway Heritage: The Magazine of the Missouri Historical Society 12, no. 2 (Fall 1991): 36-47; Margaret Lo Piccolo, “St. Louis Ethnic Neighborhoods, 1850-1930: An Introduction,” Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 33, no. 2 (1977): 64-76; Thomas C. Buchanan, “Rascals on the Antebellum Mississippi: African American Steamboat Workers and the St. Louis Hanging of 1841,” Journal of Social History 34, no. 4 (Summer 2001): 797-817. Julie Winch, introduction to Colored Aristocracy of St. Louis by Cyprian Clamorgan (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 4-5; Louis S. Gerteis, Civil War St. Louis (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001), 6-37.

¹⁷ Robert L. Paquette, “From Rebellion to Revisionism: The Continuing Debate about the Denmark Vesey Affair,” Journal of the Historical Society 4, no. 3 (September 2004): 291-334; Edward A. Pearson, Designs against Charleston: The Trial Record of the Denmark Vesey Slavery Conspiracy of 1822 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); David Robertson, Denmark Vesey: The Buried History of America’s Largest Slave Rebellion and the Man Who Led It (New York: Knopf, 1999); Douglas R. Egerton, “‘Why Did They Not Preach Up This Thing?’ Denmark Vesey and Revolutionary Theology,” South Carolina Historical Magazine 100, no. 4 (October 1999): 298-318.

¹⁸ “Slaves,” Laws of the State of Missouri, 2 vols. (St. Louis: E. Charless, 1825), vol. 2, p. 742; Sec. 29, “Slaves,” The Revised Statutes of Missouri [1835] (St. Louis, 1835), p. 585; Sec. 24, Ch. 150, Art. 1, “Slaves,” The Revised Statutes of Missouri [1855], 2 vols. (City of Jefferson: James Lusk, 1856), vol. 2, pp. 1475. Secs. 4, 5 & 9, Ch. 121, Revised Statutes of Missouri [1855], vol. 2, pp. 1126-27 (Approved, December 4, 1855). Winch, introduction to Colored Aristocracy of St. Louis, 4-5; Gerteis, Civil War St. Louis, 6-37. Revised Ordinances of St. Louis 1836, § 1, 3, pp. 124-25. Revised Ordinances of the City of St. Louis . . . 1843 (St. Louis, 1843), § 4-5, pp. 311-12. Journal of the Senate of the State of Missouri, at the First Session of the Fourteenth General Assembly . . . 1846 (Jefferson City, 1847), 69; Laws of the State of Missouri, Fourteenth General Assembly, 1846–1847, “Negroes and Mulattoes: An act respecting slaves, free,” § 2, p. 104; Secs. 2 & 3, Ch. 114, Revised Statutes of Missouri 1855, p. 1100, et seq. See also Emile Oberholzer, “The Legal Aspects of Slavery in Missouri, Part 3,” Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 6, no. 3 (April 1950): 333.

¹⁹ I. M. Allen, The Triennial Baptist Register. No. 2- 1836 (Philadelphia, 1836), 279-80; 98 Mo. 412 (1889). See N. Webster Moore, “John Berry Meachum (1789-1854): St. Louis Pioneer, Black Abolitionist, Educator, and Preacher,” Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 29.2 (1973): 96-103; Dennis L. Durst, “The Reverend John Berry Meachum (1789-1854) of St. Louis: Prophet and Entrepreneurial Black Educator in Historiographical Perspective,” North Star: A Journal of African American Religious History 7, no. 2 (January 2004): 1.

²⁰ Cornelius, Slave Missions, 108; J. Thomas Scharf, History of Saint Louis City and County, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1883), 2: 1697.

-
- ²¹ Winch, introduction to Colored Aristocracy, 6-8; Scharf, History of Saint Louis City and County, 2: 1697. Cornelius, Slave Missions, 107-15. Revised Ordinances of the City of St. Louis . . . 1836 (St. Louis, 1836), § 1, 3, pp. 124-25.
- ²² Deed of emancipation, 1 November 1822, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 144; Testimony of John H. Gay, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 90.
- ²³ St. Louis Christian Advocate, January 18, 1871, p. 2.
- ²⁴ Testimony of Daniel Lloyd, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 80.
- ²⁵ Deed of Emancipation of James Farrar, April 8, 1839, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 144; Testimony of Joseph Tabor, Record, pp. 117-118.
- ²⁶ Testimony of Daniel Lloyd, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 76, et seq.
- ²⁷ William Hyde and Howard L. Conard, eds., Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis, 4 vols. (New York & Louisville, 1899), 3:1463.
- ²⁸ Cornelius, Slave Missions, 109-110.
- ²⁹ Testimony of Daniel Lloyd, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 77 Conference records thereafter consistently listed different ministers for both the African Methodist Church and the Fourth Street congregations. The ministers whom the annual conference assigned to the African Church were always white. *Ibid.*, 295-309.
- ³⁰ Testimony of George Bushey, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 99-100; M. J. Sullivan, comp., The Revised Ordinance of the City of St Louis (St. Louis, 1881), 971-72. The local white Methodist ministers continued to preside over the congregational meetings. Testimony of G. Bushey, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 97-100.
- ³¹ Defendants Answer to Amended Bill, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 56, 61; The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York, 1844), 51. In his testimony Lloyd, referred to these men as “local preachers.” Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 83, 86, 100; Doctrines and Discipline (1844), 180-81. Testimony of Daniel Lloyd, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 78.
- ³² Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 83, 86, 100; Doctrines and Discipline (1844), 180-81. According to Bushey, Jonathan Duncan and James Farrar served in this capacity from 1835 through at least 1841. Testimony of George Bushey, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 100. According to the Reverend John Anderson, who had the “disciplinary charge” of the African Methodist Church for about three months in 1840, one black man in the congregation acted as steward, and one would act as secretary. Testimony of John Anderson, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 86, 89.
- ³³ Bill, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 1, 7; Doctrines and Discipline (1844), 172, 179.
- ³⁴ Deed of Emancipation of Louis Jones by Ramsey C. Jones, September 7, 1845, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 144; Testimony of Joseph Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 129-130.
- ³⁵ Deed of Emancipation of Ralph Harrison by Thomas Hart Benton and Elizabeth Benton, 27 June 1843, recorded July 6, 1853, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 144.
- ³⁶ Testimony of Daniel Lloyd, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 78
- ³⁷ Thomas D. Hamm, “A Quaker View of Black St Louis in 1841,” Missouri Historical Review 98, no. 2 (Jan. 2004): 119-20.
- ³⁸ Answer of Defendants, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 40

³⁹ Testimony of George Bushey, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 99-100. The Reverend George Smith was the second white preacher appointed to the African Methodist Church. Testimony of Lloyd, p. 78.

⁴⁰ Answer of Defendants, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 38

⁴¹ Testimony of George Bushey, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 100. In 1840, the Missouri Annual Conference, the governing body of the denomination in the state, appointed the Reverend James L. Forsyth “to labor at the African Church.” David R. McAnally, Life and Times of Rev. William Patton and Annals of the Missouri Conference (St. Louis, 1858), 298. The last segment of the work lists the official appointments of the Methodist ministers in Missouri.

⁴² On March 2, 1838, the Fourth Street Church established committees to establish two new MEC churches in the city: Centenary Methodist Church and the Mound Chapel (later known as St. Paul’s Methodist Church). In 1839, the quarterly conference set off the Centenary mission as an independent congregation. After 1844, it became the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Services at the Mound mission were initially held in the Washington Chapel on Mullanphy Street near Second Street. Like the Centenary Church, the Mound Chapel affiliated with the MECS in about 1845. The Mound Church edifice was built at Tenth and Chamber streets in 1850. Francis Emmett Williams, et al., Centenary Methodist Church of St. Louis: The First Hundred Years, 1839–1939 (St. Louis: Mound City Press, 1939), 16; Scharf, History of Saint Louis City and County, 2: 1692-93.

⁴³ Answer of Defendants, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 40-41.

⁴⁴ St. Louis Christian Advocate, January 18, 1871, p. 2.

⁴⁵ Hyde and Conard, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 3:1463.

⁴⁶ Deed of A. Resque to Joseph Duncan, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 135-36; University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Center, “Historical Census Browser,” (2004, accessed June 10, 2010), available at <<http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/histcensus/index.html>>.

⁴⁷ Hyde and Conard, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 3:2503.

⁴⁸ Deed of M.E.C. to S. Wiggins, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 138.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Answer of Defendants, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 16-38.

⁵¹ Exhibit C, *ibid.*, pp. 12-14; Hyde and Conard, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 3:754-56.

⁵² Bill and Amendment to the Bill, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 10-11, 50.

⁵³ Exhibit J. T., No. 1, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 29

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939, A Brief History (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966), 120. Tabor was, in the early 1840s, at least, an active proponent of colonization. On July 26, 1839, activists interested in promoting colonization met at the Methodist Church in St. Louis and organized the Missouri State Colonization Society, framed a constitution, and selected officers. Important luminaries included speaker of the house and St. Louis Judge William C. Carr, St. Louis Mayor William Carr Lane, Judge David Todd of Columbia, and Hamilton Rowan Gamble. Ministers from the larger towns included the reverends

Jackson Kemper, A. Bullard, William M. Daily, William S. Potts (Presbyterian) and Joseph Tabor. McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit, 167-168. The state colonization society continued in existence, it seems until late 1844, when it held one of its last meetings on November 14, 1844 at the Methodist Centenary Church. Scharf, History of Saint Louis, 2:1757.

⁵⁶ Exhibit J. T., No. 2, *ibid.*, pp. 30-32; Testimony of Joseph Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 131.

⁵⁷ Answer of Defendants, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 16-29; Answer of Defendants to Amended Bill, *ibid.*, pp. 55-58; Answer of Defendants to Amended Supplemental Bill, *ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

⁵⁸ Melton, A Will to Choose, 74-75, 80-83, 100-01.

⁵⁹ Answer, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 16-28; Answer to Amended Bill, *ibid.*, 54-55; Statement of the Case by Appellees, Farrar v. Finney, Missouri Supreme Court case file, p. 4.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 337-39; W. P. Harrison, Gospel Among the Slaves: A Short Account of Missionary Operations among the African Slaves of the Southern States (Nashville, 1893); Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the year 1858 (Nashville, 1859), 15.

⁶¹ In 1848, the MECS paid \$300 to support a mission affiliated with the St. Louis Conference of fifty colored Methodists. By 1861, the MECS supported 329 such mission churches in the slaveholding states, but they maintained no slave missions in Missouri that year. Harrison, Gospel Among the Slaves, 319, 323. By late 1852, there were only a handful of black pro-MECS congregants worshipped in the building or used it otherwise. Testimony of Joseph Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 127. By the end of the 1850s there were virtually no black MECS members in the St. Louis area. Minutes of the Annual Conferences 1858, 15; Harrison, Gospel Among the Slaves, 337-39.

⁶² Testimony of Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 119, 125; In the Supreme Court, Statement by Appellants, Farrar v. Finney, Missouri Supreme Court case file, p. 7.

⁶³ Hyde and Conard, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 2:976-77.

⁶⁴ Kenneth C. Kaufman, Dred Scott's Advocate: A Biography of Roswell M. Field (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1996), 155.

⁶⁵ Hyde and Conard, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 2:976-77.

⁶⁶ Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939, A Brief History (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966), 120.

⁶⁷ Don E. Fehrenbacher, Slavery, Law, and Politics: The Dred Scott Case in Historical Perspective (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 132, 139; Affidavit of Lewis Jones, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 41-3.

⁶⁸ William Francis English, The Pioneer Lawyer and Jurist of Missouri (Columbia: University of Missouri, 1947), 84; Louis Houck, A History of Missouri: From the Earliest Explorations and Settlements until the Admission of the State into the Union, 3 vols. (Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company 1908), 3: 256-57; Gerald T. Dunne, The Missouri Supreme Court: From Dred

Scott to Nancy Cruzan (University of Missouri Press, 1993), 11-12; W. V. N. Bay, Reminiscences of the Bench and Bar of Missouri (St. Louis, 1878), 46, 98-100.

⁶⁹ Amended Bill, filed January 15, 1852, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 45.

⁷⁰ Amended and Supplemental Bill, filed April 25, 1853, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 61.

⁷¹ Record, Farrar v. Finney, 32-3.

⁷² Howard L. Conard, ed., Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri (New York: Louisville; St. Louis: The Southern History Company, 1901), 428; Journal of the Senate of the State of Missouri of the Extra Session of the Seventeenth General Assembly (Jefferson City, 1852), 139.

⁷³ Journal of the Senate of the State of Missouri at the First Session of the Sixteenth General Assembly (Jefferson City, 1849), 175-76; Christopher Phillips, Missouri's Confederate: Claiborne Fox Jackson and the Creation of Southern Identity in the Border West (Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 170-71.

⁷⁴ Kaufman, Dred Scott's Advocate, 101.

⁷⁵ Scharf, History of Saint Louis, 2:1463.

⁷⁶ Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 178; A. J. D. Stewart, ed., The History of the Bench and Bar of Missouri: with Reminiscences of the Prominent Lawyers of the Past, and a Record of the Law's Leaders of the Present (St. Louis, 1898), 113.

⁷⁷ Perry McCandless, A History of Missouri. Volume II. 1820- To 1860 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2007), 162, 266, 279, 282-83; English, The Pioneer Lawyer, 113; Bay, Reminiscences of the Bench and Bar, 127, 149, 222.

⁷⁸ Invoking the rules of government set out in the Methodist Doctrines and Discipline, they maintained that the black congregation had been "separate and distinct in respect to internal Government and their Church Property." They argued that the property was "vested in and administered by different and Separate Boards of trustees for each Church or Society." Bill, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 3.

⁷⁹ On appeal, Delafield and Barretts cited as authority for these propositions Truesdell v. Calaway, 6 Mo. 605 (1840) and quoted from the opinion of that case as follows: "If a man purchase land in the name of another and pays the money, it will be trust for him that paid the money, though there be no deed declaring the trust, for the statute of frauds does not extend to trusts raised by operation of law. A resulting trust, or trust by operation of law, remains as at common law." To further substantiate these points, counsel cited Joseph Story, Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Boston: Charles C. Little & James Brown, 1839), vol. 2, pp. 232, 240-41. Statement [for Appellants], Delafield and Barretts, filed March 16, 1854, Farrar v. Finney, Missouri Supreme Court case file, p. 6. See also In the Supreme Court, Statement of Appellants by Delafield and Barretts, *ibid.*, p.12.

⁸⁰ The African Methodist Church made this argument, paradoxically, by positing the validity of the separatist initiative of the MECS. As will be shown, the first argument depended vitally on the validity of high-profile state and federal court decisions outside of Missouri upholding the national division of the church, including the Kentucky Court of Appeals in Gibson v. Armstrong (1847), the circuit court for the district of New York in Bascom v. Lane (1851), and the United

States Supreme Court in Smith v. Swormstedt (1853). Gibson v. Armstrong, et al., 7 B. Monroe 481 (Ky., 1847); Bascom, et al. v. Lane, et al., Case No. 1,089, The Federal Cases Comprising Cases Argued and Determined in the Circuit and District Courts of the United States (St. Paul, 1894), 994-1003; Smith v. Swormstedt, 16 U. S. 288 (1853).

⁸¹ By the same token, they de-emphasized that William Slater had deeded the property jointly to Tabor and the Finney Brothers, who had not, like Tabor, conveyed their one-half interest to the black trustees. Bill, Record, Farrar v Finney.

⁸² Bill and Amended Bill, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 1-6, 45-54.

⁸³ The African Methodist Church maintained that it did not, in October 1846, seek to take advantage of the Plan of Separation. They had been left no choice but to vote. Either they voted to join the MECS or they lost their church building and lot. If the St. Louis Circuit Court ruled the 1844 Plan of Separation valid and recognized the right of both the African Church and the Fourth Street members to vote on whether to remain with the MEC or join the new MECS, the property claims of the African Church would certainly be further bolstered by MEC rules set out in the 1844 Doctrines and Discipline, which maintained that only members of the MEC could serve as trustees for its churches. But available evidence strongly suggests, and without exception, that neither MEC nor MECS officials intended or interpreted the Plan of Separation to grant dependent black societies such a prerogative. *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ The second argument made by the African Methodist Church relied on MEC law, the determinations of the MEC General Conference in 1848, and the 1844 Chancery Court of New York decision Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches (1844), 1 Sandford's Chancery, pp. 439, which had rejected the property claims of pro-slavery congregations that had seceded from the national Evangelical Lutheran Church over the issue of slavery and the adoption of other heterodox articles of faith.

⁸⁵ "No person shall be eligible as a trustee to any of our houses, churches, or schools who is not a regular member of the church." Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1844), p. 172.

⁸⁶ The Methodist Discipline required that trustees holding property for a congregation be members of that congregation. Equally important, well-founded equity principles required that civil courts rely on church rules when making decisions relevant to church property. Deed of Settlement, Part Second. The Temporal Economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Doctrines and Discipline (1844), 176. Amended Bill, *ibid.*, pp. 51-52; Answer of Defendants to the Amended Bill, *ibid.*, p. 58.

⁸⁷ By the same token, they de-emphasized that William Slater had deeded the property jointly to Tabor and the Finney Brothers, who had not, like Tabor, conveyed their one-half interest to the black trustees. *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ Bill and Amended Bill, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 1-6, 45-54.

⁸⁹ William Finney v. The St. Charles College, Missouri Supreme Court Case Files, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri; Finney v. St. Charles College 13 Mo. 266 (1850). See also State ex rel. Pittman v. Adams, 44 Mo. 570 (1869) discussed in chapter five.

⁹⁰ William Finney v. The St. Charles College, Missouri Supreme Court Case Files, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri; Finney v. St. Charles College 13 Mo. 266 (1850). See also State ex rel. Pittman v. Adams, 44 Mo. 570 (1869) discussed in chapter five.

⁹¹ Answer of Defendants to Amended Bill, Record, Farrar v Finney, p. 55.

⁹² Ibid., 56.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 57; McAnally, Life of and Times of Patton, 329-37; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1850 (New York, 1850), 508-9.

⁹⁵ Minutes of the Annual Conferences 1850, 508-9; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1857 (New York, 1857), 342-43; Union Memorial United Methodist Church (1996). In 1848 the MEC reorganized in Missouri, though the records for 1848-49 only contained sporadic figures for the subsidiary congregations.

⁹⁶ Testimony of Joseph Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 125, 129-130.

⁹⁷ At trial, it undoubtedly pleased Anderson to point out, as well, that “[James] Farrar is a local preacher now and an ordained Deacon worshipping at my church [H]e was ordained Deacon by Bishop [Beverly] Waugh in my presence.” Testimony of John Anderson, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 90.

⁹⁸ Decree, Record, Farrar v Finney, pp. 64-6.

⁹⁹ Motion for New Trial, ibid., p. 147.

¹⁰⁰ Bill of Exceptions, ibid., 66-70; Assignment of Errors, Case File, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 1-13.

¹⁰¹ Testimony of George Bushey, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 103-04.

¹⁰² Ibid., pp. 112-13.

¹⁰³ Testimony of Joseph Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 127.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 117-24; Testimony of Bushey, 103-04. Under customary Methodist practice, individuals could, on their own initiative, form a class of ten people, and a Methodist minister could unilaterally establish an independent society, at least if the members were predominantly white. According to the Reverend John Anderson, “As to the mode of forming Societies there is no law. The usages are different.” Testimony of Anderson, Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 88. See chs. 1 & 2, The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York, 1844), pp. 7-96.

¹⁰⁵ Testimony of Bushey, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 112-13, 132-35; Testimony of Tabor, ibid., pp. 117-24. See Doctrines and Discipline (1844), 32-34, 170-71.

¹⁰⁶ Testimony of Tabor, Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 117-24. In addition to Tabor and Bushey, John Anderson, Daniel Lloyd, and J. H. Gay sought to demonstrate the separate or independent ecclesiastical existence of the African Methodist Church, its separate finances, the fact that Farrar, Jones, Harrison, and others had acted as trustees and stewards, the various oral agreements entered into by the African Church trustees and the Fourth Street trustees and its quarterly conference leadership regarding the various payments made by the African Church for the Green Street property. Assignment of Errors, Farrar v Finney, p. 4. Ibid., p. 10; Testimony of J. H. Gay, Farrar v Finney, 94.

¹⁰⁷ Record, Farrar v. Finney, p. 147.

¹⁰⁸ Statement [for Appellants], Delafield and Barretts, filed March 16, 1854, Farrar v. Finney, Missouri Supreme Court case file, p. 6. See also In the Supreme Court, Statement of Appellants by Delafield and Barretts, *ibid.*, p.12.

¹⁰⁹ In the Supreme Court, Statement of Appellants by Delafield and Barretts, Farrar v. Finney, Missouri Supreme Court case file, Farrar v. Finney, p. 12.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ Brief of Appellants, filed March 16, 1854, p. 5, Missouri Supreme Court case file, Farrar v. Finney.

¹¹² Statement of the Case, Polk and Dayton for Appellees, Supreme Court of Missouri case file, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 3-4.

¹¹³ Decision of the Court, John F. Ryland, *ibid.*; Farrar v. Finney, p. 3; Consaul & Barber v. Lidell, 7 Mo. 250 (1841); Pomeroy v. Selmes, 8 Mo. 727 (1844); Scott v. Bird, 9 Mo. 148 (1843); Hassinger v. Pye, 10 Mo. 156 (1846); Brief “A,” Polk & Dayton for appellants, Supreme Court of Missouri case file, Farrar v. Finney; Brief “B,” Polk & Dayton for appellants, *ibid.*

¹¹⁴ Decision of the Court, Missouri Supreme Court case file, Farrar v. Finney, p. 5.

¹¹⁵ Record, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 148-49.

¹¹⁶ By the late 1830s, growing democratic pressures had intensified against a legal system widely perceived to be hamstrung with arcane rules and technicalities that too often delayed or sabotaged the processes of justice. A revised code of practice set out in the 1845 Revised Statutes of Missouri responded substantially to this popular demand. Ch. 45, “Code of Practice,” The Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri (St. Louis, 1845). In further response to the public insistence on a fair and accessible system of justice, and to the related codification initiative of New Yorker David Dudley Field, reform-minded St. Louis jurist Robert William Wells worked to simplify pleading and practice further with a reform initiative that bore fruit in 1848. Regarding the purposes of the new “Code of Practice” adopted statutorily in that year, see the Robert W. Wells, Observations on the pleadings and practice of the courts of justice in Missouri: and, a radical change therein recommended, in a letter addressed to the “Metropolitan” (Jefferson City, 1847), pp. 1-13; Laws of the State of Missouri Regulating Pleadings and Practice in Courts of Justice (St. Louis: Missouri Republican Steam Power Press, 1849), vi, 5-6, 21-26, 55, Appendix A, 89-92. The 1845 revision of the rule regarding the filing of a bill of exceptions appears to have met with Wells’ approval. *Ibid.*, p. 56.

¹¹⁷ Consaul & Barber v. Lidell (1841); Pomeroy v. Selmes (1844).

¹¹⁸ Brief for Appellants by Miron Leslie, Missouri Supreme Court case file, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 1-2. Leslie referenced Harlow v. Humiston, 6 Cow. 189 (N. Y., 1826). According to that decision, though the bill of exceptions was signed “subsequent to verdict,” the New York Supreme Court held that “it should be intended that the exception was taken at the proper time; otherwise, the judges, it is to be presumed, would not have signed it.”

¹¹⁹ Sec. 2168, Art. 7, Ch. 33, Code of Civil Procedure, Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri, 1889, 2 vols. (Jefferson City, 1889), 1: 56; Laws of the State of Missouri, 1885, pp. 214-215.

¹²⁰ They necessarily relied on denominational books of discipline and governance, such as the Methodist Doctrines and Discipline. Typically in a segment entitled “temporal economy” or “temporalities,” such books also described the duties of congregants and lay officials for the acquisition, management, and conveyance of church property. The Doctrines and Discipline (1844); The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York, 1852); The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (Nashville, 1856); The Form of Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church of North America (Philadelphia, 1840); A Treatise of [Baptist] Church Discipline, and a Directory (Philadelphia, 1798); The Baptist Church Directory: A Guide to the Doctrines and Discipline, Officers and Ordinances, Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches, 7th ed. (New York, 1860).

¹²¹ Whitney v. First Ecclesiastical Society in Brooklyn, 5 Conn. 405 (1825); Shermer v. Rusling, 12 Haz. Reg. 1 (Pa., 1833); Commonwealth v. Green, et al., 4 Wharton 531 (Pa., 1839); Shannon, et al. v. Frost, et al., 3 B. Monroe 253 (Ky., 1842); Harmon v. Dreher (1843); Smith v. Nelson, 18 Vt. 511 (1846); German Reformed Church v. Commonwealth, 3 Pa. 282 (1846); Gibson v. Armstrong (1847); Robertson, et al. v. Bullions, et al., 9 Barbour 64 (N.Y., 1850), affirmed 11 N.Y. 243 (1854); Skilton v. Webster, Brightly, N. P. 203 (Pa., 1851).

¹²² Harmon v. Dreher (1841).

¹²³ Wilson v. Presbyterian Church of John’s Island, 2 Richardson’s Equity 215 (S. Car., 1846).

¹²⁴ Commonwealth v. Green, et al., 4 Wharton 531 (Pa., 1839) 57-62.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*; Thomas P. Roberts, Memoirs of John Bannister Gibson, Late Chief Justice of Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh, 1890), 142; David Grier Stephenson Jr., “John Bannister Gibson, 1780-1853,” John R. Vile, ed., Great American Judges: An Encyclopedia, 2 vols. (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 1:292-93. Ezra H. Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1864), 2:536-37.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*; Roberts, Memoirs of Gibson, 142; David Grier Stephenson Jr., “John Bannister Gibson, 1780-1853,” Vile, Great American Judges, 1:292-93. Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church, 2:536-37.

¹²⁷ Transcript, Smith v. Swarmstedt (1853), pp. 92-118, 121 et seq.

¹²⁸ Luther Lee, comp. The Debates of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, May 1844: To Which is Added a Review of the Proceedings of Said Conference (New York, 1845), 297-99.

¹²⁹ Bill of Complaint and Answer of Defendants, Transcript, Smith v. Swarmstedt (1853), pp. 1-32.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 126-28; Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848 (New York, 1848), 154-64; Robert Emory, History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York: Lane & Sandford, 1844), 13.

¹³¹ Transcript, Smith v. Swarmstedt (1853), p. 20.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 292.

¹³³ *Ibid.*; Journal of the General Conference, 1848, 10, 18, 20.

¹³⁴ Transcript, Smith v. Swarmstedt (1853), p. 149.

-
- ¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 295.
- ¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 15-18, 23, 138.
- ¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 295.
- ¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 293-95, 298.
- ¹³⁹ David Paul Nord, Faith in Reading: Religious Publishing and the Birth of Mass Media in America (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 156; Richard J. Carwardine, “Trauma in Methodism: Property, Church Schism, and Sectional Polarization in Antebellum America,” in Mark A. Noll, God and Mammon: Protestants, Money and the Market, 1790-1860 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 196, 201.
- ¹⁴⁰ Carwardine, “Trauma in Methodism,” 203-4.
- ¹⁴¹ Bascom v. Lane (1851), pp. 994-1003; Doctrines and Discipline (1844), 24; Doctrines and Discipline (1852), 34.
- ¹⁴² Transcript, Smith v. Swarmstedt (1853), p. 303.
- ¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 288-96, 303-8; Carwardine, “Trauma in Methodism,” 204-5.
- ¹⁴⁴ Mark A. Graber, Dred Scott and the Problem of Constitutional Evil (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 106, et seq.
- ¹⁴⁵ Strasser, “When Churches Divide,” 429-39. The southern delegates expressed this very view at their 1845 convention in Louisville – or at least they took the position that the General Conference was not bound by the Six Restrictive rules and that these rules did not amount to a constitution. Extracts from the Journal of the Louisville Convention, Transcript, Smith v. Swarmstedt (1853), p. 205.
- ¹⁴⁶ Strasser, “When Churches Divide,” 729.
- ¹⁴⁷ Journal of the General Conference, Transcript, Smith v. Swarmstedt (1853), pp. 435-36.
- ¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 439-40.
- ¹⁴⁹ Harris, “Neutral Principles,” 519-21. See Watson v. Jones, 13 U.S. 679 (1871).
- ¹⁵⁰ Den & Day v. Bolton (1831); Shannon v. Frost (1842); Harmon v. Dreher (1843); German Reformed Church v. Seibert, 3 Barr 219 (Pa., 1846); Gibson v. Armstrong (1847).
- ¹⁵¹ Harris, “Neutral Principles,” 515-18. But see Keyser v. Stansifer, 6 Ohio 364 (1834). And see Atty. Gen. ex rel. Abbot v. Dublin, 38 N.H. 459 (1859).
- ¹⁵² Baker v. Fales, 16 Mass. 487 (1820); King’s Chapel v. Pelham, 9 Mass. 501 (1813); Inhabitants of Princeton v. Adams, 64 Mass. 129 (1852); Attorney General v. Federal St. Meeting House, 69 Mass. 1 (1854); Parmele, ALR, 113-14.
- ¹⁵³ Wilson v. John’s Island Presbyterian Church, 2 Richardson’s Equity 215 (S.C., 1846); Gable v. Miller, 10 Paige Ch. 627 (N.Y., 1844), reversed Miller v. Gable, 2 Denio 492 (1845); Robertson v. Bullions, 9 Barb. 64 (N.Y., 1850), affirmed Robertson v. Bullions, 11 N.Y. 243 (1854).
- ¹⁵⁴ Note, “Hon. Thomas A. Marshall,” United States Monthly Law Magazine, 5.5 (1852): 6-10.
- ¹⁵⁵ Gibson v. Armstrong (1847), 481.
- ¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*; Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 164-65.

-
- ¹⁵⁷ Brooke v. Shacklett, Carter v. Wolfe, 13 Va. 301 (Va. 1856); “Methodist Church Cases Decided,” Hannibal Messenger, July 8, 1856, p. 2; Comment, “Judge William Daniel, Jr.,” Virginia Law Register 7, no. 1 (May 1901): 4.
- ¹⁵⁸ Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches (1844), 2, in 1 Sandford’s Chancery, pp. 439.
- ¹⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 2-10.
- ¹⁶⁰ Missouri Republican, March 25, 1851, p. 2.
- ¹⁶¹ Opinion, Digges v. Trustees, Circuit Court of Fauquier County, October 8, 1850, Fauquier County Circuit Court Chancery Order Book, No. 3, 1850-56, p. 346; Law Order Book E, 1848-54, p. 459, Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia. Citing 1 Sandford 440, et seq. and Miller v. Gable (1844), 492.
- ¹⁶² Methodist Church v. Wood, 5 Ohio 283 (1831); Trustees of Associate Reformed Church v. Trustees of Theological Seminary at Princeton, 4 N. J. Equity 77 (1837); Hadden v. Chorn (1847); Skilton v. Webster (1851); Harper v. Straws, 53 Ky. 48 (1853).
- ¹⁶³ St. Louis Christian Advocate, Nov. 13, 1851, p. 50.
- ¹⁶⁴ Ibid., Nov. 20, 1851, p. 54; Nov. 27, 1851, p. 59.
- ¹⁶⁵ “Books! Books!,” ibid., November 29, 1852, p. 58; Carwardine, “Trauma in Methodism,” 197.
- ¹⁶⁶ Tabor Scrapbook, Case File, Farrar v. Finney, pp. 1-14; Stewart, History of the Bench and Bar, 117.
- ¹⁶⁷ “Methodist Church Cases Decided,” Hannibal Messenger, July 8, 1856, p. 2.
- ¹⁶⁸ The City of Hannibal v. Draper, 15 Mo. 639–640 (March Term, 1852); The State v. Ambs, 20 Mo. 216 (October Term, 1854), pp. 217–218; Dennis K. Boman, Abiel Leonard, Yankee Slaveholder, Eminent Jurist, and Passionate Unionist (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press), 125-26, 179-80; Fehrenbacher, Slavery, Law, and Politics, 121-39; Dennis K. Boman, Lincoln’s Resolute Unionist Hamilton Gamble, Dred Scott Dissenter and Missouri’s Civil War Governor (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2006), 88-89.
- ¹⁶⁹ Boman, Abiel Leonard, 180-82.
- ¹⁷⁰ McAnally, Life and Times of Patton, 233.
- ¹⁷¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁷² Ibid., 337-39; Harrison, Gospel Among the Slaves, 319, 323; Minutes of the Annual Conferences 1858, 15.
- ¹⁷³ Minutes of the Annual Conferences 1850, 508-9; Minutes of the Annual Conferences 1857, 342-43; Union Memorial United Methodist Church. In 1848 the MEC reorganized in Missouri, though the records for 1848-49 only contained sporadic figures for the subsidiary congregations.
- ¹⁷⁴ Gaston H. Wamble, “Negroes and Missouri Protestant Churches Before and After the Civil War,” Missouri Historical Review 61.3 (April 1967): 321; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the year 1856 (New York, 1856), 168-69.
- ¹⁷⁵ Deed of Settlement, Part Second. The Temporal Economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Doctrines and Discipline (1840), p. 176.

¹⁷⁶ Receiving the most attention has been “public morals” regulation associated with the rise of middle-class evangelicalism, including criminal court enforcement of Sabbath-day restrictions such as laboring, horse-racing and engaging in various “amusements” on the Lord’s Day. Daniel Walker Howe, What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848 (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 229-30, 292, 305; William J. Novak, The People’s Welfare: Law and Regulation in Nineteenth-Century America (Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 149-90; Christopher Waldrep, Roots of Disorder: Race and Criminal Justice in the American South, 1817-80 (Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 37-58; Anne C. Loveland, Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800-1860 (Baton Rouge & London: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), 130-185. Urban working men, including German and Irish immigrants in St. Louis, often complained bitterly that restrictive liquor laws, especially those that enjoined the sale of ale on Sunday, constituted intolerable violations of religious liberty. The State v. Ambs, 20 Mo. 216 (1854); Missouri Republican, December 2, 1859; *Ibid.*, December 17, 1859; James Neal Primm, Lion of the Valley: St. Louis, Missouri, 1764-1980 (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1998), 169-73; David D. March, “The Life and Times of Charles Daniel Drake” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Missouri, 1949), 42-43, 48-51, 63-73; Scharf, History of Saint Louis, 1:690.

¹⁷⁷ Novak, The People’s Welfare, 1-50.

¹⁷⁸ Certainly frontier Missourians permitted vigilantes and, sometimes mobs, to take the law into their own hands to deal with those whose actions seemed to pose a dire threat to “the people.” But ordinary folk and jurists in the state, as in other regions of the United States, deemed the purposeful omission by government officials to restrain the depredations of one or more private persons against others a fundamental violation of liberty. This notion was intimately related to the idea that the first obligation of government was to enforce the rule of law, the very foundation of civil society in a republic organized on the consent of the governed. In this venerable conception, individuals in a “state of nature” give up the right to use deadly force to protect their property when they join civil society, based on the reasonable expectation that government thereafter assumes the obligation to protect their lives and property from the encroachments of others. Novak, The People’s Welfare, 27-32, 44; Francis Lieber, On Civil Liberty and Self-Government (Philadelphia, 1853), 1-20, 214-31; Nathaniel Chipman, Book 4, “Of Rights and Liberty,” in Sketches of the Principles of Government (Rutland, Vt., 1793), 55-59; Emmerich de Vattel, The Law of Nations, ed. Edward D. Ingraham (Philadelphia, 1852), 54. Mo. Const. of 1820, art. 16, §§ 4 & 16.

¹⁷⁹ The African Methodist Church made this argument, paradoxically, by positing the validity of the separatist initiative of the MECS. The first argument depended vitally on the validity of high-profile state and federal court decisions outside of Missouri upholding the national division of the church, including the Kentucky Court of Appeals in Gibson v. Armstrong (1847), the circuit court for the district of New York in Bascom v. Lane (1851), and the United States Supreme Court in Smith v. Swormstedt (1853). Gibson v. Armstrong, et al., 7 B. Monroe 481 (Ky., 1847); Bascom, et al. v. Lane, et al., Case No. 1,089, The Federal Cases Comprising Cases

Argued and Determined in the Circuit and District Courts of the United States (St. Paul, 1894), 994-1003; Smith v. Swormstedt, 16 U. S. 288 (1853).

¹⁸⁰ The second argument made by the African Methodist Church relied on MEC law, the determinations of the MEC General Conference in 1848, and the 1844 Chancery Court of New York decision Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches (1844), 1 Sandford's Chancery, pp. 439, which had rejected the property claims of pro-slavery congregations that had seceded from the national Evangelical Lutheran Church over the issue of slavery and the adoption of other heterodox articles of faith.

Chapter Four

Printed Religion, the Public Sphere, and the Disordering of the Union

At ten o'clock in the morning on Saturday April 14, 1855, fifteen or so of the leading citizens of the far western Missouri River town of Parkville rode to the office of the Parkville Industrial Luminary with the intention of shutting it down and punishing those who operated it. The Luminary was a Free Soil newspaper that had, since spring 1854, featured editorials supporting the efforts of abolitionists to establish the new Territory of Kansas as a Free State – and denouncing Missourians who opposed this. Situated in a fortress-like stone building at the very center of Parkville, Platte County, the newspaper had been established in July 1853 by George S. Park, leading lay member of the New School Presbyterian Church of Parkville and antislavery organizer of the town.

The sins of the Industrial Luminary were well known locally. After pro-slavery forces had won an early territorial election in Kansas by arranging for Missourians to cross the border and vote illegally, the paper stridently condemned the “Border Ruffians,” maintaining that “there is virtually no law in Kansas, and no security for life or property, save in the sense of honor and justice cherished by every true pioneer . . . the government is held up to ridicule and contempt, and its authority disregarded.”¹ For those in the Parkville mob, the anti-slavery activism of the paper was too much for their community to endure and required action.²

The liberal views on the question of slavery held by George Park, it seems, had their origins in the religious connections he had cultivated while emigrating steadily westward from Vermont and after founding Parkville. He had studied at Illinois College in Jacksonville, Illinois, a well-known anti-slavery institution. Edward Beecher, an ally of Elijah Lovejoy and the son of

Presbyterian divine and Benevolent Empire builder Lyman Beecher, had been president of the college while Park attended. After relocating to Missouri, Park became a schoolteacher and a member of the Presbyterian Church in Callaway County, situated along the Missouri River in the Boone's Lick. Anti-slavery Presbyterian minister David Nelson of Palmyra sometimes preached at that church and, it seems, had a substantial influence on him. While Park had narrowly escaped death during the Texas Revolution at the Goliad Massacre, he returned in 1844 to newly-organized Platte County, Missouri, to lay out a town that would take his name.³

The strenuous efforts of George Park to set up an anti-slavery Presbyterian society in his new town had created difficulties for him almost immediately. In 1845, he had helped organize the Parkville Presbyterian Church – a New School congregation that drew members whom Park had encouraged to immigrate from the Northeast. Park allowed the new society to meet in the warehouse he had built for his mercantile business. He also provided housing for the committed New School pastors he recruited, that is, the reverends C. D. Herbert and then, two years later, George S. Woodard, both of whom hailed from Maine. Park contributed funds, labor, and time, serving as church trustee, session clerk, and often as a delegate to presbytery meetings. He donated a large sum for the construction of a church building and parsonage in 1851. But, from the beginning, the New School Presbyterian society struggled in the face of a consistently hostile reception from the more numerous pro-slavery residents who also settled in the town and in Platte County. Through the late 1840s, pro-slavery partisans had placed increasing pressure on the Reverend Woodard, who had lived with Park and his family initially, to vacate his pastorate.⁴

The mob that assailed the Parkville Industrial Luminary largely comprised men belonging to the staunchly pro-slavery Platte County Self-Defensive Association. The association was perhaps the most locally infamous of the so-called “blue lodges,” well-organized

groups of militant white men organized by pro-slavery Missourians to ensure that Kansas would enter the Union as a slave polity. Organized in July 1854, the Platte County Self-Defensive was led by Benjamin Franklin Stringfellow, a former state attorney general who had represented the Boone's Lick County of Chariton in the Missouri General Assembly during the mid-1840s.⁵ Stringfellow was a vehement supporter of slavery and eager to crush the Free State settlers who had begun entering Kansas that same month. The Self-Defensive Association also drew the support of other "respectable" Border Ruffians, such as former United States Senator David Rice Atchison.⁶

But on the April 1855 morning the Self-Defensive Association decided to make its move against the Industrial Luminary, George Park was nowhere to be found. He had been forewarned, it seems, by one of his friends of the gathering vigilantes and had fled across the Missouri River into Kansas – leaving printer-editor William Patterson to take the heat. The mob, initially at least, deemed Patterson a satisfactory subject for the necessary communal discipline. They placed him under guard, while at least 200 other residents joined the pro-slavery throng, a daunting number given that the total population of Parkville at the time came only to about 300. One of the vigilantes, however, arose and reminded the assemblage that they were "all aware that they came there with the firm determination to black, tar and feather, and ride on a rail, G. S. Park and W. J. Patterson, but that as Park had escaped and left his scapegoat to suffer for both, he wished the meeting to decide what should now be done to the prisoner."⁷ Another speaker argued similarly that the mob should show mercy on the sole "defendant." Patterson's wife, who clung tightly to him through these deliberations, informed the vigilantes that her husband was a Canadian citizen and of the dire international repercussions if any harm should come to him. The leaders soon took a vote, and a small majority decided to spare the frightened printer, whom they

allowed to depart the scene with the understanding that he would leave Parkville swiftly and permanently.

But the vigilantes were not done. The next order of business was to deliberate over and finalize resolutions to be published in the newspapers to explain the motives and purposes of the proceedings. Among those adopted by a vote of the majority was “that we will suffer no person belonging to the Northern Methodist Church to preach in Platte County after this date.”⁸ Quite clearly, the Self-Defensive Association viewed anti-slavery MEC ministers to be more of a threat to slavery than the relatively small number of New School Presbyterian ministers in the vicinity.⁹ Next, the vigilantes invaded the Luminary office and soon returned with the offending machinery – the press – and placed on top of the defenseless mechanism a white cap emblazoned with the words “Boston Aid,” a reference to the New England-based societies that sought to make Kansas a Free State. According to later newspaper reports, the press “was marched up through town nearly to the upper landing, and there, with three hearty cheers, it was deposited into the tomb of ‘all the Capulets’ to wit: the Missouri River.”¹⁰ The vigilantes believed that Park had, at this point, reached the mouth of the Blue River in Kansas. But at least one account suggests that he was, in fact, watching the infliction of punishment while hidden in a row of brush just across the river. After yet another speech, the pro-slavery crowd dispersed much satisfied. And newspapers, in the following days, began communicating accounts of the mob action across Missouri, Kansas, and the rest of the United States.¹¹

The mobbing of the Luminary certainly demonstrates the fact that abolitionism in Missouri had strong appeal primarily to a small minority of anti-slavery evangelicals who formed congregations in its river towns that drew liberal-minded immigrants from the Northeast. And the actions of the Platte County Self-Defensive Association demonstrate rather well the way

common white men in Missouri easily brought into play customary modes of extralegal “regulation” to suppress dangerous print publications and other perceived threats to community well-being, slavery, and racial order.

Equally important, the ransacking of the Parkville Industrial Luminary highlights the anger and violence generated by pro- and anti-slavery evangelical print publications that grew increasingly strident as a consequence of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian schisms 1837-45. The assault revealed the growing power of the printed word and middle-class print culture in Missouri to advance conflicting positions on the moral question of slavery. Rather than publish his anti-slavery religious views in one of several available denominational newspapers, George Park employed his own ostensibly secular newspaper, a not uncommon practice among evangelicals strenuously at odds over the morality of slavery. In this way, both laymen and ministers, who also edited denominational newspapers, entered fully the “public sphere” of political discussion. While virtually everyone involved in this strife was sincere in their faith, by the same token, such religiously-energized activists paid little heed to the supposed separation of religion and politics congregants in Missouri had typically preferred since the territorial period.

The Parkville imbroglio also demonstrates that evangelical print warfare over the question of slavery hardly lived up to idealizations about the “free marketplace of ideas” that had gained currency in enlightened eastern precincts in the previous decade and half. In denominational and secular papers, the denunciations made by pro- and anti-slavery evangelical leaders against one another, intermixed with the larger cacophony of voices for and against slavery, contributed powerfully to the increasingly violent contest between ordinary white Missourians divided on the question. That both the Self-Defensive Association and abolitionist newspaper editors sought to shape national perceptions of the brewing conflict in Kansas by

controlling the content of newspaper coverage thereof reveals that all concerned were much more committed to advancing their respective socioeconomic, moral, and political agendas than bringing facts into the public sphere for even-handed deliberation.

Thesis

The evangelical schisms in Missouri spurred a radical escalation of theological and political disputation between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in religious newspapers and other printed publications. This verbal sparring played a heretofore unexamined central role in spawning a vicious guerilla conflict between northern and southern evangelicals and partisans on the border with Kansas after 1854. To the extent that sectarian strife over the morality of African American bondage spurred armed strife in Missouri from spring 1854 through 1860, it helped to generate the larger sectional tensions that led to secession and the Civil War.

Evangelical missionaries in the first several decades of American settlement in Missouri relied almost exclusively on the spoken Word to spread the Gospel. More effective than the publicly-funded elementary schools in improving literacy were the Sunday schools set up by Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches, whose teachers relied heavily on multi-denominational societies for texts. These efforts were crucial in spreading the heartfelt beliefs that many evangelicals held at the center of their faith. Divided by contention over slavery almost from the beginning, however, northern and southern evangelical newspapers in Missouri produced imagined communities of like-minded readers. Northern and southern evangelicals played a substantial role in producing a more literate population in Missouri. The rise of a thriving evangelical print culture in antebellum Missouri did not, however, displace the spoken word as a vital mode of religious communication.

A rapidly developing body of intertwined theological, social, and political thought regarding African American bondage informed the sectarian print wars that arose over the morality of slavery among evangelical leaders in Missouri. But the evangelical schisms virtually ensured that the tracts, treatises, and newspaper produced by their respective publishing industries would feature a rapid bi-lateral escalation of religious and political disputation over the moral question of slavery. Abolitionist publications spawned growing fears among most white Missouri residents that anti-slavery presses emboldened bonded African Americans to challenge it.

Heightening evangelical newspaper, tract, and book warfare over slavery after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act substantially increased the viciousness of the Border War that broke out between abolitionist settlers in Kansas and pro-slavery Missourians. But pro-slavery leaders in Missouri focused first on the threat that abolitionist literature posed to the security of slaveholders in the state. The dangers that Missouri pro-slavery leaders perceived in anti-slavery newspapers and tracts powerfully spurred their virulent suppression of such publications. Pro-slavery partisans waged a ruthless campaign against abolitionist presses in Kansas in an effort to shape local and national perceptions of the brewing Border War. High-profile religious and political publications divided congregations, and pro-slavery zealots from Missouri harassed, assaulted, and occasionally murdered leading northern Methodist ministers.

Pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in Missouri aggressively exploited the emerging public sphere of print communications in ways that contributed fundamentally to the mob violence over slavery that plagued the state after about 1835. Evangelical print culture did not work to promote rational deliberation of pressing political problems in an orderly public sphere as libertarian proponents of a free market place of preferred.

Literature Review

History scholarship on the Second Great Awakening has for many decades emphasized that camp meetings, revivals, and enthusiastic preaching largely account for the spread of evangelicalism in the first three decades of the nineteenth century.¹² But historian David Paul Nord argues that the phenomenal expansion of religious fervor in that period was also a consequence of the often-ignored antebellum evangelical printing industry.¹³ Historians Jonathan Daniel Wells and Paul C. Gutjahr maintain that the rise of middle-class print culture and the public sphere were critical to the formation of evangelical communities in the antebellum North and South.¹⁴ Historian Daniel Walker Howe and others emphasize that the publishing industry provided a distinctive opportunity for middle-class evangelical women to shape understandings of women's world and that evangelical women and men, notwithstanding qualms about the effects of worldly novels on the moral fiber of church-goers, produced poetry, fiction, and biography in the service of middle-class moral sensibility.¹⁵

As indicated, arguments positing the existence of a vibrant evangelical print industry in the antebellum United States implicate an extensive body of history scholarship dealing with the rise of the public sphere.¹⁶ Jürgen Habermas famously described this largely middle-class development, which began in the eighteenth century, as an inviting discursive space, situated between civil society and the state, for open and rational debate on politics and other important public issues.¹⁷ Benedict Anderson argues that nineteenth-century print culture produced nations and nationalism across the globe through “imagined communities.”¹⁸ Historian Jeffrey L. Pasley explains how partisan newspapers generated like-minded communities of political activists and energized party politics in the early republic. This is a phenomenon he associates with the rise of “deliberative democracy” and the “free market place of ideas.” Legal and constitutional scholars

have given a great deal of attention to this supposedly unencumbered emporium of ideas almost since anti-slavery editor and New York Senator William Seward and Massachusetts Senator Daniel Webster advocated the concept beginning in the 1840s.¹⁹

A number of scholars in recent years, however, have challenged work lauding the public sphere as a bulwark of political free speech and democracy in the nineteenth-century United States. Media historian John Nerone, for example, argues that the most venerable conceptions of the public sphere discount facts on the ground showing that political discourse and newspaper editorializing before the Civil War were often anything but orderly and rational.²⁰ Legal historian Mark M. Carroll demonstrates that extraordinarily libertarian popular understandings of free speech and freedom of the press in the antebellum trans-Mississippi Southwest generated political slander and newspaper libel that often spurred partisan violence, which the courts typically discounted as an unavoidable consequence of democratic deliberation.²¹ Historians of antebellum America have long well celebrated the evangelical newspaper editors who stepped out of the pulpit and into the public sphere to express moral outrage over slavery.²² Historians Paul C. Gutjahr and Candy Gunther Brown, however, maintain that pro-slavery evangelicals also weighed in on the question in denominational newspapers. Harshly-antagonistic views on the question of slavery in the contending church sheets powerfully exacerbated sectarian and sectional divisions.²³ Quite similarly, literary historian Trish Loughran argues that the increasingly pervasive and lucrative book market of the antebellum era exacerbated differing regional attitudes toward slavery, conflict that generated the sectional crisis and the Civil War.²⁴

Other historians have conceptualized newspaper-related violence in the antebellum United States as a mode of informal regulation of the public sphere. According to legal historian Richard B. Kielbowicz, anti-press mobs, including the one that sacked the Industrial Luminary,

typically drew on the strength of local majorities and preceded their actions with orderly meetings and the adoption of resolutions that authorized the employment of summary extra-judicial abatement powers under the common law of nuisance. Public meetings proceeded this way, usually, if a majority of white men in a venue deemed a publication threatening to their community.²⁵ John Nerone, too, concludes that anti-press mob violence, not just prosecutors and courts, regulated the press in antebellum America. In this conception, “the people,” heavily influenced by the ideals of Jacksonian democracy, acted as sovereigns.²⁶

From the Spoken Word to a Literate Faithful

Evangelical missionaries who entered Missouri after 1795, for the first several decades of the American invasion at least, relied almost exclusively on the spoken Word to win converts and gather new congregations.²⁷ Historian Frances Lea McCurdy contends that pioneer preachers in Missouri relied far more on their ability to preach extemporaneously than pre-prepared, written sermons.²⁸ A good case in point is Lewis Williams, the first moderator of the Missouri (later St. Louis) Baptist Association. Immigrating to Upper Louisiana with his family from North Carolina in 1797, Williams was known as an expert rifleman, expertise he sorely needed in a frontier area that is now western St. Louis County. After attending a camp meeting in 1809 or 1810, which was his first exposure to evangelical preaching of any kind, he joined the Baptist Church and was ordained a minister in 1811. As was typical of frontier preachers, Williams had grown up in a poor farming family with little formal schooling. He could barely read and was unable to write. Often he relied on his more literate wife to help him find passages in the Bible. But Williams delivered powerful sermons that drew, spontaneously, on his own conversion experience. His oral presentations were, in the opinion of Baptist chronicler Robert S. Duncan, “almost always accompanied with a recital of the way the Lord had led him from darkness to

light.”²⁹ The hardscrabble preacher was extraordinarily effective with his impromptu style of witnessing the power of divine grace. His lively sermons and stories of personal conversion often moved hardened pioneer audiences to tears and brought many women and men into the Baptist fold.³⁰

Impromptu sermons rendered in the vernacular and other oral modes of spreading the Gospel were well suited to a frontier polity that only slowly improved general literacy rates with public elementary school education. The earliest school code in Missouri, written by influential jurists Henry Geyer and Louis Pettibone in 1825, was adopted to use funds raised from the school lands that the national government had conveyed to the state. Persistent local resistance to centralized control over education decisions, however, severely undercut the implementation of the law.³¹ The General Assembly subsequently attempted to improve tax-based funding of elementary schools – but always in opposition to voters who insisted on maintaining local control over staffing and curriculum.³² From 1840 to 1850, the number of public elementary school students in Missouri increased from 18,714 to 95,245, with the total population increasing from 682,044 to 1,182,012 in the same period.³³ In essence, publicly-funded elementary education before the Civil War remained in its infancy. Most voters deemed the education of children to be a private matter and, by the same token, resented legislative efforts to impose taxation to support these institutions. Secondary education, as discussed in a previous chapter, was almost exclusively connected to private schools, known as academies, many of which were affiliated with a Christian denomination.³⁴

More effective than the publicly-funded elementary schools in raising literacy rates in Missouri were the Sunday schools set up by Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches. Certainly the “republican mother” ideal that prevailed in the early national period, which held

women responsible for the basic education of their, gained strength through the Second Great Awakening and prompted many frontier women in Missouri to instruct their children at home.³⁵ Early settler of Greene County Jesse M. Kelly recalled that his mother taught him and all four of his siblings to read – a common occurrence in pioneer households. He also recounted the unreliability of subscription schools in the relatively unsettled southwest part of the state during the 1830s and 1840s. A subscription school, commonly referred to in rural precincts as a “field school,” was typically operated by a well-educated young man from the middle class, often an itinerant, who gathered from parents written promises to pay for instruction at the beginning of a school term announced in a local newspaper. According to Kelly, such schools were, generally speaking, poorly run with a different teacher each of the infrequent times that it was in session.³⁶ In this context, Sunday schools organized by evangelical churches became a widely popular alternative for both ordinary and well-to-do residents.³⁷ In fact, Missouri evangelicals established Sunday schools more successfully than any other kind of institution. Organizers typically erected a small classroom building near their house of worship. Not only did these schools inculcate literacy and basic knowledge on other subjects, they provided instruction to young children in articles of faith specific to the denomination preferred by their parents.³⁸ Following the older British model, which reached out to the children of the impoverished working classes, the Baptist Church operated a Sunday school at its Benton Street Mission in a poor area of St. Louis. The school had hundreds of students by the end of the antebellum period.³⁹ But, beginning in the 1830s, Sunday schools grew rapidly across Missouri in both town and country.

Countless evangelical societies in Missouri established Sunday schools. The rural Baptist Shoal Creek Association in southwestern Missouri, for example, viewed Sunday schools as critical to the formation and perpetuation of the Baptist faith.⁴⁰ The Baptists in the Blue River

Association in western Missouri passed a resolution in 1844, holding “that we recommend to each of our churches to organize Sabbath Schools at some convenient place within their bounds.”⁴¹ The First Baptist Church of Hannibal reported a prosperous Sunday school in 1858, evidently one of many in Marion County.⁴² The Methodist New Madrid Quarterly Conference in southeastern Missouri maintained a thriving Sunday school in the 1840s and 1850s.⁴³ The Rock Hill Presbyterian Church in St. Louis County began a Sunday school immediately after the New School congregation was founded in 1845.⁴⁴ While the 1850 census recorded Sunday school libraries, unfortunately, only five counties were represented, far less than the number of counties that had a library by 1850. But of the sixty-six libraries listed, the average number of books in each library was slightly over 200.⁴⁵

The American Sunday School Union (American Sunday School Union), which steadily sent missionaries to Missouri after its founding in 1824, opened Sunday Schools across the state. The Philadelphia-based American Sunday School Union was a prime source for evangelical tracts and books. The goal of the society, and that of many local Sunday schools, was to entice children to come to the school in order to gain access to the free library. Along with the American Tract Society and American Bible Society, the American Sunday School Union was formed by a number of evangelicals who believed their religious commonalities outweighed their doctrinal differences. At the beginning of the Second Great Awakening, the spirit of ecumenism and its missionary outgrowth had reached its zenith.⁴⁶ Along with the American Tract Society and the American Bible Society, the American Sunday School Union produced sixteen percent of the total printed materials in the United States in 1855 according to Paul Gutjahr.⁴⁷

Many Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian Sunday schools in Missouri used printed materials produced by the American Sunday School Union, although they were never officially

affiliated with the organization. The Methodists, moreover, eventually began their own Sunday school association in 1827. Many evangelicals objected to some of the American Sunday School Union's literature because it was too Calvinist in their view.⁴⁸ The work of the American Sunday School Union in Missouri began slowly, although it sought to expand its operations into the trans-Mississippi West during the late 1820s and early 1830s.⁴⁹ John Mason Peck often assisted it in its endeavors as he traveled through Missouri and Illinois. He noted that a Baptist Sunday school was formed in Howard County in the spring of 1819 that eventually affiliated with the national society.⁵⁰ The Union officially organized in Missouri and Illinois out of St. Louis in March of 1825. Between the two states there were fifty-six schools and 1,567 students who attended them. The man who led the organization, St. Louis lawyer John Shackford, eventually became an agent and vice-president of the national union.⁵¹ The early growth, however, was slow during the 1820s and 1830s, and the 1847 report of the society does not indicate much better success at that time.⁵² But the fortunes of the American Sunday School Union had improved by 1857, notwithstanding its inability to fund a large number of missionaries. The St. Louis District of the American Sunday School Union, which included the states of Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, Arkansas, and the Territory of Kansas, organized 5,628 schools with 276,735 students from 1846 to 1856. Its agents, moreover, distributed 1,061,753 volumes in this period. The same agency organized 604 schools with 27,436 students in 1856 alone. While 273 of those schools were founded outside of Missouri, a significant number among the rest were established within the state.⁵³

One of the major impediments to the founding of a Sunday school for rural village and small town congregations was their limited capacity to purchase or erect suitable buildings. In these precincts, acquiring adequate teaching facilities and storage space for libraries constituted

daunting challenges. Many congregations in unsettled areas, consequently, did not establish full-fledged Sunday schools for years. Such shortcomings certainly were not the result of apathy on the part of congregational leaders. The Shoal Creek Association in southwest Missouri explained that Sunday school “work lay heavily on the hearts of some of our pioneer preachers and leaders.”⁵⁴ Pleasant Grove Baptist Church in Platte County was organized in 1844 but it did not vote to erect a Sunday school and library until June 1851.⁵⁵ Mount Pleasant United Baptist Church in Hartsburg (Boone County) was formed in 1858. But because the congregation was constantly in financial trouble, it did not establish a Sunday school until 1901.⁵⁶ Other congregations lacked the property to acquire books for a library, such as the Bethel German Methodist Church of First Prairie. It was located in rural Clay County, in the western part of the state, and met in the homes of congregants. Affiliated with the northern church, Bethel German Methodist Church did not construct its first building until 1877, after it had changed its name to the Arley Methodist Church.⁵⁷

Urban congregations, not surprisingly, typically had resources to establish Sunday schools sooner and of far superior quality than their rural village and small town counterparts. The Centenary Methodist Church in St. Louis, for instance, had a functioning Sunday school even before its members dedicated their permanent building in 1844. The library of Centenary loaned out 2,406 volumes to students in 1850.⁵⁸ From the figures presented in the census, it is almost certain each of the Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian churches in Hannibal sponsored libraries by 1850.⁵⁹ A young Samuel Clemens attended the school at the First Presbyterian Church in Hannibal.⁶⁰ Certainly aware of these developments, the American Sunday School Union sought to encourage wealthier readers to donate to less fortunate congregations in the West. In The Second Book of 100 Pictures, an 1862 reprint of a book first published by the

American Sunday School Union the year prior, the children of the fictional Mapletown rejoice when the Sunday school library arrives as a gift from an eastern congregation.⁶¹

Religious societies also established full-fledged elementary schools, thereby advancing both literacy and, along denominational lines, evangelical faith among the youth of each new generation in keeping with the preferences of parents. Privately-owned and operated elementary schools, including non-sectarian “subscription schools,” were far more common than those funded by the state to the end of the antebellum period. But a substantial number of these institutions were parochial schools set up by Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian congregations.⁶² Getting the most credit for pioneering work of this kind in fledgling St. Louis was early Methodist missionary Jesse Walker.⁶³

It appears as though, from an early date, evangelical leaders in Missouri viewed their parochial schools as something of a bulwark against the supposed wicked influence of Roman Catholicism. To the consternation of many Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians who arrived in early Missouri, there were a substantial number of Catholic schools in the settlements, villages, and towns along the Mississippi River with large Catholic populations. In southeastern Missouri, where there was a strong Catholic presence, the Cape Girardeau Baptist Association constantly sought to establish its own schools. According to one its leading ministers “our children have been exposed long enough to the error taught in Catholic and other schools.”⁶⁴

Anti-Catholic sentiment also appears to have shaped the development of publicly-funded education in the state. Some Missourians viewed the first public secondary school to be established in St. Louis, in 1853, as a perfectly apt institution for fortifying society against the presumed nefarious designs of the Roman Catholic Church. In one speech delivered at the dedication of the first public high school in St. Louis in 1856, Old School Presbyterian Charles

D. Drake declared that the “Public School [was] the most fatal foe of despotism, and, next to Religion of the Bible, the best friend of natural liberty.”⁶⁵ Demonstrating his fervent anti-Catholicism with that utterance, among others, Drake wrote in his unpublished autobiography that “these passages as you will have observed, were intended as a defiance of Jesuit hostility of the Public School system in this country, which had exhibited itself strikingly in St. Louis.”⁶⁶

Basic textbooks employed in Missouri schools instructed students thoroughly in the rudiments of Protestant faith. In elementary schools, public, private, and parochial, except those affiliated with the Catholic Church, readings from the King James Bible and discussion of such selections were routinely provided in the classroom as a matter of course. Teachers in public schools, however, generally presented such lessons in conformity with “nonsectarian” standards, which required that teachers avoid contentious doctrinal differences among Protestant denominations. While hewing to these guidelines, standard textbooks, nonetheless, advanced a number of moral precepts of particular importance to Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians.⁶⁷ Through at least the middle of the nineteenth century, McGuffey Readers were, by far, the most commonly employed text books in the frontier South-West, including Missouri. The Primer and the first four readers were authored primarily by William Holmes McGuffey, a Presbyterian minister who taught at a number of colleges in Ohio and at the University of Virginia. One of McGuffey’s patrons was Cincinnati physician Daniel Drake, the father of Charles D. Drake, who would be the leader of the Radicals during the Civil War and Reconstruction. His younger brother Alexander wrote the majority of the fifth and sixth readers. McGuffey embraced the goal of many Americans to advance the moral and religious character of those inhabiting the growing western states. He arrayed these ideals in the schoolbooks he authored from 1836-37.⁶⁸

McGuffey readers included what education experts at the time deemed “nonsectarian” religious ideas, that is, basic Protestant principles designed to appeal to a variety of denominations. For example, in a version of the Second Reader, the lesson entitled “The Cool Shade” explained that “all that live get life from God.”⁶⁹ Another story, “The Little Dog,” inculcated a moral lesson that reflected the increasingly delicate sensibilities of middle-class evangelicals informed by Enlightenment-era rationalism and related ideas that human personality could be liberated from culturally-ingrained forms of cruelty dating back centuries, if not thousands of years. According to the little boy featured in that tale, “I will never beat my dog, And never give him pain”⁷⁰ The Fifth Reader, first published in 1844, contained a number of more pointedly evangelical understandings about the social efficacy of Protestant faith. One was entitled “Religion, The Only Basis of Society.” It pointed out that “religion is a social concern; for it operates powerfully on society.”⁷¹

Amid an increasingly literate population, evangelical leaders also sought to increase their numbers in Missouri with publications suitable for adults. Beginning in the 1830s, Missouri’s river towns grew rapidly amid the rise of newspapers, lending libraries, and a vibrant book trade. Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ministers and lay leaders in each church relied heavily on the efforts of the American Bible Society to provide copies of their sacred book and advance their denominations in both town and country. The American Bible Society was formed in 1816 and headquartered in New York City. The American Bible Society distributed the Bible as well as printed study aids to help people interpret it. The society relied on local auxiliaries across Missouri to advance its goals. While all evangelical publishers gave donations, it was a charitable organization and could not sell its books to the extent of other organizations, which ensured reliance on auxiliaries.⁷² Certainly some evangelicals objected to particular versions of

the Bible that did not meet muster within their particular denomination. Many Missouri Baptists, such as the Franklin Association south of St. Louis, strenuously objected to the translation of the Greek verb baptizo in one edition and then opted to patronize the American and Foreign Bible Society. But other Baptists, such as minister John Mason Peck, relied on the American Bible Society.⁷³ By 1840, there were thirteen auxiliaries of the American Bible Society operating in Missouri.⁷⁴ While the number of auxiliaries had dipped to eleven in 1844, William Holmes, a Methodist minister who sided with the South after the schism, was an agent of the society whose work at organizing auxiliaries was successful during the 1840s. There were fifty-one societies in Missouri according to the 1850 census.⁷⁵ In 1862 the organization had 127 auxiliaries spread throughout the state.⁷⁶

The northern and southern Methodists particularly encouraged their Missouri members to support the American Bible Society. The MEC General Conference minutes in 1828 recommended that subordinate conferences collect funds for the society. Afterwards, the Annual Conference minutes from Missouri listed the funds collected for it. In the last year the conference was unified, that is, 1845, its records showed that minister Richard Bond served as an active agent for the American Bible Society. While the northern Methodists in Missouri continued the collections through the antebellum period, the money that the Annual Conference was able to provide the society tended to be scant because of the small size of the body. The southern Methodists, on the other hand, were able to collect a respectable amount of money for the bible society even after the turmoil of the schism. While the totals for the years immediately following the schism were somewhat modest, the southern Methodists raised \$780.75 for the society in 1853. They also retained Richard Bond as the agent for the American Bible Society. In 1852 a

second agent, William Patton, was added for western Missouri, though Patton was the sole agent listed the following two years because Bond died in 1853.⁷⁷

The multi-denominational American Tract Society, formed in 1825 from a merger of a number of smaller tract societies, steadily expanded its operations Missouri through much of the antebellum period. It was eventually headquartered in New York City. According to its leadership, the society sought to “to publish the fullness of the gospel of Christ.”⁷⁸ Its operatives began work in Missouri in the early years of statehood. Salmon Giddings, who worked to build the Presbyterian Church in the state, was an agent of the society and operated a depository in St. Louis by 1822.⁷⁹ A colportage agency that could send out missionaries throughout the state was not established until 1847, when Massachusetts minister Charles Peabody arrived in St. Louis. Two years earlier there were still thirteen agents who labored in Missouri.⁸⁰ The agency was fairly successful in the first several years of its existence, expanding its operations during this period.⁸¹ Among their numbers in Missouri, the colporteurs gave away 1,967,370 pages of materials to destitute families. They freely distributed another 202,260 pages to various institutions and individuals in the state as well. The society had a book depository in St. Louis that sold \$2,462.24 worth of literature.⁸²

Evangelicals in Missouri especially relied on the American Tract Society for their missionary efforts. One colporteur, Barnabas Baker, was a Baptist who immigrated to Missouri from England in 1843 and served the society after 1850 from his home in Columbia. He continued his work even after he was ordained a Baptist minister in 1857.⁸³ In 1842 and 1843 John Mason Peck, an ardent supporter of the national benevolent societies, was in New York and attended the national meeting of the society.⁸⁴ Many Presbyterians were active in the American Tract Society such as Salmon Giddings. Elijah Lovejoy also circulated the society’s

publications.⁸⁵ William S. Potts, one of the leading ministers in the state, was a significant donor to the society and a “director for life.” He also addressed the American Sunday School Union in 1830 as they sought to enquire about the status of evangelical religion in the West.⁸⁶

The sheer size of the trans-Mississippi Southwest placed substantial impediments on the efforts of evangelical publishing houses to saturate potential markets in Missouri. The Methodists and Presbyterians often dumped funds into the state to bolster the efforts of the evangelical publishing houses. The Baptist General Tract Society had only begun to establish a foothold in Missouri when the national Baptist schism occurred in the mid-1840s. A missionary colporteur, D. R. Murphy, resided in Missouri from 1852 to 1855, but the society’s work in the state was not very extensive before the Civil War.⁸⁷ The geographical expansiveness of the evangelical customer base was a problem which plagued the American Tract Society, the American Bible Society and the American Sunday School Union throughout the antebellum period in their work in the South. The organizations were never able to saturate the section with the amount of materials they hoped for when they began their work outside their eastern centers.⁸⁸ The American Sunday School Union bemoaned the vastness of the western frontier in its 1832 report on the Mississippi Valley, a problem which Charles Peabody often mentioned in his reports.⁸⁹ The American Bible Society also experienced difficulties stemming from the breadth and primitive modes of transportation in Missouri and the scant number of supporters they initially had in the state. In summarizing Richard Bond’s report in the 1851 national meeting minutes, the bible society concluded that Missouri “requires much attention, especially in the way of distribution, and is by far too large a field for one man.”⁹⁰

The middle-class evangelical women who circulated Bibles and tracts in the growing towns of Missouri after the War of 1812 substantially augmented the efforts of colporteurs who

dealt more directly with wilderness conditions, while disseminating religious knowledge that was well suited for maintaining traditional social arrangements. Many of the tracts and pamphlets distributed by the New England Tract Society (1814) and then the American Tract Society (1825) had, in fact, been published originally by the Religious Tract Society of London, begun in 1799. These works reflected the rather fearful reaction of British church leaders to the rising socioeconomic disorganization attendant on industrialization, leveling democratic sentiment, infidelity, atheism, and socialism. Tracts denouncing Sabbath-breaking, gambling, and drunkenness reached out to the un-churched and back-slidden of all classes, while scrupulously omitting to deal with the topic of human bondage. But the minority of publications intended for particular groups almost always addressed children, domestic servants, and laborers, including those with African ancestry. The central messages conveyed to readers were to embrace fully a sincere Christian faith, dutifully carry out assigned roles, avoid vice, and place spiritual matters far ahead of temporal ones. The multi-denominational publishing houses marketed works that articulated standards of piety that encouraged ordinary women to meet the requirements of their station or inspired elite women to make exertions as exemplars and mentors in ways that would redound to the benefit of those in particularly imperiled groups.⁹¹ The American Tract Society's Lady Huntington and her Friends, authored by Helen C. Knight, for example, extolled Selina Countess of Huntington (1707-1791), who converted to Methodism and labored fervently for the salvation of both rich and poor.⁹² The American Sunday School Union's A Visit to the Isle of Wight featured an adult-female narrator who provided lessons in Christian wisdom to her young companion, Charlotte Mackenzie.⁹³

Popular pamphlets and broadsides aimed at inculcating notably pristine standards of devout womanhood generally suited the preferences of most white men in the divergent rural and

urban settings that co-existed in antebellum Missouri. Consider The Dairyman's Daughter by eminent Anglican cleric Legh Richmond (1772–1827), the most popular religious tract distributed by the American Tract Society in the United States through the antebellum period. This fifty-two page pamphlet narrated the religious experience of Elizabeth Wallbridge, who lived and died in the Parish of Arreton, Isle of Wight, England. Put to service while a young child by poor but worthy parents, Wallbridge had come of age as a particularly willful, proud, selfish and irreligious individual. Her life was, however, transformed by a sermon and she became very devout at about the age of twenty-six. With exceptional strength of mind and an unusually good memory, she devoted time and energy to the study of the Bible in which she became remarkably adept. At age twenty-nine she became deathly ill. But always winsome and cheerful, she met her grave challenges with rare heroism, humility, altruism, and unfaltering faith before expiring in 1801 at the age of thirty one.⁹⁴ Such qualities certainly could serve as a model for the elderly or the young, a common laborer or member of the elite, male or female, or for persons black or white. But they also comported quite well with idealizations of pure, ethereal femininity pleasing to Missouri heads of households in both town and country.⁹⁵

More than school textbooks, tracts and pamphlets, the evangelical newspapers that began to circulate in antebellum Missouri in the early 1830s produced imagined communities of like-minded readers. After the development of substantial river towns and the metropolis of St. Louis, religious newspapers constituted a vital component of the larger evangelical print culture that developed in antebellum Missouri. Evangelical newspapers in the state were, to some extent, typical of the denominational weeklies and bi-weeklies that proliferated in the United States after about 1830. Their publishers believed that Americans were obsessive newspaper readers and took advantage of this wide spread preference.⁹⁶ Beginning in the early 1830s, Methodist, and

Presbyterian churches used their limited resources to establish weekly newspapers in the economic and cultural capital of St. Louis. But leaders in all three denominations sought to circulate local religious weeklies across the state that that would carry national and local news of interest to particular denominations as well as essays and articles that would provide spiritual guidance to church-goers. Readers in the more rural parts of Missouri, however, commonly relied almost exclusively on the periodical produced by the church with which they were affiliated to keep informed of state and national developments.⁹⁷

The early development of St. Louis-based Presbyterian newspapers reflected the diverging religious views of New School and Old School adherents. Established in November 1833, Elijah Lovejoy's St. Louis Observer was the first denominational organ for the Presbyterian Church in Missouri. Begun four years before the national Presbyterian schism, its pages commonly featured didactic articles that encouraged Calvinist piety similarly to evangelical tracts and pamphlets produced by the American Tract Society. The Observer also regularly offered commentary on political topics.⁹⁸ After pro-slavery ruffians murdered Lovejoy in November 1837, the Observer essentially expired over the following year and a half. But, on the heels of the Missouri Presbyterian schism in 1841, former President of Marion College and founder of the St. Louis Second Presbyterian Church William S. Potts used his influence to start up the St. Louis Presbyterian in July 1843. Almost until he died in March 1852, the Reverend Potts hewed ever closer to Old School Presbyterian articles of faith.⁹⁹ He also published, as tracts, a number of sermons outlining the growing commitment of the Old School General Assembly to rigorous, scriptural theology. In 1842, Potts co-authored with the Reverend William P. Cochran, a member of the Presbytery of Palmyra, a treatise that included a careful refutation of deviant New School theological tenets.¹⁰⁰

The Presbyterian newspapers established in antebellum Missouri undoubtedly produced an imagined community of like-minded readers. But this particular readership appears to have appreciated disparaging commentary about Roman Catholics. The Reverend Lovejoy frequently included copy in the Observer that reflected all too plainly the anti-Catholic sentiment that was particularly strong among Presbyterians in the state. In an 1835 edition, for example, he featured a conversation between an ordinary Protestant man and Roman Catholic woman. Upon being questioned about her faith and the fact that Catholic mass was conducted in Latin, according to the account, the woman was said to have replied, “it is very ridiculous that we do, but we cannot help it.”¹⁰¹ William S. Potts warned readers of the supposed Catholic threat to all rational-minded Protestants, an agenda that, perhaps, reach its zenith in 1846, when he published, with the approval of the Old School St. Louis Presbytery, Dangers of Jesuit Instruction.¹⁰² The Reverend Nathan Lewis Rice, who edited the St. Louis Presbyterian from 1854 to 1857, carried forward the publishing assault on Roman Catholics. In 1853, for instance, he published Romanism, The Enemy of Education, of Free Institutions, and of Christianity.¹⁰³

That most Baptists in Missouri were cash-strapped frontier farmers made it difficult to secure the funds required to support a newspaper in the state. Beginning in the early 1840s, however, the Missouri Baptist General Association, nonetheless, sought to establish a Baptist periodical. In September of 1842, it established the monthly Missouri Baptist in St. Louis. The paper, however, immediately had difficulty getting subscribers to pay, a common problem for all newspapers in the state, and soon looked to the Illinois Baptist Convention for help. The Illinois Baptists were willing to agree to the joint venture and the Missouri and Illinois Baptist, housed at St. Louis, was published twice a month beginning in 1843. But the sheet was discontinued the next year because of inadequate funding.

In 1848, the Missouri Baptist General Association established a newspaper in St. Louis. Undeterred at the failure of the Missouri Baptist, the General Association set up the Western Watchman in June 1848. After its offices burned to the ground later that year, the Watchman resumed publication in 1849 with influential minister John Mason Peck serving as editor pro tem. It soon achieved circulation not only in Missouri but in Illinois, Iowa and Kentucky.¹⁰⁴ Peck, although an opponent of slavery, was prudent enough not to agitate his readers on the subject during his brief tenure as editor, which ended in 1851.¹⁰⁵ There were over 1700 subscribers when William Crowell took over as the editor in May 1851 – leading the sheet on a more decidedly anti-slavery path and the paper continued its operations at least through 1857.¹⁰⁶

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, established the St. Louis Christian Advocate in 1850. The first full-time editor of the paper, beginning in December 1851, was David Rice McAnally. Born in Granger County, Tennessee, in 1810, McAnally was ordained by the MEC in 1831 and graduated several years later from Methodist-affiliated Emory and Henry College in Virginia. In 1841, he was appointed principal of the Knoxville Methodist Female Academy and helped transform the school into East Tennessee Female Institute in 1847, at which time it severed ties with the MEC and affiliated with the MECS. As editor of the St. Louis Christian Advocate, McAnally also managed the new St. Louis MECS Book Depository.¹⁰⁷ From its beginning the Advocate featured local and national news concerning the MEC, MECS, and the divisive issue of slavery, as well as inspirational stories and articles encouraging piety in keeping with basic Methodist articles of faith.¹⁰⁸ In a few short years, McAnally had increased his readership to over 3,000 subscribers throughout Missouri and even into Kansas.¹⁰⁹

The northern Methodist Church began publishing the St. Louis Central Christian Advocate in January 1853. Its organizers sought to bring northern Methodist perspectives to all

of Missouri and Illinois, with an eye toward increasing MEC membership in these states as well as in the Upper South Border States and Kansas.¹¹⁰ Financial difficulties put the Advocate out of business briefly in late 1855.¹¹¹ But national MEC infusions of cash during the Kansas Crisis firmly reestablished the paper in 1856. Appointed to the editorship of the paper at about that time was Cincinnati-born Joseph Brooks (1821–1877), who had been graduated from Indiana Asbury University and ordained by the MEC in 1840. Brooks rode circuit in Indiana and Iowa for years and had served successfully as financial agent of Methodist Northwestern University in Evanston.¹¹² As editor of the St. Louis Presbyterian, Brooks featured articles and devotional materials as well as regular commentary on political topics of interest to northern Methodists.¹¹³ Appointed editor of the Advocate in 1860 was native of Ireland Charles Elliott (1792-1869). Licensed to preach in that country in 1813, Elliott had immigrated to the United States the following year and been admitted to the Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1818. He rode circuit in Ohio, Iowa, and Pennsylvania and, in 1842, became a co-founder of Ohio Wesleyan. After having been a professor of ecclesiastical history and biblical literature at Iowa Wesleyan, he was appointed president of the school in 1858. Elliott was well experienced in religious periodical publishing before taking over the Central Christian Advocate. He had edited the Pittsburgh Conference Journal in 1833 and 1834 and the Western Christian Advocate from 1836 to 1848 and from 1852 to 1856, earning in those years a widespread reputation for his vigorous handling of controversial religious topics.¹¹⁴

Given the substantial commitment of missionaries and evangelicals to printed religion, it seems fair to credit the churches with having played a substantial role in raising the literacy rate in Missouri. Notwithstanding persistent frontier primitivism to the end of the antebellum period in Missouri, literacy rates climbed steadily. The 1840 United States Census collected literacy

data, albeit only on whites above the age of twenty. In Missouri, there were 189,919 free white men and women over the age of twenty in 1840, and only 10.2 percent or 19,457 were illiterate. Ten years later the number of illiterate white adults increased to 36,281 out of a total of 257,068 men and women – 14.11 percent. The 1850 census included literacy rates for non-white Missourians as well. About thirty-one percent of the men and women in this category could not read, or 497 out of 1602 total people.¹¹⁵

Oral and Print Cultures of Faith in Symbiosis

The rise of a thriving evangelical print culture in antebellum Missouri did not displace the spoken word as a vital mode of religious communication. While new river towns and county seats flourished, beginning in the 1820s, most people in the state continued to reside in relatively isolated frontier villages. In this context, oral and print evangelical cultures developed symbiotically to the end of the antebellum period, and in ways that reflected the preferences and needs of rural and town-dwelling church-goers.

Evangelical tracts and pamphlets commonly met with stiff resistance in rural village precincts. Historian Frances Lea McCurdy maintains that illiterate pioneer Missourians distrusted the print publications distributed by benevolent-minded missionaries.¹¹⁶ Rural villagers remained that segment of the population least skilled with reading and writing. The 1832 annual report of the American Sunday School Union concluded rather hopelessly, in this regard, that “the ignorant are satisfied with their ignorance.”¹¹⁷ D. M. Johnston, agent of the American Tract Society working in Missouri, related the story of a man whom he could not entice with any devotional literature. According to Johnson, “I could not induce him to buy a book, nor receive one as a gift. . . . I left a ‘Christian Almanac’ and some tracts on his yard fence, which he threatened that he would tear up.”¹¹⁸ Anti-mission Baptists in rural precincts

vehemently rejected religious tracts and pamphlets, as well as other innovations they associated with Godless urbane society. The Bethlehem Baptist Church in Pike County, situated in northeast Missouri, for instance, referred to tract societies and Sunday school organizations as “innovations which are calculated to alarm the true followers of the meek and lowly Jesus inasmuch as they are not authorized by Holy writ as a Church appendage.”¹¹⁹

When it came to giving sermons in the countryside, evangelical missionaries eager for success had to accommodate the common expectation among congregants that they at least appear to preach from the heart, rather than from books. As historian Adam Fox concludes about sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, written and oral evangelical cultures worked hand in hand in frontier Missouri.¹²⁰ Ministers who relied on pre-prepared sermons often faced the scorn of congregations. A little boy in Booneville rebelled at the specter of hearing one of these book-learned preachers and told his parents that “I’d rather hear someone preach by guess.”¹²¹ For those ministers who did not want to or were unable to write their own sermons, the advent of print allowed them easy access to the preaching of others. But in the pioneer settlements of Missouri, the delivery still had to be convincing.¹²² Neophyte Baptist preacher Lewis Williams adapted printed sermons, which he himself only mastered with difficulty, quite well to the demands of country preaching – ultimately converting hundreds and building up the Baptist Church substantially in the rural areas around the town of St. Louis.¹²³ The leading publisher of the southern Methodist newspaper in St. Louis, David Rice McAnally remained committed to delivering sermons that combined discussion of scriptural points with heartfelt articulation in everyday terms. As a consequence, he retained the reputation of being a powerful preacher with an imposing presence in the pulpit.¹²⁴

Oral and print modes of communication most effectively combined to spread the Gospel when literate believers read evangelical publications aloud for the benefit of those who could not read. An 1835 article in Elijah Lovejoy's St. Louis Observer encouraged this collective mode of interaction, explaining "don't by niggardly and devour it alone. If you have companions around you, who would be gratified to hear you, read aloud."¹²⁵ Through the 1850s, evangelical congregants commonly read church newspapers to the other members of their household.¹²⁶ For women and men who had difficulty reading or understanding complex aspects of scripture, books such as Presbyterian minister Charlton Henry's Letters to an Anxious Inquirer were published to clarify, in every day terms, aspects of the bible and theology.¹²⁷

In the late 1850s, household reading of religious materials appears to have been increasingly common, an index of both increasing literacy and the continuing development of mutually re-enforcing oral and print evangelical cultures. Evangelical missionaries involved in circulating printed religious materials in Missouri reported that literacy spread unevenly through frontier communities. The colporteurs or book agents of the American Tract Society indicated that there was a high degree of reading ability among the households they visited. An unnamed colporteur explained "the population coming among us is chiefly from regions where the blessing of education and the gospel have been enjoyed."¹²⁸ These same agents also noticed that at least one person in a given household often could read for those who were illiterate. Another colporteur, after visiting over two thousand homes, averred "I do not remember to have found a single family, however destitute, in which there was not at least one tolerable reader."¹²⁹

The Everlasting Slave Question and Sectarian Print Wars: Toward the Schisms

A rapidly developing body of intertwined theological, social, and political thought regarding African American bondage informed the sectarian print wars that arose over the

morality of slavery among evangelical leaders in Missouri. Through the mid-1830s, at least, pro-slavery religious writers in the state undoubtedly relied most easily on the work of influential pro-slavery Baptist minister from Charleston, South Carolina, Richard Furman (1755–1825), who based his arguments almost entirely on scripture. In his Exposition of the Views of the Baptists, Relative to the Coloured Population of the United States (1823), according to historian of religion John Patrick Daley, this work “trumpeted the numerous scriptural passages taken to favor slaveholders that would be repeated ad nauseam after 1831.”¹³⁰ Pastor of the Stevensburg Baptist Church in Culpepper County, Virginia, Thornton Stringfellow (1788-1869) similarly drew entirely on Bible passages to produce his widely-read Brief Examination of Scripture Testimony on the Institution of Slavery (1841).¹³¹

Influential Baptist minister, theologian, and President of Brown University (1827-55) Francis Wayland, however, refuted the supposed Biblical foundations of human bondage with a more sophisticated approach that enlisted scripture, the discernments of innate conscience, and empiricism, that is, moral philosophy, or, “the science of duty.”¹³² His Elements of Moral Science (1835) was the first comprehensive restatement of the discipline since the published lectures given by Presbyterian minister and President of the College of New Jersey John Witherspoon shortly before and after the American Revolution.¹³³ Wayland certainly recognized divinely-ordained duties. And he affirmed the proposition that Divine Providence awarded certain individuals with superior talents and opportunities in this world, maintaining that “in the right to use for his own happiness, without injury to his neighbor, whatever God has given to him, all men stand on the ground of perfect equality.”¹³⁴ But he took the Golden Rule articulated by Jesus, New Testament apostles, and Old Testament prophets, including Moses, as the essential message of Christianity. In doing so, he denied that the Bible justified human bondage,

at least as it had developed in the southern United States.¹³⁵ According to Wayland “the precept of the Christian religion is, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself . . . now this must be absolutely prohibitory of slavery, unless it can be shown, that any man is not my neighbor.”¹³⁶

Two years later, Episcopal cleric and President of the College of Charleston Jasper Adams produced the first comprehensive pro-slavery exegesis relying on both scripture and rational Christian ethics. While Adams had graduated from Baptist-affiliated Brown University, and also taught natural philosophy at the school, he was ordained an Episcopal priest in 1820. Mixing republican commitments to freedom of conscience with the ideas of sixteenth-century Anglican scholastic Richard Hooker, Adams published in 1833 a widely-influential treatise articulating the view that civil government, indeed all forms of government, were ordained by God. In his 1837 Elements of Moral Science, he expanded eighteenth-century British moral and political philosophy frameworks regarding the chief relations of civil and domestic government, and their arising duties, explicitly to include slaves. In his topical organization of the treatise, Adams retained the traditional categories of husband and wife, parent and child, siblings and remote relations, and master and servant. But he made it abundantly clear that the last pairing included not only paid servants but enslaved African Americans. In this revamped organic and hierarchical conception, masters were morally obligated to teach Christianity to African slaves and, otherwise, govern them benignly. In turn, slaves were morally bound to learn from, obey, and appreciate their masters and mistresses. For good measure, Adams included lengthy segments, intended to deflect abolitionist criticisms, emphasizing how, historically, the influence of Christianity had civilized and uplifted Africans. In this conception, the Golden Rule only required one to do unto others what one would have others do unto her or him should the status of those in a particular relation be reversed.¹³⁷

Under the circumstances, it not surprising that abolitionist New School Presbyterian minister Elijah Lovejoy radically increased tensions between Missouri evangelicals and non-church-goers divided over the question of slavery with the introduction of his St. Louis Observer in 1833. His views on slavery, however, evolved over time, as he was initially in favor of simply evangelizing the slaves and then moved to gradual emancipation. But at this point in his career, Lovejoy thought slavery “as it exists among us, admits of being considered in a three-fold view – in a civil, a religious, and a moral view. Considered in any of these lights, it is demonstrably an evil.”¹³⁸ Witnessing the evils of the institution, he gradually hardened his anti-slavery stance until he publically proclaimed himself an abolitionist in 1837.¹³⁹ Two years earlier, at the meeting of the St. Louis Presbytery, Lovejoy presented a number of anti-slavery resolutions which were successfully passed. These resolutions called for slavery’s removal from Missouri on both theological and civil grounds. With his success and desiring to spread this anti-slavery religious ideas even further, Lovejoy presented the same resolutions at the state-wide synod meeting a few weeks later. National problems over slavery were exacerbated in St. Louis after five slaves had recently attempted to escape to Illinois. In light of this turmoil, Lovejoy found little support for his resolutions, which were easily defeated by the synod.¹⁴⁰ Anti-slavery articles, nevertheless, were printed in the Observer almost every week it ran by late 1835. While many pro-slavery men and women in Missouri did not subscribe to the Observer, they were familiar with its ideas and reacted against them as Lovejoy vigorously denounced his opponents’ pro-slavery religious ideas. On one occasion he explained “I have not words to express my utter abhorrence of such a sentiment. My soul detests it.”¹⁴¹ By January of 1836 Lovejoy wrote one of his brothers on his anti-slavery articles and editorials elucidating that “I need not say that for some time past the “Observer” has been prominent in its attacks on Slavery.”¹⁴² As a result,

Lovejoy's circulation was modest when he was in Missouri and his paper always had trouble getting sufficient advertising. With fewer than 1000 subscribers, the paper still circulated throughout the liberal Presbyterian theological strongholds in the eastern part of Missouri and into Illinois. Upon moving to Alton, Illinois in 1836, Lovejoy's circulation increased to over 2000, as more readers in Illinois began to receive the sheet as well.¹⁴³

In late 1835 the citizens of St. Louis began to rally against Lovejoy. With the increased agitation in St. Louis over slavery, Lovejoy found himself a marked man, with many in the city wishing him dead for his stance on the institution. The major St. Louis newspapers condemned any anti-slavery ideology and a large meeting was convened against Lovejoy for his views. In light of this turmoil, the Presbyterian publishers of the Observer soon asked for his resignation as editor, which he gave them. But the man who held the mortgage on the paper, Solomon Moore, had no personal use for the press and was willing to let Lovejoy continue publishing the paper when tensions calmed in St. Louis.¹⁴⁴ The leading St. Louis newspaper, the Missouri Republican, while certainly not agreeing with Lovejoy, supported his right to publish the Observer and condemned the meetings brought against him.¹⁴⁵ After a two week absence, Lovejoy once again produced his weekly, which began to grow in its circulation and advertising with additional readers in Illinois.¹⁴⁶

Another event, however, eventually led to Lovejoy's expulsion from St. Louis. In April of 1836 a free mulatto boatman, Francis McIntosh, was burned alive by a mob of white St. Louis citizens after he murdered the deputy sheriff, George Hammond, and injured the deputy constable, William Mull. In most accounts, McIntosh was originally arrested after he interfered with the arrest of some unruly sailors.¹⁴⁷ A few days later, Lovejoy published an account in the Observer. After recounting the details, he thoroughly condemned the actions of the mob

explaining “when constitutional law and order are at stake, but when the question lies between justice regularly administered and or the wild vengeance of a mob, then there is but one side on which the patriot and the Christian can rally.”¹⁴⁸ These words intensified the anger of many St. Louisans, leading to an attack on Lovejoy’s office.¹⁴⁹

A grand jury was soon empanelled to determine if the mob leaders in the McIntosh lynching would face charges. Judge Luke Lawless, who oversaw the grand jury, felt it was his duty to explain that it would not be appropriate to punish a few of the ringleaders if the lynching had been the reaction of the people as a whole – a kind of spontaneous outbreak of popular sovereignty. He blamed the abolitionists for the violence that led to McIntosh’s lynching. Lovejoy’s anti-slavery religious ideas were put on center stage during part of Lawless’ jury instructions as he held up a copy of the Observer. He argued that “religious fanaticism is, Heaven knows, had enough when it actuates white men – but how much more terrible when brought to bear on the fiery, unreasoning instinct of the negro. The negro then kills and burns for the love of God and the name of the Divine Redeemer.”¹⁵⁰ With this potential for Lovejoy’s writings to incite slave violence, Lawless continued laying out the repercussions for Missouri’s slave society. He argued “it seems to me impossible, that while such language is used and published as that which, I have cited from the St Louis Observer, there can be no safety in a slaveholding state.”¹⁵¹ The grand jury refused to indict the mob’s leaders.

After the publication of the jury instructions in the Missouri Republican, Lovejoy’s situation in St. Louis became untenable and he had few options other than to relocate to Alton, Illinois, across the Mississippi River from St. Louis – where he ultimately was murdered. Lawless urged the citizens to take action against Lovejoy in his jury instructions. Mobs attacked Lovejoy’s press twice prior to his relocation to Alton. There, he hoped that the growing city in

the free state of Illinois would allow the Observer to flourish. Evangelical abolitionists read his newspaper, though some of its readers were not religious. The Illinois anti-slavery strongholds in Quincy and Jacksonville soaked up Lovejoy's increasingly abolitionist theology, increasing the paper's circulation. Other readers, moreover, worked with Lovejoy to form the Illinois Anti-Slavery Society in 1837. This included Edward Beecher, the president of Illinois College in Jacksonville.¹⁵² After the McIntosh incident, the Missouri Republican no longer supported Lovejoy's press freedom. Upon hearing of the formation of the Illinois Anti-Slavery Society, it thoroughly condemned Lovejoy within its pages proclaiming that "something must be done in the matter, and that speedily! The good people of Illinois must put a stop to the efforts of these fanatics, or expel them from their community."¹⁵³ With the Republican having numerous readers in Alton, which was in the commercial orbit of St. Louis and never fully in favor of Lovejoy, mobs sprang into action, destroying two of Lovejoy's presses. Another press was ordered and Lovejoy was killed attempting to defend it.

Elijah Lovejoy's antislavery religious ideas, however, made their way onto the national scene with his death. His younger brother Owen, who was with him in Alton, went to New York and worked with the American Anti-Slavery Society. There, he was able to demonstrate successfully how his brother's murder represented the encroachment of the southern slave power on America's political, cultural and religious fabric. Through his "Letter to the Citizens of Alton" and other writings, Owen Lovejoy would soon succeed in memorializing his brother throughout the nation and expanding the influence of his brother in death. And national outrage over the murder played no small role in stoking pro- and anti-slavery evangelical enmity leading to the national Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ecclesiastical ruptures in the period. 1837-1845.¹⁵⁴

Cloven Churches, the Moral Conundrum of Human Bondage, and Textual Combat to the Kansas-Nebraska Controversy

The national schisms virtually ensured that the publications produced by northern and southern evangelicals would feature a rapid bi-lateral escalation of theological and political disputation over the moral question of slavery. The northern and southern wings of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches no longer had any political pressures or theological reasons to publish books and tracts that tiptoed around the subject of slavery. Denominational publishing house editors in one section, strictly speaking, no longer had to consider or accommodate to the contrary sentiments and beliefs of co-denominationalists on the other side of the Mason-Dixon line. The editors of northern denominational outlets were, for the first time, entirely free to publish tracts and books that ventilated every last moral and political objection to African American bondage. Their southern counterparts were similarly liberated to publish tracts and books that conveyed, without impediment, the southern theological and political defense of the peculiar institution. By the same token, evangelical newspapers affiliated with religious newspapers affiliated with denominations divided over slavery fostered further enmity within evangelical communities.

After the ruptures within the national Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches, the moral issue of slavery posed a delicate problem for the national multi-denominational printing concerns. As historians John W. Quist and Anne M. Boylan suggest, tensions over slavery hampered the southern efforts of the American Tract Society, American Bible Society, and American Sunday School Union. This was so even though they attempted to remain neutral on the issue of slavery. Given that all three national organizations were headquartered in the East, southerners were generally suspicious of their agents and missionaries.¹⁵⁵

Northern and southern Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian publishing houses each developed potent operations capable of reaching Missouri markets following their respective national schisms. After prevailing in Smith v. Swormstedt (1853), the MECS used its share of the old MEC Book Concern to establish its own publishing operation in Nashville in 1854. Notwithstanding the northern Methodist loss, by the eve of the Civil War, managers of the MEC Book Concern claimed that it had become the largest publisher in the world.¹⁵⁶ The Baptist General Tract Society had been founded in 1824 in Philadelphia and, in 1841, re-organized to become the American Baptist Publication Society.¹⁵⁷ After the 1844 Baptist schism, the new Southern Baptist Convention established its Bible Board in 1851. The Southern Baptist Publication Society, a distinct enterprise, was organized at an 1847 meeting in Savannah, Georgia, and headquartered in Columbia, South Carolina.¹⁵⁸ Prior to the 1837 national Presbyterian schism, the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia had operated the Presbyterian Tract and Sabbath-School Society. The Old School General Assembly retained exclusive ownership of the Philadelphia publishing operation after the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, in Commonwealth v. Green (1838), affirmed its rights to the Presbyterian publishing house over the conflicting claims of the excised New School synods.¹⁵⁹ In 1839, the Old School General Assembly reorganized the operation and renamed it the Presbyterian Board of Publication. The New School General Assembly established its Presbyterian Publication Committee in 1852 but, not surprisingly, lagged far behind its Old School counterpart in property-holdings, funding, and publication productivity.¹⁶⁰

The revamped publishing capability of the MEC and MECS after the 1844-45 national schism seemed to offer a solution to longstanding Methodist dissatisfaction with the multi-denominational publications. A substantial number of Methodists, in Missouri and elsewhere,

had believed for decades before national split that the tracts and books produced by the American Tract Society and American Sunday School Union reflected too much the orthodox Calvinist doctrine of predestination and a chosen elect, which ran against the grain of Methodist beliefs in individual free will and the availability of salvation for all. Consequently, after the national Methodist schism, the MEC, at least, set about expanding its own printing operations, in part, to shore up this deficiency.¹⁶¹

It is not altogether clear whether the publications produced by the MEC and MECS publishing houses were, substantively at least, much different from those produced earlier by the three multi-denominational publishing societies. Historian Anne M. Boylan maintains that the new northern and southern Methodist books and tracts did not usually stress Calvinist doctrines less nor conceptions of free will more than those published by the multi-denominational organizations.¹⁶² The southern Methodists even made use of American Sunday School Union materials briefly after the national Methodist schism to avoid reliance on the northern Methodist book concerns.¹⁶³

In any case, the MECS had far more success at establishing a Missouri outlet for its publications than did the MEC. The northern Methodist book operations in New York and Cincinnati were worth approximately \$1 million shortly after the national Methodist schism.¹⁶⁴ While the MEC Chicago depository did not have the publishing rights possessed by the New York and Cincinnati book concerns, it rapidly increased its distribution efforts after opening in 1852.¹⁶⁵ The MEC General Conference also attempted to establish a depository in that city, as early as 1851, but did not succeed before the Civil War. The southern Methodists quickly ramped up the efforts of its Book Concern in Nashville. While the St. Louis Conference lost its bid for the new southern Methodist publishing operation, the MECS General Conference

operated a depository out of St. Louis affiliated with the St. Louis Christian Advocate that steadily increased its distribution of printed materials across Missouri.¹⁶⁶

A major print battle broke out between the MEC and MECS after the national Methodist schism, producing a number of polemical texts concerning the morality of slavery that reached every state that was home to sizable Methodist populations, including Missouri. In that year, with the as-yet-undivided Methodist Book Concern yet fully under the control of the MEC, Henry B. Bascom, a future bishop of the southern Methodist Church chose to publish his contentious Methodism and Slavery (1845) in his native Kentucky. He argued that the removal of Bishop Andrew had been illegal, explaining “when a lawful authority, proceeds to unlawful demands or action, and by means equally unknown to usage, the claim of authority, by the trespass upon right, is vitiated, and the procedure becomes null and void.”¹⁶⁷ The editor of the MEC-affiliated Methodist Quarterly Review, George Peck, soon published a tract, Slavery and the Episcopacy (1845), refuting Bascom. Peck took especial exception to Bascom’s charge that the leaders of the northern church were hypocrites to remove Bishop Andrew after having supported his original election to the office of bishop. In Peck’s words, “how Dr. Bascom could ever fall into so many errors in a case of such a kind is to me surpassingly strange. The main points in his statement I know to be utterly untrue, and the reflections which the while contains against the honor and candor of the north to be wholly unjust.”¹⁶⁸ In 1853, the MECS published Platform of Methodism (1853), which set out not only an explanation of the true general tenets of Methodism but a discussion of slavery that condemned the northern Methodists, their action against Bishop Andrew, and their position on slavery. In the next few years, the fully operational MECS publishing organization distributed copies of the treatise through its newly-organized depositories, including its major outlet in St. Louis.¹⁶⁹

In the early 1850s, the southern Methodists in Missouri went on the offensive instrumentally through David Rice McAnally's St. Louis Christian Advocate. McAnally used his paper to militantly advance the southern Methodist cause to his readers. McAnally's readers wanted him to comment on the secular events of the day and how they related to their Methodist faith. In November of 1852, he began a multi-part series on Methodism and slavery. McAnally condemned the institution, but he explained his religious and political support of slavery because it is "so interwoven with the very elements of society – and is such peculiar relations to municipal law – that it does not properly come within the legitimate range of ecclesiastical legislation."¹⁷⁰

Northern and southern Baptists began to hash out publicly their differences after national Baptist schism. Beginning in November 1844, five months before the national Baptist rupture, Baptist minister and President of Brown University engaged Harvard-educated pastor of the Beaufort Baptist Church Richard Fuller in an extended newspaper debate in the Worcester, Massachusetts, Christian Reflector, which was soon published in book form as Domestic Slavery Considered as a Scriptural Institution. Wayland conceded that the Bible nowhere prohibited slavery. But he continued to tout his 1835 biblical Golden Rule argument against slavery, while emphasizing more than before the equal civil rights to which African Americans were entitled under God-given liberties. His emphasis on equality, as was the case with other renderings of anti-slavery evangelicalism, was more obviously grounded in Lockean natural law theory than scripture. As well, Wayland held that since human nature was fallen, perfect laws that would protect those in bondage were unattainable, leaving slaves in the South at the mercy of their owners' absolute power.¹⁷¹ Arguing that every individual had the right to know revealed truth, Wayland bemoaned "what must be the condition of those who are wholly, by the will of another,

deprived of that knowledge.”¹⁷² Directly challenging the common assertion made by slavery apologists that slaveholders dutifully provided slaves with Christian instruction, he said

I know it may be said that they are permitted to attend church with their masters They are allowed to hear us tell what, as we affirm, God says to them; but they are not permitted to hear what God says to them himself. I confess myself utterly at a loss to conceive how a human being can assume the responsibility of thus interfering between an immortal soul and its Maker.¹⁷³

The Reverend Fuller, a slave holder, responded by emphasizing Biblical authority for slavery, insisting that human bondage was not to be confused with the abuse of slaves, and that all government, including the institution of slavery, was ordained by God. Equally important, he stressed that, even in a republican democracy, there was no such thing as perfect liberty. All liberty was regulated in the interest of preserving the well-being of society. Pointing to the status and rights women and minors, Fuller emphasized that real-world social relations necessarily and naturally comprised numerous uneven distribution of rights.¹⁷⁴

Amid the national Methodist and Baptist schisms, Presbyterian minister from South Carolina James Henley Thornwell drafted the critical language for an 1845 Old School General Assembly report clarifying its position on slavery. The essence of the report, which passed 168 to 13, was that the Presbyterian Church was purely a spiritual body and could not legislate where Christ and the Apostles had not – and they had not barred slaveholders from communion. So the Church could not do so. The doctrine of “jure divino” became, almost immediately, an ironclad article of faith among southern Presbyterians.¹⁷⁵ By 1850, Thornwell had become the most influential southern Presbyterian in the Old School General Assembly. A professor of theology and moral philosophy at South Carolina College in the 1840s, then president of the school, he had edited the Charleston-based Southern Quarterly Review after its establishment in 1842 and then helped to found the Southern Presbyterian Review in 1847. On May 26, 1850, amid

growing sectional tensions over the admission of California into the Union, Thornwell presented a sermon at the dedication of the Charleston Zion Church, a house of worship for African Americans built by white Presbyterians and Episcopalians. Soon published as a tract and in the Southern Presbyterian Review, The Rights and Duties of Masters set out succinctly the southern Presbyterian “slaveholder ethic,” which Thornwell elaborated with continued writings over the next eleven years. Rights and Duties blended the strict jure divino understanding of Presbyterian Church authority confirmed in 1845 with a Presbyterian moral philosophy setting out divinely-ordained slaveholder and slave duties that corresponded substantially with the description of “domestic relations” included in Episcopal minister Jasper Adams’ 1837 Elements of Moral Philosophy.¹⁷⁶

Those shaping the content of the St. Louis Presbyterian through the 1840s to the mid-1850s hewed ever more closely to increasingly conservative Old School theology and its related position on slavery. William S. Potts was well prepared for the task, having studied under the Reverend Ezra Styles Ely in Philadelphia and at Princeton Theological Seminary, a citadel of Old School Presbyterianism from 1825 through 1827. Before the Presbytery of St. Louis on September 30, 1842, he delivered a sermon, soon published as a tract, in which he articulated the jure divino understanding of Presbyterian Church government that the Old School General Assembly would adopt formally three year later. Having been awarded the Doctor of Divinity degree by Marion College in 1845, Potts gave a sermon a year later before the Old School Synod of Missouri, also published as a tract, in which he touted the southern Presbyterian slaveholder ethic requiring the church to carry out energetically its “domestic missions” to the slaves, ever keeping their eternal salvation the uppermost consideration.¹⁷⁷ Although born in Pennsylvania, by the time the Reverend Ebenezer Thompson Baird assumed the editorship of the St. Louis

Presbyterian in 1852, he had become a confirmed pro-slavery southerner. He had completed his education at Jefferson College in Natchez, Mississippi, and been ordained by the Presbytery of Holston, Tennessee, before becoming president of Presbyterian-affiliated Washington College, situated in the eastern part of that state.¹⁷⁸ Kentucky-born Nathan Lewis Rice (1807-1877) learned theology under the Reverend Gideon Blackburn at Center College, Danville, Kentucky, was licensed to preach in 1827, and studied at Princeton Theological Seminary from 1828 through 1830. His first pastoral charge was at Bardstown, Kentucky, where he founded a female seminary and edited the Western Herald. By the time he became pastor of the St. Louis Second Presbyterian Church and editor of the St. Louis Presbyterian in 1854, he had well established himself as yet another high-profile champion of anti-Catholicism and doctrinaire expositor of Old School Presbyterianism. From 1837 through 1850, he had published a number of works that relied on close scriptural exegesis to denounce dancing between the sexes, phrenology, and mesmerism, as well as a treatise defending both the free agency of man and divine foreordination.¹⁷⁹ In 1843, he debated breakaway Presbyterian Alexander Campbell, founder of the Disciples of Christ, for eighteen days in Lexington, Kentucky, in an effort to refute Campbell's claim that scripture did not support the baptism of infants. While editing the Presbyterian with equal orthodoxy, he also published Signs of the Times in a Series of Eight Lectures (1855), something of a tour de force that, all at once, employed Old School Presbyterian understandings of scripture to predict the downfall of "Romanism," "Mohammedanism," the overthrow of infidelity, the establishment of the millennium, and the end of the world. Such efforts, it seems, earned him the position of moderator of the Old School General Assembly that convened in Nashville in 1855.¹⁸⁰ His published writings on slavery the following year were no less orthodox.¹⁸¹

In response to the publication of Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin, United States Army chaplain and Episcopalian minister at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, Leander Ker, published Slavery Consistent with Christianity (1853) in Weston, Missouri. The tract comprised a far-flung defense of slavery. But Ker included a number of arguments grounded in pro-slavery evangelical beliefs that stressed the divinely-mandated moral obligations of organic, hierarchical social relations in which slavery was ensconced. Relying on Ephesians 6: 5-8, Ker explained that "the relationship existing between master and servant, is placed upon new and more sacred grounds than ever."¹⁸² Ker also invoked providential theology to conclude that the abolitionists would suffer God's wrath for insubordinate efforts replace the will of God with their own and the sacred relations he had established.¹⁸³

In the opinion Missouri Supreme Court Judge William Scott penned in the 1852 decision Dred Scott v. Emerson, he utterly rejected abolitionist religious innovations.¹⁸⁴ Harriet Beecher Stowe had begun publishing Uncle Tom's Cabin serially in the National Era in June 1851. By the time Dred Scott's case came before the Missouri Supreme Court, pro-slavery southerners were incensed at what they perceived to be an audacious libel against slaveholders and their version of Christianity.¹⁸⁵ Overturning decades of precedents relevant to slave freedom suits in Missouri, Judge William Scott argued that "times now are not as they were when the former decisions on this subject were made."¹⁸⁶ It is clear that Scott objected to the adverse judgments that abolitionists made on religious grounds. In condemning them he explains that "we will not go to them to learn law, morality, or religion on the subject."¹⁸⁷ Similarly to Stringfellow, Scott took the view that society in Missouri was graced by the hand of Providence to allow for black improvement, which could not have ever taken place on the continent of Africa. To this point Scott argued that

when the condition of our slaves is contrasted with the state of their miserable race in Africa; when their civilization, intelligence and instruction in religious truths are considered, and the means now employed to restore them to the country from which they have been torn, bearing with them the blessings of civilized life, we are almost persuaded, that the introduction of slavery amongst us was, in the providences of God, who makes the evil passions of men subservient to his own glory; a means of placing that unhappy race within the pale of civilized nations.¹⁸⁸

Scott's opinion was designed, moreover, not only to influence the evangelical faithful, but also to score points among lawyers, judges, editors, and politicians, North and South – many of whom would certainly read and publicize the ruling.¹⁸⁹

The Twin Specters of Abolitionist Sheetwork and Black Literacy

An 1837 Missouri statute targeting abolitionist publications drew its impetus from growing fears among most Missouri residents that anti-slavery presses emboldened bonded African Americans to challenge it. With the establishment of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1835 and the ensuing “postal campaign” in the South, pro-and anti-slavery violence spread across the nation, including Missouri.¹⁹⁰ Southern whites homed in on abolitionists, such as Elijah Lovejoy, with heightened zeal.¹⁹¹ Northern residents protested in the streets against statutes published in virtually all slaveholding states similar to that which the Missouri General Assembly passed in 1837. As legal historian Michael K. Curtis points out, the prime complaint was that such measures violated constitutionally protected press freedom, while leaders in the slaveholding states maintained that these statutes merely penalized licentious abuses of speech and press liberties.¹⁹² Missouri legislators undoubtedly were determined to quell any further anti-slavery publishing adventures in the state as energetic as that prosecuted by the Reverend Lovejoy. But the 1837 Missouri statute, on its face, makes it rather clear that a prime motivation for its passage was widespread fear among whites that abolitionist printed publications would stir

slave unrest. The measure specifically penalized spoken or printed publication “of any statements, arguments, or opinions tending directly to excite any slave or other colored persons in this state to rebellion, insurrection, or murder.”¹⁹³

The dangers that Missouri pro-slavery leaders perceived in anti-slavery newspapers and tracts, and which powerfully spurred their virulent suppression of such publications, stemmed fundamentally from the prospect of a literate African American population. Notwithstanding the efforts of pro-slavery whites to keep African American illiterate, anti-slavery evangelicals worked to teach them reading and writing skills. More than a few African Americans in Missouri were, especially after the War of 1812, educated in schools operated by independent black congregations. Historian Donnie Bellamy explains that a substantial number of slaves in the state acquired some ability to read in consequence of the efforts made by these church schools. While many of the black students were free, others were slaves who had their owners’ permission to attend the schools. The black Baptist congregations in St. Louis that grew out of John Berry Meachum’s First African Baptist Church each had schools. Recall that it was a Sunday school for African Americans that led to the foundation of that church in St. Louis. Meachum reported that his school had 150 to 300 students at any given time during the 1840s.¹⁹⁴ In his view, education was crucial for not only the future of African Americans but their eternal souls. He explained in the 1846 An Address to All the Colored Citizens of the United States that

we are bound by the law of God and man, and our good sense, to train up our children in the way they shall go when young, that when they grow old they should not depart from it. “Love your neighbor as yourself,” is the command of the New Testament. We are morally bound by the law of God to teach this to our children.¹⁹⁵

The African Methodist Church also had a similar school in its Green Street location during the 1830s and 1840s in St. Louis, as did the black Baptist church in Hannibal just prior to the Civil War.¹⁹⁶

White evangelicals made concerted efforts to educate slaves during the antebellum era, notwithstanding white fears of black literacy. Slave literacy remained a divisive reform goal as many of the national societies were fearful that it would erode their standing in the South. But white evangelicals, nonetheless, provided instruction to African Americans so they could acquire a better understanding of the Bible and articles of faith.¹⁹⁷ Even after the state of Missouri passed its law banning black education in 1847, an agent of the American Sunday School Union organized a Sunday school for slaves in Macon County, in northern Missouri, in the mid-1850s. There, he reported, the black students could read.¹⁹⁸ Northern evangelicals produced books to facilitate the education of slaves. A prime example was The Religious Instruction of Negroes by Georgian Charles Colcock Jones. This publication first discussed the history of black religious instruction and then set out a number of teaching strategies.¹⁹⁹ At the same time, it was commonly accepted that many potential black Christians were illiterate and would remain so in the future. As a result, ministers such as Presbyterian A. F. Dickson designed his Plantation Sermons, as he said, condescendingly, for those who minister to slaves and “often feel the need of something to read to them which, whilst it imparts solid instruction in a style adapted to the grade of their intellects, shall engage their attentions by its vivacity.”²⁰⁰

In response to pro-slavery fears that African American literacy would encourage slaves to run away, become unruly, or, engage in open insurrection, white authorities took regular measures to thwart black education. Part of Judge Lawless’ objection to the St. Louis Observer was that the anti-slavery paper would fall into the hands of slaves. In response to the perceived

increased threat from African American literacy, in 1847, the General Assembly passed a law decreeing “no person shall keep any school for the instruction of negros or mulattoes, reading or writing, in this State.”²⁰¹ Many black schools were, consequently, moved underground.²⁰² African American leaders, such as the Reverend Berry Meachum in St. Louis, however, reminded his own people of the actual limited power of the law. According to him, “it is a common thing for people to suppose that our oppression is occasioned by severe restrictions and disabilities laid upon us by others, but the truth is you keep yourselves down.”²⁰³

Fears that abolitionist publications would incite slaves to deadly violence spurred the harassment and kidnapping of northern Methodist minister Charles Holliday Kelly beginning in 1853. Assigned to the LaGrange Circuit in Lewis County, in northeast Missouri, the Reverend Kelly was attending the February 1853 quarterly conference at the mission church in the town of Chambersburg with fellow minister J. H. Dennis when the trouble started. Dennis was the presiding elder of the Hannibal district and the pastor of the northern Methodist church in Hannibal, and Chambersburg was divided between both branches of Methodism, although the southern church had more members.²⁰⁴ After the Sunday morning service, a man identified as Trabue approached Kelly, and wielding a colt revolver, took Kelly into custody claiming he had escaped from prison in Fort Madison, Iowa. Trabue, in fact, was not a state marshal as he claimed, but a pro-slavery zealot. Trabue forced Kelly to march virtually all the way to Iowa without an overcoat, in harshly cold winter winds. After arriving in Fort Madison, the prison officials refused to take Kelly into custody since he was not the Charles F. Kelly who had escaped from their prison, which Trabue knew all along. Kelly, whose health was always fragile, eventually died as a result of the trip into Iowa. Dennis proclaimed in the Annual Conference minutes “he fell like a martyr, He died at his post.”²⁰⁵

Tensions related to fears of abolitionist-spawned slave rebellion increased after the escape of several Marion County slaves in November and December of 1853. The Hannibal Tri-Weekly Messenger estimated that over fifteen thousand dollars of property had recently been lost as a consequence.²⁰⁶ When William Sellers, Kelly's successor in the LaGrange Circuit, announced he would regularly preach in Fabius Township, the Marion County community grew restless. Pro-slavery residents suspected that Sellers was preaching anti-slavery. Early in February 1854, a committee was formed consisting of physician A. F. Jeter, John H. Shannon, G. W. Mathews and Caleb Taylor to ascertain the views of the new minister on slavery. Sellers, who, indeed, opposed African bondage, refused to meet with the committee, while also declaring publicly that he had not helped any of the escaped slaves. On February 4th, a meeting of pro-slavery partisans was held at the Union schoolhouse in Fabius Township. J. H. Dennis attended to plead for religious toleration. Dennis insisted that all the members of his church "being required to render obedience to the powers that be, would do nothing of an incendiary or disturbing character . . . even though they might at heart be opposed to the institution of slavery."²⁰⁷ But his address and promises that the northern Methodists had not and would not assist runaway slaves had no effect. A subcommittee was appointed to draft a series of resolutions concerning the northern Methodist church.²⁰⁸

On February 18th, the Marion County vigilance committee publicly presented its resolutions, which condemned the northern Methodist church and announced its intentions to drive the disruptive MEC disruptive ministers from area. The resolutions condemned all northern Methodist preachers, declaring "that the peace and best interests of the community require that the said ministers, from this time and forever hereafter, desist from visiting and preaching among us."²⁰⁹ The vigilantes, as well, denounced MEC anti-slavery sermonizing and

the recent uptick in slave runaways they supposed to be a result of the practice. The committee concluded “that we close our doors against abolition and free soil influence of every character and shade whatever, and that we shall therefore esteem it highly improper for any citizen hereafter to countenance or encourage the preaching or teaching in this community of the Ministers of the Northern wing of the Methodist Church.”²¹⁰ The situation of Marion County close to the free state of Illinois and the abolitionist stronghold of Quincy, Illinois, certainly figured into this pronouncement. In any case, the Marion County vigilantes circulated the resolutions throughout the community, and they were printed in the Messenger ten days later along with continuing coverage of MEC and MECS litigation over the Methodist book Concern.²¹¹

The northern Methodists in Marion County fought back with some high-profile publications of their own. The MEC Hannibal Quarterly Conference soon met and circulated its own resolutions, denouncing what its members viewed as an attempt to crush religious freedom, while denying that they had any role in aiding runaway slaves. The resolutions explained that the northern Methodist ministers regarded “the system of slavery as a great moral, political, and social evil.”²¹² They made clear that the MEC always taught its ministers and laity “to use their influence against slavery.”²¹³ But the ministers also sought to convey that they would abide by the civil laws in place regarding slavery. They declared that they regarded “with fidelity the rights of slave-owners to property in their slaves, and declare that it would be inconsistent with our duty as Christians and loyal citizens to dispose them of their rights.”²¹⁴ While Marion County pro-slavery partisans continued to harass the MEC ministers, they were not driven from Marion County. The 1854 Annual Conference scheduled to meet in Hannibal was able to do so in October. Bishop Edward R. Ames presided over the conference but appears to have skillfully

dealt with anti-MEC animosity in the area. The Bishop had served briefly in St. Louis at the embattled Fourth Street Church and, thus, had some firsthand experience with pro-slavery partisans.²¹⁵

Holy Causes, Typeset Jeremiads, and Bleeding Kansas

The most intense newspaper, tract, and book warfare over slavery to date among evangelicals substantially increased the viciousness of the Border War in Kansas. This discord was far worse in northwestern Missouri than elsewhere in the state. In simple terms, anti-slavery forces wanted Kansas to enter the Union as a free state and pro-slavery, while Missourians wanted to prevent this. As a result, the contention over the Kansas question was especially fierce. Evangelicals on each side of the contest circulated number of tracts, pamphlets, and treatises advancing their principles and energizing their opponents.

Several ministers who were members of the New England Emigrant Aid Society, including Lyman and Edward Beecher, printed a brief pamphlet in 1855 encouraging Free State partisans to settle Kansas. They argued that the officers of the society knew the importance of Christianity because they “have understood that to make a free state, they needed, first of all, the gospel.”²¹⁶ The tract, nevertheless, surely functioned as a companion piece to the society’s Information for Kansas Immigrants.²¹⁷ Pro-slavery evangelicals also distributed pieces designed to encourage the continuation of slavery not only in Missouri and the South, but its introduction into the Kansas Territory.

The growing conflict in Kansas after 1854, it seems, left the national multi-denominational tract societies at something of a loss. In April and May of 1855, the St. Louis Christian Advocate published the minutes of all three national multi-denominational publishing societies, indicating that their various publications remained at least suitable for MECS members

in the view of editor David R. McAnally.²¹⁸ The virtual silence of the major publishing houses on the question of slavery, undoubtedly, figured into the decision. But growing strife in spring 1855, especially after John Brown “executed” five pro-slavery settlers at Pottawatomie Creek, Kansas, appears to have undercut the efforts of the American Tract Society in the slaveholding states. Divisions arose within the American Tract Society over the next five years, which led to the decision of the Boston chapter to secede from the national organization in 1859.²¹⁹ American Sunday School Union operatives in Missouri sometimes found themselves attempting to placate corporate superiors concerned about flagging sales. For example, an American Sunday School Union missionary in Missouri, in 1856, sought to assure headquarters in Philadelphia that, insofar as his instruction of the slaves was concerned, he had refrained as much as possible from doing anything to alarm local slaveholders.²²⁰

Southern evangelical leaders across the South unleashed a flood of works to combat the abolitionist threat that, given events in Kansas, had become all too plain. Baptist minister from Virginia Thornton Stringfellow published treatises in 1856 and 1861 that supplemented his 1841 scriptural arguments in behalf of slavery with new statistical data and probing historical analysis.²²¹ Fellow Virginian, professor of moral philosophy at Randolph-Macon College, and future pastor of Centenary Methodist Church in St. Louis William Andrew Smith published a notably polemical series of lectures in 1856. On the whole, Smith insisted that slavery was entirely consistent with scripture, first principles of republican government, absolutely necessary for the maintenance of social order, and that it would continue into perpetuity.²²² In 1859, the southern Methodist Nashville Book Concern published Elements of Moral Philosophy, authored by president of Centenary College in Jackson, Louisiana, Richard Henderson Rivers. This was the first full-scale treatment of its kind to be authored by a Methodist cleric.²²³ Henderson sought

to deflect, all at once, what he perceived to be the utterly unscriptural anti-slavery theologies and moral philosophies of Baptist minister and President of Brown University Francis Wayland; New York Congregational Church clergyman and President of Oberlin College Asa Mahan; and Presbyterian minister and popular evangelist Charles Grandison Finney (1792–1875). The Reverend Rivers looked to scripture, the supposed beneficent reciprocal relations of slaves and masters, and the slaveholder ethic to discount what he viewed as wrongheaded understandings of the Golden Rule and virtually heretical ideas about “Christian perfection” and the inherent goodness of humankind.²²⁴

Pro-slavery leaders in Missouri closer to the action focused first on the threat that abolitionist literature posed to the security of slaveholders in the state. An editorial in the Squatter Sovereign, a pro-slavery newspaper in Atchison, Kansas, argued shortly after the April 1855 attack on the Industrial Luminary that the anti-slavery presses posed a dire threat not only to the institution of slavery but to the safety of white residents. According to its editor, “we have frequently heard it asserted, that slaves in Platte County subscribed to and read this paper without their master’s knowledge. It had become an intolerable nuisance and the citizens of Platte owed it to themselves to abate it.”²²⁵ The Platte County Self-Defensive Association elaborated on the problem in its summer 1854 publication, authored by Benjamin F. Stringfellow, entitled Negro-Slavery, No Evil.²²⁶ According to Stringfellow, the circulation of abolitionist literature in Missouri encouraged slaves to rebel, escape, and worse. Stringfellow and the other founders of the Platte County Self-Defensive Association firmly believed that their location on the border with Kansas put them on the first line of defense against the abolitionists. He explained “to guard as far as possible against such fearful evils, was the immediate cause of our organization.”²²⁷ According to him, when one slave escaped “other slaves are thereby induced to make like

attempts; a hatred for their masters, whom they begin to regard as their oppressors, is thus begotten, and this, too, is often followed by arson and murder.”²²⁸ Stringfellow characterized abolitionist publications as a high crime completely outside of the realm of constitutional free speech and free press protections. He argued that abolitionism “is not within event the much-abused liberty of speech.”²²⁹ Stringfellow further maintained that, in the absence of an “adequate penal law,” the people of Platte County had, a “slave holding community of good citizens,” had no choice but to act in their own “self defense” – that is, “investigate and punish” violations of the laws protecting slavery and expel from the community “all who shall be found proclaiming principles which tend to induce our slaves to insurrection and rebellion.”²³⁰ Vigilantism was justified as “self-protection demands that we should guard against such crimes.”²³¹ Negro-Slavery, No Evil was re-published in February 1855 in Squatter Sovereign and in other venues inside and outside of Missouri.²³²

Negro Slavery, No Evil also articulated the religious views of the Self-Defensive Association on the questions of slavery and abolitionism. According to Stringfellow, “so triumphantly and conclusively was the consistency of slavery with the Christian religion established, that the abolitionists were driven to infidelity, to blasphemy; they trampled under foot the Bible, spurned the God and Saviour of slaveholders.”²³³ In his view, “the degenerate son of the simple-hearted, humble-minded Puritan, the pharisaical abolitionist, who . . . seeks to glorify himself rather than his God by the erection of costly temples from which the humble Christian is excluded.”²³⁴ Stringfellow also linked the Christianization of the slaves to Providence, arguing that “it is not for us to question God’s purposes, but it is certain from our first knowledge of the negro race . . . those only have learned to know the God of the Christian who have been instructed by their masters.”²³⁵ Slavery, its domestic form of government, and

close association with the churches greatly benefitted the slaves. Referencing the 1850 census, Stringfellow concluded that “slaveholders are more disposed to build churches; that their object is not display, but to accommodate those who wish to worship God.”²³⁶

University of Missouri President James Shannon weighed in on the growing violence in Kansas at a pro-slavery convention held in Lexington, Lafayette County, situated in the Boone’s Lick, on July 13, 1855. Shannon, a fire-eating Disciples of Christ minister was, among other things, deeply troubled by how the abolitionists melded together promiscuously scripture and Enlightenment-era natural law ideas about human nature and government, including the Lockean suggestion that all men were equal. Arguing that ministers such as Francis Wayland had abandoned the Bible with theological statements backing vague notions of equality, Shannon believed abolition subverted well-established forms of domestic and civil government ordained by God. He also alluded to Divine Providence to castigate slaves who refused to serve their masters. According to Shannon, “if they refuse to render this service, they can be justly punished [by God].”²³⁷ In his view, those who maintained the divinely-sanctioned institution of slavery would receive providential rewards.²³⁸

The publications of St. Louis Presbyterian editor Nathan Lewis Rice on the question of slavery during the Kansas Crisis comported almost entirely with Old School jure divino theology and the slaveholder ethic articulated by James Henley Thornwell in 1850. More than a few of Rice’s contemporaries viewed him as something of an anti-slavery man.²³⁹ His editorial commentary in the St. Louis Presbyterian and other publicans certainly reveal that, by the mid-1850s, he had grown decidedly uneasy under the constant barrage of abolitionist publications that illuminated the terrible ordeal that African Americans in bondage faced daily. But Rice remained committed, as a matter of unwavering faith, to the holdings of the Old School

Presbyterian Church on the subject. In the first of his Ten Letters on the Subject of Slavery published as a pamphlet in 1856, Rice insisted that “there are two aspects in which the subject of slavery ought to be viewed . . . 1st. As a providential fact; and 2d. As an institution involving important duties and interests.”²⁴⁰ Notwithstanding the evil intent of those who established the institution, he argued, “God has permitted it for wise reasons, in the accomplishment of great and important ends.”²⁴¹ According to Rice, the Presbyterian Church recognized God’s providential design, which the abolitionists wickedly ignored, and enjoined slaveholders to fulfill their divinely-ordained duties toward bonded women and men, the most important of which was to inculcate Christian faith among them for their own benefit.²⁴² In essence, Rice continued to adhere, fundamentally, to the position he had taken in 1845 in his highly-publicized Cincinnati debate with New School Presbyterian minister Jonathan Blanchard: “[N]o Christian will deny that it is infinitely more important that the slaves be delivered from the bondage of sin and Satan than from temporal slavery.”²⁴³

The ordeal of New School Presbyterian minister Frederick Starr illuminates rather well how evangelical and regular newspaper publications combined to fuel anti- and pro-slavery militancy. Situated in Platte County on the border with Kansas, developers in the town of Weston sought to make it one of the largest urban places in western Missouri. But because of the liberal views on slavery held by some of its organizers, Weston faced many of the disruptions that befell neighboring Parkville. Originally from Rochester, New York, Frederick Starr graduated from Auburn Theological Seminary after attending Yale. He was a devout New School minister and a man deemed by his peers to be possessed of an impeccable character. Choosing to further Presbyterianism on the Missouri frontier, he relocated to Weston in 1850 where he was ordained as pastor.²⁴⁴ While his church was somewhat impoverished, Starr helped

to retire much of its debt; he was able to write his sister Caroline in 1852 that “I am situated very pleasantly here. My room is quite comfortable and I board . . . in the nicest, tastiest, finest place in the whole town. I find it very pleasant.”²⁴⁵ Starr did not preach abolition of slavery from the pulpit. But, in his view, it was the role of “Ministers of the Gospel to look after the interests of their flock political as well as religious.”²⁴⁶ In 1853, the Weston Argus published his Thanksgiving Day sermon on American government. In it, he extolled the greatness of the American system explaining that “human government should have this for its object, to govern as little as possible, and yet govern thoroughly. . . . And this, our Government does better than any other government upon earth.”²⁴⁷

Starr’s position began to deteriorate as he became drawn into the Border War. In October 1854, he began lending his support to free soil settlement of the Leavenworth area. Starr authored a letter indicating such support that was published in The Home Missionary, the magazine of the American Home Missionary Society. The missive pleaded for eastern evangelical migration to the region. He concluded in the correspondence that “if a few churches from the east could be taken up bodily and set down in the new Territory, it would be a blessing beyond calculation.”²⁴⁸ These efforts angered many of the local pro-slavery residents in the area. In 1854 he wrote his father, Frederick Starr, Sr., that “the abuse freely poured out upon the clergy for their petitions and remonstrances were reechoed here and so fanatical were many of the people that their language would imply that clergymen had not even the rights of the meagerest citizens.”²⁴⁹

The positions of the Reverend Starr on the extension of slavery into Kansas and the morality of African American bondage flouted the beliefs of most Weston residents and of many within his own congregation. In February 1854, the Weston Argus declared that Starr was an

abolitionist and that he had improperly merged politics with religion. According to the piece, Starr was a “Political Priest,” the leader of a “gang of abolitionists,” and he “had deserted his pulpit to engage in a political gathering, composed principally of the lower class of Irish and Dutch [Germans], and in a round-about way attempt to excite them against such a champion of southern rights, as Gen. B. F. Stringfellow. Shame, shame on such a hypocrite!”²⁵⁰

Soon Starr drew the ire of the Platte County Self-Defensive Association. According to pro-slavery Platte County Episcopal priest John McNamara, in his book In Perils by My Own Countrymen: Three Years on the Kansas Border (1856), physician George W. Bayless, drafter of the key resolves of the Platte County Self-Defensive Association in July 1854, accused Starr of teaching Negroes to read, proposing to buy the freedom of at least one slave, and of riding, as if on terms of perfect social equality, in an open carriage with another.²⁵¹ In the summer of 1854, one of Starr’s congregants, John W. Vineyard, a prominent slaveholder and leading member of the association, questioned him on his views on slavery. Some of Vineyard’s slaves had run away prior to the formation of the blue lodge. Starr was soon brought before the Self-Defensive Association for a “trial” in July. Accused of operating a school for slaves, enticing numerous slaves to run away, and for sharing his carriage with a Negro, Starr was forced to account for his actions at the public meeting.²⁵²

The “trial” of Starr before the Self-Defensive Association engendered heated and intemperate public debate. Starr was able to placate the association and allowed by its leaders to remain in his pulpit.²⁵³ Benjamin Stringfellow, nonetheless, gave a speech denouncing him and his objectives. But Stringfellow misspoke, reportedly saying at one juncture, “every man who works for his living a slave and every poor white working woman a whore.”²⁵⁴ On Starr’s behalf, H. Miles Moore pointed the public’s attention to Stringfellow’s gaffe in the Weston Reporter.

This publication prompted Stringfellow to clarify his remarks, and, in the process, he alleged that “Moore is a fit witness for abolitionists. This, like their other statements, has the lie stamped upon its face!”²⁵⁵ Moore then responded by writing a letter to Stringfellow asserting “it has been currently reported about town, that I have been publically misrepresenting your speech in this city of Saturday last. This I pronounce false and its author a coward.”²⁵⁶ A number of slaveholders subsequently supported Stringfellow in the paper.²⁵⁷

The Self-Defensive Association eventually compelled Starr to leave Weston in the spring of 1855. The exact circumstances of Starr’s departure are not entirely clear. Starr participated in a September public meeting that passed a number of resolutions against the Platte County group which had “tried” him sometime earlier.²⁵⁸ In April 1855, however, Starr wrote his father explaining “we are in the midst of terrible times again I shall withdraw from Weston in the course of three or four weeks.”²⁵⁹ The only reason that he gave in the letter was the mobbing of his friend George Park. Starr returned to the East but continued to condemn the pro-slavery partisans in western Missouri. He made speeches about his expulsion from Weston and the persecution of anti-slavery advocates in western Missouri, which he anonymously published as a pamphlet in 1855 entitled Letters to the People.²⁶⁰ A series of speeches he gave in Batavia, New York, were also published, which prompted a response in the Weston Argus:

but what we have to deal with now is the Rev. Frederick Starr! And the slanders manufactured from his story. It seems that they five years spent in Weston by this reverend reprobate, instead of preaching the gospel, which he ostensibly professed to do, were in reality devoted to the duties that pertain to the office of a spy – miserable pimp of Greeley’s and the abolitionists, which he really was, as the sequel has shown.²⁶¹

But, according to the Reverend Starr, he had “done all in his power to bring about the emancipation of slaves, and placing them in a country where they might be what God intended them to be.”²⁶²

In spring 1855, pro-slavery partisans set about purging troublesome northern Methodist preachers from their midst. The leaders of the Platte County Self Defensive Association, at a public meeting held only a few days after the sacking of the Industrial Luminary, further condemned the anti-slavery activism of the northern Methodist Church. Northern Methodist ministers soon began to abandon Platte County and the surrounding area after having received written notification of the doom that had been published against them. The MEC sent no replacements to Platte County in the next several years, and the MEC district was reconfigured to eliminate the circuit in nearby Weston.²⁶³ An editorial piece that appeared in the southern Methodist Nashville Christian Advocate expressed the hope that the northern bishops would heed the threats of pro-slavery vigilantes and stop sending missionaries to Missouri and other slave territories.²⁶⁴

Pro-slavery partisans in Missouri waged a vigorous campaign against abolitionist presses in Kansas in an effort to shape local and national perceptions of the brewing Border War. In April 1855, the Kansas Herald of Freedom, situated in Lawrence, republished the public letter that Owen Lovejoy, brother of Elijah Lovejoy, had penned following the murder of his brother, entitled “Letter to the Citizens of Alton.” Editors of the Herald compared Elijah Lovejoy with Presbyterian editor George S. Park. The piece compared “the murdered Lovejoy” with “the proudest warrior of ancient or modern times,” concluding that his name “gathers lustre with age, and is enrolled with the martyrs of freedom.”²⁶⁵ Notwithstanding the fact that Park was alive and well, the Herald of Freedom declared him, a month later, to be “the first great martyr in the

cause of freedom for Kansas.”²⁶⁶ Editor G. W. Brown also lauded the providential role that Park had played in the growing conflict: “[W]hatever his future lot may be may the smiles and approbation of a just Providence await him, and an approving conscience be ever his reward.”²⁶⁷ A mob of Missouri “Border Ruffians” sacked the Kansas Herald of Freedom in Lawrence and another abolitionist press during the raid that pro-slavery sheriff of Douglas County, Kansas, Samuel Jones organized against the town in May 1856. As historian John Nerone points out, pro- and anti-slavery leaders shut down presses to shape perceptions of the Border War across the United States.²⁶⁸

The high-profile religious and political pronouncements of New School Presbyterian minister Joseph L. Bennett further divided the town of Hannibal in summer 1856. As discussed, the First Presbyterian Church in Hannibal had been founded by anti-slavery Presbyterian minister David Nelson and served by seven of the other men who participated in the Marion College venture.²⁶⁹ After Bennett completed his pastorate at the church in 1853, he returned to New England. In July of 1856 an anonymous article was addressed to the editor of the Messenger under the moniker “M.” This contributor maintained that Bennett had recently preached a sermon in Cambridge, Massachusetts, supporting the Free State movement in Kansas and the election of Republican presidential candidate John C. Fremont. That Bennett based his abolitionist and providential theology on Ezekiel 22:29 had, in particular, outraged M. In his words

by a most audacious perversion of the Holy Scriptures, Mr. B[ennett] applies the first verse quoted above to slaveholders, especially those who have gone to Kansas. – And the last verse according to his perversion, are threatenings of Divine wrath, which a righteous God will pour out on all this nation, if Kansas should become a slave State!²⁷⁰

The mixing of politics and religion in this sermon appears to have particularly angered M. In his view, right-minded southern ministers would not dare to mix politics and religion as had Bennett. According to M, pro-slavery ministers “leave the work of desecration and profanity to Mr. Bennett and his co-ministers of a politico-religion.”²⁷¹ M was not the only individual indignant over Bennett’s sermon. The following week the editor of the Messenger commented on it, coming to a conclusions similar to those articulated by M. Once again, Bennett’s anti-slavery religious ideas were an extremely troubling perversion of Christianity for the Messenger, which wrote “he seems to have forgotten the legitimacy of the pulpit. The priceless value of immortal souls, and the prodigious and inestimable cost of redemption, paid by a compassionate Savior through a whole life of ignominious suffering.” The publication of this sermon angered not only the pro-slavery Presbyterians, but many other Hannibal residents.²⁷²

Contentious debate over slavery and events in Kansas inflamed warring factions in the Hannibal First Presbyterian Church and, ultimately, splintered the congregation. Amid growing contention over Kansas, a minority of the members insisted on maintaining the affiliation of the congregation with the New School presbytery, while the increasingly anti-slavery pronouncements of its leadership became too much for most of the Hannibal First Presbyterian congregants to tolerate. James W. Phillips, who had been pastor since 1853, led the New School faction. In December 1858, Phillips and his faction formed the First Presbyterian Church, Phillips Branch. In January 1859, the majority of the congregants of First Presbyterian terminated its relationship with the New School Presbytery of Northern Missouri and joined the Old School Palmyra Presbytery. Phillips and his New School society, however, folded by the end of 1859.²⁷³

Pro-slavery zealots from Missouri harassed, assaulted, and occasionally murdered leading Methodists in Kansas and Missouri. Methodist ministers in on either side of the Kansas-Missouri line were expelled by “blue lodges” such as the Platte County Self-Defensive Association.²⁷⁴ A pro-slavery mob placed northern Methodist minister and Free State advocate Pardee Butler on a raft in the Missouri River at Atchison, Kansas. The mob then followed Butler, pelting him with stones.²⁷⁵ A Methodist missionary in Lawrence reported continual harassment by pro-slavery mobs. According to him, “it has seemed as though the Sabbath was selected as the day for special excitements & not infrequently have the members of my congregation . . . left the morning service, to be called upon to go to the rescue of their brethren, attacked by the banditti who surround us.”²⁷⁶ Abolitionist MEC minister William Sellers, who had outraged pro-slavery Methodists, and others, in Marion County, prompted the formation of a committee in February 1854. Sellers was tarred and feathered in June 1856 while attempting to preach in Rochester, Andrew County, in the northwestern part of the state. An elderly member of the congregation there, Benjamin Holland, was murdered in the same incident.²⁷⁷ In August 1856 a northern Methodist woman, Mrs. Cantner, was abducted by four pro-slavery men after leaving her house at night. The men tied a cord around her tongue and neck and after subsequently beating her, left her for dead by the side of a road. Because Cantner was a widow and lived alone, no one discovered she was missing until the next day, when she was found barely alive.²⁷⁸

Missouri Baptists, most of whom supported slavery, drove anti-slavery Baptist minister William Crowell’s Western Watchman out of business in the four years preceding the Civil War. Baptist ministers James Gilpatrick and William W. Hall had publicly declared that they and their congregations, situated in Topeka and Lawrence, had been harassed by pro-slavery ruffians from Missouri. Both men were missionaries of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society and

the society often published their reports.²⁷⁹ Given the general pro-slavery orientation of Missouri Baptists, however, reports of such outrages in Missouri were relatively rare. By the same token, Missouri Baptists had little toleration for anti-slavery activists in the state. William Crowell, editor of the Western Watchman, which was officially approved by the Missouri General Association, condemned slavery in an 1857 edition of the paper and, in another, criticized the American Tract Society for omitting to render publications that addressed at all the moral deficiencies of African American bondage. In yet another, he printed a letter from leading anti-slavery Baptist divine Francis Wayland.²⁸⁰ Adding to this problem was the fact that Crowell's expressed views on the question of infant baptism were not in line with those of many Missouri Baptists. Crowell, it seems, had increasingly made the Watchman his individual venture, a step that his ownership of its plant and equipment facilitated. By 1859, many Baptists had lost all patience with Crowell's anti-slavery publications, and the Watchman quickly lost most of its readership. A meeting was held in the Chariton River Baptist Church in Howard County (in the Boone's Lick) in 1859 to either buy the paper from Crowell or establish a new one. Crowell refused to sell the paper and it failed in 1861. The Howard County meeting established the Missouri Baptist Publication Society and it began printing of another Missouri Baptist on March 3, 1860 from St. Louis. The paper went bankrupt in June 1861 as the Civil War began.²⁸¹

The St. Louis Christian Advocate and the Central Christian Advocate increasingly aired out their contending grievances over slavery in the several years preceding the Civil War. The Central Christian Advocate had, from its establishment in 1853, been an anti-slavery sheet. Editor Joseph Brooks was an outspoken abolitionist and critic of the new MECS. Having remained viable as a consequence of cash infusions from the MEC, the Central Christian Advocate took up the cause of anti-slavery with especial zeal after bloodshed in Kansas had

seized the attention of the nation.²⁸² Consider, for example, its handling of the August 1856 outrage committed on MEC congregant Mrs. Cantner. The attack had left her tongue so badly swollen as to make it impossible for her to keep it entirely in her mouth. But she soon recovered sufficiently to convey the story of her abduction and abuse by pro-slavery ruffians. Levan B. Dennis, a northern Methodist minister in Lawrence, crafted a detailed, if not harrowing, narrative of the outrage and the Reverend Brooks promptly published it in the Central Christian Advocate.²⁸³ Readers of the St. Louis Christian Advocate, beginning in January 1855, encouraged editor David R. McAnally to comment more on the situation in Kansas. McAnally, who was certainly predisposed to do so, soon was competing strenuously with the northern Methodist newspaper for the hearts and minds of the Missouri Methodists, including editorials in the St. Louis Christian Advocate that strenuously supported the establishment of Kansas as a slave state and arguing the religious merits of such an outcome.²⁸⁴ An abolitionist pamphlet published in St. Louis under the title A Vindication of Northern Methodism prompted the Reverend McAnally, in January 1859, to publish in his paper a biting critique of the piece, including the comment that “no sensible, well-informed man will be at all likely either to be misled or form a very high opinion of the talents of the writers, the goodness of their cause, the fairness or the honorableness of the northern Methodists of Missouri.”²⁸⁵

By 1861, editor of the Central Christian Advocate Charles Elliott had turned from denouncing the MECS to fingering McAnally as a traitor to the Union. The 1860 appointment of leading MEC minister Charles Elliott to the editorship of the Central Christian Advocate, to say the least, ushered in a more heated confrontation by that MEC organ with McAnally and his Louis Christian Advocate.²⁸⁶ In a November 1852 edition of his paper, McAnally had suggested that the influential Reverend Elliott, who was then teaching at Iowa Wesleyan, supported the

national Methodist schism. But it does not seem that McAnally was entirely candid on this point. In 1850, Elliott had published several tracts in Cincinnati suggesting clearly that the MEC was not at all willing to co-exist contentedly with the MECS: Slavery Contrary to the Spirit of Christianity and Sinfulness of American Slavery. And, in 1855, the MEC Book Concern published Elliott's A History of the Great Secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Year 1845, the definitive repudiation of the MECS bearing the official imprimatur of the northern Methodist Church.²⁸⁷ Elliott had, in fact, become one of the harshest critics of the MECS.²⁸⁸ After taking over the Central Christian Advocate in early 1860, he gave McAnally and the St. Louis Christian Advocate no quarter, viewing his nemesis and the MECS as threats not only to true Methodism but the security of the Union. According to Elliott, McAnally's St. Louis Christian Advocate, was "in every respect the promoter of . . . the southern rebellion."²⁸⁹

Conclusions

The evangelical schisms in Missouri spurred a radical escalation of theological and political disputation between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in religious newspapers and other printed publications. This verbal sparring played a heretofore unexamined central role in spawning a vicious guerilla conflict between northern and southern evangelicals and partisans on the border with Kansas after 1854. To the extent that sectarian strife over the morality of African American bondage spurred armed strife in Missouri from spring 1854 through 1860, it helped to generate the larger sectional tensions that led to secession and the Civil War.

Evangelical missionaries in the first several decades of American settlement in Missouri relied almost exclusively on the spoken word to spread the Gospel. Impromptu sermons rendered in the vernacular were well suited to a frontier polity that only slowly improved general literacy rates. More effective than the publicly-funded elementary schools in improving literacy were the

Sunday schools set up by Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches, whose teachers relied heavily on multi-denominational societies for texts. The print publications of such societies further propagated evangelical faith among adult residents. Divided by contention over slavery almost from the beginning, northern and southern evangelical newspapers in Missouri produced imagined communities of like-minded readers. This was a development that, among the Presbyterians, also fomented adverse sentiment against Roman Catholics. Even so, northern and southern evangelicals played a substantial role in producing a more literate population in Missouri.

The rise of a thriving evangelical print culture in antebellum Missouri did not, however, displace the spoken word as a vital mode of religious communication. Evangelical tracts and pamphlets commonly met with stiff resistance in rural village precincts. When it came to giving sermons in the countryside, evangelical missionaries eager for success had to accommodate the common expectation among congregants that they preach from the heart, rather than from books. Oral and print modes of communication most effectively combined to spread the Gospel when literate believers read evangelical publications aloud for the benefit of family member and co-congregants who could not read. Household reading of religious materials constituted an index of both increasing literacy and the continuing development of mutually re-enforcing oral and print evangelical cultures.

A rapidly developing body of intertwined theological, social, and political thought regarding African American bondage informed the sectarian print wars that arose over the morality of slavery among evangelical leaders. The religious discourse of southern evangelical theologians and moralists drew primarily on scripture and natural theology. Their northern counterparts engrafted onto these well-established frameworks egalitarian natural law principles,

thereby bringing into the battle of words influential conceptions about social organization and government that had the power to persuade and unsettle educated leaders and ordinary residents alike.

The evangelical schisms in Missouri virtually ensured that the tracts and treatises produced by their respective publishing industries would feature a rapid bi-lateral escalation of religious and political disputation over the moral question of slavery. The northern and southern wings of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches no longer had any politic pressures or theological reasons to publish books and tracts that tiptoed around the subject of slavery. Evangelical newspapers affiliated with particular denominations similarly fostered further enmity within communities. In the 1830s, abolitionist publications spawned growing fears among most white Missouri residents that anti-slavery presses emboldened bonded African Americans to challenge it.

Heightening evangelical newspaper, tract, and book warfare over slavery after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act substantially increased the viciousness of the Border War that broke out between abolitionist settlers in Kansas and pro-slavery Missourians. Southern evangelical leaders unleashed a flood of works to combat the abolitionist threat that, given events in Kansas, had become all too plain. Pro-slavery leaders in Missouri closer to the action focused first on the threat that abolitionist literature posed to the security of slaveholders in the state. The dangers that Missouri pro-slavery leaders perceived in anti-slavery newspapers and tracts, and which powerfully spurred their virulent suppression of such publications. Pro-slavery partisans waged a ruthless campaign against abolitionist presses in Kansas in an effort to shape local and national perceptions of the brewing Border War. High-profile religious and political pronouncements

divided congregations, and pro-slavery zealots from Missouri harassed, assaulted, and occasionally murdered leading northern Methodist ministers.

Pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in Missouri aggressively exploited the emerging public sphere of print communications in ways that contributed fundamentally to the mob violence over slavery that plagued the state after about 1835. The bold entry of clerics into the public sphere of political disputation amid the rise of abolitionism was unprecedented, and the repercussions of this involvement were profound, especially with the advent of editorial pieces in denominational papers that declared contentious positions on the question of slavery.

Evangelical print culture did not work to promote rational deliberation of pressing political problems in an orderly public sphere as libertarian proponents of a free market place of ideas professed. The volatile mix of spiritual and political issues in the public prints played a central role in ratcheting up conflict over slavery, especially amid the conflict over whether slavery would be established in Kansas. Editorial pieces carried in evangelical newspapers and religious tracts, both in opposition to and in favor of slavery, constituted a volatile field of public religious and political disputation. Unrestrained exploitation of the public sphere by the evangelical presses roiled the raw emotions of partisans and fueled the bloody vigilantism and anti-press mob violence that erupted over that fateful question.

Notes

¹ W. M. Paxton, Annals of Platte County, Missouri, From its Exploration Down to June 1, 1897. . . (Kansas City, Mo., 1897), 198.

² A committee had been organized by pro-slavery residents to deal with the newspaper consisting of John Winston, Hugh Sweeney, Jesse Miller, Lycurgus Sheppard, Vard Cockerill, W. J. Miller, and Dr. Joseph Walker. Sheppard was the only member of the committee not in Parkville on the day of the mobbing. History of Clay and Platte Counties, Missouri, Written and Compiled From the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources . . . (St. Louis, 1885), 642-43, 834, 840; “Intense Excitement in Parkville, Mo. – The Luminary Press Thrown into the River – The Editors Driven from the Town, From the Platte Argus, Extra, 16th,” New York Times, 26 April 1855, p. 1; “From the Platte Argus: April 16, 1855,” Squatter Sovereign, 24 April 1855, p. 2; “Destruction of the Press,” Kansas Herald of Freedom, 21 April 1855, p. 2; Paxton, Annals of Platte County, 171, 198-99, 920; Walter Williams, ed., A History of Northwest Missouri 3 vols. (Chicago, 1915), 1:233; Roy V. Magers, “The Raid on the Parkville Industrial Luminary,” Missouri Historical Review, 30, No. 1 (October 1935): 39-41. As the mob destroyed the press office and the paper was not restarted by Park, copies of the Luminary have not been located.

³ Park supposedly escaped the Mexican firing squads who executed the Texans by ducking and using the smoke of the gunfire to escape. He later told Sam Houston of the events of the massacre. Lew Larkin, Vanguard of Empire: Missouri’s Century of Expansion (St. Louis: State Publishing Company, 1961), 79-80. Co-publisher of the Luminary, William Patterson, was originally from Canada and maintained his citizenship throughout his residence in Parkville. He later returned to Montreal where he became a wealthy businessman. Paxton, Annals of Platte County, 198, 919-20. William Lloyd Garrison reported in his Liberator Park was a slaveholder notwithstanding his anti-slavery sentiments. The county tax records indicate that Park did indeed have one male slave who was valued at \$200 in 1847 and then \$300 two years later. Using the average slave prices in 1850, the slave is likely to have been less than ten years old, which would explain the jump in the tax assessment over two years. As there would have been no economic benefit to keeping the child, most likely Park was simply raising him until he was old enough to go out on his own. “Letter From Mr. Park,” The Liberator, 1 June 1855, p. 1; Betty Runner Murray, ed., Platte County Missouri: Records 1839-1849 (Platte City: Platte County Historical Society, 1993), 175, 234; Robert William Fogel, Stanley L. Engerman, Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), 74, 76.

⁴ The original minister, C. D. Herbert, was a licentiate who had studied at the Bangor Theological Seminary in Maine. An agent of the American Home Missionary Society, Herbert was ordained four months after relocating to Parkville in April 1846. He left two years later, however, after the congregation had lost most of its members. In 1849 the Reverend George S. Woodard, who was born in Maine, came to Parkville from Pennsylvania. Woodard was introduced to the congregation by the noted St. Louis New School minister Artemas Bullard.

Pro-Confederate Missourians would run Woodward out of the area during the Civil War. By 1849, the congregation had dwindled to three members – Park along with Alfred and Mary Painick. Mary B. Baker, ed., Historical Sketch and Records of Parkville Presbyterian Church, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri; Paxton, Annals of Platte County, 963.

⁵ Chariton County was a part of the Boone’s Lick. Nicole Etcheson, Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 32-34; Secretary of State, Missouri – State Archives: Missouri State Legislators, 1820-2000, at <http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/history/historicallistings/molegs.asp>. Accessed 8 January, 2010; Ibid: Attorneys General, at

<http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/history/historicallistings/ag.asp>. Accessed 8 January, 2010.

⁶ Members of Congress strenuously debated the Kansas-Nebraska Act from January 1, 1854 through to its passage on May 30, 1854. Kansas-Nebraska Act, 10 Stat. 277 (1854). Congressman from Massachusetts Eli Thayer announced the organization of the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Society on March 4, 1854. Other aid societies soon coalesced. The first colony from Boston arrived near what would become the town of Lawrence on July 28, 1854. A second group arrived in early September 1854. William E. Connelley, A Standard History of Kansas and Kansans, 5 vols. (Chicago: Lewis, 1918).

⁷ “Intense Excitement in Parkville, Mo.,” New York Times, 26 April 1855, p. 1.

⁸ “From the Platte Argus: April 16, 1855,” Squatter Sovereign, 24 April 1855, p. 2. At the first meeting of the Platte County Self-Defensive Association in July 1854, Physician George Wood Bayless, originally from Kentucky, authored the resolves of the new organization, which became known as the “Bayless Resolutions.” George Bayless owned a 540 acre farm and homestead called “Hazelwood” between Weston and Platte City, Platte County. He appears to have owned at least fifteen slaves who worked his hemp farm. Generally speaking, the Resolutions committed the Self-Defensive Association to the expulsion of free blacks from Platte County, the suppression of “traffic” between whites and slaves, slave self-hiring, and the punishment of abolitionists. Several others held “That this association will, whenever called upon by any of the citizens of Kansas Territory, hold itself in readiness together to assist and remove any and all emigrants who go there under the auspices of the Northern Emigrant Aid Societies” and “That we recommend to the citizens of other counties, particularly those bordering on Kansas Territory, to adopt regulations similar to those of this association, and to indicate their readiness to co-operate in the objects of this first resolution.” William G. Cutler, History of the State of Kansas: With Biographical Sketches and Portraits (Chicago: A. T. Andreas, 1883), Part 6.

⁹ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1855 (New York, 1855), 661-62; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1856 (New York, 1856), 169; History of Clay and Platte Counties, 643-44.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid; “From the Platte Argus: 16 April 1855,” Squatter Sovereign, 24 April 1855, p. 2; Paxton, Annals of Platte County, 198-99; Magers, “Raid on the Parkville Industrial Luminary,” 40-41. Oftentimes vigilantly mobs saw themselves as embodying popular sovereignty and upholding

justice. Jennet Kirkpatrick, Uncivil Disobedience: Studies in Violence and Democratic Politics (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 1-16. For local and state coverage see “Mobocracy in Parkville, Missouri,” The Liberator, 4 May, 1855, p. 1; “Despotism of Slavery,” Ibid., 11 May, 1855, p. 1; Liberty Weekly Tribune, 20 April 1855, p. 2; Booneville Weekly Observer, 28 April 1855, p. 1. For a description of the trend toward national circulation of the Free Soil newspapers along the Missouri-Kansas border see John Nerone, Violence Against the Press: Policing the Public Sphere in U. S. History (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 112-16.

¹² Dickson D. Bruce, Jr., And They all Sang Hallelujah: Plain-Folk Camp-Meeting Religion, 1800-1845 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1974); John Boles, The Great Revival: Beginnings of the Bible Belt (University Press of Kentucky, 1996); Ibid., The Great Revival, 1787-1805: The Origins of the Southern Evangelical Mind (University Press of Kentucky, 1982).

¹³ David Paul Nord, “Benevolent Books: Printing, Religion, and Reform,” in Robert A. Gross and Mary Kelley, eds. A History of the Book in America, Volume 2, An Extensive Republic, Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation, 1790-1840 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 221-46.

¹⁴ Wells, Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 42-57; Paul C. Gutjahr, “Diversification in American Religious Publishing,” Casper, The Industrial Book, 234-36, 273-77; Jonathan Daniel Wells, The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1861 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 42.

¹⁵ Daniel Walker Howe, What God Hath Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848 (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 608-09, 629-31.

¹⁶ Paul C. Gutjahr, An American Bible: A History of the Good Book in the United States, 1777-1880 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 1-7; David Paul Nord, Faith in Reading: Religious Publishing and the Birth of Mass Media in America (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 6-7.

¹⁷ Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), xvii-xix, 1-5.

¹⁸ Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (London: Verso, 1983), 12-16.

¹⁹ Jeffrey L. Pasley, “The Tyranny of Printers,” Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2001), 13-22, 35; Michael Kent Curtis, Free Speech, “The People’s Darling Privilege,” Struggles for Freedom of Expression in American History (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000), 1-21; Norman L. Rosenberg, Protecting the Best Men: An Interpretive History of the Law of Libel (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 3-11, 140-45.

²⁰ Nerone, Violence Against the Press, 5-6.

²¹ Mark M. Carroll, “‘All for Keeping His Own Negro Wench’: Birch v. Benton (1858) and the Politics of Slander and Free Speech in Antebellum Missouri,” Law and History Review 29, no. 3 (August 2011): 835-39.

²² Richard Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 22-30; Wesley Norton, Religious Newspapers in the Old Northwest to 1861: A History, Bibliography, and Record of Opinion (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1977), ix-x.

²³ Paul C. Gutjahr, "Diversification in American Religious Publishing," Casper, The Industrial Book, 194-203; Candy Gunther Brown, "Religious Periodicals and Their Textual Communities," Ibid., 270-78.

²⁴ Trish Loughran, The Republic of Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. National Building, 1770-1870 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 27-29.

²⁵ Richard B. Kielbowicz, "The Law and Mob Law in Attacks on Antislavery Newspapers, 1833-1860," Law and History Review, 24, no. 3 (Fall 2006): 559-63.

²⁶ Nerone, Violence Against the Press, 116-27, 226-29.

²⁷ Frances Lea McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit: Speechmaking on the Missouri Frontier (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1969), 172-76.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ R. S. Duncan, A History of the Baptists in Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1888), 81.

³⁰ Ibid., 79-82.

³¹ David L. Colton, "Lawyers, Legislation and Educational Localism: The Missouri School Code of 1825," Missouri Historical Review, 59, no. 2 (January, 1975): 121-22.

³² Howard I. McKee, "The School Law of 1853, Its Origins and Authors," ibid., 35, No. 4, (July, 1941): 543-45. Missouri's schools were, on paper at least, standardized by the passage of the Missouri School Law of 1853. Ken Luebbering, "The Emergence of Bureaucracy: The Missouri School Law of 1853," Missouri Historical Review, 74, no. 3 (April, 1980): 302-4.

³³ University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Center, "Historical Census Browser," (2004, accessed 19 January, 2010); available from <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/histcensus/index.html>.

³⁴ The 1820 Constitution of Missouri entailed provisions that made use of the land grants made by the federal government of the sixteenth section or its equivalent in each township for the use of public schools. An 1825 measure established the Common School Fund. The monies for this came from fines, forfeitures, and penalties. In response to the efforts of Governor Daniel Dunklin (1832-36), the General Assembly enacted an improved School Code in 1835, which established a State Board of Commissioners. The law, which was never actually implemented, set the elementary school term at six months and specified a curriculum that included reading, writing, arithmetic, and geography, English grammar, and other subjects. The law forbade the teaching of "theology." The General Assembly replaced the 1835 School Code with the Geyer Act in 1839. This ambitious statute prescribed a comprehensive system of public schools at the elementary, secondary, college, and university levels. The 1839 law also authorized localities to sell the sixteenth sections to raise funds for schools, which would go into a Township Fund. But such a sale had to be approved by three-fourths of the voters.

The Common School Fund only garnered a small amount each year. The 1839 reforms were complicated and too standardized in the view of many Missourians, who were leery of centralized state government. Local residents attempted to finance their public schools from endowments from federal land grants, that is, fees paid for the use of the sixteenth section of each township. But such funds remained inadequate through the antebellum period. Few public schools were actually built or funded. In 1853, the General Assembly voted down a bill that required each county court to levy an annual tax for schools. But the Kelly Act, passed shortly thereafter, required that twenty-five percent of the state's general revenue be apportioned among the counties to support public schools. This raised the state distribution from \$27,751 in 1850 to \$262,000 in 1860. But, at the local level, relatively few school districts were organized or funded. The state legislature failed to grant county authorities the power to levy property taxes for the support of public elementary schools, and no efforts were made to fund secondary schools. To make matters worse, school funds were often misappropriated by the General Assembly and loaned out to earn interest that would pay for internal improvements. Perry McCandless, A History of Missouri, Volume II, 1820 To 1860 (Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press, 1971, 2000), 12, 30, 79-80, 190-203.

³⁵ While women began the nineteenth century trailing men in literacy, they steadily closed the gap through the antebellum period as their educational opportunities increased. Catherine Hobbs, "Introduction: Cultures and Practices of U.S. Women's Literacy," Catherine Hobbs, ed., Nineteenth-Century Women Learn to Write (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1995), 2-5; Jean Ferguson Carr, "Nineteenth-Century Girls and Literacy," Jane Greer, ed., Girls and Literacy in America: Historical Perspectives to the Present (Santa Barbara, Ca: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 51-3.

³⁶ Personal Reminiscences and Fragments of the Early History of Springfield and Greene County, Missouri . . . (Springfield, 1914), 26-27.

³⁷ McCandless, History of Missouri, Vol. II, 190-203.

³⁸ Many American Sunday schools initially followed the British model by teaching their often poor students reading and writing, along with religion. But by the 1830s these schools had taken a back seat to those that simply sought to educate students in a particular faith. Anne M. Boylan, Sunday School: The Formation of an American Institution, 1790-1880 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988), 6-17.

³⁹ E. D. Jones, Sunday School Work in the Benton Street Mission, St. Louis (St. Louis, 1868), 1, 18.

⁴⁰ T. L. Largen, History of the Shoal Creek Association With History of Her Churches and Biography of Ministers (Kansas City, Mo., 1908), 39.

⁴¹ Martin Rice, History of the Blue River Baptist Association of Missouri (Kansas City, Mo., 1890), 27.

⁴² Rev. A. E. Prince, D.D., History of Fifth Street Baptist Church (Kansas City, Mo: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1944), 45.

⁴³ New Madrid Quarterly Conference Minutes, State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Collection 3595, Volume 1307.

⁴⁴ Alena Chance Jablonsky, ed., Vital Statistics of Rock Hill Presbyterian Church Rock Hill, St. Louis Co. MO, 1845-1956, 4, 82.

⁴⁵ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser." The five counties were Gentry, Lewis, Lincoln, Marion and Randolph. Note that St. Louis County which had Sunday school libraries was not represented.

⁴⁶ Charles I. Foster, An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960), 122-23. Nationally, the American Sunday School Union was organized in 1824 from the Philadelphia Sunday and Adult School Union. The earlier Philadelphia society started as a local organization, as did many others throughout the nation. By 1824 it had expanded sufficiently to prompt its leaders to consider a name change. The cohesiveness of the United Front definitely helped to advance American Protestantism in the early nineteenth century. Other scholars are quick to point out, however, that the founders of these societies sought to use them as a means of "social control," since these conservative clerics resented the democratic impulses associated with the rise of Jefferson and later Jackson. Clifford S. Griffin, "Religious Benevolence as Social Control, 1815-1860," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 44, no. 3, (December, 1957): 423-30.

⁴⁷ Paul C. Gutjahr, "Alternative Publishing Systems," Casper, The Industrial Book, 195.

⁴⁸ Boylan, Sunday School, 61.

⁴⁹ Edwin Wilbur Rice, The Sunday-School Movement, 1780-1917 and the American Sunday-School Union, 1817-1917 (Philadelphia, 1917), 195-97.

⁵⁰ Rufus Babcock, ed., Forty Years of Pioneer Life, Memoir of John Mason Peck D. D. Edited from His Journals and Correspondence by Rufus Babcock (Philadelphia, 1864; reprint, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965), 143, 194.

⁵¹ First Report of the American Sunday-School Union: Read at their Annual Meeting, Held in the City of Philadelphia, On Tuesday Evening, May 24, 1825 (Philadelphia, 1825), 7, 11-12.

⁵² Fourth Report of the American Sunday-School Union: Read at their Annual Meeting (Philadelphia, 1828), 8; Eighth Report of the American Sunday-School Union, 1832, 29; Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union . . . (Philadelphia, 1838), 24; The Twenty-Third Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union, May 17, 1847 (Philadelphia, 1847), 56.

⁵³ The Thirty-Third Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union; Presented at the Annual Meeting, May 12, 1857 (Philadelphia, 1857), 93-95.

⁵⁴ Largen. Shoal Creek Association, 39.

⁵⁵ Betty R. Murray, ed., Gone and Forgotten, Pleasant Grove Cemetery and Church, Camden Point, Missouri, Researched and compiled by Lu Durham and Irma Miller (Platte City, Mo: Platte County Historical Society, 1994), 4.

⁵⁶ Mount Pleasant United Baptist Church, Hartsburg, Missouri, Records, 1858-1950, State Historical Society of Missouri, Collection 2990, Volumes 1, 3.

-
- ⁵⁷ “History of the Arley United Methodist Church, 1845-1974: The First Hundred Years An Historical Sketch The Church Since 1946,” State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Collection 3727, Folder 275, p. 1.
- ⁵⁸ Centenary Methodist Church of St. Louis, The First Hundred Years, 1839-1939 (St. Louis, 1939), 11, 41, 69.
- ⁵⁹ University of Virginia, “Historical Census Browser.”
- ⁶⁰ Henry H. Sweets III, The Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church: A Sesquicentennial History (Hannibal, Mo: Presbyterian Church of Hannibal, 1984), 17-18.
- ⁶¹ The Second Book of 100 Pictures (Philadelphia, 1862), 23.
- ⁶² McCandless, A History of Missouri, 190-203.
- ⁶³ J. C. Maple, History of the Cape Girardeau Baptist Association from 1824 to 1912 (Cape Girardeau, Mo., 1913), 16-17.
- ⁶⁴ In 1861 they were able to form the Jackson School, named in honor of the county. Maple, History of the Cape Girardeau Baptist Association, 16-17.
- ⁶⁵ Charles D. Drake, “Autobiography,” State Historical Society of Missouri, Collection 1003, Folder 20, p. 629.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid.
- ⁶⁷ R. Laurence Moore, “Bible Reading and Nonsectarian Schooling: The Failure of Religious Instruction in Nineteenth-Century Public Education,” The Journal of American History, 86, no. 4 (March, 2000): 1583-86.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., 69.
- ⁶⁹ The reader was a copy of McGuffey Second Eclectic Reader for use in Indiana schools. The Indiana Series. The Second Reader: Progressive Lessons for the Young Reader (Cincinnati), 5, 30-31.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., 69.
- ⁷¹ William H. McGuffey, McGuffey’s New Fifth Eclectic Reader: Selected and Original Exercises for Schools (Cincinnati and New York, 1866), 306. The various publishing companies that began producing elementary texts in the 1870s eliminated much of this religious pedagogy from their pages. But many of the moral lessons were retained and were oftentimes enhanced. Dolores P. Sullivan, William Holmes McGuffey: Schoolmaster to the Nation (Rutherford, Madison and Teaneck, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994), 30-31, 73-77, 140-49; John A. Nietz, “Why the Longevity of the McGuffey Readers?” History of Education Quarterly, 4, no. 2, (June, 1964): 119-21.
- ⁷² Nord, Faith in Reading, 71-72. In their 1867 Jubilee Memorial the organization explained “the auxiliaries of all grades have borne the principal part. It has been the preferred policy of the Board to secure their organization over the whole country . . .” Isaac Ferris, Jubilee Memorial of the American Bible Society: Being a Review of its First Fifty Years’ Work . . . (New York, 1867), 32. .
- ⁷³ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 300; John W. Kuykendall, Southern Enterprize: The Work of National Evangelical Societies in the Antebellum South (Westport, Ct: Greenwood

Press, 1982), 89; Babcock, Forty Years Pioneer Life, 125; Proceedings of the Bible Convention . . . of the American and Foreign Bible Society, Embracing the Period of its Provisional Organization (New York, 1837), 3, 48. The General Association donated a modest fund for the society's organization and one of its vice-presidents, Jeremiah Vardeman, was from Missouri. Ibid.

⁷⁴ A Massachusetts minister, Sylvester Holmes, visited St. Louis in 1840 but was able to obtain little information from the thirteen auxiliaries in Missouri which were scattered along the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Twenty-Fifth Annual Report of the American Bible Society . . . (New York, 1841), 36, 45, 143.

⁷⁵ Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the American Bible Society, Presented May 9, 1844 (New York, 1844), 51, 145; Thirty-Fifth Annual Report of the American Bible Society, Presented May 9, 1850 (New York, 1850), 169-70; D. R. McAnally, Life and Times of Rev. William Patton and Annals of the Missouri Conference (St. Louis, 1858), 302, 313.

⁷⁶ The Parkville auxiliary's president was the Presbyterian minister George Woodard. United States Senator and member of Centenary Methodist Church, Trusten Polk, was the president of the St. Louis Young Men's group. Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the American Bible Society, Presented May 8, 1862 . . . 59, appendix 18-20.

⁷⁷ The first year in which the northern Annual Conference was able to collect funds for the American Bible Society was 1851. The German Methodists under the care of the Illinois Annual Conference had presumably been contributing to the society since the schism. The General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church from 1792 to 1896 (Cincinnati and New York, 1900), 103; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1849, (New York, 1851), 651, 671; McAnally, Life and Times of Patton, 247, 264, 267-69, 272, 311-325.

⁷⁸ Ninth Annual Report of the American Tract Society, MDCCC, XXIII, with List of Depositories, Life Members and Benefactors, Extracts of Correspondence (Andover, 1823), 1; Ferris, Jubilee Memorial of the American Bible Society, 9; Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the American Tract Society; Presented at New York, May 10, 1854 (New York, 1854), 5; Kuykendall, Southern Enterprize, 14-15; Elizabeth Twaddell, "The American Tract Society, 1814-1860," Church History, 15, no. 2 (June, 1946): 116; J. Orin Oliphant, "The American Missionary Spirit, 1828-1835," *ibid.*, 7, No. 2 (June, 1938): 125.

⁷⁹ Ninth Report of the American Tract Society, 1823, 35.

⁸⁰ Ten Years of Colportage in America (New York, 1851), 1-3, 17; Twentieth Annual Report of the American Tract Society; Presented at New York, May 7, 1845 . . . (New York, 1845), 65, 157; Rev. Charles Peabody, Twenty Years Among the Colporteurs (New York, 1865), 7. Peabody had previously been assigned to Ohio. Ibid.

⁸¹ Thirty-Second Report of the American Tract Society, 1857, 128.

⁸² The agency also served central and southern Illinois along with Iowa, thus it is impossible to determine the precise figures for Missouri. But the colporteurs were successful in their work –

visiting 54,672 families during 1857. They prayed with 23,930 of these families and sold 54,960 volumes worth \$13,739.87 or more than one per family they visited. *Ibid.*, 22, 25-26, 128.

⁸³ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 827.

⁸⁴ Babcock, Forty Years of Pioneer Life, 305, 323.

⁸⁵ Lovejoy was listed as treasurer of the St. Louis Auxiliary of the American Tract Society. Eleventh Annual Report of the American Tract Society . . . (New York, 1836), 130.

⁸⁶ Twentieth Report of the American Tract Society, 1845, 167; The Sixth Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union . . . (Philadelphia, 1830), 5.

⁸⁷ Lemuel Call Barnes, et al, Pioneers of Light: The First Century of the American Baptist Publication Society, 1824-1924 (Philadelphia, 1924), 3-8. Once the Civil War ended, nevertheless, a publication house of the society was established in St. Louis in 1868. Annual Report of the American Baptist Publication Society, Presented in Cleveland, Ohio. 1863 (Philadelphia, 1863), 23; Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 604, 910.

⁸⁸ Kuykendall, Southern Enterprise, 159-60.

⁸⁹ Eighth Report of the American Sunday-School Union, 1832, 27; Thirty-Second Report of the American Tract Society, 1857, 132.

⁹⁰ Thirty-Fifth Report of the American Bible Society, 1851, 64.

⁹¹ See, for example, “Happy Negro,” “The Pious Labourer,” “The Praying Soldier,” “Parley the Porter,” in The Publications of the American Tract Society, vol. 1 (Printed for the Society by Flagg & Gould, 1824), 89-97, 197-207; Twenty-Ninth Report of the American Tract Society, 1854, 183-210; Mary Kupiec Cayton, “Harriet Newell’s Story: Women, the Evangelical Press, and the Foreign Mission Movement,” in Gross and Kelly, eds., A History of the Book in America. Volume 2, 408-16; Gutjahr, “Diversification in American Publishing,” 194-202.

⁹² Helen C. Knight, Lady Huntington and Her Friends; or, The Revival of the Work of God in The Days of Wesley, Whitefield, Romaine, Venn and Others in the Last Century (New York, 1842), 3-8.

⁹³ A Visit to the Isle of Wight (Philadelphia, 1828), 5.

⁹⁴ “The Dairyman’s Daughter” (ATS, No. 9), Publications of the American Tract Society, Vol. 1, 101. The Dairyman’s Daughter was first issued in tract form in 1814 and that same year was published by the New England Tract Society in Boston. The American Tract Society in 1825 published it as tract No. 9. The tract was more popular in the United States than in Britain. In 1828, its circulation exceeded four million copies in nineteen languages. Grace Greenwood, Queen Victoria: Her Girlhood and Womanhood (1883; reprint, Middlesex: The Echo Library, 2008), 21-22; Abel Stevens, The History of the Eighteenth-century Religious Movement Called Methodism, Vol. 2 (New York: Carlton & Porter, 1859), 348, et seq.

⁹⁵ Brown, “Religious Periodicals and Their Textual Communities,” 270-278; Jonathan Daniel Wells, The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1860 (Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 89-132.

⁹⁶ Nord, Faith in Reading, 6-7, 121.

⁹⁷ “Political News,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 12 January 1859, p. 2.

-
- ⁹⁸ St. Louis Observer, 10 September 1835, p. 1.
- ⁹⁹ Ebenezer Thompson Baird, President of Presbyterian Washington College in Tennessee, took over the editorship and then passed it on to the Reverend Nathan L. Rice in mid-1852, who held the post through 1857; Scharf, History of Saint Louis, 1: 947; “Ebenezer Thompson Baird,” Historical Sketch of the Bethel Presbyterian Church, Lowndes County, Miss., Prepared for the Semi-Centennial Celebration, June 21, 1884 (Columbus, Ms., 1885); 12-13; E. C. Stott, Ministerial Directory of the Presbyterian Church, U. S., 1861-1941 (Austin, Tx.: Von Boeckmann-Jones, 1942): 28. William Hyde and Howard L. Conard, eds. Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference 4 vols. (New York, 1899), 3:1813.
- ¹⁰⁰ William S. Potts, Presbyterian Church Government Scriptural: A Sermon, Delivered by Appointment before the Presbytery of St. Louis, September 30, 1842 (St. Louis, 1843); William S. Potts and William Porter Cochran, Review of “A Declaration of Sentiments Made by the Synod of Missouri, Formed by a Convention of Presbyterian Ministers and Elders, Held at Hannibal, Oct. 7, 1841 (St. Louis, 1842).
- ¹⁰¹ “A Specimen of French Preaching,” St. Louis Observer, 3 September 1835, p. 1.
- ¹⁰² William S. Potts, Dangers of Jesuit Instruction (St. Louis, 1846).
- ¹⁰³ Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis, 3:1908; N. L. Rice, D.D., Romanism, The Enemy of Education, of Free Institutions, and of Christianity (Cincinnati, 1853). Few issues of the paper exist from the 1850s.
- ¹⁰⁴ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 897-99; W. Pope Yeaman, A History of the Missouri Baptist General Association (Columbia, Mo, 1899), 296-300; Western Watchman, 20 September, 1849, p. 3.
- ¹⁰⁵ There was an 1850 article discussing the success of the black Baptists in Missouri. Western Watchman, 21 March 1850, p. 2.
- ¹⁰⁶ Of the four issues of the paper that remain from Crowell’s tenure as editor, only one from 1857 discussed the slavery issue. In that issue there was a discussion of the controversy in the American Tract Society over the discussion of slavery in its publications. *Ibid.*, 26 November, 1857, p. 1.
- ¹⁰⁷ John A. Marshall, American Bastille: A History of the Illegal Arrests and Imprisonment of American Citizens in the Northern and Border States on Account of Their Political Opinions during the Late Civil War (Philadelphia, 1881) 487, et seq.
- ¹⁰⁸ St. Louis Christian Advocate, *ibid.*, 14 November 1850, p. 1.
- ¹⁰⁹ Hilliard, Stepping Stones to Glory, 1-3, 85; St. Louis Christian Advocate, 14 November 1850, p. 1.
- ¹¹⁰ Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 130-31.
- ¹¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹² James H. Atkinson, “The Arkansas Campaign and Election of 1872,” Arkansas Historical Quarterly 1 (December 1942): 307–321; Earl F. Woodward, “The Brooks-Baxter War in Arkansas, 1872–1874,” Arkansas Historical Quarterly 30 (Winter 1971): 315–36.

¹¹³ Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 130-31.

¹¹⁴ Franklin Ellis, ed., History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania; with Biographical Sketches of Many of its Pioneers and Prominent Men (Philadelphia, 1882), 315-16; James Hadden, History of Uniontown, Pennsylvania (1913; reprint, Mt. Vernon, Indiana: Wiedrich Publishing - Unigraphic 1978), 490-92.

¹¹⁵ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser." The census data was by no means entirely accurate. The lack of census data for children skews the calculation as well, given that many children in the state could read. Adults, too embarrassed to admit they could not read, likely dissembled before the census takers about this shortcoming. Also, the level of literacy was not surveyed in the census; many could read but not write. According to the guidelines established by the census takers, adults who were literate in a language other than English were to be counted as literate. But it appears as though census takers often did not credit newly-arrived immigrants as they should have. By the same token, it seems the increase in illiterate white adults in 1850 resulted from the thousands of foreign immigrants who had poured into Missouri during the 1840s. Scott Casper, "The Census, the Post Office, and Governmental Publishing," Scott E. Casper, Jeffrey Groves, Stephen Nissenbaum, and Michael Winship, eds., A History of the Book in America. Vol. 3. The Industrial Book, 1840-1880 (Chapel Hill: Published in Association with the American Antiquarian Society by the University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 178-80. There were 160,525 foreign born white Missourians in 1860 according to the census. University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹¹⁶ Frances Lea McCurdy, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit: Speechmaking on the Missouri Frontier (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1969), 172-76.

¹¹⁷ Eighth Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union, May 22, 1832 (Philadelphia, 1832), 29.

¹¹⁸ Thirty-Second Report of the American Tract Society, 1857, 130.

¹¹⁹ Siloam Church Record Book One, 1832-1857, 20. Siloam, Union and Spencer Creek churches received this letter from the Bethlehem church and became anti-mission congregations.

¹²⁰ Adam Fox found that written and oral cultures affected each other in this dynamic fashion, even among those who could not read since they were influenced by literate individuals. Adam Fox, Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1-50.

¹²¹ Mrs. Farrie L. Cole Sr., Mrs. Alvin E. Phillips, Mrs. Royce Moser, Mrs. Clarence M. Brumback, Mrs. Virginia Bailey and Mrs. A. P. Reichel, A History of the Lamine Baptist Association of Missouri 1872-1971 (Stover, Mo, 1971), 6.

¹²² One of the more popular works, Village Sermons, was written by the English Congregationalist minister George Burder and republished by the American Tract Society. George Burder, Village Sermons; or, Fifty-Two Plain and Short Discourses on the Principal Doctrines of the Gospel . . ., 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 1804), 3-6; Henry Forster Burder, Memoir of the Rev. George Burder, Author of the "Village Sermons," and Secretary to the London Missionary Society (New York and Boston, 1833), 320.

¹²³ Williams was able to arrange for a hired hand to oversee his farm for six months, which allowed him time to study with eminent Baptist minister John Mason Peck. Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 83.

¹²⁴ Frances McAnally Blackburn Hilliard, Stepping Stones to Glory: From Circuit Rider to Editor in the Years in Between, Life of David Rice McAnally D. D. 1810-1895 (Baltimore: Gateway Press, Inc., 1975), 4-7.

¹²⁵ "How to Read a Religious Newspaper," St. Louis Observer, 10 September 1835, p. 1.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 14 November 1850, p. 1; St. Louis Observer, 10 September 1835, p. 1. During the Civil War, many members of the Providence Baptist Church in St. Francois County, situated south of St. Louis, came to the home of one member, Abraham Ringer, to hear news of the war. He was the only person many of them knew who subscribed to a weekly paper. By reading aloud the news to his neighbors, however, Ringer expanded its influence in his rural village. History of Providence Baptist Church and Germania Cemetery (Bonne Terre, Mo, 1976).

¹²⁷ Rev. Charlton Henry, D. D., Letters to an Anxious Inquirer, Letters to Relieve the Difficulties of a Friend Under Religious Impressions (Philadelphia, 1840), iii-vi.

¹²⁸ Thirty-second Annual Report of the American Tract Society; Presented at New York, May 13, 1857 (New York, 1857), 138. The term colporteur is a French term for an itinerant seller of books and other materials.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ Baptist Richard Furman, Exposition of the Views of the Baptists, Relative to the Coloured Population of the United States (1823). See John Patrick Daly, at < <http://www.enotes.com/american-history-literature/proslavery-writing>>.

¹³¹ See John Patrick Daly, at < <http://www.enotes.com/american-history-literature/proslavery-writing>>.

¹³² Francis Wayland (1796-1865) was born in New York City. He graduated from Williams College in 1800, entered Andover Theological Seminary in 1816, where he was greatly influenced by Moses Stuart. With insufficient funds to complete his theology studies, Wayland worked as a tutor at Union College in 1817-21. After serving as pastor of the First Baptist Church of Boston for five years, he returned to Union College as a professor of natural philosophy. He founded Newton Theological Institution in 1825, served as President of Brown University from 1827 to 1855, and as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Providence, Rhode Island.

In addition to becoming an early advocate for the anti-slavery cause, Wayland supported the temperance movement and other reforms, and wrote a number of books on ethics, economics, and religion. See Elements of Moral Science (1835); Elements of Political Economy (1837); The Limitations of Human Responsibility (1838); Domestic Slavery Considered as a Scriptural Institution (1845); Elements of Intellectual Philosophy (1854); Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches (1857); Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel (1863). See also Francis Wayland and Heman Lincoln, The Life and Labors of Francis Wayland, 2 vols. (New York, 1867).

¹³³ Jack Scott, ed., An Annotated Edition of Lectures on Moral Philosophy by John Witherspoon (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1982), 1-62.

¹³⁴ Wayland, Elements of Moral Science, 95.

¹³⁵ Southerner evangelicals generally embraced the framework of moral philosophy set out by the British Rationalists, Frances Hutcheson, and John Witherspoon. But there were substantial areas of disagreement. In addition to expanding the set of social relations ordered by divinely-ordained moral duty to include, explicitly, masters and slaves, many southern moralists charged that the northern abolitionists had improperly elevated conscience, or the moral sense, to the exclusion of other sources for discerning moral duty, such as scripture and natural theology (which sought to make scripture and empirical science compatible). In the view of southern moralists, this fundamentally threatened the supremacy of revealed truth and thus the foundation of Christian ethics. Presbyterian theologians and moralists, such as James Henley Thornwell, moreover, emphasized that southern evangelical adherence to a belief in an innate moral sense, or conscience, demonstrated that slaveholding southerners, in fact, recognized the humanity of slaves, in contradiction to abolitionists who charged that they viewed their bondsmen as mere chattel or property. John B. Adger, D.D. and John L. Girardeau D.D., eds., The Collected Writings of John Henley Thornwell, D.D., L.L.D. Late Professor of Theology at the Theological Seminary at Columbia, South Carolina 4 vols. (Richmond, 1873), 4:403-5.

Francis Wayland first on the social and civic relations and duties in his 1835 Elements of Moral Science. The second book, "Practical Ethics" related the obligations of people to not only love their creator but deal with one another. Francis Wayland, The Elements of Moral Science (Boston, 1843), 14-15.

Others, such as Virginian Thomas R. Dew, fused moral philosophy with classical economics and, thus, to a favorable view of material progress. His linkage of these bodies of thought remained popular throughout the South in the decades leading up to the Civil War. Dew, who taught at William and Mary, was one of the few non-clerics who taught moral philosophy.

Mitchell Snay, Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 60-61, 84-85; John Patrick Daly, When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 47-55.

¹³⁶ Wayland, Elements of Moral Science, 104.

¹³⁷ Jasper Adams (1793 – 1841) was born in East Medway, Massachusetts and graduated from Brown University in 1815. He taught at Phillips Academy of Andover, Massachusetts, and became a professor of mathematics and natural philosophy at Brown University in 1819. But he was ordained a priest in the Episcopal Church in 1820. He became president of the College of Charleston in 1824. He was elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1835. After writing Elements of Moral Philosophy (1837), he became a chaplain, and a professor of geography, history and ethics, at the United States Military Academy. He died in Pendleton, South Carolina, in 1841. Daniel D. Dreisbach, ed., Religion and Politics in the Early Republic: Jasper Adams and the Church-State Debate (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky,

1996), 1-36; Jasper Adams, Elements of Moral Philosophy (Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, & Thurston, 1837), *Ibid.*, The Relation of Christianity to Civil Government in the United States: Sermon preached in St. Michael's Church, Charleston, February 13th, 1833 by Rev. J. Adams (Charleston: A. E. Miller, 1833).

Anglican cleric Richard Hooker (1553-1600), in some ways, advanced the scholastic theology of St. Thomas Aquinas set out in his Summa Theologica (1265-74). In Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Politie (1593, 1597, 1662), Hooker sought to validate the position of Queen Elizabeth I as the supreme governor of the Church against the conflicting claims of Scottish Presbyterians. Martin Luther had argued for the priesthood of all believers. If this doctrine were taken to its extreme by an elect, then having the monarch as the governor of the Church was unscriptural and intolerable. On the other hand, if God had appointed the monarch to be the governor of the church, then local parishes could not have the latitude to adopt Lutheran views on church and civil government. See Arthur Stephen McGrade, ed., Hooker: Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), xiii-xxxii.

¹³⁸ Missouri Republican, 30 April 1835, p. 1.

¹³⁹ Tanner, Martyrdom of Lovejoy, *Ibid.*, 95; Paul Simon, Freedom's Champion: Elijah Lovejoy (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994), 27-30.

¹⁴⁰ Joseph C. and Owen Lovejoy, Memoir of the Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy; Who was Murdered in Defense of the Liberty of the Press, at Alton, Illinois, Nov. 7, 1837 (Freeport, NY, 1838; reprint, Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), 160-61; Simon, Freedom's Champion, 35-36; Merton L. Dillon, Elijah P. Lovejoy, Abolitionist Editor (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), 64.

¹⁴¹ St. Louis Observer, 5 November 1835, p. 3.

¹⁴² Lovejoy, Memoir of Elijah Lovejoy, 160.

¹⁴³ Alton Observer, 10 March 1837, p. 2.

¹⁴⁴ Lovejoy, Memoir of Elijah Lovejoy, 162-65.

¹⁴⁵ Missouri Republican, 10 December 1835, p. 2.

¹⁴⁶ St. Louis Observer, 19 November 1835, p. 1; John Gill, Tide Without Turning: Elijah P. Lovejoy and the Freedom of the Press (Boston: Starr King Press, Beacon Hill, 1958), 59.

¹⁴⁷ St. Louis Observer, 30 April 1836, p. 2; Louis S. Gerteis, Civil War St. Louis (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001), 7-8.

¹⁴⁸ St. Louis Observer, 5 May 1836, p. 2.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 2 June 1836, p. 1; *Ibid.*, 9 June 1836, p. 1; Simon, Freedom's Champion, 50.

¹⁵⁰ Missouri Republican, 26 May 1836, p. 2.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² Tanner, Martyrdom of Lovejoy, 105-7.

¹⁵³ Missouri Republican, 28 October 1837, p. 2.

¹⁵⁴ William F. Moore and Jane Ann Moore, eds., His Brother's Blood: Speeches and Writings, 1838-64, Owen Lovejoy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 4-15.

¹⁵⁵ John W. Quist maintains that slavery remained an issue for the three multi-denominational publishing operations after the schisms. And he concludes that all three organizations did not sell as many publications or otherwise place agents in the southern states as well as they did in northern ones. But he also seems to suggest that each national organization operated rather similarly in both sections of the country. John W. Quist, "Slaveholding Operatives in the Benevolent Empire: Bible, Tract and Sunday School Societies in Antebellum Tuscaloosa County, Alabama," The Journal of Southern History, 63, no. 3 (August, 1996): 523-25. According to Anne M. Boylan, The American Sunday School Union faced difficulties in fashioning its southern strategy, and the approach it employed in producing printed publications and organizing Sunday schools appears to have undercut its sales in the South. But it is somewhat difficult to ascertain the full impact of the slavery question on the American Sunday School Union after the evangelical schisms. Boylan, Sunday School, 80-84.

¹⁵⁶ The Methodist Episcopal Church Book Concern had been founded in 1789. James Penn Pilkington, The Methodist Publishing House: A History 2 vols. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), 1:vii-viii, 280-98, 334; Charles W. Barnes, ed., One Hundred Years of Progress, 1820-1920 . . . (Cincinnati, 1920), 17-19, 34-39; Nord, Faith in Reading, 156.

¹⁵⁷ The Southern Baptist Convention's bible board, established in 1851, failed in 1863 during the turmoil of the war and after it was realized that the American Bible Society had planted a number of auxiliaries throughout the South prior to the war. B. F. Riley, A History of the Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi (Philadelphia, 1898), 239; Jesse Harrison Campbell, Georgia Baptists: Historical and Biographical (Macon, Ga., 1874), 31.

¹⁵⁸ The Southern Baptist Convention's bible board, established in 1851, failed in 1863 during the turmoil of the war and after it was realized that the American Bible Society had planted a number of auxiliaries throughout the South prior to the war. B. F. Riley, A History of the Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi (Philadelphia, 1898), 239; Jesse Harrison Campbell, Georgia Baptists: Historical and Biographical (Macon, Ga., 1874), 31.

¹⁵⁹ Commonwealth v. Green, et al., 4 Wharton 531 (Pa., 1839) 57-62. See discussion in Chapter Three.

¹⁶⁰ Nord, Faith in Reading, 155.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 156.

¹⁶² Boylan, Sunday School, 80.

¹⁶³ Kuykendall, Southern Enterprize, 124.

¹⁶⁴ Nord, Faith in Reading, 156.

¹⁶⁵ Pilkington, Methodist Publishing House, 395-98.

¹⁶⁶ The MEC achieved its goal in 1865, in this connection, as a consequence of Radical Republican rule, established in 1861. "Books! Books!," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 November 1852, p. 58; "Doing Business on a Large Scale," *ibid.*, 13 November 1851, p. 50; Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939, A Brief History (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966), 130-31.

¹⁶⁷ H. B. Bascom, D. D., Methodism and Slavery: with other matters in Controversy Between the North and the South; Being a Review of the Manifesto of the Majority . . . (Frankfort, Ky., 1845), 3-4.

¹⁶⁸ George Peck, D. D., Slavery and the Episcopacy: Being an Examination of Dr. Bascom's Review of the Reply of the Majority . . . (New York, 1845), 52; Bascom, Methodism and Slavery, 80-81.

¹⁶⁹ Rev. Moses M. Henkle, D. D., Primary Platform of Methodism; or, Exposition of the General Rules (Louisville, Ky., 1853), 174-99. As the southern Methodist book concern was not established in 1853, the book was published in Louisville but eventually distributed from the book concern according to the title page.

¹⁷⁰ "Methodism and Slavery," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 4 November 1852, p. 45.

¹⁷¹ Richard Fuller and Francis Wayland, Domestic Slavery Considered As a Scriptural Institution: In a Correspondence Between The Rev. Richard Fuller And Rev. Francis Wayland (New York, 1860), 110-14.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 114.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁴ Domestic Slavery Considered as a Scriptural Institution: In a Correspondence between the Rev. Richard Fuller and Rev. Francis Wayland (New York, 1845). Fuller delivered sermons at the annual meetings of the Triennial Convention in 1844 and 1845 and then at the Southern Baptist Convention in 1846 and at every subsequent annual meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention until 1872. Fuller was the third president of the Southern Baptist Convention and also served as president in the years 1859-1861 and 1861-1863. Fuller's sermons were heavily grounded in theology but crafted to engage the practical problems facing ordinary believers. His sermons reveal that he embraced fully the concept of "predestination." The effectiveness of prayer, and a belief in Divine Providence that construed misfortune and suffering as blessings necessary for spiritual uplift. Fuller believed that God also provided individuals temporal blessings, which were to be enjoyed. But for an individual to set her or his affection on earthly objects, so as to make requisite for one's highest happiness, was a sin. Don Whitney, "Richard Fuller, Pt. 1 – A Biographical Sketch," The Founders Journal 7 (Winter 1992), nn. 1-8, 11-13, 14, 18; J. H. Cuthbert, Life of Richard Fuller (New York: Sheldon and Company, 1879), pp. 25, 43-45, 61-69, 105, 157; Thomas Armitage, A History of the Baptists (New York, 1890; reprint ed., Watertown, Wisconsin: Baptist Heritage Press, 1988), 2:760.

¹⁷⁵ James O. Farmer, Jr., The Metaphysical Confederacy: James Henley Thornwell and the Synthesis of Southern Values (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986; reprint 1999), 218-19.

¹⁷⁶ The tract comprised an expanded version of the May 26, 1850 sermon. See James Henley Thornwell, The Rights and the Duties of Masters. Sermon Preached at the Dedication of a Church Erected in Charleston, S.C., for the Benefit and Instruction of the Coloured Population (Charleston, 1850). This expanded version was also published in the Southern Presbyterian Review as "Slavery and the Religious Instruction of the Colored Population," 4 (July 1850): 105-41. See also Adger and Girardeau, eds. Collected Writings of Thornwell, 4: 398-427. It seems

fairly clear that both Jasper Adams and Thornwell, relied on the well established concept of relations espoused initially by early eighteenth-century Anglican divine Samuel Clarke, to defend the institution of slavery. See “Lecture XI. Moral Government,” in Adger, Collected Works of Thornwell, 1:52-63; Samuel Clarke, Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God, the Obligations of Natural Religion and the Truth and Certainty of Christian Revelation, 8th ed. (London, 1732). See also John Patrick Daley, When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War (Lexington: The University of Press of Kentucky, 2002), 21, 29, 40-41, 47-56, 88-89, 95, 105-9; Snay, Gospel of Disunion, 82, 84-7; 89, 60-61, 84-85; Farmer, Metaphysical Confederacy, 106, 153-75. One of the best socially, culturally, and politically contextualized discussions of Thornwell’s theology and moral philosophy is set out in Stephanie McCurry, Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, & the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 174-78, 210-13, 225, 232-34, 288-92.

¹⁷⁷ William S. Potts, Presbyterian Church Government Scriptural: A Sermon, Delivered by Appointment before the Presbytery of St. Louis, September 30, 1842 (St. Louis, 1843); Ibid., Ministers Should Live of the Gospel: A Sermon on the Duty of the Presbyterian Church in Missouri in Regard to Domestic Missions: Preached by Appointment Before the Synod of Missouri, in Columbia, October 16, 1846 by William S. Potts (St. Louis, 1846).

¹⁷⁸ After leaving St. Louis in 1854, Baird assumed a number of pastorates in Mississippi, Virginia, Arkansas. Baird, Historical Sketch of the Bethel Presbyterian Church, Lowndes County, Miss., 12-13; Stott, Ministerial Directory of the Presbyterian Church, 28.

¹⁷⁹ Nathan L. Rice, Account of the Law-Suit Instituted by Rev. G. A. M. Elder . . . against Rev. N. L. Rice . . . for a Pretended Libel on the Character of Rev. David Duparque, a Roman Priest, Together with Some Remarks on Celibacy and Nunneries (Louisville, 1837); A Debate between Rev. A. Campbell and Rev. N. L. Rice on the Action, Subject and Administrator of Christian Baptism; also, on the Character of Spiritual Influence in Conversion and Sanctification, and on the Expediency and Tendency of Ecclesiastic Creeds, as Terms of Union and Communion; Held in Lexington, Ky., from the Fifteenth of November to the Second of December, 1843 (A. T. Skillman & Son, 1844); A Discourse on Dancing, Delivered in the Central Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati (Cincinnati, 1847). The immediately foregoing treatise conceded that, in a biblical context, dance was utilized as a part of worship. But Rice stressed that this rite was only performed by women dancing with each other. He also emphasized the dangers of contact between the sexes. He also emphasized that dancing was bad for the health, especially in women. Nathan Lewis Rice, Phrenology Examined, and Shown to be Inconsistent with the Principles of Physiology, Mental and Moral Science, and the Doctrines of Christianity, also an examination of the Claims of Mesmerism (New York, 1848); God Sovereign and Man Free, or, the Doctrine of Divine Foreordination and Man’s Free Agency Stated, Illustrated, and Proved from the Scriptures (Philadelphia, 1850). Alfred A. Thomas, ed., Correspondence of Thomas Ebenezer Thomas, Mainly Relating to the Anti-slavery Conflict in Ohio, Especially in the Presbyterian Church (Published by Alfred A. Thomas, 1909), 96, et seq.

¹⁸⁰ Nathan Lewis Rice, The Signs of the Times in a Series of Eight Lectures (St. Louis, 1855). See also Ibid., Increase of Crime: An Address Delivered before the Society of Moral and Religious Inquiry, of Shurtleff College, June 16, 1855 (St. Louis, 1855); Ibid., The Immortality and the Soul and Destiny of the Wicked (Philadelphia, 1871); Thomas, Correspondence, 97-98.

¹⁸¹ Nathan Lewis Rice, Ten Letters on the Subject of Slavery (St. Louis, 1856).

¹⁸² Leander Ker, Slavery Consistent with Christianity: With an Introduction, Embracing a Notice of the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" Movement in England (Weston, Mo, 1853), 18-19. The text of Ephesians 6: 5-8 is "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; Not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free." The Holy Bible: King James Version.

¹⁸³ Ker, Slavery Consistent with Christianity, 19-25; Henry Shindler, Fort Leavenworth, Its Churches and Schools (Fort Leavenworth, Ks, 1912), 37.

¹⁸⁴ E. Brooks Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1978), 144-48; B. F. Stringfellow, Negro-Slavery, No Evil; or The North and the South . . . (St. Louis, 1854), 6; F. H. Hodder, "Some Phases of the Dred Scott Case," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 16, no. 1 (June 1929): 6.

¹⁸⁵ Harriet Beecher Stowe was the daughter of Lyman Beecher, a Congregationalist minister. Uncle Tom's Cabin first appeared as a 40-week serial in National Era, an abolitionist periodical, starting with the June 5, 1851 issue. Because of the story's popularity, the publisher John Jewett contacted Stowe about turning the serial into a book. While Stowe questioned if anyone would read Uncle Tom's Cabin in book form, she eventually consented to the request.

Convinced the book would be popular, Jewett made the unusual decision (for that time) to have six full-page illustrations by Hammatt Billings engraved for the first printing. Published in book form on March 20, 1852, the novel soon sold out its complete print run. A number of other editions were soon printed (including a deluxe edition in 1853, featuring 117 illustrations by Billings. In the first year of publication, 300,000 copies of Uncle Tom's Cabin were sold. According to literary historian Jane Tompkins, "Stowe conceived her book as an instrument for bringing about the day when the world would be ruled not by force, but by Christian love." Jane Tompkins, "Sentimental Power: Uncle Tom's Cabin and the Politics of Literary History," in In Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 122-146; Deborah C. de Rosa, Domestic Abolitionism and Juvenile Literature, 1830-1865 (State University of New York Press, 2003), 121; George L. Aiken, Uncle Tom's Cabin (New York: Garland, 1993).

¹⁸⁶ Scott v. Emerson, 15 Mo, 686.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 687.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 587.

¹⁸⁹ Mark M. Carroll, “Religion, Public Morals, and the Supreme Court of Missouri, 1821–1860,” presented on April 22, 2004 at the 46th Missouri Conference on History, Jefferson City, Missouri.

¹⁹⁰ Platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society and its Auxiliaries (New York, 1855), 3; David Grimsted, American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 3, 12-13, 17-18; Leonard L. Richards, “Gentlemen of Property and Standing.” Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 3-19.

¹⁹¹ The murdered minister may well have brought the mob action on himself in ways not so obvious. In addition to the anti-slavery publications in the St. Louis Presbyterian, he sent to Jefferson City in 1835 a package of religious periodicals from the American Tract Society wrapped with abolitionist sheets. Henry Tanner, The Martyrdom of Lovejoy: An Account of the Life, Trials and Perils of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy . . . (Chicago, 1881; reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1971), 55-58; Missouri Republican, 26 May 1836, p. 2. In his instructions to the grand jury impaneled to indict the leaders of the Francis McIntosh lynch mob, Judge Luke Lawless, after condemning the Observer, suggests that the Missouri General Assembly take action against anti-slavery periodicals.

¹⁹² Curtis, Free Speech, 229-40.

¹⁹³ Sec. 10, art. 1, ch. 47, Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri (St. Louis: J. W. Dougherty, 1845), p. 342; secs. 10-12, art. 1, ch. 50, Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri, 2 vols. (Jefferson City, 1856), 1:556-57; Curtis, Free Speech, 40-44, 130.

¹⁹⁴ John B. Meachum, An Address to All the Colored Citizens of the United States (Philadelphia, 1846), 5.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁹⁶ Thomas D. Hamm, “A Quaker View of Black St Louis in 1841,” Missouri Historical Review, 98, no. 2, (Jan. 2004): 119-20; Donnie D Bellamy, “The Education of Blacks in Missouri Prior to 1861,” The Journal of Negro History, 59, No. 2, (April, 1974): 144-155.

¹⁹⁷ Janet Duitsman Cornelius, “When I Can Read My Title Clear”: Literacy, Slavery and Religion in the Antebellum South (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 125-28.

¹⁹⁸ The XXXII Report of the American Sunday School Union, 1856, 97-98.

¹⁹⁹ Jones embraced a wide variety of reforms but had grave concerns about the institution of slavery, although he was a slaveholder himself and continued to work within the system. Charles C. Jones, The Religious Instruction of Negroes. In the United States (Savannah, 1842), v-xiii; Cornelius, When I Can Read My Title Clear, 35-36.

²⁰⁰ A. F. Dickson, Plantation Sermons, or Plain and Familiar Discourses for the Instruction of the Unlearned (Philadelphia, 1856), xi.

²⁰¹ Mo. Rev. Stat. §167-24 (1845), 1016-17.

²⁰² In some cases, sympathetic whites continued to support these schools. The Roman Catholic and Methodist Episcopal Church, South, moreover, continued to create schools for blacks in St. Louis. Bellamy, “The Education of Free Blacks in Missouri,” 150-55.

²⁰³ Meachum, Address to All the Colored Citizens, 11.

²⁰⁴ “A History of Kahoka Methodist Church,” State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Collection 3727, Folder 274, p. 1-2. Chambersburg is located in Clark County in the northeast corner of the state.

²⁰⁵ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the year 1854 (New York, 1854), 481-82; Elliott, South-western Methodism, 32-34.

²⁰⁶ “Marion Association,” Tri-Weekly Hannibal Messenger, 15 December 1853, p. 2. William League was the publisher of the paper, which changed its name numerous times, from 1853 to 1860. Kate Ray Kuhn, A History of Marion County (1963), 88. League’s son was listed as a prominent member of the southern Methodist Park Memorial Church during the 1880s. Hannibal Station Quarterly Conference Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Collection 3727, Folder 271.

²⁰⁷ R. L. Holcombe, History of Marion County, Missouri, Written and Compiled from the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources . . . (St. Louis, 1884), 320.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 320-21; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the year 1853 (New York, 1853), 312; Elliott, South-Western Methodism, 39; Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 122.

²⁰⁹ H. S. Lipscomb was the principle author of the resolutions and J. B. Redd, W. C. Dingle, James McPike and Dr. A. F. Jeter formed the remainder of the committee. Holcombe, History of Marion County, 321.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 320-22. Lipscomb ran as a pro-slavery Democrat in an 1862 election for the General Assembly but supported Douglas in 1860. *Ibid.*, 344, 521.

²¹¹ “Adjourned Meeting. Feb. 18th 1854,” Tri-Weekly Hannibal Messenger, 28 February 1854, p. 2; “The Methodist Church Controversy,” *Ibid.*, 20 December 1853, p. 2; “Methodist Church Questions,” *Ibid.*, 18 February 1854, p. 3.

²¹² Elliott, South-Western Methodism, 42.

²¹³ *Ibid.*

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 42-43. In many ways these statements were consistent with an 1863 article in the Methodist Review discussing the imbroglio. The author explained the northern Methodists “never allowed her ministry or members to engage in opposition to the law.” “Art. VI- The Martyrdom of Bewley,” Methodist Quarterly Review 45 (1863): 631. In many ways these statements were consistent with an 1863 article in the Methodist Review discussing the imbroglio. The author explained the northern Methodists “never allowed her ministry or members to engage in opposition to the law.” “Art. VI- The Martyrdom of Bewley,” Methodist Quarterly Review 45 (1863): 631.

²¹⁵ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1854 480; Holcombe, History of Marion County, 982; Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 122-24.

²¹⁶ Education, Temperance, Freedom Religion in Kansas (Boston, 1855).

²¹⁷ Thomas H. Webb, Information for Kansas Immigrants: Prepared by Thomas H. Webb, Secretary of the New England Immigrant Aid Co. (Boston, 1855).

²¹⁸ St. Louis Christian Advocate, 26 April 1855, p. 146; Ibid., 10 May 1855, p. 155; Ibid., 24 May 1855, p. 162.

²¹⁹ Thirty-First Annual Report of the American Tract Society . . . (New York, 1856), 22-23; Thirty-Second Report of the American Tract Society, 1857, 226; Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the American Tract Society, Presented at Boston, May 30, 1860 (Boston, 1860), 4-9; Robert Trendel, "The Expurgation of Antislavery Materials by American Presses," The Journal of Negro History 58, no. 3 (July, 1973): 271; Nord, Faith in Reading, 152-54. Truman M. Post, a New School Presbyterian and Congregationalist minister from St. Louis was a vice-president of the Boston society. Otherwise, the organization did little work in Missouri or outside of the Northeast.

²²⁰ The XXXII Report of the American Sunday School Union, 1856, 107-9.

²²¹ Thornton Stringfellow, Scriptural and Statistical Views in Favor of Slavery (1856); Slavery: Its Origin, Nature, and History (1861).

²²² Smith also argued that all men are, to some extent, slaves. The family and even republican democratic government required men to be dependent upon others and to restrain their actions in recognition of and deference to the rights of others. Like the family and civil government, slavery was conducive to good order in society. Lectures on the Philosophy and Practice of Slavery, as Exhibited in the Institution of Domestic Slavery in the United States: with the Duties of Masters to Slaves (Nashville, 1856). Smith was fully admitted as a minister in the Methodist Church in 1827 in the Virginia Conference. In 1846, he was elected President of Randolph-Macon College in Ashland, Virginia. In 1866, he resigned from his position at Randolph-Macon College and became pastor of Centenary Church in St. Louis. In 1868, Smith was chosen to be President of Central College in Fayette, Missouri. Smith died in Richmond, Virginia on March 1, 1870. John McClintock and James Strong, eds., Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature (New York, 1880), 9:831.

²²³ Richard Henderson Rivers was born in Montgomery County, Tennessee in 1814. He graduated from La Grange College in Alabama in 1835 and was ordained a Methodist minister at about that time. In 1843 he was elected president of the Athens female seminary (1843-48). And, in 1848 and 1849, was a professor of moral science in Centenary College, Jackson, Louisiana. In 1849 he was elected its president, which office he held till 1854. Also in that year he became president of La Grange College, a post he retained until the Civil War. He subsequently became president of Centenary College, Summerfield, Alabama, in the war years. In 1865 he became principal of an academy for women at Somerville, Tennessee, and later other schools in the Southwest. Beginning in about 1834, the Reverend Rivers preached as well as taught and served as pastor of various Methodist churches. In 1888, he became pastor of the Shelby Street (Louisville, Kentucky) Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1850, La Grange College awarded him the degree of D. D. He contributed articles to journals and published textbooks on mental philosophy (Nashville, 1860) and moral philosophy (Nashville, 1859; 1866) and authored Our Young People (1880) and Life of Bishop Robert Paine (1884). He also edited a volume of sermons in 1872. Nell Peerson, The Life of Richard Henderson Rivers (N. Peerson, 1933); John

Howard Brown, ed., Lamb's Biographical Dictionary of the United States (Boston: Federal Book Co., 1903), 489; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene D. Genovese, The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholder's Worldview (Cambridge University Press, 2005), 58, 100, 103, 151, 162, 501-02, 511, 514, 525, 574, 680.

²²⁴ Richard Henderson Rivers, Elements of Moral Philosophy (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1859); John R. McKivigan and Mitchell Snay, "Introduction: Religion and the Problem of Slavery in Antebellum America," in McKivigan and Snay, eds., Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery (University of Georgia Press, 1998), 18; Asa Mahan, Science of Moral Philosophy (Oberlin: James M. Fitch, 1848); Edward H. Madden, "Asa Mahan and the Oberlin Philosophy," in Maurice Wohlgelemer, ed. History, Religion, and American Democracy (Columbia University Press, 1989; exp. ed., New Brunswick: Transaction, 1993), 155, et seq.; "Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection by Asa Mahan," in Charles W. Dunn, ed., American Political Theology: Historical Perspective and Theoretical Analysis (New York: Praeger, 1984); Charles Grandison Finney, Lectures on Systematic Theology: Embracing Lectures on Moral Government, the Atonement, Moral and Physical Depravity, Natural, Moral, and Gracious Ability, Repentance, Faith, Justification, Sanctification (Oberlin Press, 1846); Allen C. Guelzo, "An Heir or a Rebel? Charles Grandison Finney and the New England Theology," Journal of the Early Republic 17, no. 1 (Spring 1997); 60-94; Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, Charles G. Finney and the Spirit of American Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1996).

²²⁵ Squatter Sovereign, 1 May 1855, p. 2.

²²⁶ Stringfellow, Negro-Slavery, No Evil, 3-5; Paxton, Annals of Platte County, 192, 198.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

²³⁰ Missouri Platte County Self-Defensive Association, Benjamin F. Stringfellow ed., Negro-Slavery, No Evil, or the North and the South (St. Louis, 1854), 6.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 6.

²³² Squatter Sovereign, 3 February 1855, p. 1; *Ibid.*, 13 February 1855, p. 1. Some of the issues that defended the theology of slavery published around the Luminary mobbing include: *ibid.*, 6 March 1855, p. 2; *ibid.*, 5 June 1855, p. 1; *ibid.*, 12 June 1855, p. 1. It also appeared in the St. Joseph Commercial Cycle from February 2 to March 9, 1855. History of Clay and Platte Counties, 535.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 10.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

²³⁶ Stringfellow, Negro-Slavery, No Evil, 10. Many pro-southern ministers used the census to tout the superiority of the South. Daley, When Slavery was Called Freedom, 80-81.

²³⁷ James Shannon, An Address Delivered Before the Pro-Slavery Convention on the State of Missouri, Held in Lexington, July 1855 (St. Louis, 1855), v-vi, 10-17. For a description of the

convention see Milton Eugene Bierbaum, "The Rhetoric of Union or Disunion in Missouri, 1844-1861" (PhD. Diss., University of Missouri, 1965), 230-52.

²³⁸ Mark A. Noll, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 75-94; *Ibid.*, America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 365-438; Harry S. Stout, Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the Civil War (New York: Viking Press, 2006), 73-81, 132-34; Daly, When Slavery was Called Freedom, 136-54.

²³⁹ Thomas, Correspondence, 96.

²⁴⁰ Nathan L. Rice, Ten Letters on the Subject of Slavery: Addressed to the Delegates from the Congregational Associations to the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (St. Louis, 1856), 6-7.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁴² *Ibid.*

²⁴³ A Debate on Slavery: Held in the City of Cincinnati, On the First, Second, Third, and Sixth Days of October 1845 . . . (Cincinnati: 1846).

²⁴⁴ Nelson, A Shining Light, 7-8; Rev. David Magie, Memorial Sermon of the Late Rev. Frederick Starr, Jr. . . (Rochester, N.Y., 1867), 13-14; Milton E. Bierbaum, "Frederick Starr, A Missouri Border Abolitionist: The Making of a Martyr," Missouri Historical Review, 58, No. 3, (April 1964): 311-12.

²⁴⁵ Frederick Starr, Jr., Papers, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 2073, Folder 1; Bierbaum, "Frederick Starr," 213-13.

²⁴⁶ Starr Papers, Folder 18.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, Folder 10.

²⁴⁸ Rev. Frederick Starr, "The Kansas Movement," The Home Missionary, 27, No. 6, (October, 1854): 146.

²⁴⁹ Starr Papers, Folder 1; Bierbaum, "Frederick Starr," 315-16.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, Folder 12.

²⁵¹ According to the Reverend McNamara, Bayless was a vestryman of the Platte County church, situated between Weston and Platte City, at which McNamara was pastor. John McNamara, In Perils by My Own Countrymen: Three Years on the Kansas Border. By a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church, (New York, 1856), 41-49.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, Folder 2.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, Folder 2.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, Folder 5.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁸ History of Clay and Platte Counties, 636-38.

²⁵⁹ Starr Papers, Folder 3; Bierbaum, "Frederick Starr," 325.

²⁶⁰ The tract seems to have escaped the notice of the Missouri press. Magie, Memorial Sermon, 16.

²⁶¹ Starr Papers, Folder 20. Horace Greeley was the editor of the New York Tribune and a prominent anti-slavery advocate. Starr eventually returned to Missouri in 1865 and served as the pastor of the North Presbyterian Church in St. Louis. He died two years later after his doctor had warned him that he was overworking himself. Nelson, A Shining Light, 3, 22; Magie, Memorial Sermon, 22-23.

²⁶² Starr Papers, Folder 18. Starr argued that the New School ministers endured the taint of abolition notwithstanding their actions in a speech in New York after his expulsion from Weston. Ibid.

²⁶³ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1855 (New York, 1855), 661-62; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1856 (New York, 1856), 169; History of Clay and Platte Counties, 643-44.

²⁶⁴ Pro-slavery vigilantes assaulted northern Methodists in Missouri through the Civil War. Charles Elliott, South-western Methodism. A History of the M. E. Church in the South-West, From 1844 to 1864 . . . (Cincinnati, 1868), 60. See chapters four and five.

²⁶⁵ "Destruction of the Press," Kansas Herald of Freedom, 21 April 1855, p. 2.

²⁶⁶ "Letter from Geo. S Park, Esq.," Ibid., 5 May 1855, p. 2.

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

²⁶⁸ "To the Reader," Kansas Herald of Freedom, 1 November 1856, p. 2; Nerone, Violence Against the Press, 115; Floyd Shoemaker, "Missouri's Proslavery Fight for Kansas, 1852-1855," Missouri Historical Review 48 (April, July 1954): 41-54, 325-40; 49 (October 1954): 41-54; Lester B. Baltimore, "Benjamin F. Stringfellow: The Fight for Slavery on the Missouri Border," Missouri Historical Review 62 no., 2 (1967): 14-29.

²⁶⁹ James Gallaher and his brother Allen, who were both influential in the St. Charles Presbytery schism, were among these supply ministers in Hannibal. At the same time, though, the fact that the larger Marion County community was pro-slavery and fears of incursions from the abolitionists in neighboring Quincy, Illinois helped lead others into the Old School. Sweets, Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church, 3-4; Terrell Dempsey, Searching for Jim: Slavery in Sam Clemens's World (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2003), 56. Supply ministers were ministers who regularly preached at a particular church and were not officially pastors.

²⁷⁰ The paper was originally Whig-oriented but was supporting the Know-Nothing candidates for president in 1856. "For the Hannibal Messenger. Abolitionism," Hannibal Weekly Messenger, 17 July 1856, p. 1; The text of Ezekiel 22:29 is "The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy: yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully." The Holy Bible: King James Version.

²⁷¹ "For the Hannibal Messenger. Abolitionism," Hannibal Weekly Messenger, 17 July 1856, p. 1; Ibid., 8 July 1856, p. 2.

²⁷² “Bennett and his Abolition Sermon,” Hannibal Tri-Weekly Messenger, 19 July 1856, p. 2; Dempsey, Searching for Jim, 59-61.

²⁷³ There is no evidence that the breakaway faction that formed the Phillips Branch had significant property holdings. Sweets, Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church, 10.

²⁷⁴ David Marquette, A History of Nebraska Methodism: First Half-Century, 1854-1904 (Cincinnati, 1904), 58-59.

²⁷⁵ William Henry Sweet, A History of Methodism in Northwest Kansas (Kansas Wesleyan University, 1920), 39-40. Another Methodist minister, James Shaw, claimed this man was a minister of another denomination. James Shaw, Early Reminiscences of Pioneer Life in Kansas (Atchison, 1886), 38.

²⁷⁶ Don W. Holter, Fire on the Prairie: Methodism in the History of Kansas (Methodist Publishing House, 1969), 63.

²⁷⁷ Eliza Wigham, The Anti-Slavery Cause in America and its Martyrs (London, 1863), 112.

²⁷⁸ Elliott, South-western Methodism, 86-87.

²⁷⁹ W. A. Steward Sharp, History of Kansas Baptists (Kansas City, 1940), 46-52.

²⁸⁰ Of the four issues of the paper that remain from Crowell’s tenure as editor, only one from 1857 discussed the slavery issue. In that issue there was a discussion of the controversy in the American Tract Society over the discussion of slavery in its publications. *Ibid.*, 26 November, 1857, p. 1.

²⁸¹ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 899-901; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 300-03.

²⁸² Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 130-31.

²⁸³ Elliott, South-western Methodism, 86-87.

²⁸⁴ “Letter from Kansas,” *Ibid.*, 5 January 1855, p. 1; Matthew Simpson ed., Cyclopedia of Methodism. Embracing Sketches of its Rise, Progress and Present Condition . . . (Philadelphia, 1878), 337.

²⁸⁵ “That Pamphlet,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 19 January 1859, p. 2.

²⁸⁶ Matthew Simpson ed., Cyclopedia of Methodism. Embracing Sketches of its Rise, Progress and Present Condition . . . (Philadelphia, 1878), 337.

²⁸⁷ Charles Elliott, A History of the Great Secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Year 1845 (Cincinnati, 1855).

²⁸⁸ “Methodism and Slavery,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 11 November 1852, p. 49.

²⁸⁹ During the early 1860s the communities of readers which each paper had built up prior to the war could read articles that presented the full range of pro- or anti-slavery theology from the respective newspapers. Theological ideas were often presented as part of the argumentative exchanges between McAnally and Elliott. “Please Read the Following,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 20 February 1862, p. 2; Elliott, South-western Methodism, 239. While copies of the Central Christian Advocate during Elliott’s editorship have seemingly not survived, his book South-western Methodism makes numerous references to McAnally and the St. Louis Christian Advocate.

Chapter Five

Sundered Flocks, Militant Godliness, and the Woes of Embattled Church-goers during the Civil War

One Sunday evening in the summer of 1863 Divine Providence appears to have intervened to deliver the Reverend D. B. Cooper from a fate all too common in war-torn north central Missouri. As he gave his sermon at the southern Methodist meeting house in the town of Leclède, a group of Union soldiers in the street plotted to teach him a lesson after the congregation departed. According to physician N. W. Harris, who witnessed the scene but was not a member of Cooper's flock, "some half-dozen soldiers who had come up from Brookfield, had gone into a 'loyal' doggery, imbibed freely, and meeting some 'loyal Methodists,' were told that the rebel was preaching. Under the stimuli of bad whiskey and the worse hearts of the 'God and morality' Methodists, they had come to the church with a fence-rail intending to commit an outrage upon this gentleman." Occupying the upper floor of a house nearby, a meeting of northern Methodists, "God's elect," according to Harris, eagerly waited for the fun to begin. But Harris sent word for help to Colonel James McFerran, the United States Army officer in charge of the occupied town, whom he deemed trustworthy because he was a "Democrat and a gentlemen." In short order, "two files of soldiers, with fixed bayonets" appeared and surrounded the gathering crowd. In the words of Dr. Harris, "The miserable tools of the bad-hearted fanatics slunk away like whipped curs, leaving their pious instigators gnashing their death and calling down curses upon McFerran and myself."¹

For decades, Missourians had commonly employed vigilante justice, including employment of the rail, to deal with men who openly flouted community norms. But the Civil War in Missouri brought stark reversals. The Union troops who plotted against Cooper targeted a

minister who was, in fact, a member of the largest denomination in the state. Northern Methodists, who staunchly supported the Union and opposed African American bondage, were limited largely to far away St. Louis. According to Harris, Reverend Cooper was “one of the purist men I have ever known . . . and he never preached or talked politics, even to his most intimate friends and acquaintances.”² But Cooper was a southern Methodist and thus, by definition, a rebel. And that had been enough to generate the extralegal sanction, at least in the view of the MEC congregants and drunken Union soldiers. Civil authorities did not even attempt to investigate the disruption that Dr. Harris and the Union commander skillfully averted. But Harris himself did not see much point in prosecuting the young soldiers, given that “no violence had been done.” In his words, moreover, “These maudlin soldiers were not to blame. They were mere tools in the hands of the base-hearted men and women who instigated the outrage.” According to him, “This act is only a type of the general conduct of this people. . . . I am no professor of Christianity, but if such people are Christians. . . I pray the Giver of all good to incline my heart to heathenism rather than such a mongrel abomination.”³

The decidedly unsavory impression left on Dr. Harris highlights a critical feature of Civil War strife in Missouri often overlooked by historians. While no harm came to the Reverend Cooper, the contending militant faiths of pro-Confederate and Unionist congregations commonly spurred conflict between the two groups through the war. Given that the United States army occupied the state through most of the conflict, harassment of congregations comprising evangelicals deemed disloyal to the Union were especially widespread. As much as the questions of secession and emancipation, however, diametrically opposed understandings of true religion and related ideas about society, politics, and government fundamentally generated the strife.

Thesis

The escalation of theological and political disputation between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in religious newspapers and other printed publications, which ensued after the evangelical schisms, played a prime role in fueling the vicious guerilla conflict that engulfed Missouri during the Civil War. Conflict between northern and southern evangelicals over the question of slavery contributed substantially to the pro- and anti-slavery guerilla depredations that disrupted congregations and church activities through the bloody conflict. Northern and southern evangelicals invoked Divine Providence variously to justify their respective causes and to settle the daunting existential question of which of their contending worldviews were true.

An unfettered war of words among white evangelicals over the morality of slavery in Missouri had fanned the flames of intolerance and produced mob violence against abolitionists for at least a decade and a half before secession. The evangelical schisms in Missouri in the period 1837-45 provided the critical social, cultural, and institutional pre-conditions necessary for the formation of irreconcilable views on the morality of slavery. In that context, institutionally-unconstrained evangelical ministers, often doubling as newspaper editors, purified and consolidated their opposing doctrines. In doing so, they developed two mutually antagonistic worldviews in which Protestant articles of faith defined righteousness and sinfulness, grounded individual and sectional identities, and inextricably implicated understandings of cardinal social, economic, and political relations. Pro-slavery evangelicals embraced religious beliefs and related ideas about government, civil society, and politics that situated master and slave within an organic and hierarchical social order, one they insisted should be beyond the reach of civil authorities or secular government. Abolitionists developed a new and unorthodox theology that incorporated egalitarian commitments to civil and political equality for African Americans.

Amid increasingly virulent sectional rancor, the growing felt need to know which one of the contending sectional credos was true took on an unprecedented sense of epistemological urgency.

The election of Lincoln pitted the consolidated systems of belief and sentiment that had set pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals against one another for at least a decade and a half. Brought with increasing energy into the public sphere by clerics, politicians, and secular newspaper editors and printers, the antithetical world views of pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals provided the critical moral and intellectual energy for the armed resistance of rural Missourians to Union occupation and the determination of United States Army troops and Unionist partisans to quell this rebellion. In the first years of the war, white evangelical leaders locked horns over the issue of whether slavery, secession, and loyalty were within the scope of religion. They also engaged in super-heated disputation that focused on the question of whether secession amounted to defensible rebellion under God-given natural law principles or abandonment of Christian obligations to support civil government – and whether Union military force was constitutional and consistent with Christian doctrine and duties.

Through the war, committed white evangelicals struggled with the ponderous questions that had divided them but remained determined to continue their devotional activities. But evangelicals on both sides of the aisle invoked Divine Providence to justify their respective causes and settle the question of which of the two sets of understandings of theology, social order, government, and politics would prevail. Pro-Union evangelicals, however, increasingly committed themselves to the view that support of slavery and secession and disloyalty to the United States were tantamount to sin, positions that Union military victories seemed to confirm.

They disliked pro-Confederate evangelicals for their disloyalty to the Union and secondly for their continued support of slavery.

The persistent fervor of white evangelicals during the war translated into a heretofore unexamined dimension of the infamous guerilla war in Missouri that erupted after Union forces had established their dominance. Militant evangelicalism spurred denominational and congregational disruptions for both pro-Union and pro-Confederate church-goers. Believers in both camps certainly suffered depredations that further fragmented church organizations. But given Union control of the state after 1862, this kind of vigilantism more often resulted in harassment of congregations who Unionists believed to be in sympathy with the Confederate cause. Burning sectional loyalties amid irregular armed contention increased the number of congregational schisms, engendering legal battles over the meeting houses and lands that pro-Union evangelicals attempted to misappropriate from their increasingly powerless pro-Confederate counterparts.

Literature Review

A substantial amount of scholarly work augments the thesis advanced by Richard J. Carwardine and C. C. Goen that the major national evangelical schisms 1837-45 constituted tears in the political fabric of the nation so deep as to spur secession and the Civil War.⁴ A number of historians suggest, in one way or another, that the divergent evangelical faiths, moral philosophies, and ideas about social organization and government of northerners and southerners inexorably shaped antagonistic sectional relations and spurred secession.⁵ To the extent that these colliding sets of ideas and sentiments manifested themselves in publications, no less important is the work of Edward Ayers and Trish Loughran, who identify the unfettered war of words in the new print culture as a prime cause of the war.⁶

Historians of religion Douglas M. Strong and Dan McKanan maintain that, after the organization of the abolitionist movement in the early 1830s, its clerical leadership made increasingly militant efforts to purge the churches and society of the sin of slavery and to force evangelical morality into political discourse – a modulation that drew on the doctrine of “perfectionism,” a democratic belief in universal free will, and a shift to secular concerns.⁷ John R. McKivigan argues that part and parcel of this transformation was the rejection of traditional theology and related moral philosophy that underwrote, as part of God’s divine plan, traditional social distinctions and hierarchies.⁸ Anti-slavery ministers increasingly emphasized, furthermore, that slave society was flawed by “organic sin.” Imbued with millennial expectations, abolitionists and other evangelical reformers had no doubt that Divine Providence would assist them in making a perfected Holy Kingdom on earth, setting the stage for the return of Jesus. Ultimately more than a few sought to enlist the power of the state in behalf of righteous causes.⁹

Historian John Patrick Daley argues that, while southern clerics responded to abolitionist theological innovations conservatively and with innovation, they thoroughly decried the doctrine of salvation for all, each according to his free choice, and “perfectionism.” They found the concept of collective guilt by association with slavery bewildering.¹⁰ Central to militant pro-slavery evangelical thought, like that of their abolitionist counterparts, was the belief that devout southerners would, ultimately, receive providential rewards. E. Brooks Holifield demonstrates that understandings of Providence were grounded deeply in Protestant theology and a related rational moral philosophy that undergirded it. According to Daley, pro-slavery clerics advanced the view that sincere believers would be rewarded, on earth or in the hereafter, for adhering to their faith in the face of increasingly virulent and unscriptural northern denunciation of slavery.¹¹ Historians Mitchell Snay, Stephanie McCurry, and Rachel N. Klein argue that, for pro-slavery

evangelicals, divinely-ordained moral duties translated into the reciprocal and hierarchical relations binding together heads of households with their dependents, including wives, children, and slaves.¹² Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese show, consequently, that contention between pro-slavery evangelicals and abolitionists was only the most publicly recognizable aspect of a much larger set of daunting questions facing the country – the future organization of social, political, and governmental relations.¹³

Recent work, however, suggests that a complete assessment of the apocalyptic intersectional contest over social, political, and governmental relations must transcend the traditional conceptual duality of urban, northern evangelicals versus rural, pro-slavery southern evangelicals – to take into account also the ideas and sentiments of the long-ignored church-going southern middle class. According to historian of religion E. Brooks Holifield, pro-slavery ministers, who increasingly identified with the town-dwelling middle class, emphasized that they were building a society and culture that was superior to that of the North.¹⁴ Historian Jonathan D. Wells shows that members of the evangelical southern middle class did not denounce reforms developed in the North. Instead, the southern bourgeois embraced them. Temperance, Sabbatarianism, anti-gambling crusades gained its energetic support – but not, of course, abolitionism or expanded civil and political rights or economic prerogatives for women.¹⁵ According to Daley, the most influential southern ministers actually espoused competitive individualism, were perfectly happy with the dictates of *laissez faire*, and fully subscribed to middle-class values that undergirded the emergence of free-market capitalism. They wholeheartedly emphasized the importance of domesticity and child-rearing, which included the sacred obligation of parents to instill in their children true religion and character – self-control and adherence to moral duty. This moral code nurtured the character traits vital for eternal salvation and middle-class success. Because they

adhered to the duties prescribed by the master-servant relation, southern masters took care of their slaves, while northern factory owners exploited workers bound to them only by the “cash nexus.” The organic and hierarchical framework of divinely ordained relations was, it seems, somewhat flexible.¹⁶

The work of historians Mark A. Noll, Mitchell Snay, and Beth Barton Schweiger has brought into much sharper focus the impact that the evangelical schisms during the period 1837-45 had on rapidly diverging northern and southern evangelical theologies and worldviews. According to Noll, the strife that divided northern and southern evangelicals was fundamentally a “theological crisis” driven by irreconcilable differences among clerics about what the Bible said on the topic of slavery. Southern antebellum clerics tended to give literal meaning to Old and New Testament scriptural passages that, indeed, condoned bondage. Northern clerics who engaged in abolitionist activism took a less literal approach and looked for the spirit of the faith conveyed by the Bible as a whole.¹⁷ Snay argues that, subsequent to the advent of organized abolitionism in the 1830s, evangelical religion powerfully transformed principled disagreement over the question of human bondage into a sectional conflict of the highest moral significance.¹⁸ The re-organization of national and local churches brought on by the evangelical schisms in the period 1837-45, however, intensified oppositional theological ideas and sentiments. The resulting heightened rhetoric fanned the flames of contention. Divided into new ecclesiastical organizations devoted exclusively to one or the other side of the theological divide, clerics no longer had to engage interpersonally, or in any official capacity, those who expressed antagonistic views and perspectives.¹⁹ Historian Beth Barton Schweiger demonstrates that one of the prime social and public consequences of the Methodist and Baptist schisms of the 1840s, at

least in Virginia, was to substantially enhance the authority and prominence of the churches and their clerical leadership.²⁰

As historians Harry Stout, Randall M. Miller, Drew Gilpin Faust, and others have made abundantly clear, the Civil War was a powerful religious experience for those involved.²¹ The question these experts, and others, have explored, perhaps, more than any other is the way understandings of Divine Providence spurred the Civil War, shaped its course, and generated understandings of it later. According to historian John Patrick Daley, in the early stages of the conflict Confederates drew on distinctively southern cultural strains that had encouraged slaveholders to expect God's favor and economic progress in reward for faith and Christian dutifulness.²² Historian Mark A. Noll emphasizes that both southern and northern evangelicals believed that God favored their causes in the Civil War and would punish the other for its role in subverting the divine plan for the nation and the world. Faith in Providence was thus central to the theological crisis that had engendered the armed strife.²³ According to historian Eugene Genovese, after the tide of battle turned against the South in 1863, ministers in the region clung to Providence as a mode of explaining battlefield losses.²⁴

Most studies of the guerilla war in Missouri refer very little to its relationship with evangelicalism.²⁵ Historian Michael Fellman, however, maintains that the neo-Calvinism of irregular combatants entailed a Manichean view of good and evil that powerfully energized the guerillas as the majority of rural Missourians were evangelicals. In this conception, pro- and anti-slavery guerillas were each convinced of the righteousness of their cause and of the utter wickedness of their opponents.²⁶ Historian Jeremy Neely shows that traditional Calvinist components of evangelicalism shaped the attitudes and behavior of ordinary residents who engaged in partisan violence along the Missouri-Kansas line.²⁷

When Worldviews Collide: Abolitionism versus Pro-slavery Religion

The violence and destruction of Civil War in Missouri was fueled by growing conflict between anti-slavery evangelicalism and pro-slavery religion dating back decades. But more than any other single development, the evangelical schisms in the state provided the critical social, cultural, and institutional pre-conditions necessary for the formation of hardened, irreconcilable views on the morality of slavery. With increasing vigor after the ruptures within the Missouri Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches, anti-slavery evangelicals discounted the more egalitarian conception of society and politics that abolitionist theology advanced. Anti-slavery members of these churches responded in kind.

Intensifying religious strife over African American bondage after the evangelical schisms certainly turned on differing biblical interpretations of slavery. But this rancor escalated, primarily, because the schisms unleashed mutual charges and countercharges that direly threatened the worldviews cherished by both abolitionist and pro-slavery ministers and parishioners. The intensifying conflict was grounded in two mutually antagonistic credos, each of which blended divergent understandings of theological doctrine, natural law, rational moral philosophy, social order, individual liberty, and the boundary of state and federal power. These contending visions, in fact, provided the vital moral and intellectual energy for rural and small town Missourians to rise up in arms against Union troops and the forcible suppression of that movement.

In the fifteen years preceding secession, evangelical ministers in Missouri clearly become much more militant, unforgiving, and openly hostile toward the ideas and actions of their opposing brethren once liberated from having to cooperate with one another within ecclesiastical organizations. Pro-slavery evangelical newspapers that originated in and circulated across the

state beginning in the early 1840s fueled the strife. Anti-slavery ministers produced and circulated equally inflammatory publications. Church-goers in the polity were thus uniquely whiplashed by religious print warfare. Particularly in St. Louis and towns with regular postal service, ordinary congregants could not easily avoid witnessing closely – or avoid being drawn into – the heated intra-state verbal conflict between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals.

Unavoidable personal encounters with those adhering to opposing views, in town and country, were similarly much more common among congregants residing in the state than elsewhere.

The understandable impatience of contemporary historians with the woeful wrong-headedness of the “pro-slavery argument” has often resulted in insufficient consideration of the enormous power with which evangelical faith and related ideas, including Protestant moral philosophy and foundational political principles, generated understandings of slavery and the world in which it existed. Such impatience has also produced scholarship that has sometimes dismissed a bit too peremptorily the power with which sincere commitments to religion and related ideas could spur visceral reactions to utterances bringing into question those intertwined commitments.

At the deepest levels of belief and sentiment, most church-going white Missourians faced an extraordinary epistemological crisis involving cherished beliefs regarding social, governmental, and political relations as the prospect of Civil War loomed larger. In the waning hours of the antebellum period, there can be no doubt that a substantial number of pro-slavery evangelicals in Missouri truly believed in the prescribed religious underpinnings of their universe, as did their equally zealous abolitionist counterparts. But the national schisms had obliterated the only national religious institutions that might have worked cooperatively and, perhaps inter-denominationally, to resolve the crisis in doctrine concerning the morality of

slavery. Local congregational schisms further disrupted any possibility of consensus. The state and federal court interventions to settle church property disputes had certainly not settled questions turning on articles of religious belief. The radical reconfiguration of Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches in Missouri after the evangelical schisms provided extraordinarily fertile ground for the rapid growth of interrelated secular and religious ideas designed to achieve such purposes.

Few, if any, politicians in Missouri publicly espoused doctrinaire abolitionist views. But both clerics and public officials openly advanced arguments in behalf of slavery that deeply implicated evangelical tents of faith. In the 1850s, the most militant proponents included Disciples of Christ minister and President of the University of Missouri James Shannon, former attorney general Benjamin F. Stringfellow, leader of the Platte County Self-Defensive Association and notorious “border ruffian,” and Missouri Supreme Court Judge William Scott, author of the majority opinion of the Missouri Supreme Court in Dred Scott v. Emerson (1852). A somewhat more moderate public advocate was Nathan L. Rice, pastor of the St. Louis Second Presbyterian Church.

The oppositional system of belief that these influential leaders cultivated drew heavily on the Bible and certainly embraced the providential design that promised rewards and success to the members of a God-fearing slaveholding polity. But it also encompassed an Enlightenment-era moral philosophy grounded in scripture that articulated an organic and hierarchical conceptualization of social and governmental relations – one that thoroughly eschewed the concept of social, civil, and political equality for all men. This framework drew, as well, on a founding era understanding of natural and positive law wedded to the idea of “regulated liberty” and the related idea that the liberties of an individual were contingent on the needs of her or his

community. More familiarly, perhaps, evangelical leaders and public officeholders invoked an interpretation of the Constitution that reserved strictly to state government the sovereign power to regulate household relations, including the “domestic institution” of slavery, and the right of individual property in those of African heritage. Last, but certainly not least, this view of the Constitution emphasized republican commitments, in the name of liberty, to a separation of church and state. This set of ideas vigorously condemned the efforts of abolitionists to combine their unorthodox theology with the power of government to promote egalitarian socioeconomic and political relations across the racial spectrum.²⁸

Partisan disputation transformed mutually antagonistic worldviews that blended divergent understandings of theology, moral philosophy, social order, and government to produce several distinctive and persistent antipodal themes. In the view of pro-slavery evangelicals, to say that owning slaves was a sin was to say the Bible and the Constitution were fallacious. In this context, two basic questions arose: Could a literal reading of these texts provide foundational truths to ordinary people for organizing the relations of the individual with the Almighty and with society, politics, and government? Or were the definitions of essential truths to become the exclusive purview of an intellectual and elite class of reformers, secular and religious, associated with institutions mostly situated in the more urban and cosmopolitan precincts of the northeast? Denunciations of the socioeconomic and political order preferred by pro-slavery evangelicals, including the right to hold property in slaves, constituted both infidelity and political heresy. Pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals, not surprisingly, denounced one another virulently as heathens and traitors – while reserving to themselves the role of virtuous and patriotic defenders of true Christianity.

Verbal contention also centered on diametrically opposed views on the question of whether opposition to slavery, as either sin or civil inequity, justified the entry of anti-slavery ministers into politics. After 1854, efforts by abolitionist immigrants in Kansas to establish a free territory spurred pro-slavery clerics and politicians to invoke more stridently than ever before republican and constitutional principles requiring a separation of church and state.

After the evangelical schisms in the period 1837-45, coalescing militant opinions on the question of slavery in Missouri implicated somewhat unpredictable political and denominational affiliations. Party alignments in the state became increasingly complicated and did not coincide with, simply, opposition to or support of slavery. The position staked out by Methodist minister Nathan Scarritt well illustrates the point. The rupture of the Methodist Episcopal Church left him connected with the MECS and affiliated with the Whig party, which generally favored state support of Protestant morality and policies that spurred commerce and industry. Although he was opposed to slavery on moral grounds, he agreed with the position taken by the southern Methodists that slavery was strictly a civil institution, a social relation entirely within the jurisdiction of state government and subject to its traditional police power. Through to secession and beyond, however, he remained a hardcore Unionist.²⁹

The Kansas struggle polarized opinions on the slave question, obliterating the distinction between antislavery advocacy and abolitionism. Long before massive European immigration to St. Louis and its surrounding area, a large number of residents there had embraced strong antislavery sentiments. Most of these people had immigrated to the city from the northeast and Border States. A substantial segment of the St. Louis press after the mid-1840s was staunchly antislavery. By the early 1850s, the traditional distinction between religiously-grounded abolitionism and secular antislavery sentiment fell by the boards. The Kansas struggle largely

caused this reductionist tendency among the majority of residents who indulged increasingly virulent pro-slavery views.³⁰

One of the greatest objections of pro-slavery evangelicals in Missouri to the work of their anti-slavery counterparts was that they had directly entered the realm of politics in contravention of Christian duty and basic constitutional precepts. New England religious leaders became openly political, almost en masse, after the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act. Charles Sumner, Salmon P. Chase, and Harriet Beecher Stowe encouraged ministers in the North to protest the plan of Illinois Senator Stephen F. Douglas to organize the Nebraska territory. The bill, which would also open up Kansas for settlement, left the question of whether slavery would exist in the new polities up to territorial legislatures. By the same token, it would overturn the Missouri Compromise, which had banned slavery north of 36° 30'. A mass meeting in Boston on March 1, 1854 called for action against the bill. Ultimately, 3,050 New England clergymen signed a lengthy document denouncing the proposed measure. It declared as follows: “[the undersigned] in the name of Almighty god, and in his presence, do solemnly protest [against the Nebraska bill or the repeal of the Missouri Compromise as] a great moral wrong [and] a breach of faith.” For the next several hours, a number of senators denounced and ridiculed the intrusion of the ministers. Virginian James Mason pointed out that, because the ministers had petitioned in the name of God instead of citizens, they could be deemed foreigners and their petition ignored. “Besides,” he intoned, “preachers, of all others . . . are the most encroaching, and, as a body, arrogant class of men.” Douglas was outraged, and the petition was tabled.³¹

Missouri southern Methodist minister William Leftwich also thoroughly condemned the protest of the New England ministers. According to him, they had produced “a great moral wrong . . . Unjust to the moral principles of the community.”³² Leftwich further complained that

the MEC clerics in Missouri had worked hand in hand with the Republican Party “in the character of partisans, and not ministers.”³³ Leftwich drew on ideas set out in moral philosophy, natural law, scripture, as well as the Constitution, to convey the belief, common among pro-slavery ministers, that it was his Christian duty to obey the laws of the government, which was a divine institution. Missouri law that upheld slavery and proscribed abolitionist publications could be no exception. Leftwich further maintained that newspaper editorials and commentary on the resolutions of public meetings in Missouri to denounce abolitionists in Kansas demonstrated that ordinary residents in the state, evangelical and otherwise, deeply resented anti-slavery ministers because they were working as Republican Party political operatives and not functioning as ministers of the gospel. Certainly Irish immigrants in St. Louis took this view.³⁴

In their newspapers and sermons, pro-slavery ministers in Missouri condemned the abolitionists for injecting theology into politics. Vehemently pro-slavery southern Methodist minister William Goff Caples of Chariton County, situated in the Boone’s Lick, expressed the view in 1855 that abolitionist ministers sought to subordinate scripture to their political movement, a course that would surely merit God’s vengeance. For this reason, abolition was “a deadly infection of society, under which all simple faith in the Word of God must perish.”³⁵ None of his sermons on the subject of slavery have survived. But Caples developed a wide reputation in the closing years of the antebellum period for sharing with his congregants, and anyone else who would listen, his disdain for anti-slavery arguments that drew on the authority of the Bible. In his view “abolitionism was the deadliest sin in modern society.”³⁶ David Rice McAnally, editor of the southern Methodist St. Louis Christian Advocate, published similar comments in 1854.³⁷ Amid a lull in the border strife four years later, he issued more restrained injunctions against clerical involvement in politics. Shortly after elections had been held in

Kansas in January 1858, McAnally pointed out that “Missourians had not roasted the people of Kansas, nor had they of Kansas eaten the people of Missouri. . . .”³⁸ This startling revelation he attributed to a policy, adopted by at least some of the MECS preachers in Kansas, of “not mixing with the political matters, as are many others – but preaching the Gospel of peace and love.”³⁹ He called for the Methodist ministers in Kansas, Missouri, and the rest of the nation to “attend to their work faithfully, let slavery and free stateism alone, and the results will show the wisdom of the course.”⁴⁰

Secular newspaper in Missouri widely propagated the intertwined religious, political, and socio-economic justifications of slavery advanced by pro-slavery clerics and politicians. The print culture generated by the church-goers of the town-dwelling middle class had effectively disseminated evangelical beliefs and sentiments to the rural countryside for decades. But secular newspapers served as willing conduits for religious news, including that which implicated the growing sectional conflict. After delivering a fire-eating address at a pro-slavery convention at Lexington, Missouri, in July 1855, James Shannon easily succeeded in expanding his campaign in the popular press. Following the convention, he reiterated his rejection of the moral judgments of abolitionists in several pieces published in newspapers throughout the state. His persistent theme was that slavery was “sanctioned alike by the Bible, the Laws of Nature, and the Constitution of the United States.”⁴¹ His address was published in full, along with minutes of the proceedings and commentary in various newspapers, including the Boonville Dollar Missouri Journal, the St. Louis Weekly Pilot, and the Missouri Statesman.⁴²

A few months before Shannon gave his Lexington address, Benjamin F. Stringfellow began publishing a single tract a series of essays he had written in justification of the Platte County Self-Defensive Association, entitled Negro-Slavery, No Evil. The individual essays

appeared serially in the spring of 1855 in several Missouri and Kansas newspapers. In the same year, some of these same newspapers featured editorials that, in particular, complained that the northern ministers had crossed the line between politics and religion. “The whole course of this Northern Methodist Church since the separation has been faithless and dishonorable,” declared an 1855 editorial published in the St. Louis Weekly Pilot. “They are sending preachers into this State against an express agreement and plighted faith . . . They send them . . . not for the purpose of propagating the Christian faith . . . but to overthrow slavery.”⁴³ After the April 1855 proslavery meeting in Parkville, Platte County, at which abolitionists were roundly denounced, one the resolutions banned northern Methodist ministers from preaching in the area.

Lincoln’s Election, a Pro-Slavery Majority, and a Unionist Provisional Government

Missourians held a variety of positions on the question of Union in the months following Lincoln’s election, when the allegiance of the state arose as a vexed question. The majority essentially voted both to maintain the Union and slavery in the 1860 presidential election by supporting either Democrat Stephen Douglas of Illinois or Constitutional Union candidate John C. Bell of Tennessee. Quite obviously, support of slavery in Missouri correlated very little with secession sentiment. Douglas narrowly won the state over Bell. But both of these men were deeply committed to maintaining the Union and inter-sectional cooperation on the question of slavery. Together they polled 117,173 votes. It is difficult to gauge accurately individual sentiment by count of votes, especially in a presidential election. But the conservative preferences of Missouri are evident and the numbers at least suggestive. Out of a total poll of 166,518 in 1860, pro-secession Democrat Breckinridge received 31,317 votes, or nineteen percent, while Republican Abraham Lincoln received 17,028, or about ten percent.⁴⁴ The pattern

of voting comported substantially with the religious geography that had spawned the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist schisms a decade and a half earlier. Lincoln's strongest support came from the City and County of St. Louis and farming districts south of the Missouri River nearby, such as Perry, Franklin, and Gasconade counties, where the anti-slavery German population was heavy. St. Louis, the citadel of the anti-slavery Methodists and Presbyterians, contained a multitude of staunch anti-slavery Unionists who would not abandon those commitments under any circumstances. Marion County, the Mississippi River stronghold of the Presbyterians further north, cast eighty percent of its votes for either Bell (forty-two percent) or Douglas (thirty-eight percent), thirteen percent for Breckenridge, and only seven percent for Lincoln. The anti-slavery evangelical bastion of Greene County in southwest Missouri, home to the rapidly-growing city of Springfield, went overwhelmingly to Bell (fifty-six percent), while its voters cast the second largest number of votes for Breckenridge (twenty-four percent). The voters of the Boone's Lick counties, which were inhabited by fervently pro-slavery evangelicals, typically cast most of their votes for Bell, with Douglas usually receiving the second largest number. The middle-class populations that thrived in the river towns in these counties, particularly in Boone, Howard, and Platte, appear to have generated substantial moderation of militantly pro-slavery sentiments. But in the more thoroughly rural counties of the Ozark highlands to the south, where staunch pro-slavery Baptist and Methodist congregations prevailed, the clear candidate of choice was John C. Breckenridge. In Oregon County, situated on the border with Arkansas, of 358 votes cast, 245, or sixty-eight percent, went to the militant Vice President from Kentucky. Two votes, or less than one percent, went to Lincoln.⁴⁵

Missouri leaders were sharply divided as the secession crisis began in the winter of 1860-61. Conditional Unionists supported the Union only so long as the federal government refrained

from forcibly interfering with slavery. And, true to their moniker, they sided with the South when it became apparent that Lincoln would use force to save the nation. Others who supported the emerging Confederacy did so either because they wanted to keep their slaves or were devoted to the region because of cultural affiliations that were the consequence of family ties. A number of Missourians with southern roots, nevertheless, were firm Union supporters – such as Hamilton R. Gamble and the influential Blair brothers. A slaveholder from Virginia, Gamble who had served as chief justice of the Missouri Supreme Court from 1846 to 1855 and written the dissenting opinion in Dred Scott v. Emerson (1852). With moderate views on slavery, he had been a Whig prior to the collapse of that party after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854). The brothers Francis P. Blair, Jr., and Montgomery Blair realized the necessity of ending slavery in the Union and had been important members of the Republican Party since its founding. A St. Louis lawyer born in Kentucky and a graduate of Princeton University, Frank Blair, had been a vocal Free-Soiler and then elected by Missourians to the United States House of Representatives in 1856. He was among the leaders of the Unconditional Union Party, which had organized after the election of Lincoln to prevent Missouri from seceding. Also a lawyer, Montgomery Blair had resided in Maryland since 1852, serving there as United States Solicitor in the Court of Claims. During that time he was one of several lawyers representing Dred Scott before the Supreme Court in Scott v. Sanford (1857).⁴⁶

A state convention in 1861 appeared to situate Missouri firmly within the Union. Unionists won 110,000 out of the 140,000 votes cast for the state convention. The voters did not reward secessionists, as none was elected to serve as delegate. At the same time, only four Republicans from St. Louis won positions. Elected governor in 1860, Claiborne Fox Jackson was a lawyer from Kentucky and leader of the pro-slavery Missouri Democrats from the Boone's

Lick. Jackson, who had seen that Stephen A. Douglas would likely win Missouri, publicly supported him but, in fact, favored Missouri's secession even during the presidential election. Jackson was actually hell-bent on leading Missouri out of the Union. Popular former governor Sterling Price, sympathetic to the southern cause, served as chair of the convention but exercised little influence in that position. When the state convention met in March of 1861 to decide the relation of Missouri to the government of the United States, St. Louis lawyer Uriel Wright warned that emancipation of the slaves meant the destruction of the agricultural interests of the slaveholding states, including Missouri.⁴⁷ Those on the committee on federal relations, however, insisted that Missouri would suffer from the policy of free trade that the southern states advocated. They strenuously condemned secession and maintained that the North could never be at peace with the South as a separate nation, especially given the inevitable difficulties posed by fugitive slaves.⁴⁸ The convention refused to affirm that the federal government possessed the constitutional power to employ military force to retain any state in the Union. But many Missourians, as was the case for residents in the other Border States, believed that state sovereignty only required defense against extremism in the Union. In this view, until war began neutrality was still not secession. On March 21st, the convention decided that Missouri would remain in the Union by a vote of 98 to 1. Hamilton Gamble was chair of the committee that authored the resolve to remain in the Union. The formal resolution declared "that at present there is no adequate cause to impel Missouri to dissolve her connection with the Federal Union."⁴⁹

The resolves of the convention rather quickly spurred a mass conflagration in St. Louis that radically altered the attitudes of most Missourians toward the Union cause. The convention had firmly decided that Missouri would not supply weapons or men either to the United States government or the seceding southern states if full-scale war broke out. As a consequence, control

of a major munitions depot, the St. Louis arsenal, became a critical concern for both pro-Union and pro-secession leaders. Undeterred by the vote of the convention for Missouri to remain in the Union, Governor Claiborne Fox Jackson moved toward armed neutrality to prompt its secession. About May 1st, Governor Jackson, ostensibly still neutral on the question of secession, reorganized the Missouri Militia and called it out for exercises a few miles northwest of the arsenal. Alarmed by these developments, unconditional Unionists in St. Louis, led by Frank Blair, were able to rally many of the Germans. They welcomed staunch Unionist Captain Nathaniel Lyon, who arrived with eighty United States Army regulars from Kansas to strengthen the undermanned federal arsenal in the city. On May 10th, Lyon mobilized his troops to Camp Jackson, on the west side of St. Louis, named after the governor, and forced the surrender of the militiamen. He also ordered them to take an oath of allegiance to the federal government. But the militiamen refused, and Lyon marched the prisoners to the arsenal through downtown St. Louis. This amounted to a public humiliation for the state forces and immediately angered civilians in the city, especially those who sympathized with the South. Rubbing salt in the wound, Lyon situated the captured militiamen between two lines of armed German Home Guards – who, to secessionist partisans at least, clearly stood for the forces of militant anti-slavery. Angered onlookers threw rocks at and insulted the federal troops. A growing mob targeted the German guards. After a shot killed one of the volunteers, the rest of them opened fire on the crowd, killing twenty people and wounding about fifty more. Several days of rioting followed amid rising anti-German sentiment in the city.⁵⁰ The majority of residents in the state condemned Lyon's actions and many citizens moved toward secession, although public sentiment was not, at this time at least, decisively in favor of leaving the Union.

The disorder in St. Louis wrought by secession left the state with two governments, both of which claimed sovereignty. After the Camp Jackson Affair, Governor Jackson reorganized the state militia into the pro-Confederate Missouri State Guard under the command of conditional Unionist Sterling Price, a lawyer and a planter who had served as governor of Missouri from 1853 to 1857. Meeting with the recently-promoted Brigadier General Lyon and Frank Blair at the St. Louis Planters' House on 10 June, Jackson and Price were stunned when Lyon refused to concede any point on the authority of the Union and effectively declared war on Jackson's government. Lyon's biographer, Christopher Phillips, asserts that Lyon had no intention of negotiating and thus purposefully brought war to Missouri. Lyon soon forced Jackson's supporters from Jefferson City, and Unionists organized a constitutional convention in July 1861 to establish a new government. Staunch Unionist Hamilton R. Gamble was elected governor for the pro-Union provisional government. A rump pro-Confederate legislature, meeting in the southwest corner of the state in Neosho, passed a secession ordinance on October 28th and was admitted into the Confederacy on November 28th.⁵¹

The provisional government established in Missouri certainly did not feature an anti-slavery leadership in agreement on how to proceed with the growing crisis. The fundamental problem was that about eighty percent of rural whites in Missouri supported slavery. While only a minority had favored secession at the end of 1860, most rural and small town residents deeply resented Union military occupation and the efforts of Union forces to terminate slavery by force. Loyal, pro-Union partisans, mostly situated in St. Louis, were eager to take up arms to suppress what they viewed as nothing less than Confederate rebellion. In any case, the coalition led by Gamble, referred to as Claybanks, was relatively conservative. Gamble hoped, by gentle means, to placate those who believed in the "Union with slavery." He ultimately became a moderate

Republican. Opposed to this party were the “Radicals” or “Charcoalers,” headed by influential Presbyterian layman-turned-politician Charles Daniel Drake and George R. Smith, a Kentucky-born lawyer and businessman from Pettis County whom Governor Gamble appointed adjutant general of Missouri. Drake and Smith preached immediate emancipation and accused the governor and his friends of having lurking pro-slavery sentiments.⁵² Frank Blair served as a Union general and Montgomery Blair as Lincoln’s postmaster general. But many Missourians, like the Blair brothers, sided with the North, even if they came to that position only after the fighting started.⁵³ Governor Gamble realized that most of the people in Missouri favored slavery. It was probably less evident to him in summer 1861 that the Camp Jackson affair had shifted majority opinion, especially in the rural countryside outside of St. Louis, radically in favor of the South.⁵⁴

Major conventional battles were fought across Missouri in 1861 and 1862 that at least allowed Union officials to claim that the state was under their control. By the late summer of 1861, General Lyon had secured Union control of most of the state, though Price’s Confederate Missouri State Guard remained lodged in the southwestern corner of Missouri. Viewing even a portion of a state under Price’s control as unacceptable, Lyon took the initiative against the Missouri State Guard and a Confederate force under Brigadier General Benjamin McCulloch, culminating in the Confederate victory, and his own death, at Wilson’s Creek, south of Springfield, on August 10, 1861. Notwithstanding the major victory, Price and Governor Jackson were not able to fully exploit their triumph. After the defeat of the Confederates at the Battle of Pea Ridge in northwest Arkansas in March of 1862, the Union consolidated control of Missouri and much of the Trans-Mississippi West.

Pugnacious Preachers and the Ever-Escalating War of Words

After the election of Lincoln, an escalating war of words between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals aired out their contending views on the proper relationship of religion to the organization of society, government, and politics. While certainly more than a few ministers refrained from entering the fray, at least publicly, in the year and half following Lincoln's election, verbal strife centered on several interrelated old and new questions: 1) Was slavery consistent, or not, with scripture and, thus, a social relation properly regulated by civil government? 2) Under the circumstances, did secession constitute defensible rebellion under God-given natural law principles or abandonment of Christian obligations to support civil government? 3) Could Union forces, consistent with the Constitution and Christian principles, use military force to thwart secession? 4) Were the questions of slavery, secession, loyalty to the Union, and the use of military force by the United States government "political" matters properly, or not, within the purview of religion?

St. Louis Presbyterian minister Nathan L. Rice ducked out of the increasingly heated verbal conflict by leaving town before the war began. He had attempted for years to walk the narrow line between preaching the theological legitimacy of slavery and eschewing rhetoric that would inflame sectional passions. In 1857, he left St. Louis and established a pastorate at the North Presbyterian Church in Chicago.⁵⁵ Rice continued to convey his moderate pro-slavery viewpoints. But in Chicago he could, at last, also safely express his support for the Union. A sermon he gave in 1862 set out his position unequivocally: "I declared my undoubting conviction, that the movement in the South was a great and terrible wrong."⁵⁶ Amid the carnage of war, however, Rice continued to take the position that religion and political activism should

not mix. According to him, “when they speak or write as ministers of Christ, they must deliver to men his message, not their political notions.”⁵⁷

Vehemently pro-slavery southern Methodist minister William Goff Caples expressed the secessionist views to which more than a few southern Methodist ministers in Missouri subscribed. He was serving as the presiding elder in the Boone’s Lick at Brunswick when the war broke out.⁵⁸ Caples held that the election of Lincoln by the abolitionist vote put the South in a precarious situation where the North would subvert the constitutional rights of the southern minority. Alluding to Lockean principles, just as James Shannon had done at Lexington five years earlier, Caples insisted that secession was a necessity given that “the occasion justified revolution.”⁵⁹ He put his commitments into practice and joined his friend and former governor Sterling Price’s Confederate Missouri State Guard, as many men had done in the Boone’s Lick.⁶⁰

Like many Unionist ministers in Missouri, pastor of the St. Louis Second Baptist Church Galusha Anderson rejoiced at the election of Lincoln.⁶¹ But not all of those in his congregation, which had grown to be one of the largest Baptist societies in the state, shared the sentiment. In spring 1861, he recoiled angrily at open southern sympathy in the city and within his own flock. He took to task his pro-Confederate congregants for disloyalty to the Union and their wicked abandonment of a righteous government divinely-ordained by God. During his evening service on 21 April, he preached in response to pro-Confederate Old School Presbyterian minister S. J. P. Anderson, pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church. A few weeks earlier, the Presbyterian minister had published a sermon entitled “The Ultimatum of the South.” Anderson relied on Romans 13: 1-2. This passage of scripture prophesized, in part, that those who resisted the just power of God were to be treated to eternal damnation. The implications of the verses were enough to leave the congregation silent. In a sermon, entitled “Duty of Loyalty to the

Government,” Galusha Anderson reminded his congregants that the Christian faith required obedience to civil authorities and government in all circumstances. As Richard J. Carwardine shows, pro-Union evangelicals often expressed emphasized theological ideas that required support of what they perceived to be a divinely sanctioned federal government.⁶² According to Caples, this mandate was especially to be observed in a democratic nation committed to Protestant Christianity.⁶³ Anderson concluded the sermon by explaining that “there is no sufficient reason for this rebellion and revolution. It is the most wicked and condemnable of any recorded in the history of nations.”⁶⁴ The service closed with Anderson and his fellow pro-Union congregants enthusiastically joining in singing “My Country, ’Tis of Thee.” Since it was a pleasant evening, several northern Methodists heard his sermon through the open windows and joined in singing the hymn from the church vestibule. The southern congregants sat in silence and soon permanently left the church.

Anderson’s sermon, however, outraged a number of pro-Confederate citizens in the city. Joseph W. Tucker, an influential southern Methodist layman, lambasted Anderson in his secessionist Missouri State Journal, declaring “the devil preaches at the corner of Sixth and Locust Streets, and he is just the same sort of a being that he was more than eighteen hundred years ago; he wants everybody to bow down and worship him.”⁶⁵ After a mob attempted to attack members of the Second Baptist Church congregation while Anderson was in Cincinnati on a honeymoon, he submitted a copy of his sermon to the Missouri Republican for publication, hoping to ease the tensions. The paper printed it on its front page on May 7, 1861.⁶⁶

As had been the case during the late antebellum period, newspaper publications had great power to shape public opinion on the question of slavery and secession. Southern Methodist minister William Leftwich remarked that newspaper coverage of the public meetings in various

parts of the state to work up public sentiment on these questions “did much to aggravate the spirit of animosity between northern and southern people in Missouri and to embitter scenes of war.”⁶⁷ To the extent evangelical newspapers fomented militant activism among those who sided with the North and South, these sheets and other printed publications discussing the divisive issue constituted a substantial part of a modern print culture that transformed the sectional conflict into a total, modern war.

Evangelical newspapers certainly contributed to the growing sense of crisis and, in particular, encouraged pro-slavery church-goers to support secession. As the southern states, one by one voted to secede from the Union, David R. McNally came to believe that he had no choice but to defend the MECS against verbal attacks from northern Methodists. After reading one of these critical pieces, he argued in his St. Louis Christian Advocate that his opponents “have ignored existing and well-established facts, shunned everything like calm, dispassionate, honorable, and mainly discussion, and evidently sought, often by means to which no high-minded and honorable man would resort, to excite prejudice and arouse bad passions”⁶⁸

In the early months of the war, cardinal pro-slavery and pro-Union Methodist tenets found their way onto the pages of both the St. Louis Christian Advocate and the pro-Union Central Christian Advocate. Through late 1861 and early 1862, McNally often featured commentary on the war and published letters that reported on the conflict that continued to embroil Missouri and Kansas.⁶⁹ He clearly favored the Confederacy, although he did not state this directly – a fact not lost on Charles Elliott, anti-slavery Methodist minister and editor of the Central Christian Advocate. In February 1862, McNally quoted, utterly without comment, a segment of an article that had appeared in Elliott’s paper which he had asked McNally to include in his. In that piece, Elliott had responded to the elaborate theological defense of slavery

that McAnally had published two weeks earlier. According to Elliott, “our late neighbor, Dr. McAnally, of the St Louis Christian Advocate, between whom and our self now three squares intervene, has recently come out in favor of stealing men, women and children, in his last three numbers.”⁷⁰ McAnally then felt compelled both to clarify his earlier remarks and quote a number of scriptural passages to explain the southern Methodist view on the issue.⁷¹ Elliott’s South-western Methodism summed up his opinion of McAnally:

the St. Louis Christian Advocate, the organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in St. Louis, edited by Dr. M’Anally, was, in every respect the promoter of rebellion, and in consequence, he was the bosom ally of Mr. Tucker, the editor of that rebel sheet, the Missouri State Journal, subsequently suppressed as an open foe to the Union, and a supporter of the southern rebellion.⁷²

The verbal jousting by northern and southern evangelical leaders highlights the fact that the now consolidated systems of sentiment and belief that had set the two groups at odds for at least a decade and a half were locked in full-scale and open conflict. For pro-slavery Missourians, northern military efforts to maintain the Union and to end slavery were unconstitutional and ran roughshod over Biblical authority. With the Camp Jackson affair fresh in their minds, they deeply resented the decision of Lincoln to employ lethal military force against them. By supporting Union military force to quell an incipient secession movement Unionist evangelicals sought to advance, as social and political reality, abolitionist beliefs and related political commitments requiring emancipation of the slaves. Evangelical fervor in Missouri, in the eighteen months following the election of Lincoln, crystallized around competing abolitionist and pro-slavery worldviews that shaped divergent perceptions of the situation and motivations for actual combat. These competing worldviews drew on the antagonist understandings of Christian faith, founding political principles, and appropriate social relations

that evangelical and political leaders had touted with increasing fervor after the major evangelical schisms of the period 1837-45.

Evolving Views of Divine Providence

While Missouri remained largely under Union control after early spring 1862, political party organization reflected the divergent combinations of popular sentiment for and against emancipation. White evangelicals supportive of the Union or of the Confederate cause were arrayed across the state much in keeping the voting patterns that had produced the outcome in the 1860 presidential election. But these preferences persisted amid increasingly complex political party alignments. Pro-Confederate governor in exile Claiborne Fox Jackson struggled in vain to secure additional support from Richmond for Missouri but died in December 1862. His successor, Thomas Reynolds, fared little better from his headquarters in Marshall, Texas. Many Democrats supported the Confederacy, especially those residing in the Boone's Lick. Such support was especially strong in Platte County, which bordered on Kansas. But Democrats who supported the Union were both for and against emancipation. Republicans controlled the provisional government, but they were split between the Radical wing, that is, the Charcoals, and the moderates Claybanks. The Radicals had organized in early 1862 to oppose this coalition because it had developed no concrete plan for emancipation. The Radical Republicans found their support among some small non-slaveholding Ozark farmers, Germans residing south of the Missouri River, and in St. Louis, where businessmen with roots in the northeast and German immigrants strenuously supported emancipation of African Americans. With Confederate supporters no longer part of the electorate, the majority of voters in the state favored emancipation in the fall 1862 elections. A small faction of pro-slavery zealots, known as the "snowflakes," had little power. Given the split between Claybanks and Charcoals, legislation to

immediately and fully emancipate the slaves did not pass until the constitutional convention in January 1865.⁷³

Through the war, white evangelicals struggled with the vexed question that had produced divisions among them – the arrangement of individual, social, political, and governmental relations. But the theological framework for the debate, under the circumstances of a possibly glorious or disastrous future, on both sides of the aisle, became the doctrine of Divine Providence. Much more than their pro-Confederate counterparts, pro-Union evangelicals in Missouri invoked Providence in their public addresses to spur support for the war. Pro-slavery evangelicals in Missouri had readily embraced a providential theology that southern theologians and moral philosophers had linked solidly to explicit scriptural passages condoning human bondage. The wedding of providential thinking to anti-slavery theology, which had incorporated novel commitments to civil and political equality for all men, had been more problematic, if only because of those same scriptural passages. Once the war began, nonetheless, pro-Union evangelicals in Missouri appear to have been much more eager to predict that God would intervene in their behalf.

Consider the contentious spring 1861 sermon that Galusha Anderson delivered before his St. Louis Second Baptist Church. While admonishing the pro-Confederate St. Louisians for their faithlessness and disloyalty, he warned that there might be tremendous suffering during the war. But he also pointed out that God would eventually provide for the preservation of a “just nation.” In his words,

brethren, we need have no fears as to the ultimate issue. The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. In this conflict your property may be swept away, and all may be reduced to a common level. Your life and mine may be sacrificed on the altar of our country, yet Jehovah, who presides over the scene, will bring the nation forth from the ordeal wiser, purer, nobler.⁷⁴

Providential thinking was fully evident in the publications of Charles Elliott. After the onset of hostilities, the Central Christian Advocate featured an editorial on 18 September 1861 from a number of leading northern Methodist ministers in Missouri about the war and the status of the church. In it, they reminded their readers of the punishments of God that would be inflicted upon Missouri for the Border War. The editorial said, “let us just note the retribution of Heaven here. Missouri in her days of border-ruffianism, invaded Kansas at the instigation of men of Cottondom; now those disturbers of the peace have left her to her fate, to suffer tenfold all Kansas ever suffered.”⁷⁵

Influential Presbyterian layman and leader of the Radical Union Party in Missouri Charles Daniel Drake invoked Providence to undergird strident pronouncements in some of his 1862 speeches. Like other evangelical politicians in the state, Drake linked true religion to the Union war effort, speaking to audiences that included evangelicals and non-church-goers alike. He sought to convince his listeners that the Union cause enjoyed the backing of God while those who opposed it would face everlasting torment. In one of his several published speeches, given on Washington’s Birthday in 1862, Drake explained that the ministers and congregants of the Confederacy in their “‘southern sympathies’ shrink from ‘declaring the whole counsel of God’ when it calls for preaching divine truth as contained in the opening verses of the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.”⁷⁶ For turning their back on the Constitution by leaving the Union, Drake continued, a just God will ensure that they will be chained “without hope to the parricide’s swift and ignominious fate.”⁷⁷ Later that year, in both Union and St Louis, he expanded on these points by proclaiming that the evil of the Confederacy was manifested with its attack on the United States, which he characterized as a “satanic onslaught on the best of human governments.”⁷⁸

In the last year of war, pro-Union evangelicals in Missouri invoked Divine Providence in more impassioned and complex ways than they had during the first years of the conflict. In his 1864 book South-western Methodism, Charles Elliott included a number of recent letters from northern Methodists that often alluded to providence. One from former minister and Radical Thomas J. Babcock, who had served in the Union militia, condemned anti-Union Copperheads by saying “such men will have their rewards. They will be hated on earth, excluded in heaven, and loathed in hell.”⁷⁹ By 1864, however, it appears that providential theology served Unionists as much as an explanation for tragedy and loss as a justification for the war or as a guarantor of victory. A parishioner of William Caples thus explained his death in 1864 from a stray round during the Confederate artillery bombardment of Glasgow, Missouri: “a merciful Providence directed the shell that removed him before the increasing malice of cruel men had ventured to murder him.”⁸⁰ Judge Advocate of the General Court-Martial William S. Stewart of Cape Girardeau similarly appears to have focused on the power of Providence to shield individual men caught up in the conflict. While stationed in St. Louis he wrote a letter to his mother and father two days before Christmas in December 1861, just as the worst of the conventional warfare was winding down: “[T]he last rebel army in Missouri is now crippled and they seem disheartened everywhere Be patient and hopeful and prayerful, and when peace, honorable peace is won, if Providence still spare me I will see you again soon.” Further in the same missive Stewart wrote, “I am glad to assure you that your ‘trust in our heavenly father’ has not been in vain in respect to me, for during the past 8 months of danger, both open and lurking, that have continually surrounded me, more than all my prior life, that same Providence has shielded me from all such dangers, and permitted me to enjoy the best of health.”⁸¹

Some pro-Union evangelicals plied the idea of Providence in the final years of the war no less enthusiastically than at its beginning but increasingly associated true Christian devotion with loyalty to the United States government. Continuing to emphasize the virtue of the Union military effort and its deeper political implications, Radical Republican Charles Drake reminded his audiences that the righteousness of the cause would insure victory for the North. In a September 1863 speech to the Radical Convention in Jefferson City entitled “The Wrongs to Missouri’s Loyal People,” Drake told his listeners “let us not, my friends, lose sight of the great and vital truth . . . If we sleep now, all is lost. The loyal men of Missouri are her rightful sovereigns. If true to themselves and to the great cause which in the providence of God is committed to their keeping, all will be well.”⁸² Afraid that the members of his church would begin to favor a negotiated peace with the Confederacy in fall 1864, pastor of the Second Baptist Church in St. Louis Galusha Anderson urged them forward, asserting that God still favored the fight. In his Thanksgiving sermon given that year, he hastened to speak to the Almighty in behalf of all the congregants: “O God, save us in mercy from such a peace . . . This is no time for fear or faltering . . . Christ the Prince of Peace anticipated such conflicts and his words, coming across the centuries, shall cheer us till the last blow is struck, truth vindicated, and righteousness immovable established.”⁸³

The certainty with which pro-slavery evangelicals had believed Providence favored their understanding of divine and human relations appears to have flagged considerably from the earliest days of the conflict. Fire-eating pro-Confederate ministers in Missouri shied away notably from publicly invoking Providence to predict victory even before Union forces took control of the state in fall 1862. By the same token, ministers and evangelical editors sympathetic

to the Confederate cause avoided such bold pronouncements well before Union authorities began suppressing their publications at about the same time.⁸⁴

By the end of the war, evangelical Missourians who had actually fought in the Confederate uniform appear to have had no more confidence than their ministers that God would redeem the southern war effort. Corporal Michael Weeks of western Barry County, attached to the Confederate 11th Regiment, Missouri Infantry, credited divine intervention for having survived the war. According to him, “Although, I have had my clothes shot full of holes, it seems like a kind of Providence interfered on my behalf many times.”⁸⁵ What lingered in his mind most poignantly, however, was the terrible pain that the war had wrought. In the same passage in which he had recognized that the hand of God had spared him, he conveyed a less sanguine memory: “But the saddest sight I saw and one that aroused my sympathy most was a Federal Soldier with both arms off, carrying water to a dying comrade.”⁸⁶

Congregations and the Disorganizing Effects of War

Given United States Army dominance across Missouri after March 1862, anti-slavery Methodists suffered little loss of organization because of wartime disruptions. In the opening months of the conflict, before the state was under Union control, the 1861 northern Methodist annual conference had to be moved from Jefferson City to St. Louis for its protection. The central region of the state was only gradually brought under Union control, whereas St. Louis, a stronghold for the northern church, was far more secure. But federal authorities had no reason to interfere with their assemblies, whose leaders vigorously encouraged Union patriotism. The next year, when the conference met again in St. Louis, it requested that the Union authorities come and administer a loyalty oath.⁸⁷ The state provost marshal who heeded the request, Lieutenant Colonel Bernard G. Farrar, Jr., whose father was the former owner of James Farrar and patron of

the African Methodist Church, commented positively on the pro-Union sentiment of the conference when he reportedly said that “the damnable heresy of secession had so dried up the fountains of his faith in, he regretted to say, many of his fellow-countrymen and citizens it became to him a most pleasant duty to turn away from them and fraternize with men who had always been loyal.”⁸⁸ After Farrar’s speech, the Methodists showed their approval by giving him a standing ovation. The support of Union authorities arose in response to such northern church leaders as Charles Elliott, who curried favor with the federal authorities by publicly articulating the anti-slavery and pro-Union sentiments of the denomination. For instance, Elliott wrote Secretary of War Simon Cameron in 1861 that “there is no more loyal people in the Union than the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church.”⁸⁹

Union authorities were also not disposed to interfere with the routine activities of the New School Presbyterians in Missouri. Already reduced in numbers, and with many of the denomination’s ministers living in Illinois, the New School Presbyterian Synod of Missouri was not able to meet in 1861 or 1862. The synod, however, sent commissioners to the New School General Assembly meeting in both years. In 1863, the synod convened in Kansas, which was still within its ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Because the remnant of the New School in Missouri included members who were both anti-slavery and pro-Union, like the northern Methodists, federal authorities did not cause them much trouble. Their remaining membership, moreover, was largely centered in Union strongholds around St. Louis.⁹⁰

Pro-Union congregants increasingly identified disloyalty, secession, and support of dis-Union with sin. Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church in Greene County, situated in the southwest corner of the state struggled considerably to continue meeting through the conflict. Indicative of the Unionist sentiments to which many residents in that area adhered, the congregants passed a

resolution in March 1864 formally condemning disunion in favor of the Constitution and the federal government. According to the resolution, “the act of secession is sinful, is rebellion against civil law and cannot in justice be tolerated either by civil or religious government. Resolved, that we declare an unfellowship with the said act of secession.”⁹¹

Wartime violence, fear, and resource scarcity compelled most evangelical colleges and academies, generally affiliated the pro-slavery denominations, to close their doors. The southern Methodist St. Charles College lost most of its students after the outbreak of fighting, forcing its curators to suspend classes until the end of hostilities. The reverend Tyson Dines and his family were allowed to live on the grounds as caretakers of the facility.⁹² William Jewell College, a Baptist institution in Liberty in western Missouri, was forced to close in 1861 and did not fully reopen until 1868.⁹³ A school supported by the southeastern Cape Girardeau Baptist Association in the town of Jackson failed as a result of wartime disorder almost as soon as it commenced classes.⁹⁴ Both William Jewell and the Jackson School were situated in areas of Missouri where guerilla activity was heavy. Situated in the Boone’s Lick, the Old School Presbyterian Westminster College in Fulton, however, was able to keep its doors opened during the war for all but two months in 1861. While it was located in the slaveholding Boone’s Lick region, fighting was not as intense there as it was elsewhere. The board of the college, nonetheless, hotly debated whether or not to continue classes in light of the unpredictable armed strife. And one member at the 1861 meeting made motioned to suspend the exercises of the College that year.⁹⁵

Interneine strife beset the larger Baptist associations because of the tendency of members sympathetic to the Confederate cause to utter their dissatisfaction with the Union war effort. Conflict within the Mt. Pleasant Association in the Boone’s Lick highlights the often very personal features of this kind of contention. Association moderator Jesse Terrill was a Unionist,

even though he was born in Virginia. Two other ministers in the association, Y. R. Pitts and Noah Flood, supported the Confederacy and sought refuge at Terrill's home in Randolph County. While Terrill was willing to shelter his fellow Baptists, he refused to hear their complaints at his dinner table about how they, unlike other Confederate supporters, had been persecuted by Union authorities. He enjoined them "brethren, I can tell you, take James' advice and bridle your tounge [sic]!"⁹⁶

On the other hand, some congregations divided by pro- and anti-slavery factional strife maintained their operations and unity. Take, for example, the Noix Creek Baptist church, in northeastern Pike County along the Mississippi River. Its location spared it from the worst of the guerilla warfare, but there were a number of pro-Confederate slaveholders in the congregation who, along with others, supported the Union, leading to considerable discord during the war. But in subsequent years its members remarked how "it seemed that when we met to worship those of the Union and Confederate armies met around the same altar and rejoiced in the forgiveness of their sins."⁹⁷

The First Presbyterian Church in Columbia, Boone County, the only Presbyterian congregation in the Boone's Lick town, was without a pastor from 1861 to 1862. The church was not uniformly aligned with either side, notwithstanding its location. Presbyterian manpower shortages left it without a minister. To make matters worse, the strain of the war led to the resignation of several ruling elders. While each of these men declared they were not suited to help lead the congregation because of their views on the war, the congregants, nonetheless, refused to accept the resignations. In 1862 M. M. Fisher, a Latin professor from Westminster College, came to the church to preach every other week. Fisher arranged for Union chaplain Robert W. Landis and pro-Confederate minister Samuel S. Laws to officiate jointly at a

communion service.⁹⁸ Union authorities eventually banished Laws, who had resigned as president of Westminster in the fall of 1861, for being a Confederate sympathizer.⁹⁹

In Hannibal, the Old School Presbyterian congregation begged Aaron P. Forman to continue as their pastor through 1863. Church members there resolved “we believe that if our present condition is dissolved, we will never be able again to unite in calling another pastor.”¹⁰⁰ While under Union control, the town had a significant number of southern partisans. Forman agreed to stay on until May 1864, when he left for the town of St. Joseph, Buchanan County, situated on the western border of the state.¹⁰¹

Concerned that his pro-Union preachments might lead to the dissolution of the only operating Protestant institution in Kansas City, pastor of the First Baptist Church Jonathan Fuller toned down his rhetoric at the behest of his Radical Unionist choir-leader. With western Missouri under the most serious strain from the guerilla war, Fuller felt duty bound to help maintain his congregation.¹⁰² Consider also parishioners of the Ramsey Creek Baptist Church in Pike County, situated on the Mississippi River. Church chronicler Wiley Jones Patrick emphasized the enduring religious zeal of its members, characterizing it in nurturing maternal terms: “the church maintained her through the fires and thunders of the Civil War.”¹⁰³ This devotion had persisted notwithstanding the fact that the congregation included slaveholders and Union-supporters.

Religious Societies and the Guerillas

Scholarship on the notorious guerilla conflict in Missouri during the Civil War provides the most useful framework for assessing the wartime strife that ensued between religiously-minded pro-Union and pro-Confederate partisans. After the March 1862 Union success at the Battle of Pea Ridge, pro-Confederate guerillas in Missouri, dubbed “bushwhackers” by their Union critics, began to harass United States forces.¹⁰⁴ Pro-Confederate guerillas sniped at Union

troops and employed hit and run attacks against them. Kansas Jayhawkers, or “redlegs,” relied on the same tactics. This kind of warfare intensified after Confederate military setbacks in July 1863. The most notorious of the pro-Confederate guerilla forces, at least from the perspective of pro-Union residents and United States military personnel, was led by Maryland-born William Clarke Quantrill, who launched a devastating raid on Lawrence, Kansas in August 1863.¹⁰⁵ Equally hated in Unionist circles was William T. “Bloody Bill” Anderson, who grew up in Randolph County, Missouri. While guerrilla warfare waxed and waned across the state, most of the incidents occurred along the western border with Kansas and in northern Missouri, where more residents in small towns and rural areas had sided with the Union than further South. Union supporters also hated pro-Confederate guerillas for their ruthless treatment of captured United States soldiers. In a widely-publicized event that occurred on September 27, 1865 in the town of Centralia, which straddled Audrain and Boone Counties, guerilla leader William T. Anderson led a force that captured, executed, and mutilated twenty-four Union troops. In an ensuing battle, Anderson and his men virtually wiped out a detachment of Union mounted infantry.

Pro-Confederate and pro-Union evangelical fervor powerfully energized the guerilla conflict and the vigilantism associated with it. Civilians on both sides of the border pointed to the violence employed by opposing partisans as an excuse to take revenge on hated antagonists.¹⁰⁶ Union provost marshals certainly attempted to suppress irregular partisans, especially when they targeted Union troops or pro-Union settlements and towns. The sniping and hit and run attacks employed by pro-Confederate guerillas, nonetheless, frequently combined with the spontaneous assistance of civilian supporters from small town and rural neighborhoods in sympathy with the southern cause, violence that sometimes pitted neighbor against neighbor and community against community. Pro-Union residents cooperated similarly with Kansas “redleggers.”¹⁰⁷ Household

and community loyalties, as well as commitments to evangelical faith, figured heavily in the motivations and strategies of local residents who combined with guerillas on both sides of the conflict. By the same token, the religious beliefs and sentiments nurtured by individual men and women involved in that irregular fighting drew strength from the local churches that their households and neighborhoods vitally sustained. The hotly fought guerilla war, especially after 1862, ultimately shaped the experiences of pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals much more than the formal military campaigns, which were largely confined to the first year of the war.

Through the war, militant ideologies and military conflict spurred disruptions of congregations affiliated with both pro-Union and pro-Confederate denominations. Especially in the most war-torn areas of the state, the exigencies and terrors of war compelled pro- and anti-slavery congregations to cease regular meetings. Amid the uncertainty about troop movements and eruptions of guerilla insurgencies, many men and women in the rural areas of the state found it something of an ordeal to attend church. Travel along country roads on foot or by horse-drawn carriages was fraught with perils. The Augusta Presbyterian Church in Callaway County, abutting the Missouri River in the Boone's Lick, canceled its meetings from 1861 to 1864. The members of the congregations were not infrequently questioned and intimidated by Union authorities.¹⁰⁸ The members of Prospect Baptist Church, far to the south in the Ozark highlights in Webster County, did not assemble after June 1861. The southwestern congregation only reformed in November 1865 after the worst of the guerilla fighting had come to a conclusion.¹⁰⁹ The Neosho, Bethpage and Prosperity Baptist churches, in the southwest corner of the state, moreover, similarly suspended regular worship through the war.¹¹⁰ The Hornersville Methodist Church, situated in Dunklin County in the Bootheel bordering on Arkansas, had worshipped in the local Masonic hall prior to 1861 because they so they had no meeting house. But when that

structure burned in 1862, the congregation collapsed. Union forces were under a constant threat from Confederate positions further south, which compelled heightened vigilance among Union authorities, a posture that spurred harassment of the MECS congregation. Under the circumstances the Hornersville Methodists decided to wait out the war.¹¹¹

A number of congregations who continued to meet during the war permanently lost members as a consequence of guerilla warfare. Leaders of the Methodist New Madrid Quarterly Conference, also situated in the Bootheel, observed at their July 1861 meeting that “people’s minds were drawn away.”¹¹² While Methodist church activities had flourished during the 1850s, it became increasingly difficult to obtain class leaders in war-torn southeastern Missouri.¹¹³ In central Missouri, many of the congregations in the MECS Brunswick District, the circuit lead by William Caples, lost substantial numbers of adult male congregants swept up by the fervor to enlist. Many who were Confederate supporters in the Boone’s Lick joined Sterling Price’s Missouri State Guard.¹¹⁴ George Miller, a Unionist Old School Presbyterian minister in Cass County, situated in central Missouri on the Kansas border, explained these sentiments. While eventually pressured by pro-Confederate guerillas to abandon his congregation, Miller explained that for many in his congregation “southern pride and sympathy ran deeper with the vast majority . . . the hostile feeling grew and deepened from Lincoln's election, until by June 1, men were seen everywhere rushing into confederate camps.”¹¹⁵ In the same area of the state, the Blue River Baptist Association was not able to convene after 1861. Many of the younger ministers in the association, like Caples, joined the army to attend their denominational members as chaplains. The congregations of the Blue River Association, furthermore, were devastated by the infamous General Order Number 11, which Brigadier General Thomas Ewing implemented four days after William Clarke Quantrill’s August 21, 1863 raid on Lawrence, Kansas. Ewing sought

to discourage further guerilla activity in western Missouri and punish their supporters by forcing the residents of Bates, Cass, Jackson and the northern half of Vernon Counties to leave the area or move within a mile of Union military posts. Designated refugee towns were available to those who could prove their loyalty to the Union. But most of the membership of the association fell under the scope of the order and were thus exiled. Consequently, many were denied fellowship with co-congregants similarly dislocated or even access to their meeting houses.¹¹⁶ As a result of the command and the raids from pro-Union guerillas in Kansas, the majority of the churches along the western border in all three denominations had ceased to function by the end of the war.

Aligned with the northern church, the German Methodists often suffered because of their intertwined religious beliefs and political commitments to equality and freedom for African Americans. While they were located in liberal areas such as St. Louis, a significant portion of the German wing of Missouri Methodism lived in the counties along the Missouri River into the western part of the state, where they were vulnerable to guerilla onslaughts. According to J. A. Muller, himself a German Methodist, Confederate soldiers and guerillas often attacked their convocations in western Missouri. Many guerillas linked the anti-slavery and pro-Union sentiments espoused by most German Methodists. For example, in August of 1863, several southern guerillas broke up a German Methodist camp meeting in southwestern Missouri around Eudora.¹¹⁷

Unionist vigilantism generated depredations that fragmented southern Methodist congregations and spurred harassment of their members. In step with Union military dominance, mobs of northern Methodists assaulted southern Methodist congregants and sometimes took possession of their houses of worship. In northeast Missouri, at least, depredations of this kind were, at one level, a continuation of the turmoil that had erupted after passage of the Kansas-

Nebraska Act. In essence, anti-slavery partisans turned the tables on their pro-slavery counterparts after Union troops took charge of the state. Consider the experience of James Penn, a southern Methodist minister in Williamstown, Lewis County, situated on the Mississippi River in northeastern Missouri. In August 1863, he was violently interrupted by a group of pro-Union partisans in the middle of Sunday services¹¹⁸ As he led the congregation in prayer, fifteen members of an armed band surrounded the church and began shouting and heckling the congregants while they prayed in silence. After forcing their way into the meeting house, some of the vigilantes demanded that Penn take an oath of loyalty to the Union. Calmly leading his terror-stricken congregants outside, however, Penn continued to preach, allowing the armed mob to take control of the meeting house. In the following weeks, pro-Union partisans retained possession of the building and, as a practical matter, forced the Williamstown congregation to continue meeting out of doors. Sometime after the events in August, the members of the church attempted once again to use their meeting house for Sunday worship, only to find upon entering the pulpit draped in American flags. Armed members of the Unionist band stood guard on the makeshift shrine. Penn later explained that once it became apparent to the vigilantes that he was intent on continuing with the service, “a lot of wicked women raised a fight and fought like savages, so we were compelled to leave the house and ceased to preach at that place.”¹¹⁹ Regular worship became a problem also for the southern Methodists in Winchester, another town in Lewis County, where a mob of northern Methodists destroyed the MECS church building. Pro-MEC partisans seized the meeting house of southern Methodists in La Grange, a St. Louis County town deep in Unionist territory.¹²⁰

Fully in the grip of abolitionist zeal, Kansas Jayhawkers conducted raids throughout western Missouri after 1861 and homed in on congregations believed to be in sympathy with the

Confederate cause. Their free-form foraging targeted residents, including church-goers, merely suspected of having Confederate sympathies. These onslaughts, quite obviously to all concerned, had the objective of punishing residents for both supporting slavery and for disloyalty to the Union.¹²¹ William Leftwich explained that “southern Methodists, and Southern Baptists, and Southern Presbyterians were by the Union men and forces constructively identified with secession and rebellion and put in sympathy with the Southern Cause.”¹²² In southwest Missouri, Jayhawkers disrupted the southern Methodists from the beginning of the war. In the 25 July 1861 issue of the St. Louis Christian Advocate, David McAnally expressed his fear that the MECS in Missouri might be snuffed out of existence and begged his fellow ministers not to give up, expressing the earnest hope that “the preachers will remain at their work as generally as possible.”¹²³ But the situation for the southern Methodists grew worse the war. Jayhawkers constantly threatened MECS congregants in Independence, Jackson County, on the border with Kansas.¹²⁴ The redleggers virtually destroyed the Baptist Union Association in northwestern Missouri. Only four of the thirteen churches that had been established by 1860 in that association were functioning in 1863.¹²⁵

Congregational Schisms and Church Property Litigation

Heated sectional loyalties amid armed conflict increased the number of congregational schisms during the war, a development that, in the case of the Presbyterians, turned on larger denominational ruptures and realignments. At the outbreak of the war in 1861 the Old School General Assembly voiced its unconditional support for the Union with the Gardiner Spring Resolutions, named for a New York Presbyterian minister of the same name. The General Assembly declared to subordinate bodies in the church their “obligation, to promote and perpetuate, so far in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold and

encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions.”¹²⁶ In December of that year, consequently, the ten synods in the Confederacy separated from the Old School General Assembly to form the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.¹²⁷

In this context, consider how intra-church factions fought for control of the Second Presbyterian Church in St. Louis. Charles Drake and Hamilton Gamble, ruling elders in the congregation, represented the opposing sides in the battle. In light of the Missouri Synod’s condemnation of the Presbyterian General Assembly, which had openly declared in favor of the Union, Drake urged his fellow elders to take a harsh stand against the synod at an upcoming meeting in November 1861. According to him, “the publication of the resolution of [the] Synod will create the impression abroad that the churches within the bounds of the Synod are disloyal; the effect of which will be unfavorable to those churches in the loyal States.”¹²⁸ Gamble, on the other hand, was not worried about the impression of disloyalty, insisting that a harsh formal condemnation was unnecessary. This was especially so, in his view, because the declaration of the synod had been unnecessary from the beginning. Gamble sought to negotiate a position that would take into account the fact that neither the congregation nor the City of St. Louis was completely united under the Union banner. Since the late mid-1850s the Republican Party in St. Louis had constructed a coalition of merchants and professionals, many formally aligned with staunch Unionist Thomas Hart Benton, and immigrant groups, including the liberal-minded Germans. The majority of the older families and newcomers from the South, however, either supported the Confederacy or only tenuously favored the Union cause.¹²⁹ Like many other eminent town-dwellers in the city, Gamble could not easily trample on the rights and sensibilities of any upstanding Presbyterian, regardless of his or her political views on slavery and the war. Class loyalties and divided sectional affiliations thus required a certain amount of diplomacy. His

initiative sought to keep the peace in a congregation that was split between businessmen inclined to support the Union and those who had migrated from the Upper South and favored that section. To Drake's chagrin, the elders saw Gamble's logic and voted for his resolution.¹³⁰

The town of Louisiana, Pike County, situated in the northeastern part of the state on the Mississippi River, was the site of a protracted legal battle after the northern Methodists there attempted to seize the meeting house and land of their southern counterparts. Tensions between the MEC and MECS remained high in Missouri through the Civil War.¹³¹ Because Louisiana was on the border with Illinois, the northern Methodists had attempted to send a preacher to start a congregation there in the early 1850s. They failed, however, to establish a lasting following.¹³² In 1853, Edward G. McQuie and his wife conveyed by deed a plot of land in the town to the trustees of the congregation which was still under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. This conveyance was to provide the MECS congregants a site for the construction of a new meeting house.¹³³ During the secession crisis, however, some of the congregants became disaffected with the southern affiliation. Among this group was trustee Edwin Draper, who wrote David Rice McAnally a letter in February 1861 explaining that he was canceling his subscription to the St. Louis Christian Advocate because of its seeming support of the secession movement.¹³⁴ Still under the control of southern Methodists because the MECS trustees outnumbered Draper and others who now favored the MEC, the congregation proceeded to construct a building. As was the case elsewhere in the state, however, the congregation formally switched its affiliation to the MEC in about 1862 simply to avoid harassment. The pro-southern quarterly conference, meeting in July 1862 with Barry Hill Spencer presiding, condemned them for this action. Clearly the switch provided the northern church an opening for expansion and aroused suspicions against pro-Union trustee Edwin Draper. According to

Spencer, “a man who is in open organized rebellion against the established usages and regularly constituted authorities of the church, cannot justly claim . . . the rights and privileges in the M. E. Church South.”¹³⁵ With Union military forces now in control of Missouri, the northern Methodists were in a position to displace the pro-Confederate congregation. Two trustees had resigned shortly before the fighting started. David Watson had died and Thomas Stokes had left the state. Pointing to supposed irregularities in the original deed, Edwin Draper, John S. Markley, Joseph Charleville and John Shurmur filed an ex parte bill in the Pike County Circuit Court to have pro-Union Charles Hunter appointed to fill the vacancy left by Watson and Unionist Robert S. Strother to fill that left by Stokes. Sitting in chancery, the court granted the request on 21 July 1862, allowing the northern Methodist trustees to assumed control of the meeting house and the town plot on which it sat.¹³⁶

The southern Methodists of the Louisiana church immediately fought back to obtain control of their meeting house, arguing that the Unionist trustees had usurped the vacant offices left by the untimely departures of Watson and Stokes. Three of the original trustees signing the bill filed by Draper and his supporters averred that their signatures had been forged. This group included John M. Allen, Ivey Zumwalt and Samuel O. Minor along with W. A. Gunn and Samuel S. Allen. This combination of trustees filed a counter-suit in the Pike County Circuit Court in an action styled Draper v. Minor on July 23, 1862. The counter-bill explained that Gunn had been appointed on January 21, 1861 to the trustee position vacated by Watson’s death and that Allen had been appointed to the other on April 23, 1862. Both of these selections, the complainants emphasized, had been approved by the Louisiana Quarterly Conference and thus valid under Methodist law.¹³⁷ The case came to trial on July 24, 1862, with Samuel Allen representing the pro-Confederate members of the church. The Unionist Methodists retained as

counsel one of their own, Thomas J. C. Fagg, a Radical Republican and later judge of the Missouri Supreme Court. That same day, an editorial penned by Fagg appeared in the Louisiana Journal, which responded pointedly to the quarterly conference resolutions condemning the formal re-affiliation of the Louisiana church with the MEC. He particularly expressed his resentment of the position taken by quarterly conference president Barry Hill Spenser, declaring “you were thought of only as constituting a very small portion of the brood in the nest of ‘unclean birds’ that we intend to dislodge.”¹³⁸ For Fagg and many other pro-Union MEC members across the state, the litigation quite obviously involved much more than simply which set of Louisiana church trustees would control its property:

[I]t is expected that every member of the Church in the State will be compelled to take a position upon the issues to be presented by the Convention, and that hereafter hypocritical pretenders who talk aloud about ‘rendering into Caesar the things that are Caesar’s’ will be exposed and convicted not only as traitors and rebels, but branded cowards and hypocrites.¹³⁹

Judge Gilchrist Porter sided with Fagg and ruled in favor of the pro-MEC defendants, notwithstanding the evidence against them. The pro-Confederate complainants appealed to the Supreme Court of Missouri, filing its bill of exceptions in the waning days of the war.¹⁴⁰ The bill maintained that the Pike County Court had blatantly circumvented the law and evidence to award ownership to the pro-Union trustees – an injustice spawned entirely by prejudice against those with southern leanings. Acknowledging that there had been flaws in the original deed, Judge Walter Lovelace, a Republican from the Missouri River County of Montgomery, wrote the unanimous opinion for the October 1865 decision of the Missouri Supreme Court. The Republican-dominated Court refrained from openly chastising Judge Gilchrist Porter. But it did determine that the Pike County Court had, indeed, erred. According to Judge Lovelace, “over the church, as such, the temporal courts of this country most clearly have no jurisdiction, except to

protect them”¹⁴¹ The southern Methodists, consequently, were able quickly to place their trustees in control of the long-disputed meeting house.¹⁴²

The Mississippi River town of LaGrange witnessed another extended legal dispute between embattled Methodist congregations during the war. The congregants of the Methodist Church in Lagrange, situated in Lewis County north of St. Louis, had voted to join the MECS shortly after the 1845 schism. But since the MEC repudiated the Plan of Separation in 1848, the handful of members who had voted against the majority in 1845 saw their opportunity to set things right about halfway through the war. In 1863, MEC superiors dispatched W. C. Stewart to LaGrange to assess the situation. Since the southern congregation only met in their building twice a month, Stewart asked the MECS trustees for use of the facility for the other two weeks. Realizing that their northern counterparts had seized the property of other congregations in the state, the MECS trustees refused his request and suggested a nearby German Methodist edifice as an alternative. Insisting the German Methodist meeting house was inadequate, Stewart gave his pledge as a Christian gentleman and as a minister to return the key from the LaGrange church every week. The southern Methodist trustees subsequently granted his request. Shortly after organizing a board of trustees for his congregation in January 1865 Stewart changed the locks on the structure and served notice on the southern Methodist trustees that the property rightly belonged to his MEC congregation. The forcible exclusion left the MECS trustees little choice but to seek redress in the Lewis County Circuit Court. They filed their bill later that spring but could make no headway in the case for years. In some precincts, the local courts could move only at a snail’s pace because of the disruptions wrought by war.¹⁴³

A southern Methodist congregation under siege by pro-Union Methodists further west, however, had far better luck than their brethren in Lewis County. Emboldened by Union military

occupation of central Missouri, MEC congregants resorted to the courts to wrest control of a meeting house owned by MECS congregants in the town of Lexington, Lafayette County, situated in the Boone's Lick. Several years earlier, officials of the MEC established a mission for some of the Union troops stationed in the town. Even with these Methodist soldiers, the northern Methodists had few adherents in the vicinity. In 1864, however, they filed suit in the Circuit Court of Lafayette County, claiming that the newly-constructed church of the southern Methodist congregation was actually theirs. Presuming that the rulings in Gibson v. Armstrong (1847) and Smith v. Swormstedt (1853) mattered very little in the circumstances, the plaintiffs alleged that the 1844-45 division of the MEC was invalid, the vote by the majority of the Lexington congregation to join the MECS was void, and that, as a consequence, the MECS trustees had no right to the property.¹⁴⁴

The resolution of the Lexington Methodist Church case involved rather curiously the final gasp of Confederate military operations in the state of Missouri. General Sterling Price and his Confederate regulars invaded Missouri in early fall 1864. His troops struck in the southeast corner of the state in September and moved northward in an effort to capture Fort Davidson, situated high in the Ozark Mountains. But this effort failed. After approaching St. Louis, Price found it too heavily fortified for his tastes and headed west across the Boone's Lick. On October 19th, Price's army approached Lexington and engaged federal troops. Without the entire Union force under the command of Major General Samuel R. Curtis, the Yankees could not stop the Confederates, who drove them westward along the road to Independence. Four days later in a major battle at Westport, which involved at least 30,000 soldiers, Price's troops got the worst of it and retreated through Kansas and the Indian Territory into Arkansas, never to return clad in Confederate colors.¹⁴⁵ But for several more months, Lexington remained the home base of

operation for Quantrill's Raiders, who refused to honor the cease fire or go away peacefully. According to counsel for the MECS Lexington trustees at about that time, "when I went to court . . . expecting to try the case, I found that the suit had been dismissed and the M. E. Church, South, left in undisturbed possession of their property." In the estimation of southern Methodist minister William Leftwich, the explanation for the sudden capitulation of the MEC plaintiffs was simple: "Finding that they had no shadow of claim to the property, and no pretext even for getting possession by military interference, they withdrew the suit, paid the costs, and turned their attention to other places where they had a better show of success."¹⁴⁶

Conclusions

The escalation of theological and political disputation between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in religious newspapers and other printed publications, which ensued after the evangelical schisms, played a prime role in fueling the vicious guerilla conflict that engulfed Missouri during the Civil War. Conflict between northern and southern evangelicals over the question of slavery contributed substantially to the pro- and anti-slavery guerilla depredations that disrupted congregations and church activities through the bloody conflict. Northern and southern evangelicals invoked Divine Providence variously to justify their respective causes and to settle the daunting existential question of which of their contending worldviews were true.

The evangelical schisms in Missouri provided the critical social, cultural, and institutional pre-conditions necessary for the formation of irreconcilable views on the morality of slavery that ultimately helped spawn civil war in Missouri after the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency. The radical reconfiguration of Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian organizations after the evangelical ruptures of the period 1837-45 provided institutionally-liberated clerics the opportunity to purify and consolidate their opposing doctrines. The

intensifying ideological conflict in the decade and a half before secession was grounded in mutually-antagonistic worldviews, each of which blended divergent understandings of theology, natural law, rational moral philosophy, social order, government, individual liberty, and the boundary of state and federal power. Advanced by clerics, politicians, and secular and religious newspaper editors, these conflicting visions provided the vital moral and intellectual energy for armed resistance to Union occupation and forcible suppression of that movement.

Both pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in Missouri thoroughly embraced the providential design that promised rewards and success to the members of a God-fearing polity. But the ideological overhaul advanced by pro-slavery clerics and allied public officials in the decade and a half before the election of Lincoln challenged most energetically unorthodox abolitionist theology that had incorporated egalitarian commitments to civil and political equality for all men, including African Americans. For pro-slavery evangelicals, denunciations of the more conservative social order to which they subscribed, including master and slave as but one relation in an organic and hierarchical social order, were tantamount both to infidelity and political heresy. Pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals derided one another virulently as heathens and traitors – while reserving to themselves the role of virtuous and patriotic defenders of true Christianity. Verbal contention also centered on diametrically opposed views on the issue of whether opposition to slavery, as either sin or civil inequity, justified the entry of anti-slavery ministers into politics. Especially after abolitionist settlers attempted to establish a free territory in Kansas, pro-slavery clerics and politicians invoked more stridently than ever before republican and constitutional principles requiring a separation of church and state.

After the election of Lincoln, the war of words between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in Missouri reached its ultimate intensity and pitted against one another the now

consolidated systems of belief that had set these two groups at odds for at least a decade and a half. Initially, verbal conflict focused on the question of whether slavery, secession, and loyalty were within the scope of religion. Heated disputation also concentrated on the questions of whether military force by the Union was constitutional and consistent with Christian articles of faith -- and whether secession constituted defensible rebellion under God-given natural law principles or abandonment of Christian obligations to support civil government. Evangelical and secular newspapers contributed to the growing sense of crisis, encouraging pro-slavery churchgoers and those who favored abolition to redouble their respective commitments.

The certainty with which pro-slavery evangelicals had believed Providence favored their understanding of divine and human relations appears to have flagged considerably from the earliest days of the armed conflagration. In notable contrast, pro-Union evangelicals invoked Providence to support their cause to the end of the war. Committed white evangelicals on both sides demonstrated a collective determination through the conflict to continue their devotional activities, while struggling with the questions that had produced divisions among them. But Unionist congregants, in this connection, increasingly embraced the view that disloyalty to the United States, secession, and support of slavery amounted to sin. While disloyalty was clearly the most grievous sin in the mind of most Unionists, they grew also ever confident that true Christian faith required emancipation of the slaves. Union military successes ratified these beliefs.

The wartime fervor of both pro-Confederate and pro-Union evangelicals played a heretofore unexamined role in energizing the notorious guerilla war in Missouri and the vigilantism associated with it. Through the bloody conflict, militant evangelical ideologies spurred denominational and congregational disruptions for both pro-Union and pro-Confederate

evangelicals. Unionist and pro-Confederate vigilantism generated depredations that further fragmented evangelical church organizations. More frequently, however, this kind of strife spurred harassment of congregations that pro-Union partisans deemed in sympathy with the southern cause. Heated sectional loyalties amid armed contention increased the number of congregational schisms during the war. Such ruptures engendered protracted legal battles over the church buildings and lands that pro-Union evangelicals attempted to seize from their increasingly vulnerable pro-Confederate counterparts.

Notes

¹ William M. Leftwich, Martrydom in Missouri: A History of Religious Proscription, the Seizure of Churches, and the Persecution of Ministers of the Gospel in the State of Missouri during the Late Civil War, 2 vols. (St. Louis, 1870), 1:417-19; W. H. Lewis, The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870 (Nashville, 1890), 128-30. McFerran, a noted lawyer and judge originally from Gallatin in northwestern Missouri was originally a Whig before he became a Democrat after the former party's collapse. "Whig Meeting in Daviess," Liberty Tribune, 14 January 1848, p. 1.

² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:418.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Richard J. Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 162-68; Clarence C. Goen, Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the American Civil War (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985), 68-75. See also Donald G. Mathews, Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965), 282; John R. McKivigan, The War Against Proslavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Church, 1830-1865 (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1984), 74, 82-83, 86-88; "The Battle for the Border State Soul: The Slavery Debate in the Churches of the Middle States," presented October 1, 2008, Annual Meeting of the Filson Club, p. 12.

⁵ Mark A. Noll, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene D. Genovese, The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' World View (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); John Patrick Daley, When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004). According to Mitchell Snay, theology, as opposed to simple evangelical fervor, played an important part in the onset of the war. In his words, "By creating and sustaining a moral dimension to sectional politics, religion played a key role in infusing sectional ideologies into the political process." Mitchell Snay, Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 216-17.

⁶ Ayers, What Caused the Civil War, 140-41; Trish Loughran, The Republic of Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. National Building, 1770-1870 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 363-40.

⁷ Northern ministers intensified criticisms of southern clerics and their religious defense of slavery and southern society. Historians Douglas M. Strong and Dan McKanan suggest that anti-slavery evangelicals adopted a number of diverse approaches to anti-slavery reform, some of which were far from the vanguard of the movement. Crucial to the activism of the most radical clerics, however, were the doctrines of "perfectionism" and related Arminian ideas that emphasized the inherent goodness in humankind and the capacity of all women and men to choose freely salvation through Christ. Abolitionist ministers ruffled conservative feathers by

adhering to theological views that called for ambitious programs of social improvement, a shift to secular concerns that drew its inspiration from the intellectual ferment of continental Europe. Douglas M. Strong, Perfectionist Politics: Abolitionism and the Religious Tensions of American Democracy (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999), 1-11; Dan McKanan, Identifying the Image of God: Radical Christians and Nonviolent Power in the Antebellum United States (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 4-10; McKivigan argues against the conclusion that evangelical congregations were leaders in the anti-slavery movement. McKivigan, The War Against Pro-Slavery Religion, 74, 82-83, 86-88. For early national and antebellum period examples, see Samuel Hopkins, et al., The Works of Samuel Hopkins 2 vols. (Boston, 1852); Francis Wayland, Elements of Moral Science (Boston, 1835); Charles G. Finney, Systematic Theology: Lectures on Classes of Truths, Moral Government (London, 1847); and Asa Mahan, Science of Moral Philosophy (Oberlin, Oh, 1848).

⁸ Abolitionist rhetoric departed radically from conservative Protestant traditions by becoming much more democratic and by embracing the associated ideal that all of God's children should have equal civil and political rights. Presbyterian divine Charles Grandison Finney, whose preaching drew converts by the tens of thousands, was the most well-known American expositor of democratized evangelicalism. By the same token, abolitionist ministers substantially modified the doctrine of Divine Providence to provide rewards for those who adhered to new democratic and egalitarian Christian doctrines that mandated civil and political equality for all men. Northern ministers touted the superiority of their version of Protestant faith, moreover, because of its distinctive compatibility with democratic government, republicanism, individualism, free market capitalism, free labor, and prosperity. Strong, Perfectionist Politics, 20, 78, 131, 159, 163-67; McKivigan, The War Against Proslavery Religion, 143-82; McKanan, Identifying the Image of God, 3-10, 46-101.

⁹ In this conception, all southerners who tolerated slavery were guilty – whether they owned slaves or not. Since slavery was an inherent evil, every feature of southern society was tainted. Abolitionists and their secular anti-slavery allies increasingly adopted the position that “moral suasion” alone was insufficient to restrain, much less eliminate, the intertwined evil and gross civil injustice of African American bondage. They increasingly engaged in politics to change laws and government policy relevant to the status of African Americans. To some extent, abolitionists sought to draw on the principles of traditional American law, which had, since the Revolution, supported Protestant morality. The problem, from their perspective, was to change popular understandings about the morality of slavery sufficiently to bring it within the scope of that law. McKivigan, The War Against Proslavery Religion, 161-82; Strong, Perfectionist Politics, 66-91, 74, et seq.

¹⁰ John Patrick Daley argues that southern clerics responded conservatively and with innovation to abolitionist criticisms and the myriad transformations of antebellum America that generated them. They decried as heretical abolitionist “perfectionism” and related Arminian ideas positing that all human beings were free to choose salvation. Abolitionists and other northern reformers, from this perspective, were dealing in theories and abstractions unproven by the test of historical

experience and inconsistent with scriptural understandings of human nature. Most southerners found the concept of collective guilt by association with slavery thoroughly bewildering. Daley argues demonstrates, middle-class southern clerics promulgated arguments that directly engaged northern criticisms of slavery and the South. Daley, When Slavery Was Called Freedom, 32, 56-60, 78, 91; Snay, Gospel of Disunion, 4, 13, 29-30, 55, 57, 157.

Leading pro-slavery ministers did not denounce individualism. Instead, they emphasized that their brand of Protestant faith was grounded in a time-tested moral order that placed a premium on the force of individual character, which depended fundamentally on the fulfillment by the individual of sacred obligations and related secular duties. This was a view that southern-ized moral philosophy copiously reinforced. B. M. Palmer, ed., The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1875; Oxford: University Printing House, Oxford, 1986): 1:252-63, 2:453-75; Richard Henderson Rivers, Elements of Moral Philosophy (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1859), 97 et seq.

¹¹ Divine providence denoted the entry of the Almighty into human affairs in order to reward the faithful and punish the wicked. Intervention of this kind could affect an individual, a community, or a whole nation. Widespread adherence to this belief, North and South, went hand in hand with the evangelical conception of a living and all-powerful God whose actions could be observed in day to day life. Evangelicals in the North and South believed they would be rewarded, on earth or in the hereafter, by adhering to the moral precepts set out in scripture and the reasonable dictates of well-informed conscience. This reward would come in the form of additional western lands, industrial growth, prosperity, theological vindication, and, ultimately, a place in heaven. The fact that the southern economy had grown and prospered was, by the late 1850s, simply providential proof that southern evangelicals were adhering to “true religion.” The supposed success of the missions to the slaves similarly proved providentially that slaveholders were improving that race of people by leaps and bounds. And the slave themselves, under the tutelage of God-fearing masters, would receive their proper earthly and heavenly rewards. One of the prime criticisms of the abolitionists was, in fact, that they arrogantly attempted to interfere with the workings of this providential design. James H. Thornwell gets credit for articulating most eloquently this kind of providential thinking. *Ibid.*, 16, 91, 112-14, 124-35

¹² By validating an organic vision of society, proslavery evangelicalism incorporated the world views of both planters and yeomen. As a traditional social relation situated under the umbrella of patriarchal household governance, duty-bound masters, in theory, protected the interests and rights of their slaves. This arrangement obviated entirely the need for government interference, which could, under the Constitution, be exercised only by the states in any case. Snay, Gospel of Disunion, 216, n. 8; Stephanie McCurry, Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, & Political Culture in the South Carolina Low Country (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 277-302; Rachel N. Klein, Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760-1808 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 301.

Radical anti-slavery evangelicals in the North certainly enjoyed no monopoly on the religious views appropriate for that rapidly transforming region. Fearful that untrammelled democracy, industrial society, consumerism, and expanding personal freedom might lead to heterodoxy or even atheism, conservative clergymen in the northern states insisted that true progress could arise only from individual faith and Protestant orthodoxy. Historian Mark Y. Hanley suggests that a substantial number of northern ministers in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches openly criticized the popular embrace of social and economic change as signs of progress – at least as far as religion was concerned. The emerging consumer culture associated with the market revolution and industrialization, the unfettered individual liberty available in growing cities, and white man’s democracy seemed to have engendered widespread spiritual complacency. Jeremiads often denounced as infidelity philanthropy and benevolence – of which abolitionism had achieved pride of place among reformers. Such religiously-inspired initiatives, in the view of the northern orthodox ministers, separated virtue from Christian morality and led people to confuse the secular with the sacred. By the same token, secular reform became blurred with salvation and spiritual regeneration. Mark Y. Hanley, “The New Infidelity: Northern Protestant Clergymen and the Critique of Progress, 1840-1855,” Religion and American Culture 1.2 (Summer 1991): 203-206.

¹³ Consider the snippet Fox-Genovese and Genovese set out in Mind of the Master Class from an essay penned by pro-slavery South Carolina Presbyterian theologian James Henley Thornwell: “If our principles are true, the world must come to them It is not the narrow question of Abolitionism or Slavery – not simply whether we shall emancipate our Negroes or not; the real question is the relations of man to society, of States to the individual, and of the individual to States – a question as broad as the interests of the human race The parties in this conflict are not merely Abolitionists and Slaveholders; they are Atheists, Socialists, Communists, Red Republicans, Jacobins on the one side, and the friends of order and regulated freedom on the other.” Quoted in Fox-Genovese and Genovese, The Mind of the Master Class at 407. For the full text from which this quote was extracted, see James Henley Thornwell, “Christian Doctrine of Slavery,” in Palmer, The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell, 1:405-406, 398-436.

¹⁴ Historian E. Brooks Holifield demonstrates that pro-slavery clerics in the South fully subscribed to membership in the town-dwelling middle-class by the 1830s. And they touted their brand of evangelicalism as conducive to true progress. E. Brooks Holifield, The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1978), 5-35.

¹⁵ Jonathan D. Wells, The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1860 (Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 69-150.

¹⁶ Pro-slavery ministers also increasingly held up the situation of African Americans as further proof of their superior religion and socioeconomic system. Southern ministers, moralists, newspaper editors, and politicians certainly often characterized slaves as the antithesis of human beings whose lives were properly ordered by moral virtue and self-control. But the religious and moral instruction that masters provided slaves instilled in them a proper appreciation of their

duty. Adherence to duty translated into critical gains in the development of individual character, self-discipline, and a beneficial work ethic. Caring masters would nurture, teach, and guide them until they had the character sufficient to use liberty responsibly and for the benefit of themselves and society. African American slaves, argued southern ministers, would work out their own progress in due time and in this fashion. In any case, by the eve of secession, evangelicals in the slaveholding states had convinced themselves that they were God's chosen people and that they were the "redeemer" segment of the nation. According to Daley, southern evangelicals formulated the idea of binding duties and obligations among slaves and masters in the 1850s – "a new genre" – that is, a new discourse. As Daley's own notes indicate, such ideas emerged much earlier than the 1850s: Theodore Clapp in the 1830s, James H. Thornwell and Bishop Fuller in the 1840s. In any case, this chapter explains that southern evangelicals, employing the ideas about "the relations" set out in slaveholder renditions of eighteenth-century moral philosophy. Daley, When Slavery Was Called Freedom, 111-35.

¹⁷ Conflicting interpretations arose as a consequence of Arminian and other challenges to Calvinistic determinism beginning in the eighteenth century. These theological inroads ultimately divided Americans who supported slavery from those who did not. American commitments to republicanism and democracy, furthermore, emphasized the private, individual reading of scripture – and thus increased the possibility of conflicting understandings. Northern clerics were also willing to allow that slavery in biblical times was substantially different from the form of bondage that had developed in the American South – including the troublesome identity of permanent, hereditary slavery with African heritage. According to Noll, rival interpretations ultimately generated deadlock given the absence of higher ecclesiastical authorities who might have defused the conflict by promulgating a single, authoritative doctrine on the question. The result was secession and war. And the war itself was a murderous struggle over religious ideas. Noll, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis, 1-16, 31-74.

¹⁸ Snay, Gospel of Disunion, 1-15.

¹⁹ Daley, When Slavery Was Called Freedom, 78-80, 91.

²⁰ Beth Barton Schweiger, "The Restructuring of Southern Slavery, Denominations, and the Clerical Profession in Virginia," in John R. McKivigan and Mitchell Snay, eds., Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1998), 296-316.

²¹ Stout also identifies evangelical conflicts as a significant cause of the war. Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the Civil War (New York: Viking Press, 2006) 73-81, 132-34; Randall M. Miller, "Catholic Religion, Irish Ethnicity and the Civil War," in Randall M. Miller, et al., eds., Religion and the Civil War (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 261-96; Drew Gilpin Faust, "'Without Pilot or Compass': Elite Women and Religion in the Civil War South," *ibid.*, 250-60.

²² Evangelicals in sympathy with the southern cause embraced the idea that Providence would reward the Confederacy with victory and usher in a purified religion and advance prosperity for the slaves, slaveholders, and the nation. Because southerners alone adhered to God's law,

performed their duties, and nurtured their independence and high character, they would be rewarded in the military realm. Daley, When Slavery Was Called Freedom, 139, 143.

²³ Noll, Civil War as a Theological Crisis, 75-94; *Ibid.*, America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 365-438; Stout, Upon the Altar of the Nation, 73-81, 132-34; Daly, When Slavery was Called Freedom, 136-54.

²⁴ In the face of mounting defeats, some southern clerics maintained that God had visited his anger upon the slaveholders as a test of faith, as a way of working out the higher development of humanity and its capacity for constitutional liberty. Other ministers conjectured that God had inflicted defeats on the slaveholders because they had not lived up to the Christian duties required of them as masters. Most southerners did not accept the possibility that slavery might have been morally wrong until the war ended. But Genovese shows that front-line soldiers, well before Appomattox, expressed in letters home the nagging belief that slavery had corrupted the morals of the southern people and that the war itself had been wrong. Eugene Genovese, A Consuming Fire: The Fall of the Confederacy (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998), 99-128.

²⁵ Gilmore, Civil War on the Missouri-Kansas Border; Tomas Goodrich, Black Flag: Guerrilla Warfare on the Western Border, 1861-1865 (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995); Robert L. Dyer, Jesse James and the Civil War in Missouri (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1996); Edward E. Leslie, The Devil Knows How to Ride: The True Story of William Clarke Quantrill and His Confederate Raiders (New York: De Capo Press, 1996); Richard S. Brownlee, Gray Ghosts of the Confederacy: Guerilla Warfare in the West, 1861-1865 (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1958); Duane Schultz, Quantrill's War: The Life and Time of William Clarke Quantrill (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996).

²⁶ Michael Fellman, Inside War: The Guerrilla Conflict in Missouri During the American Civil War (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 91.

²⁷ Neely, however, points out that the religious beliefs of the postwar settlers of the Missouri and Kansas border counties are not well-documented. Jeremy Neely, The Border Between Them: Violence and Reconciliation on the Kansas-Missouri Line (Columbia and London: The University of Missouri Press, 2007), 55, 143, 260.

²⁸ James Shannon, An Address Delivered Before the Pro-Slavery Convention of the State of Missouri, Held in Lexington, July 13, 1855 (St. Louis, 1855); Platte County Self-Defensive Association, Benjamin F. Stringfellow, ed. Negro-Slavery, No Evil, or The North and the South (St. Louis, 1854); Scott v. Emerson, 15 Mo. 586-587 (1852); Gerald T. Dunne, The Missouri Supreme Court: From Dred Scott to Nancy Cruzan (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), pp. 52-54; Nathan Lewis Rice, Ten Letters on the Subject of Slavery Addressed to the Delegates from the Congregational Associations to the Last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, 2d ed. (St. Louis, 1856).

²⁹ Harrison Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1914), 131-32.

-
- ³⁰ Ibid., 133.
- ³¹ James L. Huston, "Democracy by Scripture versus Democracy by Process: A Reflection on Stephen A. Douglas and Popular Sovereignty," Civil War History 43 (1997): 4.
- ³² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:174.
- ³³ Ibid., 1:93.
- ³⁴ Ibid., 47, 100-02.
- ³⁵ Ibid., 256.
- ³⁶ Enoch Mather Marvin, The Life of William Goff Caples of the Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (St. Louis, 1870), 255.
- ³⁷ "Political Preaching," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 24 August 1854, p. 2.
- ³⁸ St. Louis Christian Advocate, 7 January 1858, p. 2.
- ³⁹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., 3.
- ⁴¹ For Shannon's "card" and editorial commentary following its initial publication, see Boonville Dollar Missouri Journal, 12, 19, & 27 July 1855.
- ⁴² Ibid.; St. Louis Weekly Pilot, 5 October 1855; Missouri Statesman, 19-20, 25 October 1855.
- ⁴³ Weekly Pilot (St. Louis), March 10, 1855. A similar editorial also appears in the issue of March 17.
- ⁴⁴ Christopher Phillips, Missouri's Confederate: Claiborne Fox Jackson and the Creation of Southern Identity in the Border West (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 231-32. Douglas won 35.5 percent while Bell received 35.4 percent of the vote. Douglas, however, finished a strong second to Lincoln in St. Louis. Donald L. Gilmore, Civil War on the Missouri-Kansas Border (Gretna, La: Pelican Publishing Company, 2006), 105-6.
- ⁴⁵ "Vote by Counties at the Presidential Elections of 1852-56-60," in n. a., History of Missouri: The General History (Chicago, 1888), 165-67.
- ⁴⁶ Dennis K. Boman, Lincoln's Resolute Unionist Hamilton Gamble, Dred Scott Dissenter and Missouri's Civil War Governor (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2006), 184-86; William E. Parrish, Frank Blair: Lincoln's Conservative (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1998), x, 80.
- ⁴⁷ Journal and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City and St. Louis February 28 to March 22, 1861, p. 35; Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 232.
- ⁴⁸ Journal and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City and St. Louis February 28 to March 22, 1861, p. 35. The committee reported March 9; Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 232.
- ⁴⁹ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, Held at Jefferson City, July, 1861 (St. Louis, 1861), 20; Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 224-41. Historian James McPherson, nevertheless, argues that Missouri's view on state autonomy and neutrality was equivocal to secession. James M. McPherson, Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 294-95.
- ⁵⁰ Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 232-233.

-
- ⁵¹ “Capture of Camp Jackson ,” Missouri Republican, 11 May 1861, p. 2; “The Conference,” ibid., 12 June 1861; Phillips, Missouri’s Confederate, 242-69; Ibid., Damned Yankee: The Life of General Nathaniel Lyon (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 175-214; Boman, Lincoln’s Resolute Unionist, 103-15.
- ⁵² Charles. D. Drake, Union and Anti-Slavery Speeches, Delivered During the Rebellion, p. 348. Harding, p. 338; Trexler, p. 232.
- ⁵³ Dennis K. Boman, Lincoln’s Resolute Unionist Hamilton Gamble, Dred Scott Dissenter and Missouri’s Civil War Governor (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2006), 184-86; William E. Parrish, Frank Blair: Lincoln’s Conservative (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1998), x, 80.
- ⁵⁴ Trexler, 171.
- ⁵⁵ Nathan. L. Rice, The Pulpit: Its Relation to the National Crisis. A Sermon, Preached in the Fifth Avenue and Nineteenth Street Presbyterian Church (New York, 1862), 61; Ibid., Lectures of Slavery, Delivered in the North Presbyterian Church, (Chicago, 1860), 21-22.
- ⁵⁶ Rice, The Pulpit, 61; Ibid., Lectures on Slavery, Delivered in the North Presbyterian Church, (Chicago, 1860), 21-22.
- ⁵⁷ Rice, The Pulpit, 58-59.
- ⁵⁸ Enoch Mather Marvin, The Life of William Goff Caples of the Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (St. Louis, 1870), 255.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., 260. Beginning on the eve of secession, pro-Confederate evangelicals regarded an independent Confederacy as a necessity in the light of Union aggression against the South and the election of Lincoln. Snay, Gospel of Disunion, 212-18; John Patrick Daly, When Slavery was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery and the Causes of the Civil War (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 136-37; Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 308-18; Robert E. Bonner, Mastering America: Southern Slaveholders and the Crisis of American Nationhood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), xi-xxii.
- ⁶⁰ Marvin, Life of Caples, 264-65, 328-53; Union Provost Marshals’ File of Papers Relating to Individual Citizens, F1292, William G. Caples, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo. Price had served as a class leader under Caples during his earlier appointment to Chariton County. Charles Elliott, South-western Methodism. A History of the M. E. Church in the South-West, From 1844 to 1864 (Cincinnati, 1868), 364.
- ⁶¹ Galusha Anderson, The Story of a Border City During the Civil War (Boston, 1908), 18.
- ⁶² Carwardine, Evangelicals and Politics, 308-18.
- ⁶³ “Sermon by Rev. G Anderson: Pastor of Second Baptist Church,” 7 May 1861, Missouri Republican, p. 1; Anderson, Story of a Border City, 129. Romans 13: 1-2: “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” The Holy Bible: King James Version.

⁶⁴ “Sermon by Rev. G Anderson: Pastor of Second Baptist Church,” 7 May 1861, Missouri Republican, p. 1; Frederick L. Anderson, Galusha Anderson: Preacher and Educator, 1832-1918 (1933), 8.

⁶⁵ Anderson, Story of a Border City, 166. Anderson incorrectly lists Tucker as a Presbyterian deacon.

⁶⁶ “Sermon by Rev. G Anderson: Pastor of Second Baptist Church,” 7 May 1861, Missouri Republican, p. 1; Anderson, Story of a Border City, 121-34; Anderson, Galusha Anderson, 8

⁶⁷ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:99-100.

⁶⁸ “The Vexed Question – Slavery – What the Church Teaches – What the Bible Teaches,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 9 January 1861, p. 2.

⁶⁹ “Letter from Kansas,” *ibid.*, 3 April 1862, p. 2.

⁷⁰ “Please Read the Following,” *ibid.*, 20 February 1862, p. 2; Elliott, South-western Methodism, 360.

⁷¹ “Please Read the Following,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 20 February 1862, p. 2.

⁷² Elliott, South-western Methodism, 239. Tucker’s paper was eventually suppressed by the Union authorities in St. Louis. Louis S. Gerteis, Civil War St. Louis (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001), 131, 169. For a description of Tucker’s support of the Confederacy see G. E. Rule, “Tucker’s War: Missouri and the Northwest Conspiracy,” www.civilwarstlouis.com, 2002. Accessed 4 July 2010.

⁷³ William E. Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 1865-1870 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1965), 2-4; Boman, Lincoln’s Resolute Unionist, 184-86.

⁷⁴ “Sermon by Rev. G Anderson: Pastor of Second Baptist Church,” 7 May 1861, Missouri Republican, p. 1; Anderson, Story of a Border City, 129.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 323.

⁷⁶ Charles D. Drake, Union and Anti-Slavery Speeches, Delivered During the Rebellion (Cincinnati, 1864), 83. The additional scripture quote was Acts 20:27. His speech was entitled “Washington’s Birthday: North and South” and given in St. Louis.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 103. The speech, entitled “The Rebellion: Its Origin and Life in Slavery,” was first given in Union, Missouri on 7 April 1862. The text quoted in the book was from its April 14, 1862 rendition at the Mercantile Library in St. Louis.

⁷⁹ Elliott, South-Western Methodism, 407.

⁸⁰ Marvin, Life of Caples, 283. The battle of Glasgow was a minor Confederate victory during Price’s 1864 raid into Missouri.

⁸¹ “William S. Stewart Letters, January 13, 1861, to December 4, 1862,” eds. Harvey L. Carter and Norma L. Peterson, Missouri Historical Review 61, no. 3 (April 1967): 313-14.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 374.

⁸³ Anderson, Galusha Anderson, 12.

⁸⁴ See discussion in chapter five regarding Union suppression of pro-slavery publications. Genovese, A Consuming Fire, 75-102; Daley, When Slavery was Called Freedom, 148-52.

⁸⁵ Cassville Republican, 1896, accessed on 10 August 2010 at <http://www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~mobarry/civilwar/civilwar.htm>.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Elliott, South-western Methodism, 370-72.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 371. Farrar was an active Republican before and after the war. His father, Dr. Bernard Farrar, Sr., was the former owner of James Farrar, one of the black trustees in the Farrar case. Howard L. Conrad, ed., Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference, 4 vols. (New York, 1901), 2:730.

⁸⁹ Elliott, South-western Methodism, 244-45, 371.

⁹⁰ Rev. Timothy Hill, Historical Outlines of the Presbyterian Church in Missouri (Kansas City, Mo, 1871), 59-60; Rev. George Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 1860-1870 (Columbia, Mo, 1898), 42; Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XII A. D. 1861 (New York, 1861), 437, 623-24; Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XIII A. D. 1862 (New York, 1862), 7, 195-96.

⁹¹ Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church Minutes, 1838-1870, Greene County, Missouri Greene County Archives and Records Center, Office of the County Clerk, Springfield, Mo, 109.

⁹² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, II: 73-75.

⁹³ R. S. Duncan, A History of the Baptists in Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1888), 854-55; Liberty Tribune, August 14, 1868, p. 2.

⁹⁴ J. C. Maple, History of the Cape Girardeau Baptist Association from 1824 to 1912 (Cape Girardeau, Mo., 1913), 16-17.

⁹⁵ M. M. Fisher, A History of Westminster College, 1851 to 1903 (Columbia, 1906), 170.

⁹⁶ S. Y. Pitts, The Mt Pleasant Association Historic-Biographic (Salisbury, Mo, 1895), 23; Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 181-82, 193-97, 363-68. The quote was based in part on James 1:26.

⁹⁷ Wiley Jones Patrick, The History of the Salt River Association, Missouri (Columbia, Mo, 1909), 71.

⁹⁸ Addresses Delivered at the Centennial Celebration of the Founding of the First Presbyterian Church (Columbia, 1908), 24-25; First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, Missouri, Records, 1833-1935, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, Collection 2308.

⁹⁹ Union Provost Marshal's File, S. S. Laws, F1480.

¹⁰⁰ Henry H. Sweets III, The Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church: A Sesquicentennial History (Hannibal: Presbyterian Church of Hannibal, 1984), 13.

¹⁰¹ Ibid; Minutes of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School) . . . 1866 (Philadelphia, 1866), 205.

¹⁰² Jonathan Fuller to William Fuller, June 20, 1864, Jonathan B. Fuller Papers, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo, Collection KC0040, Folder 11.

-
- ¹⁰³ Patrick, Salt River Association, 32.
- ¹⁰⁴ Allan Nevins, The War for the Union: The Improvised War, 1861-62 (1959), 120-29, 310-36).
- ¹⁰⁵ Duane Schultz, Quantrill's War.
- ¹⁰⁶ Phillips, Missouri's Confederate, 263-77; Nicole Etcheson, Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 219; Fellman, Inside War, xv-xx; William L. Shea, Earl J. Hess, Pea Ridge: Civil War Campaign in the West (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), xi, 3-5; Gilmore, Civil War on the Missouri-Kansas Border, 109-12.
- ¹⁰⁷ Albert Castel, Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind (1997), 1-2; David H. Donald, Jean Harvey Baker, Michael F. Holt, The Civil War and Reconstruction (2001), 177. The quote within the larger quote is from Fellman, Inside War, 23.
- ¹⁰⁸ Callaway CO. Missouri, Augusta Presbyterian Church, Shamrock, Missouri, 1846-1953: Admissions, Dismissals, Baptisms, Burials in the Augusta Cemetery, 30-33.
- ¹⁰⁹ Prospect Baptist Church Minutes, 1858-1910, Webster County, Missouri, Greene County Archives, p. 8.
- ¹¹⁰ T. L. Largen, History of the Shoal Creek Association With History of Her Churches and Biography of Ministers (Kansas City, Mo, 1908), 10, 109.
- ¹¹¹ Jerry D. Young, The Hornersville United Methodist Church: A History 1860-1984 (Hornersville, Mo, 1984), State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Folder 273, pp. 1-2.
- ¹¹² New Madrid Quarterly Conference Minutes, State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Collection 3595, Volume 1307.
- ¹¹³ Ibid; Elmer T. Clark, One Hundred Years of New Madrid Methodism: A History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in New Madrid, Missouri (1912), 32-33.
- ¹¹⁴ Marvin, Life and Times of Caples, 262-65.
- ¹¹⁵ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 62.
- ¹¹⁶ Martin Rice, History of the Blue River Baptist Association of Missouri (Kansas City, Mo, 1890), 52-53; Ronald D. Smith, Thomas Ewing Jr.: Frontier Lawyer and Civil War General (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 186-211; Fellman, Inside War, 95-96.
- ¹¹⁷ The Old Grey Book, State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Collection 3595, Folder 29.
- ¹¹⁸ Union Provost Marshal's File, James Penn, F1161.
- ¹¹⁹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:293.
- ¹²⁰ Ibid., 1: 293-95.
- ¹²¹ Fellman, Inside War, 34-35.
- ¹²² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:132.
- ¹²³ "Traveling Preachers," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 25 July 1861, p. 2.
- ¹²⁴ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:189.
- ¹²⁵ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 470.

¹²⁶ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (Old School) (Philadelphia, 1861), 45.

¹²⁷ The members of the United Synod of the South gradually joined the new southern church to create a largely unified church in the South after 1864. Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, 1862 (Atlanta, 1862), 9; Parker, United Synod of the South, 249-64.

¹²⁸ Charles D. Drake, "Autobiography," State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1003, Folder 25, p. 703.

¹²⁹ Gerteis, Civil War St. Louis, 72-73.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 703-7.

¹³¹ Ellwood K. Smith, "Background and Consequences of Methodist Union," Methodist History, 2, no. 2, (January, 1964): 7-9. Reunification occurred in 1939 as both branches merged, along with the Methodist Protestant Church, to form the Methodist Church (now the United Methodist Church).

¹³² Jordan to Lanius, State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri East Conference, Collection 3595, Folder 17.

¹³³ The trustees were Edwin Draper, John S. Markley, John M. Allen, Samuel O. Minor, John Shurmur, Ivey Zumwalt, Joseph Charleville, David Watson and Thomas T. Stokes. The value of the property was \$500. Bill, Record, Draper v. Minor, Supreme Court of Missouri Case File, Missouri State Archives, pp. 1-7.

¹³⁴ Union Provost Marshal's File, Edwin Draper, F1155.

¹³⁵ "The Methodists in Missouri . . .," Louisiana Journal, 10 July 1862, p. 1.

¹³⁶ Bill, Record, Draper v. Minor, pp. 1-4.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ "To Rev. B H Spencer," Louisiana Journal, 24 July 1862, p. 2.

¹³⁹ Ibid. The scripture quote is from Mark 12:17.

¹⁴⁰ Circuit Court Decision, Draper v. Minor, p. 1.

¹⁴¹ Appellant's Brief, ibid., p. 2.

¹⁴² Missouri State Supreme Court Decision, Ibid., 1-5. For a description of the case by southern Methodist sources see also Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:212-30; Lewis, Methodism in Missouri 1860 to 1870, 62-64.

¹⁴³ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:205-8.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 1:203-4.

¹⁴⁵ As Price moved westward along the Missouri River corridor, federal troops also engaged his force in skirmishes at Glasgow (Howard County). In western Missouri, Confederate and Union forces engaged in a number of major clashes: Battle of Little Blue River in Jackson County; Second Battle of Independence in Jackson County; Battle of Byram's Ford in Jackson County; Battle of Westport, Jackson County. William E. Parrish, A History of Missouri. Volume III. 1860-1875 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973), 50, 79, 85, 111-15, 208

¹⁴⁶ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:204.

Chapter Six

Wartime Trials and Tribulations: Emancipation, Disloyal Believers and the Hard Birth of a New Civil Religion

On January 16, 1863 southern Methodist minister Berry Hill Spencer received an order to leave his east central Missouri home in High Hill. As was common with many accused traitors, he was being exiled by federal authorities to northern Indiana. The order, served to him by a Union officer, was from Colonel Lewis Merrill, the commander of the Northeast District of Missouri. Spencer had labored for the Methodists since 1843 and was the presiding elder of the St. Charles District in the Missouri Conference.¹ Spencer was never told why he was being exiled, but assumed it was because he was a southern Methodist minister. Aghast by the order, he soon went to Merrill's headquarters in nearby Warrenton to ascertain why he was being compelled to leave the state and his six young children. Merrill was only willing to meet with Spencer as he dined, and was not in the least sympathetic with the minister's plight. Towards the end of their tense conversation, Merrill reminded Spencer that he was lucky when he angrily retorted "you may think yourself very fortunate that you are not hung, and should feel that you are very mercifully dealt by!"² Owing to a railroad accident, Spencer was allowed to remain with his family until 28 January when he was exiled to Ashby Mills, Indiana.³

Over the next several months numerous citizens, including Spencer's wife Carrie, wrote the army on Spencer's behalf – common in similar cases. In March, a man from nearby Danville, James H. Robinson, corresponded with Merrill asserting that Spencer was a traitor to the union who preached secession. Robinson explained if he was allowed to return "all the rebels ought to be set at liberty. . . [and] so long as traitors are forgiven and received into full fellowship this rebellion will continue."⁴ Others, such as Captain A. C. Stewart, the community provost marshal,

argued that all of the loyal men in Montgomery County, where Spencer lived, were opposed to his return. A local man, Robert C. Fulkerson, also wrote a letter to the provost marshal expressing the same worry.⁵ Spencer did have his supporters who campaigned for his return. Almost as soon as his exile began, several Methodists in St. Charles County wrote another Union general. They argued that Spencer was not engaging in political agitation elucidating since “the commencement of our national troubles, he has so far as we know or believe has adapted himself to his appropriate work of preaching the Gospel.”⁶ Carrie Spencer wrote at least two letters on behalf of her husband, as did numerous citizens of High Hill. They argued that without Spencer at home no one was able to support his family, who recently welcomed its seventh child.⁷

Arguing that he was in fact a loyal citizen, Spencer was eventually able to get his exile lifted. Soon after arriving in Indiana, he began to write letters questioning why he was banished since he believed he was loyal to the Union. Spencer was able to persuade Captain Stewart to forward his petition, and that of three other men exiled with him, to the Union commander in Palmyra, General Thomas Jefferson McKean. McKean had the power to allow Spencer to return to Missouri. In it, he explained that “I have never engaged in this rebellion in any way, or violated any law, civil or military; and therefore, am not deserving of this punishment.”⁸ While Stewart forwarded the petition to McKean, he reiterated his concerns that the Union men in Montgomery County were against Spencer’s return. McKean thus ignored the petition, leaving Spencer in Indiana.⁹ Spencer, nevertheless, was able to gain the ear of some prominent pro-Union citizens in Indiana who were able to arrange another letter to the authorities in Missouri. Oliver P. Morton, the Republican governor of Indiana and an ally of Abraham Lincoln, vouched for the loyalty of the petitioners. That letter was still sent back – a victim of red tape, Spencer claimed in retrospect. After Indiana Republican Senator Henry S. Lane used his influence to send

a request to General John Schofield, the commander of the Department of Missouri, Spencer and his fellow exiles were allowed to return home in late September.¹⁰

Spencer's plight is but one example of the numerous attempts by pro-Union forces in Missouri to suppress the activities of churches whose members they viewed as in sympathy with the Confederate cause. More than any others in this category, Union officers singled out the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for heightened scrutiny and harassment. In Spencer's estimation, he "was persecuted in various ways, and banished from my helpless family for ten long months, for no higher and no other crime than that I was a Southern Methodist preacher!"¹¹

The ordeal of the Reverend Barry H. Spencer demonstrates all too clearly how northern federal authorities automatically presumed that ministers with southern affiliations were traitors. Union military allies embarked on this heavy-handed crusade to crush the supposed treachery of the southern-leaning denominations and their individual congregations. Spencer may have been telling the truth when he declared that he was not a Confederate sympathizer. He took a mandatory loyalty oath to the Union in 1862 to prove it. But this was a requirement to which a number of pro-Confederate congregants and ministers strenuously objected on conscientious grounds as a matter of Christian faith.¹² Such encroachments on individual dignity and the free exercise of religion, however, were common in wartime Missouri.

Thesis

Anti-slavery Unionists in Missouri during the Civil War embraced the view that disloyalty to the United States and support of slavery were tantamount to sin, a position that northern evangelicals, Union troops, and Radical Republicans sought to impose as a new civil religion on southern evangelicals via wartime ecclesiastical sanctions and loyalty oaths. Such

sentiments prompted Union authorities to muzzle the pro-slavery evangelical press, while spurring Unionist evangelicals to appropriate the church lands and buildings of their pro-slavery counterparts. Challenged in the courts by dispossessed southern evangelicals, these were seizures that local tribunals under Radical control generally ratified in the name of well-established rules of ecclesiastical law, constitutional doctrine, and equity jurisprudence. This variegated body of law, however, did not determine such outcomes as much as did the religious, social, and political preferences of partisan judges. Their rulings, moreover, obscured the boundaries of church and state, while powerfully shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and the armed struggle.

The heightened ideological conflict generated by the evangelical schisms 1837-1845 fundamentally shaped the northern war effort in Missouri and the social, political, and ideological revolution that Unionist leaders wrought at the expense of defeated pro-Confederate partisans. African Americans in Missouri ultimately took the most decisive initial steps toward establishing on the ground abolitionist religious views that incorporated equality for African Americans. By the same token, anti-slavery evangelicals and their Radical allies in Missouri extinguished property in human beings. More than any other wartime development, this redefinition of fundamental liberties gave effect to the radical vision advanced by abolitionists in the state – an encompassing worldview generated by decades of strife with pro-slavery evangelicals wedded to a theology that undergirded hierarchical and organic human, civil, and political relations.

Continuing strife in wartime Missouri within evangelical congregations and denominations took on harsh new features that included Union efforts to curtail accustomed religious liberty. United States and Missouri officials combined with Radicals and abolitionists

to seize the lands and meeting houses of evangelicals suspected of Confederate sympathies. Strife between evangelicals divided over slavery and by civil war disorganized denominational associations sometimes obliterated entire congregations. Union military forces sided with pro-Union evangelicals to eradicate the religious belief and praxis they deemed inimical to the Union war effort. United States army officers took possession of the meeting houses and other property of southern-leaning churches under the pretense of wartime necessity. Northern Methodists employed federal power to seize southern Methodist property and appoint ministers for suspect congregations. Bolstered by federal authority, northern evangelicals took control of local churches and, thereby, sought to acquire ownership of congregational property under the control of pro-Confederate trustees, ushering in years of litigation. To achieve their military aims, Union authorities discounted entirely religious views that had generated secessionist sympathies. Pro-slavery evangelicalism and related views of social, civil, and political order were tantamount to treason in the view of most Union officials. Anti-slavery evangelicals were, consequently, often at the complete mercy of Union officials, federal troops, and pro-Union Missouri militia units.

The institutionalization of abolitionist understandings of civil and political equality entailed rigorous suppression of the accustomed liberty to express religious ideas and the adoption of practices that co-opted religious faith for the purposes of political inquisition. Printed publication of pro-slavery views no longer merited any consideration or constitutional protection. Union troops and irregular pro-Union partisans ruthlessly suppressed pro-Confederate evangelical newspapers. Lincoln justified these encroachments by invoking military necessity and his war powers as commander in chief. Union officials and Radical leaders in Missouri, furthermore, imposed a number of loyalty oaths on suspect citizens, including both ministers and influential evangelical laity – a practice that created distinctive dilemmas of conscience for them.

Some Radical leaders, and President Lincoln, had sought to mediate the claims of those who clung to slaveholder property rights and those determined to establish a new order erected on radical abolitionist theology. By the end of the war, the worldview to which pro-slavery evangelicals had adhered for decades no longer enjoyed the imprimatur of government. Unionists and Missouri Radicals had successfully enlisted military force and the power of the federal and state governments to impose a new civil religion. From their perspective, at least, the war had enshrined as unshakeable first principles of government abolitionist religious commitments to civil and political equality for African Americans and loyalty to a perpetual Union.

Literature Review

A number of historians, including James McPherson and Joseph T. Glattaar, have examined closely the extraordinarily active efforts that slaves and former slaves made, as operators of the Underground Railroad, United States Army troops, and otherwise, to liberate themselves during the Civil War.¹³ Steven V. Ash maintains that Civil War histories that focus on great military battles underestimate the critical role that African Americans in slaveholding states played in de-stabilizing the Confederate effort with day-to-day work slow-downs or stoppages, sabotage, and espionage.¹⁴ And Michael Fellman, the preeminent expert on the guerilla war in Missouri, shows that African Americans in that state energetically seized upon on distinctive opportunities for self-liberation during the military conflict, efforts that allowed them to experience “a tantalizing hint of genuine freedom.”¹⁵

Constitutional historian Harold M. Hyman emphasizes that, for most citizens in the northern states, decisions about loyalty were simple – but that such choices constituted terrible dilemmas for those in the geographical border regions who faced the trauma of divided families

and the terrors of guerilla warfare.¹⁶ He also demonstrates how Union officials, drawing on a long tradition stretching back to the colonial era in North America, settled on the loyalty oath to secure the devotion of all citizens, notwithstanding the disdain with which most American political thinkers, jurists, and legal scholars had come to view the inquisitorial practice by 1861.¹⁷

Several legal historians in recent years have investigated how intense loyalty to the Union sometimes generated mob actions and vigilantism that targeted dissident speakers and newspaper editors. Historian John Nerone, for example, identifies 111 anti-war newspaper presses outside the Confederacy that were mobbed during the war¹⁸ Nerone demonstrates that anti-press violence targeting Copperhead publications was commonplace in the North through the war.¹⁹ According to legal historian Richard B. Kielbowicz, such vigilantism, at least to the eve of the war, partook of the republican “law mindedness” with which antebellum anti-press mobs had commonly justified their depredations.²⁰

Most history scholarship that examines official violations of civil liberties during the Civil War maintains that the repressive policies instituted by the Lincoln administration, such as the suspension of habeas corpus, trials by military commission, and the jailing of dissident publishers, were unfortunate but necessary measures to save the nation from catastrophe.²¹ Others, such as legal historian Michael Kent Curtis, argue that military trials of northern anti-war newspaper editors and speakers were, in some cases, unwarranted encroachments on constitutionally-protected freedom of speech.²²

Historians focusing on the question of civil liberties in Missouri during the Civil War conclude that widespread guerilla warfare, a largely pro-Confederate population, and intermittent formal military campaigns produced violations that would forever stain Lincoln’s historical

reputation. According to historian Mark E. Neely, Jr., “If Maryland and Kentucky somehow became early ‘success stories’ for the Lincoln administration, Missouri proved from start to finish to be a sorry blemish on the administration’s record. It became a nightmare for American civil liberties.”²³ But neither Neely nor any other contemporary historians has carefully examined military sanctions imposed on individuals or groups because officials deemed their southern evangelical beliefs or affiliations tantamount to disloyalty.²⁴

Self-Liberating African Americans and the Arduous Work of Divine Justice

Escaped slaves took the most courageous and dangerous steps toward implementing a radical abolitionist theology that had, in heated disputation with pro-slavery evangelicals for a decade and a half, boldly incorporated civil and political equality for African Americans. The Underground Railroad reached new levels of efficiency after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, thanks to the interventions of New England abolitionists in Kansas who helped move ever larger numbers of escaped slaves northward. With the onset of war, thousands of African Americans immediately fled the state.²⁵ Accounts of runaways increased in the winter of 1861-62, and the mass exodus continued unabated when guerilla warfare intensified after Congress approved Lincoln’s plan of compensated gradual emancipation in April 1862. Black men who ran for United States Army outpost sometimes brought their families with them, with St. Louis rapidly become the sanctuary of choice.²⁶ By September 1861, large numbers of slave had descended upon the encampment of General John C. Frémont. He refused to permit his officers to return any of these refugees to their masters. Union officers in the southeastern part of the state hired runaways as servants.²⁷ While the federal census of 1860 counted 114,931 slaves in Missouri, that number had dropped to 73,811 by 1863.²⁸ The decision of the Radical-dominated

Missouri Convention on July 1, 1863 gradually to terminate slavery only further accelerated the process of immediate African American self-liberation.²⁹

The heroic efforts of African Americans in Missouri to free themselves by the tens of thousands certainly did not bring the ordeal of slavery to an immediate end. Through the last year of the war, slavery officially persisted, notwithstanding abolition in numerous southern states by virtue of the final Emancipation Proclamation.³⁰ According to an editorial published in the 1864 issue of the *Annals of Platte County*, “Slavery is not extinct. It dies slowly.”³¹ A report of the Western Sanitary Commission, published the same year, makes the point. According to the Reverend J. G. Foreman, writing about the situation of African Americans in St. Louis, “they were compelled to do most of the hard work of the place and press gangs were sent out to take them in the streets Sometimes they were shot down and murdered with impunity. They were often driven with their families into ‘Camp Ethiopia’ with only cast off army tents to shield them. At one time an order was issued driving them out of the Union lines and into the hands of their old masters.”³² In the rural countryside, especially in the counties of the Boone’s Lick and Ozark highlands of southern Missouri, dislocated slaves and runaways became tempting targets for vengeful “bushwhackers.” Finding a new beginning outside the state required some ready cash, the assistance of others, and place to settle and work. Angry whites determined to stymie the inevitable could easily destroy well-laid plans for freedom.³³ To the end of the war, angry white men violated black women. Especially in the last year of the conflict, when the reality of full scale emancipation became apparent to even the most diehard pro-Confederate partisans, brutal beatings and the lynching of free blacks were all too common.³⁴

African Americans seized on distinctive opportunities in the Border State of Missouri to take up arms against their oppressors. Self-liberation for African Americans entailed much

more than simply fleeing northward. Abolitionist General James H. Lane in Kansas had, from the very beginning of the war, enrolled African Americans into his forces. Small units and companies of Kansas colored troops fought in the first engagements in the war. From November 1861 through May 1862, at least two thousand black men from Missouri converged on Kansas to help form the First Kansas Colored Infantry, which Congress formally commissioned in January 1862. The decision of federal authorities to recruit African American men into the ranks of the Union army simply ratified a truly militant black freedom movement already underway in Missouri. Amid enlistment shortages and growing dissent in the North, Lincoln at last threw his support behind the recruitment of slaves from the Border States. Deeply concerned about alienating slaveholders in those states, and especially Missouri, he sought to avoid freeing slaves on the condition that they enlist. Radicals and slaveholders were divided on the question. But willingness of black men to fight earned them new respect among the white populace generally, as did the sacrifices that black women made to protect and support their men.³⁵

On August 25, 1862, the war department gave official sanction to the policy of recruiting black soldiers. And the abolition party in Missouri seized upon the opportunity.³⁶ Under the leadership of Charles Daniel Drake, Missouri Radicals embraced the policy of recruiting free black men into the Union army in early September 1863, along with immediate emancipation of the slaves. By that time, tens of thousands of black men had already fled the state. But African American enlistments in Missouri, nonetheless, soared. Many of the new recruits were, in fact, runaways. In 1864 General James A. Pike organized several black regiments at Benton Barracks in St. Louis.³⁷ An entry in the Annals of Platte County for 1 February 1865, states that many slaves had crossed to Kansas and enlisted in the Federal army.

Another item, published in the sheet on April 1, 1865, declared that the slaves were daily escaping after having been enticed away by Union soldiers.³⁸ By spring 1865, black men from Missouri accounted for 8,344 enlistments in the state. Included in this number were 665 who volunteered as substitutes for white draftees.³⁹

As in other slave states, emancipation in Missouri constituted the most revolutionary social change wrought by the Civil War. Slaves who abandoned their masters to support the Union war effort found their flights from bondage both daunting and exhilarating. With segregation yet to be imposed, African Americans sat in St. Louis street cars, bids for equal access to public space that thoroughly enraged pro-Confederate whites in the city. With the backing of white allies and Union troops, whose numbers increasingly included African Americans, Missouri blacks participated in public life during the war as never before. Under the distinctive pressures of guerilla war, slaves deployed one segment of white society against the other. They worked as covert operatives and informed Union authorities about the plans and movements of Confederate guerillas. This was a practice that African Americans commonly viewed as a prime means for acquiring liberty. As well, slaves testified in court martial proceedings against slaveholders, sometimes humiliating and punishing their former owners in the process.⁴⁰

The communications of former slaves with their former owners suggest that self-liberated African Americans had few doubts about the immorality of bondage or the connection between slaveholding, sin, and disloyalty. Consider, for example, the 1864 missive that Union Army Private Spottswood Rice wrote while encamped with his unit at St. Louis to his erstwhile master in the Boone's Lick river town of Glasgow, Howard County. The basic purpose of Rice's letter was to lay claim to his children and declare unequivocally that they were not the property of any

slaveholder. According to Rice, “the longer you keep my Child from me the longer you will burn in hell and the quicer you will get their for we are now making up a bout one thousand blacke troops to Come up thorough and wont to come through Glasgow and whin we come wo be to copperood rabbels and the Slaveholding rebels for we don’t expect to leave them root neor branch.”⁴¹

The Struggle to End Property in Human Beings and the Victory of Radical Republicans and Abolitionists

Liberty for African Americans, of course, entailed the destruction of property in human beings, a highly contested transformation in the meaning of fundamental rights that Missouri Radicals celebrated as nothing less than abolitionist victory. Numerous historians have emphasized that slaveholders opposed abolitionism because it undermined the economic and political dominance the master class enjoyed over non-slaveholding yeoman, destroyed an effective mode of controlling and exploiting African Americans, and wrecked the institution of marriage and household patriarchy.⁴² While certainly of critical importance, such interpretations often obscure the radical nature of emancipation at the time it occurred – and, by the same token, the extent to which a stalwart complex of southern ideology, including religion, had enshrined human property by the late antebellum period.

That slaveholders in early Missouri perceived the problem of runaway slaves, first and foremost, as a loss of valuable property is evident, simply, in the way they characterized such losses – “slave stealing” and took steps to deter this offense.⁴³ By the early 1840s, organized abolitionism had generated a siege mentality among Missouri slaveholders, one that they expressed most indignantly in terms of threatened property rights.⁴⁴ Introduced by state senator Claiborne Fox Jackson, leader of the pro-slavery Democrats in Missouri, the infamous January

1849 Jackson-Napton Resolutions claimed for slaveholders an unassailable constitutional right in their slave property. The resolutions restated the arguments made by John C. Calhoun in his contentious “Southern Address” that the United States Constitution did not authorize Congress to proscribe slavery in the territories under its jurisdiction.⁴⁵ In the 1853 public debates over passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Missouri politicians framed the question persistently in terms of threatened property rights.⁴⁶ A prime motivation behind the notorious violence of border ruffians like David Rice Atchison after passage of the Nebraska Act was to prevent slave property from succumbing to the siren song of abolitionism in the newly-formed Territory of Kansas.⁴⁷ Growing trepidation about the safety of white residents in western Missouri complicated, but did not eclipse, fears about the loss of slave property.⁴⁸

By the eve of the Civil War, Missouri slaveholders had articulated a comprehensive indictment of “slave stealing” that cast bonded African Americans as a form of property protected by the constitution of the state, the United States Constitution, and an evangelical moral order undergirding this foundational law.⁴⁹ In his address at the Lexington Convention in June 1855, for example, President of the University of Missouri and Disciples of Christ minister James Shannon recited a series of resolutions condemning the efforts of the Emigration Aid Society in Kansas, including one maintaining “That the whole state is identified in interest and sympathy with the citizens on our Western border, and we will co-operate with them in all proper measures to prevent the foul demon of Abolition from planting a colony of negro-thieves on our frontier to harass our citizens and steal their property.”⁵⁰ “Already many of our slaves have been carried off and as self preservation is the first law of nature, it certainly cannot be objected to, if Missourians should adopt the most summary method to secure themselves against this avalanche of abolitionists on our frontier.”⁵¹ Under the moral law set out in the Old

Testament and New Testament, which comported fully with the law of nature, Shannon insisted, “man could rightfully hold property in man.”⁵² “Reckless anti-slavery fanaticism” was thus determined “to rob six millions of their fellow-citizens of two thousand millions of property”⁵³ Missouri politicians shared Shannon’s indignation. In February 1857, the General Assembly of the state duly instructed its representatives in Congress to demand that the federal government secure slave property as guaranteed by the Constitution.⁵⁴ By the eve of the Civil War, however, Missouri slaveholders had lost human property on a scale greater than that occurring in the Deep South and the other slaveholding Border States.⁵⁵

The initial official challenge to slave property rights in wartime Missouri came early in the war. The United States Congress passed the Confiscation Act of 1861 on August 6th of that year. The legislation allowed Union authorities to confiscate any property used by the Confederates.⁵⁶ The act, however, did not declare such slaves free, effectively making them the property of the United States government.⁵⁷ While the bill passed the House sixty to forty-eight, Lincoln signed it only with reluctance. He took the view that the measure would provide no practical benefit, given recent Confederate success in the battlefield and that the United State Supreme Court might rule the act unconstitutional. Such a ruling, he speculated further, might establish a judicial precedent that could sabotage future legislative attempts at emancipation.⁵⁸ Within days, abolitionist-minded Major General John C. Frémont, whose command was situated in St. Louis, boldly declared that all slave property in Missouri was forfeited and that all slaves were free.⁵⁹

Major General Henry W. Halleck soon reversed Frémont’s edict insofar as it affected Missouri. A native of Oneida County, New York, Halleck was appointed to replace the free-wheeling commander of the Department of Missouri on 9 November 1861. Halleck’s General

Order No. 3 directed that all runaways be excluded from within his lines. When queried about the order, he replied that it was his intention to steer clear from deciding on the question of slaveholder property rights. According to him, he preferred that his officers act neither “in the capacity of negro-catcher or negro-stealer.”⁶⁰ His reversal of Fremont’s emancipation policy reflected his close familiarity with the law of war. Halleck was an 1839 graduate of the United States Military Academy, a lawyer, and a serious scholar. In 1846, he had delivered a series of lectures at the Lowell Institute in Boston, which were published as a book that year entitled Elements of Military Art and Science. This work served as one of the most influential tactical treatises employed during the war, while also earning him the somewhat derogatory moniker ““Old Brains”” among the soldiery. But his reputation as a military scholar of the first rank figured heavily in the earnest recommendation of Union General-in-Chief Winfield Scott that he be promoted to the rank of major general in the regular army in August 1861.⁶¹ In his 1861 treatise International Law, Halleck acknowledged that, under “ancient practice,” at least in the case of a “just war,” private property could be taken by a “conqueror” if it in any way reduced the strength of an enemy. According to him, however, “the modern usage is, not to touch private property on land, without making compensation.”⁶²

The considered views of General Halleck on the proper legal status of runaway slaves during time of war comported much more with the thinking of Lincoln on the subject than did that of Frémont. In October 1861, Lincoln asked Secretary of the Interior Caleb B. Smith to investigate the possibility of colonizing American blacks on the Isthmus of Chiriqui in Panama.⁶³ But it was in Lincoln’s 1861 annual message that he first publicly expressed his support for colonization. According to him, runaway slaves seeking refuge in Union lines, still regarded as contraband, had generated considerable trepidation and resentment among northern whites, while

also threatening to create an economic burden. With this rationale, Lincoln encouraged Congress to appropriate funds for colonizing former slaves.⁶⁴ Lincoln certainly proposed colonization to make emancipation more palatable for slaveholding Border States, such as Missouri, that had not seceded. But he also advanced colonization because he viewed it to be essential for making emancipation an acceptable Union war aim in the North. Equally important for Lincoln, colonization would entail the payment of monetary compensation to the owners of emancipated slaves.⁶⁵

Through the first year of the war, Lincoln's plan for colonization had considerable support in Missouri. Shortly before the president delivered his annual message to Congress in December 1861, Francis P. Blair, Sr. had conveyed to him his approval of such a plan. His sons, United States House of Representative from Missouri Francis P. Blair, Jr. and Postmaster General Montgomery Blair, similarly favored the idea.⁶⁶ Well before the War, both Frank Blair and B. Gratz Brown had touted colonization because it would spare white labor competition with free blacks and help draw eastern capital.⁶⁷ Others approved the movement before the war only because it would remove from the state free blacks whose very presence was thought to corrupt the slave population.⁶⁸ The Methodist Episcopal Church, especially in St. Louis, had enthusiastically supported colonization in the 1830s and 1840s.⁶⁹ While the American Colonization Society foundered after the Mexican-American War, it enjoyed a resurgence of support in the 1850s.⁷⁰ Among the prominent clerics who staunchly endorsed the movement in that decade were Presbyterian ministers James A. Lyon and Nathan L. Rice of St. Louis. The latter viewed colonization as both a providential design for bringing the gospel to Africa and for defusing the increasingly virulent sectional conflict.⁷¹

Staunch pro-slavery Missouri ministers linked any scheme of emancipation to colonization and the monetary compensation of slaveholders. They grounded this belief in the mandates of Protestant theology, southern moral philosophy, early republic federalism, and the United States Constitution. In his June 1855 address to the pro-slavery convention in Lexington, James Shannon articulated this ideological mix at length. In his view, both scripture and the Constitution required compensation to slaveholders in any scheme a state might adopt to abolish slavery. “If a political community, or State, considers domestic slavery incompatible with its prosperity, it has an indubitable right, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to cancel that institution; provided, however, that it make full compensation to the owners for the slaves thus emancipated. Without such compensation, government has no more right to emancipate a single slave than the robber has to the purse or to the life of his victim.” Shannon relied on due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, the various pro-slavery provisions of the Constitution, as well as the broadly-interpreted contract clause set out in Article 1, Section 10. In the absence of compensation, he argued, the people of the sovereign states had an indefeasible right to maintain property in slaves, one that the Constitution of the United States was bound to protect.⁷²

The steps President Lincoln took to reverse the ad hoc slave liberation policy of Major General John C. Frémont actually strengthened emancipation sentiment in Missouri. On New Year’s Day 1862, Lincoln removed him from command of the Western Department. Notwithstanding Halleck’s General Order No. 3, Frémont’s edict had continued in effect in that part of the Western Department outside of Missouri, which included mostly areas where slavery did not exist: Illinois, the New Mexico Territory, and western Kentucky. According to Lincoln, only slaves who had taken up arms against the United States or had aided her enemies were to be confiscated.⁷³ Almost certainly Lincoln reversed Frémont’s declaration because he feared that to

do otherwise might cause the slaveholding Border States of Kentucky and Missouri to secede.⁷⁴ But Frémont's effort inspired many Unionists and abolitionists to more vigorous exertions, especially those with evangelical orientations.⁷⁵ Shortly after Lincoln's New Year's Day address, Anthony Trollop wrote, "I think there is every reason to believe that slavery will die out in Missouri. The institution is not popular with the people generally and as white labor becomes more abundant—and before the war it was becoming more abundant and profitable—men recognize the fact that the white man's labor is more profitable."⁷⁶ In April 1862, anti-slavery evangelicals and their political allies organized the General Emancipation Society of Missouri.⁷⁷ In spring of that year, as slaves evacuated Missouri in increasingly large numbers, a substantial minority of Unionists in the state began to question the wisdom of perpetuating human bondage.⁷⁸

Through spring 1862, Frank Blair continued to back Lincoln's colonization scheme in Washington, D. C. On April 11, 1862, Congress abolished slavery in the District of Columbia. According to historian Michael Vorenberg, Lincoln expressed his full assent to the measure because Congress had joined emancipation with his own "two principles of compensation, and colonization . . . and practically applied [them] in the act."⁷⁹ Blair defended Lincoln's policy in the House of Representatives the next day and once again optimistically declared his support for the prospect of colonizing African Americans in Central America. In his words, "We can make emancipation acceptable to the whole masse of non-slaveholders at the South by coupling it with the policy of colonization." In response to such preachments, Congress appropriated \$100,000 for the president to use for colonizing the emancipated slaves in the capital.⁸⁰

Amid much contention, the Missouri Constitutional Convention that reassembled in the early summer of 1862 rejected Lincoln's plan to achieve emancipation in Missouri with

monetary compensation to slaveholders. After the Battle of Pea Ridge on March 7-8, 1862, appeared to forestall further Confederate military threats to the state, the Missouri State Convention came together for its fourth meeting in Jefferson City in June 1862. On June 13th Governor Gamble submitted to the convention the offer of President Lincoln of the recent congressional resolution that proposed to compensate Missouri slaveholders in case of gradual emancipation, which the convention considered favorably.⁸¹ Gamble, however, expressed some trepidation that approval of the compensation resolution “would produce excitement dangerous to the State.” And so he suggested that, in light of this circumstance, Lincoln would not consider a rejection of it disrespectful. The convention took up the question of whether to advise the president of such a danger and thank him for the offer. A committee of five organized for this purpose declared that “. . . a majority of this Convention have not felt authorized at this time to take action with respect to the delicate and grave questions of private right and public policy presented by said resolution.”⁸² It was thus tabled.⁸³ Virginia-born brigadier general in the pro-Union Missouri Militia Willard P. Hall of St. Joseph, who had served Missouri as a member of the United States House of Representatives 1847-53, immediately proposed a counter-resolution. The Unionist stalwart and soon-to-be governor of the state declared that “the people in choosing the Convention never intended or imagined that body would undertake any social revolution wholly unconnected with the relations between the State and the General Government.” But this resolution was also rejected.⁸⁴

Notwithstanding Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation he clung to the idea of compensated emancipation. On June 29, 1862, Congress prohibited slavery in United States territories. On July 16, 1862, Congress passed and Lincoln signed the “Second Confiscation

Act.” It liberated slaves held by those in rebellion and declared free, as captives of war, all slaves who took refuge within Union lines. On the other hand, it included provisions for transporting and colonizing blacks who consented to emigrate to some tropical country that was ready to extend to them the rights and privileges of free men.⁸⁵ In his so-called preliminary emancipation proclamation of September 22, 1862, Lincoln declared free all slaves in any state of the Confederate States of America that did not return to Union control by January 1st. But in his annual message to Congress of December 1, 1862, he advocated once again the emancipation plan that the Missouri Constitutional Convention had rejected in June 1862. Lincoln argued at great length in favor of the adoption of a constitutional amendment that would provide compensation to slaveholders for liberated slaves. The project would be funded by the issue of federal bonds to states that abolished slavery by a gradual process to become complete by the year 1900. In this context, Lincoln issued his final emancipation proclamation on 1 January 1863, naming ten specific states to which the terms of his September 22, 1862 executive order would apply, that is, South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, Arkansas, and North Carolina. Not included were the Union slave states of Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, and Kentucky, as well as the divided state of Tennessee. He issued the executive order, according to him, “by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy . . . and as a fit and necessary war measure.”⁸⁶

In late January 1863, efforts by the Missouri General Assembly to acquire funds from Congress to emancipate the slaves in the state foundered on the constitutional protections of slavery set out in the 1820 state constitution. On January 21st, concurrent resolutions were introduced in the Missouri House of Representatives declaring that \$25,000,000 would be necessary to carry emancipation into effect in the state and requesting that amount of Congress

for the purpose.⁸⁷ But the General Assembly took the position in the coming months that it was powerless actually to emancipate the slaves in the state because of language in the 1820 state constitution that explicitly mandated that the freeing of the slaves would require not only that compensation be paid to slaveholders but also their permission.⁸⁸ On April 15th, Governor Gamble responded by calling the state convention into session in the early summer to deal with the problem.⁸⁹

In mid-summer 1863, the Missouri Convention passed an ordinance authorizing the gradual, uncompensated emancipation of the slaves. The convention re-assembled on 15 June 1863. On June 16th, George R. Smith, one of the leading unconditional emancipationists, the Charcoalers, along with Charles Daniel Drake, introduced an ordinance for the “emancipation of slaves.”⁹⁰ On the initiative of Drake, the convention passed an ordinance on July 1, 1863 declaring that all slaves over forty years of age remain as apprentices for the remainder of their lives and those under twelve till they were twenty-three, and that all others be free on July 4, 1870.⁹¹ The governor approved the ordinance the same day.⁹² The abolitionist-sponsored constitutional amendment implementing gradual emancipation differed radically from that touted only a few years earlier by supporters of colonization. It included no provisions for relocating freed slaves abroad or providing monetary compensation to former slave owners.⁹³ To justify the withholding of compensation, the convention simply declared that the state of Missouri lacked sufficient revenues to pay any compensation to the slaveholders.⁹⁴

By late July 1863, pro-Confederates in Missouri chafed at the increasingly prevalent position taken by Union authorities that neither Christian morality nor true patriotism could tolerate the holding of property in slaves. Given the horrific costs in human life and suffering wrought by the twin Union victories at Gettysburg and Vicksburg in the first week

of July 1863, United States Army officers in Missouri grew increasingly impatient with policing the ancient regime. Consider the example provided by historian Michael Fellman. He relates the rude awakening of Ephriam J. Wilson to the new dispensation toward the end of that month. A slaveholder with a farm situated near the town of Palmyra, Marion County, Wilson complained to a Union officer that a hired African American man had absconded with a small boy, a slave, his property. After Union troops arrived to seize a pistol Wilson had brandished in a disruptive search of the vicinity for the boy, he complained to the provost marshal about the confiscation. The Union official “bluntly remarked that any man who would hold a slave with very few exceptions is neither a Christian, a patriot, or a loyal citizen.”⁹⁵ Wilson then complained, to no avail, to the district commander. He simply could not comprehend that any honorable man would not share or at least sympathize with the theft of his private property.⁹⁶

By early September 1863, a large portion of the Unionist partisans in the state had come down decidedly in favor of immediate emancipation. The halfway measures of the July 1863 convention had displeased the Radicals. Quantrell’s raid on Lawrence, Kansas, on August 12, 1863, the inability of the state guard to maintain order, and the occasional success of Confederate sympathizers aroused Charles Daniel Drake and his followers.⁹⁷ In a speech that Drake gave on September 1, 1863, the day the constitutional convention re-assembled, he maintained that, in the summer of 1861, “a large majority—perhaps seven-eighths—of them [the people of Missouri] then were proslavery people.” But in the next two years, he declared, “sentiments of the people of Missouri in regard to the institution of slavery underwent a radical change.”⁹⁸ In his view, furthermore, “Lincoln’s offer of cooperation in reimbursing the slaveholders was largely responsible for this transition.”⁹⁹ On the opening day of the Radical or “Charcoal” convention,

Drake condemned Governor Gamble for seeking to betray the will of the people by opposing immediate emancipation.¹⁰⁰ A committee of one from each county was appointed to go to Washington and interview the President on the subject of immediate emancipation.¹⁰¹ The convention formally thanked the German immigrants in the state for their “undivided support and defense of the government and the constitution.” Without a single dissent, the convention declared “that we demand a policy of immediate emancipation in Missouri because it is necessary not only to the financial success of the State and the prosecution of its internal improvements, but especially because it is essential to the security of the lives of our citizens.”¹⁰² Dismayed that free blacks from Missouri were helping other states to meet Union enlistment quotas, the Radicals passed resolution requesting General John M. Schofield permission to recruit black men belonging to rebels in the state so that these might help Missouri meet its quota.¹⁰³

While Missouri Radicals zealously advocated immediate, uncompensated emancipation, Lincoln appears to have agonized over the possibility that his invocation of military necessity as the legal justification for the destruction of private property in slaves might be perceived as an exertion of dictatorial power. Such concerns appear paramount in a draft letter he wrote to abolitionist from Ohio and Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase on September 2, 1865. In reference to the vexed question of extending the area to which the final Emancipation Proclamation might be extended, Lincoln declared “. . . . The original proclamation has no . . . legal justification, except as a military measure. . . . If I take the step must I not do so, without the argument of military necessity, and so, without any argument, except . . . that I think the measure . . . expedient and . . . right? . . . Would I not thus be in the boundless field of absolutism? . . . Could it fail to be perceived that without any further stretch, I might do the same

in Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri; and even change any law in any state? Would not many of our own friends shrink away appalled? Would it not lose us the elections, and with them, the very cause we seek to advance?”¹⁰⁴

In the coming weeks Lincoln reined in the efforts of Missouri Radicals to destroy slaveholder property rights. Loyal slaveholders in the state lodged vigorous protests against the efforts of General Schofield to recruit adult male slaves into the Union ranks. Lincoln responded by ordering the curtailment of black enlistments. Schofield implemented a plan whereby owners loyal to the Union would be compensated \$300 for each slave successfully recruited.¹⁰⁵ The delegation of Missouri Radicals sent to persuade Lincoln to adopt a policy of immediate emancipation for all slaves met with little success. Member of the delegation J. F. Hume, who had been captain of a state militia company from Moniteau County, recalled the ineffectual effort: “An hour was set for the interview, and we were promptly at the door of the President’s chamber, when we were kept waiting for a considerable time.” According to Hume, “as the door opened, but before we could enter, out stepped a little old man who tripped away very lightly for one of his years. That little old man was Francis P. Blair, Sr., and we knew that we had been forestalled. The President received us politely and patiently listened to what we had to say, but our mission was fruitless.”¹⁰⁶

The political momentum for immediate, uncompensated emancipation in Missouri reached critical mass in the fourteen months following the November 1863 judicial elections. Thereafter, according to Boone County delegate William F. Switzler, “little or nothing remained of previously existing national political parties. The mad torrents of civil war had swept them all away. New issues and new combinations, with new objects arose . . . the nuclei of the present political parties of the State were formed; one as the ‘Conservative’ and the other as the

‘Radical’; and now known as the ‘Democrat’ and ‘Republican.’ All the ante-bellum issues had gone down in the bloody vortex of fratricidal war. Elements hitherto antagonistic now coalesced on the living issues of an all-absorbing present.”¹⁰⁷ The plan to emancipate the slaves gradually had infuriated Radicals, who took their grievances to Lincoln. To accept compensation was to concede the moral, legal, and constitutional legitimacy of slavery before the war. The Radicals could not tolerate this ambiguity, nor its deep implications for the legitimacy of the war effort itself. On February 15, 1864, the General Assembly removed all restrictions on legal manumission.¹⁰⁸ Through the spring and summer, Radical Republicans vigorously advocated emancipation across the state. Former champion of gradual, compensated colonization B. Gratz Brown, editor of the St. Louis Missouri Democrat, grew especially active in this cause both in and out of the legislature.¹⁰⁹ The Radical Republican strongly opposed Lincoln in the presidential election of 1864 for not acting decisively against slavery in Missouri.

Two-thirds of the delegates attending the new constitutional convention that assembled on 6 January 1865 were members of the Radical Republican party. William F. Switzler reported that Charles D. Drake was the “Ajax Telamon” of the meeting, which assembled in the auditorium of the St. Louis Mercantile Library, and that he impressed upon it his “spirit and ability.” The body was, consequently, known as the “Drake Convention.”¹¹⁰ Five days later, with Drake orchestrating the proceedings, the members voted 60 to 4 to repeal the slavery clauses of the constitution and the ordinance passed by the convention the year before. The convention abolished slavery with no compensation for owners.¹¹¹

On January 11, 1865, newly-elected governor of Missouri Thomas C. Fletcher issued his “Proclamation of Freedom,” which celebrated the ascendancy of the abolitionist vision of civil government, equal rights, and individual freedom in the state: “It having pleased Divine

Providence to inspire righteous action the sovereign people of Missouri . . . have this day ordained that hereafter . . . there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . and that . . . henceforth and forever no person within the jurisdiction of this state shall be subject to any abridgement of liberty, except such as the law shall prescribe for the common good, or know any master but God.” The proclamation was quickly dispatched to Speaker of the United States House of Representatives Schuyler Colfax. Appended to it were the glad tidings added by President of the Senate of Missouri Walter L. Lovelace and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Missouri George R. Smith, who, along with Charles Daniel Drake, led the unconditional emancipationists, or Charcoalers, at the state constitutional convention: “The following is the proclamation of Thomas C. Fletcher, first governor of free Missouri. We know you join in spirit with Missouri in her jubilee today.” The reference to “Jubilee” denoted the once-in-a-half-century year described in the Biblical Book of Leviticus in which slaves and prisoners would be freed, debts would be forgiven, and the mercies of God would be particularly manifest. Its meaning certainly could not have been lost on Schuyler Colfax of Indiana, an ardent abolitionist who had earned national notoriety for his strenuous public denunciations of the pro-slavery Lecompton legislature in Kansas – and who had the honor of announcing the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment in the House on January 21, 1865.¹¹²

Several weeks after the constitutional convention in Missouri had freed African Americans in that state, President Lincoln again advanced his effort to secure some kind of monetary compensation to southerners for the emancipation of their slaves. At the Hampton Roads Conference in Newport News, Virginia, on February 3, 1865, Lincoln and Secretary of State William H. Seward met with a CSA delegation, including Vice President of the Confederacy Alexander H. Stephens, to negotiate a cease fire and peace settlement. With Lincoln

dominating the fruitless four-hour meeting, he rejected the militaristic plan of Francis P. Blair, Sr., to reunite the nation with an attack on Emperor Maximilian in Mexico and refused to enter into a treaty with the Confederacy. He insisted on nothing less than a complete restoration of the Union and remained adamant about maintaining the Emancipation Proclamation. On the other hand, he conveyed his support for the re-admission of southern delegations to Congress, should the Confederacy surrender, and approval of a plan whereby the United States government would pay “a fair indemnity for the loss to the owners.” In his words, he “would be willing to be taxed to remunerate the Southern people for their slaves.” He further expressed the view that some kind of compensation to the slaveholders was in order because “the people of the North were as responsible for slavery as the people of the South.”¹¹³

Lincoln’s initiatives in behalf of compensated emancipation did little to thwart the consolidation of unconditional black liberation in Missouri. Several days after the Hampton Roads Conference, with the Missouri constitutional convention in session, the General Assembly acted upon the proposed Thirteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution.¹¹⁴ Governor Fletcher signed the measure on the February 10, 1865.¹¹⁵ The convention in St. Louis soon drafted a new constitution for the state that finalized the emancipation of the slaves with no language whatsoever concerning the question of compensation to the former slaveholders. The resolution adopting it was passed on April 8, 1865.¹¹⁶ By its provisions, slavery was again proscribed, and civil rights, including equal rights to public education, were extended to African Americans.¹¹⁷

By January 1865 there could have been few actual slaves in Missouri given the mass exodus of African Americans that had commenced even before the fighting began. But the decision by the Radicals to deny masters compensation for the loss of their property in slaves had

far-reaching effects. In the words of historian Michael Fellman, “For the slaveholders [in Missouri], the world turned upside down. They lost their property . . . and their means to wealth; they lost their traditional means of control over blacks . . . they lost much of their community standing as men of station”¹¹⁸ To secure this end, Missouri constitutional delegates, almost a year before the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, utterly ignored the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Dred Scott v. Sandford, which held that the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution forbade the government from denying or destroying slave property. While no one can doubt the moral imperative of emancipation and its benefits, the decision of Missouri constitutional delegates to deny compensation to former slaveholders flouted entirely a well-established constellation of Biblical authority, conservative moral philosophy, and constitutional law – and the determined efforts of President Lincoln both to emancipate the slaves and adhere to the constitutional precepts that had sanctified vested property rights. After Lincoln’s assassination on April 15, 1865, public debate no longer included disputation over compensation for slaveholders, which the victorious northern majority deemed merely an odious vestige of a defunct social, civil, and political order. Ratified on July 9, 1868, Section Four of the Fourteenth Amendment irrevocably settled the question, maintaining that “neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay . . . any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave.”

**Rampant Fears of Disloyalty
and Southern Church-Goers in the Crosshairs**

The constitutions of the United States and Missouri set out explicitly the civil liberties that civilian and military authorities would deny evangelicals suspected of Confederate sympathies. The First Amendment of the United States Constitution proscribed the establishment

of religion and guaranteed the free exercise of religion, freedom of speech and of the press, and the right to peaceably assembly.¹¹⁹ Section 4 of the Declaration of Rights of the Constitution of the State of Missouri (1820) declared that “That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no man can be compelled to erect, support, or attend any place of worship, or to maintain any minister of the gospel, or teacher of religion; that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no person can ever be hurt, molested, or restrained in his religious profession or sentiments” Section 3 maintained the right of the people “to assemble for their common good.” Section 16 held “That the free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the invaluable rights of man, and that every person may freely speak, write, and print on any subject”¹²⁰

As historian Mark E. Neely, Jr., suggests, hallowed fundamental liberties enshrined in the Constitution of the State of Missouri and that of the United States did not ensure their preservation during the extraordinarily chaotic warfare that transpired in the state. The first trials by military commission occurred in Missouri in the early months of the war, a practice that the United States Supreme Court rebuked in Ex parte Milligan in 1866. In addition to widespread arrests of civilians, Union forces took civilian hostages, relied on hearsay evidence to support verdicts of disloyalty before military commissions, and denied prisoners the writ of habeas corpus well before Lincoln declared its suspension. Some suspected of disloyalty were tried for treason. Major General John C. Frémont instituted martial law across the state in 1861, which continued through April 1862, when Halleck restricted its imposition to St. Louis. To his credit, Halleck began to overrule verdicts of treason at about the same time. But General Order No. 11, issued by Brigadier General Thomas Ewing in August 1863 and approved by Lincoln two

months later, entailed the forced evacuation of about twenty thousand civilians from four western border counties.¹²¹ Against Lincoln's strict orders, Union officials routinely arrested Missourians because of their opinions.¹²² Anti-war presses were mobbed in the Cooper County town of Booneville, situated in the Boone's Lick, and in the town of Louisiana, Pike County, abutting the Mississippi River north of St. Louis.¹²³

As indicated, the wartime suppression of suspect evangelicals in Missouri stemmed essentially from a deep preoccupation of United States officials with loyalty to the Union. Meeting for the third time in St. Louis, on October 10, 1861, the Missouri State Convention created loyalty oath requirement for state officials. In June 1862, after more than a year of intensive guerilla warfare, the convention extended its oath to voters, teachers, attorneys, bank officers and preachers. Among other things, the oath required an individual pledge of "true faith, loyalty, and allegiance to the United States" and a solemn declaration, before God, that he or she had not "willfully taken up arms or levied war against the United States or against the Provisional Government of the State of Missouri. So help me God."¹²⁴

Preoccupations with disloyalty figure heavily in the efforts of Union officers to disrupt the meetings of Baptists suspected of sympathy with the Confederacy. Under the strain of harassment at the hands of Union forces, the Missouri Baptist General Association began to fragment and disintegrate after 1861. Mostly situated in the rural areas of the state, where pro-Confederate sentiment prevailed, Missouri Baptists found it increasingly difficult to attend the meetings of their general association. Affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention, they were cut off from fellowship behind Confederate lines. So isolated, they were subject to Union persecution for suspected disloyalty. After having met the western part of the Boone's Lick, at Rehoboth Church in Saline County in fall 1861, the federal militia from nearby Marshall arrived

as minister William Thompson was preaching his sermon. Some of the members of the militia were Baptists and thus assumed the chore of questioning men, women and children in attendance who they believed were southern sympathizers.¹²⁵ A notable Baptist minister in the state from Saline County, A. P. Williams, lamented afterwards that “there were Baptists among the troops! Did not angels weep when they witnessed such a spectacle? Baptists assisting in arresting their own brethren when assembled in General Association doing the work of the Lord! The Judgment! O the Judgment day!”¹²⁶ The association issued a circular after the meeting that bemoaned its troubles: “O how greatly are these suffering! Some of our district Associations have ceased to meet; our General Association was, last year and this, almost a failure.”¹²⁷ With the state under Union control by 1862, and with the memory of what happened the year before, the General Association did not meet that year. Few attended the 1863 assembly, and the next year the general association cancelled its gathering because Union authorities, often affiliated with the Baptists, harassed those deemed to be southern sympathizers.¹²⁸

Union officials in Missouri responded to what they regarded as the questionable loyalty of southern Methodists with determined efforts to disrupt their annual conferences. The St. Louis Annual Conference attempted to meet in 1861. With control of Missouri not settled, it changed its meeting venue twice to Waverly, which was in the western part of the Boone’s Lick in Lafayette County. William Leftwich, then assigned to Kansas City, made a vain attempt to reach the conference, indicative of the experiences of many southern Methodists and the contempt they were held in by the federal authorities. After being unable to dodge the army, a Union officer questioned Leftwich on his destination. Upon being told that Leftwich was in route to the annual conference, the officer replied “What! that Secesh concern? I’ll see to that. No such body of traitors can meet in this State.”¹²⁹ The federal authorities used their control of Missouri after

1862 to ensure that the St. Louis Annual Conference did not convene until 1864. The conference recorded no minutes of its proceedings that year or in 1865. The Missouri Annual Conference also felt this persecution and was forced to be more clandestine in its meetings.¹³⁰ Cut off from her bishops with the general conference behind Confederate lines, nevertheless, it was able to meet after 1861 during 1863 and 1864, but with a minister as its president instead of a bishop.¹³¹ While certainly more cosmopolitan than the largely rural Baptists, many of the difficulties that befell that denomination were problems for the Methodists as well since they had a number of members in pro-Confederate regions of the state. Southern Methodist congregations in Missouri's cities who did not support the Union, however, were quickly suppressed after 1862. Enoch Mather Marvin, one of the two delegates from the St. Louis Annual Conference, was forced to brave the perils of crossing Union lines in route to the 1862 general conference in New Orleans. When the conference was canceled, he was not allowed to return to Missouri until 1865. Marvin served as a Confederate chaplain in the interim. His only contact with Missouri was a series of letters that he wrote to his wife Harriet, as reported by neighbor Emma English when she was interrogated by the military. Marvin was a fervent states' rights man and was heavily influenced by the pro-slavery theology of William Caples. A number of Methodists in places like St. Louis, nonetheless, were Unionists even if they remained southern Methodists.¹³²

The Old School synod and presbyteries in Missouri were sometimes unable to meet during the war because suspicious Union authorities prevented them from doing so. The resulting derangement of denominational organization substantially undercut the religious activities of pro-slavery Presbyterians across the state. Many of the Old School synods in the Confederacy joined the newly created Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, which eventually absorbed the United Synod of the South. But sympathetic Missouri

Presbyterians were cut off from these groups during the war. Pro-southern Presbyterians in Missouri had little choice but to retain their membership in the Old School General Assembly, which relieved of its southern synods, declared its pro-Union sentiments through the war. This fact was certainly troubling for the majority of the Presbyterians in the thriving river towns of Boone's Lick, the Mississippi River or into western Missouri. At its 1861 meeting, the Missouri Synod resolved "the action of the General Assembly on May last, in relation to the political condition of the country was unscriptural, unconstitutional, unwise and unjust."¹³³ In 1864 the Missouri synod was able to achieve a slight quorum at its annual meeting. The agenda for the synod meeting, however, was largely dictated by the military at the behest of pro-northern Presbyterians to ensure its loyalty to the Union.¹³⁴ Referring to the 1861 condemnation of the General Assembly, the synod declared "that it be, and the same is hereby rescinded, now, in the presence of the Synod"¹³⁵ New School affiliated congregations outside Union strongholds in St. Louis, such as those in Platte County, were suppressed by pro-Confederate guerillas.¹³⁶

Federal authorities sometimes hounded congregants believed to harbor southern sympathies. Union officials, moreover, forced ministers in the three denominations they suspected who were southern loyalists to pray for federal officials, including the president, or for the success of the Union war effort. In the words of William Leftwich, the demands were primarily "to trifle with the consciences of men in the solemn matters of divine worship."¹³⁷ The southern Methodist Mt. Zion Church in northern Boone County was spared any destruction during a battle on 28 December 1861. But it was burned to the ground by federal troops on 22 September 1862. While the initial battle ended major Confederate operations in the county until 1864, the Third Iowa Calvary committed the atrocity after accusing the congregation of supporting southern guerillas. Even after hearing the rationale of the soldiers, the conservative

Unionist editor of the Columbia Missouri Statesman, William Switzler, condemned the burning of the church. He said “we considered and still consider the act wrong and unjustifiable.”¹³⁸

Troublesome “She-Rebel” Believers

Evangelical women believed to be in sympathy with the Confederate cause were not immune from the retribution of Union officials. Federal officials homed in on such women for their disloyalty. The leader of the Union garrison in Independence, Major Oliver, sought to make an example out of a pro-southern woman in the town. This was after Confederate-leaning guerillas, allegedly part of Quantrill’s notorious band, shot one of his men. Oliver questioned the loyal citizens about the identity of the leading “she-rebel” in Independence and determined that Marietta Wallace was that woman. Wallace was the wife of Thomas Wallace, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Oliver sent a letter to her demanding that she make a funeral shroud for the soldier shot by the guerillas. Responding to the strongly worded request, Wallace replied “present my respects to Major Oliver, and tell him the shroud will be ready in two hours; and say to him that it would afford me the greatest pleasure to make shrouds for his whole command.”¹³⁹ After hearing her response and receiving the covering, Oliver left Wallace alone for the remainder of the war.¹⁴⁰ Thomas Wallace and many other notable southern Methodists in Independence, however, remained marked men to the Jayhawkers.

Union persecution of evangelical women suspected of pro-Confederate commitments highlights that some of them were both victims of and participants in the guerilla war.¹⁴¹ On 21 February 1862, noted Boone County resident Colonel Odon Guitar was marching his troops past the Baptist Female College in Columbia. Two women at the school, Mrs. Cecile R. Parker and Mrs. E. T. Fristoe, waved black flags at the colonel’s men and shouted “hurrah for Jeff Davis.” Outraged by the show of defiance, Guitar lodged a complaint with his superiors. The women,

sensing the potential fallout from their actions, quickly wrote a letter of apology that was accepted by the military. Although black flags were often used to show dissatisfaction with the government, they said “we had no intention of offering an insult you or your command.”¹⁴² Elizabeth Monroe, the wife of Andrew Monroe, a preeminent southern Methodist minister, would share in her husband’s troubles at the hands of the provost marshal. The Monroes, who lived on a farm outside of Fayette, an important political center in the Boone’s Lick, were arrested in February of 1862. They were taken to the headquarters of the local federal military commander, Major Hubbard. Elizabeth Monroe and a number of other women who were also arrested with their husbands were released after Hubbard announced that it was not his intension to have them apprehended. Hubbard, nonetheless, reserved the right to interview the women if he so desired, to which Elizabeth Monroe “promptly replied that she was obliged to him for releasing them so early, but as for seeing him, she had no desire whatever to see him at her house or anywhere else.”¹⁴³ In March, another Union commander, Captain Hale, arrested Andrew Monroe as he departed for his preaching charges. After Elizabeth accompanied her husband to Hale’s post, the captain commented “the secesh talk of the women of this family should be stopped.”¹⁴⁴ Andrew Monroe, however, sensing that his wife was also facing the possibility of arrest, placated the commander by taking the loyalty oath required of him. Neither he nor his wife was again troubled by the federal authorities.¹⁴⁵

Men of the Cloth Worth Watching Closely

Federal officers began harassing pro-Confederate ministers in northeast Missouri when Union and Confederate forces fought for control of that region in 1861. At an assembly of the Bethel Association in 1861, Confederate Colonel Martin E. Green, who had formed the First Calvary Regiment in the Second Division of the Missouri State Guard, asked for a minister to

officiate at a Sunday service for his men. The association sent William Cleveland to fulfill the request. A captain in the federal Twenty-First Missouri regiment, John H. Cox, soon discovered that Cleveland ministered to Green's regiment and had him confined to a make-shift jail in Hannibal. Cox, a northern Methodist minister and Radical Unionist, constantly tormented Cleveland during his captivity for his southern loyalties and theology. Eventually Cox brought him before the regimental commander, Colonel David Moore, who questioned Cleveland on his loyalties. Moore decided to force Cleveland to pray publically for Lincoln over nine days before he could be released. Cox, who was to oversee Cleveland's "penance," forced the elderly and overweight man to mount a cannon in front of the snickering men of the company as he prayed for the president. Cleveland, however, bore his humiliation well to avoid further harassment and did not have to subsequently pray on the cannon.¹⁴⁶

Mobs, guerillas and even ordinary Union soldiers singled out ministers with southern affiliations for persecution. One such man, Enoch Mather Marvin, commented after the war that many of his fellow southern Methodist ministers were marked men and were often harassed by the federal authorities to ensure their congregations would no longer be able to effectively function without them.¹⁴⁷ Residing two miles south of the Fayette, southern Methodist minister Edwin Robinson made the decision in November of 1864 to relocate north to Chillicothe. Robinson attempted to avoid Glasgow, which had recently been recaptured by the Union after falling to a contingent of Price's men during his raid into Missouri. Passing two miles from the town, Robinson and the slave who was traveling with him were intercepted by a group of Union soldiers from the Marion County Thirty-Ninth Regiment, Missouri Infantry, commanded by Captain John D. Meredith. Meredith rode up to Robinson and his companion. After ascertaining that he was a southern Methodist minister, Meredith said to him "that, sir, is enough to damn

you.”¹⁴⁸ Letting the two men ride off fifty yards, Meredith called to the slave and questioned him further on Robinson, discovering that he had a son who was a Confederate guerilla. With that knowledge, Meredith ordered one of his men to take aim at Robinson and “blow his damned brains out.”¹⁴⁹ After killing Robinson, Meredith refused to allow the dead body to be moved and it lay beside his horse. Two ladies who had witnessed the murder, afraid to move the body themselves, retrieved Mrs. Thomson from Glasgow, who subsequently removed the body. The citizens of that town, however, were unwilling to keep the body in their homes, for fear of Union reprisals. It was later placed in the basement of the Disciples of Christ Church. Even after Robinson had been buried, his wife and children still bore the brunt of the federal anger towards their family. The widow, with her husband dead, attempted to remain at their farm. With the children too young to help on the farm, the family nearly starved to death over the winter and was forced to move in with the widow’s mother in Grundy County, in northern Missouri.¹⁵⁰ Knowing that murders of men perceived to be southern-sympathizers were not uncommon, other southern Methodists, such as Robert A. Austin, also fled their congregations. Austin, who was stationed in Keytesville in late 1862 and early 1863, fled his central Missouri charge to the western Boone’s Lick. Realizing that his position was untenable, he explained his reasoning in his memoirs “knowing that my own life was in constant peril, and that I was accomplishing nothing, I took my family and returned to my mother’s in Carroll County.”¹⁵¹

Far from the worst of the carnage of the war, ministers in northern Missouri suspected of disloyalty commonly endured maltreatment at the hands of Unionists. Take for instance Jacob Waltenbarger, a southern Methodist minister who was preaching a funeral sermon for two children of a federal soldier in northern Sullivan County in 1863. A mob composed in part of Union soldiers, burst into the church during the services and took Waltenbarger to nearby

Scottsville. The men in the mob told the minister in no uncertain terms to never preach at the funeral of anyone associated with the federal military. Waltenbarger was scheduled to preach the funeral sermon of a Union soldier later that day. After releasing the minister, the same group burned the local Methodist campground.¹⁵² John L. Wood, another southern Methodist minister in Sullivan County, was murdered visiting nearby Unionville by a group of federal soldiers from the Eighteenth Missouri Regulars, who were home in Unionville for a furlough in March of 1864. One of the soldiers, who had never met Wood but was told he was a southern Methodist, took out his gun and shot Wood in the back. Even though he was taken to Proctor, the local physician, he died fifteen hours later.¹⁵³ After these events, the religious life of rank and file southern Methodists was certainly disrupted in that section of northern Missouri.

The Take Down of Southern Presbyterians at the St. Louis Pine Street Church

In early summer 1862, a Unionist faction of the Old School St. Louis Pine Street Presbyterian Church sought to gain the ascendancy over their pro-Confederate brethren with the assistance of the provost marshal. A minority of its members, who held Radical sentiments, clashed with the majority of their congregation and the pastor, Samuel B. McPheeters. Some members were troubled by McPheeters' southern sympathies and that he not made his views on the war publically known to the congregation. Worse still was that his wife Eliza was an outspoken Confederate supporter and his brother William eventually became a surgeon in Sterling Price's army.¹⁵⁴ The church, moreover, had been formed from the union of an Old School and New School congregation in 1853, leaving a number of parishioners who were at least somewhat sympathetic with the New School.¹⁵⁵ While problems had been brewing for some time, the trouble started when McPheeters baptized the son of one of his congregants, Samuel

Robbins, on 8 June 1862 as “Sterling Price,” after the Confederate general. Thirty members of the congregation led by noted Radical politician George P. Strong sent McPheeters a letter ten days later protesting the baptism as a microcosm of his disloyalty and a perversion of their church. They wrote “we consider it nothing less than a public and sacrilegious prostitution of a sacred ordinance of God’s house, to the gratification, on his part, of the most contemptible and malicious feelings of hostility to ‘the powers that be.’”¹⁵⁶ McPheeters was visiting St. Paul, Minnesota to deal with persistent health issues when the letter was authored, but the provost marshal still attempted to investigate him, forcing his wife to intercede on his behalf.¹⁵⁷ With McPheeters returning from St. Paul, and not satisfying the minority faction, several members of his congregation held a meeting on October 15th to force McPheeters to either clarify his position on the war or resign his pastorate. McPheeters wrote a letter standing by his principles. He insisted that a minister should not comment on political affairs and reiterated a loyalty oath he took to the Union. The radical members were still not satisfied. Six other members, however, sent another letter to their pastor accepting his reasoning on the matter.¹⁵⁸

The Radical bloc dissatisfied with McPheeters sought the aid of Union military authorities to subdue their pastor and his supporters. Some of the Unionist congregants, George Strong, J. M. Corbett and John M. Ferguson, wrote a letter to force the provost marshal’s hand which appeared in the Missouri Democrat on December 13th.¹⁵⁹ Notwithstanding a letter that McPheeters published defending himself in several newspapers, on December 19th Major General Samuel Curtis arranged for Provost Marshal Lieutenant Colonel Franklin A. Dick to remove McPheeters from his pulpit via Special Order 152. Curtis was a radical abolitionist and the commander of the Department of Missouri. The faction that sought to oust McPheeters was vindicated as the order allowed them to take possession of the church and its records.

McPheeters and his wife Eliza, moreover, were directed to leave St. Louis within ten days and relocate to North.¹⁶⁰ Curtis and Dick had been alerted to the case by Frank Blair.¹⁶¹ Writing Postmaster General Montgomery Blair on the same day, Dick, a close ally of the Blairs, echoed the sentiments of many radical Unionist Pine Street Presbyterians. The letter was eventually forwarded to President Lincoln. Dick illustrated his contempt for southern-leaning evangelical ministers saying that “if the president will sustain me, I will rid the State of rebel preachers, and send them to preach to their southern brethren.”¹⁶² By virtue of these statements, Dick gained many enemies for his firm support of the Union.¹⁶³

McPheeters and his conservative supporters defied the order given by Curtis and determined to take the matter to President Lincoln. A Pine Street session on December 20th unanimously condemned the order proclaiming that the church records could not be turned over Strong’s group per the military order since none of its members were ruling elders of the congregation.¹⁶⁴ Determined to go to Washington and press his case to Lincoln, McPheeters went to Governor Gamble’s residence in St. Louis for help in order to contact United States Attorney General Edward Bates to set up a meeting with Lincoln. Gamble was more than willing not only to provide his fellow Presbyterian with the address of his brother-in-law, but write a letter supporting McPheeters. After sleeping on the matter, McPheeters, nevertheless, decided to press the principle of his case to Lincoln and returned the letter to Gamble the next morning.¹⁶⁵

Lincoln’s response to the complicated situation at the Pine Street Presbyterian Church reveals his views on the relationship between the wartime government in Missouri and its churches. Writing Bates on December 23rd, McPheeters was able to secure a meeting with Lincoln on December 27th. Notwithstanding Curtis’ pleas to the contrary, Lincoln, while believing McPheeters to be a southern sympathizer, was satisfied by the oath that McPheeters

presented to him and revoked the special order.¹⁶⁶ Lincoln explained to Curtis “but the question remains whether or such a man of unquestioned good moral character, who has taken such an oath as he has, and can not [sic] even be charged with no other specific act or omission, can, with safety to the government be exiled upon the suspicion of his secret sympathies.”¹⁶⁷ More importantly, he added “that the U. S. government must not, as by this order, undertake to run the churches.”¹⁶⁸ Lincoln was somewhat hesitant to interfere with his military commanders, but knew that they could not supplant legitimate religious authorities to avoid further problems in the troubled state. While his faith was not orthodox, Lincoln did attend the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington. The president believed that evangelical support was crucial to the war effort, and many believed that providence had intervened to make him the nation’s leader. Lincoln, nonetheless, was not inclined to take the radical view of Dick and others who wanted to interfere with the Pine Street congregation to silence McPheeters.¹⁶⁹

The intra-congregational conflict in the Pine Street Presbyterian Church spiraled out of control as both sides continued to press their arguments. Two days after the meeting with Lincoln, Frank Blair’s wife Apolline corresponded with her brother-in-law Montgomery lambasting the president’s actions in the case. She wrote “the order of the President revoking the sentence of banishment against Mr. McPheeters has come upon the loyal people here like a thunder clap. We cannot believe for a moment that the President rightly understands the case which is one of almost vital importance to us.”¹⁷⁰ Continuing on, she explained how the minister ended his frequent prayers for the president after Lincoln’s election and how her husband Frank, moreover, had told her to worship elsewhere, even though he and McPheeters were once close friends.¹⁷¹ She was certainly pleased that Curtis and Dick were unwilling to enforce Lincoln’s command and allowed Strong’s contingent to gain control of the congregation.¹⁷² Nine St. Louis

citizens wrote Lincoln on December 30th protesting this action.¹⁷³ Charles Drake, nonetheless, used McPheeters as a prominent example in a letter to the president on January 22, 1863 lamenting the lax treatment of rebel sympathizers.¹⁷⁴ Word of the situation, in the meantime, spread throughout the state.¹⁷⁵ Curtis once again corresponded with Lincoln on April 3, 1863 elaborating on the reasons why McPheeters was still not allowed to preach, seemingly not meriting a response from the president. Without McPheeters' knowledge, the elders of the Pine Street congregation, along with several other members, authored a letter to Lincoln trying to get their pastor reinstated. Lincoln, confused on why he received this note, notwithstanding his previous order of non-interference, was not willing to act without additional information – which he subsequently requested. The communication, published in March 1864 in the Missouri Republican, reiterated that he had “never interfered, nor thought of interfering, as to who shall or shall not preach in any church; nor have I knowingly or believingly tolerated any one [sic] else to interfere by my authority.”¹⁷⁶ Seeing the possible fallout, Gamble wrote a letter to Bates giving Lincoln enough information to act upon, allowing the attorney general to convey an order that McPheeters finally be allowed to return to his charge. Strong and his faction, failing to gain recourse from the government, took the case to the presbytery. Controlled by Union authorities, the presbytery ruled against McPheeters – an edict upheld by the General Assembly. Certainly tired of the controversy, he eventually received a call from a congregation in Mulberry, Kentucky and relocated there in 1865.¹⁷⁷

The Take-Over of Suspect Southern Congregations and Seizures of Their Houses of Worship

Union forces occupied the church buildings of a number of southern-leaning congregations, while the provost marshal suppressed their meetings. This practice became more

common after the state fell under federal control in 1862. For example, in 1864 the Union Army occupied the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in Chillicothe in the northwestern part of the state. The trustees attempted to send a letter to the army headquarters in nearby St. Joseph on November 30th claiming eighty-five dollars in damages. It alleged Colonel J. N. Shanklin, who occupied the building, caused this destruction. A letter from the headquarters was delivered on December 7th, however, that explained Shanklin was well within his bounds as a commander to occupy the building even with the harm to the structure.¹⁷⁸ W. M. Rush, a southern Methodist minister whose family lived in Chillicothe even though he was stationed in St. Joseph, abandoned his charge in 1862 when it became untenable because of harassment by the military. He returned to Chillicothe only to find the first floor of his house employed as a stable, and the second as a barracks, by the Union army.¹⁷⁹ In southwestern Missouri, an order relayed by William Q. Kittridge commanded Springfield district provost marshal Captain W. W. Braden to occupy the First Baptist Church as a school for African American children. Mary McClury was to run the school. Kittridge's reasoning was that the congregation "has been uniformly disloyal."¹⁸⁰ The church, which was composed middling citizens, could not convene during the war as its building was occupied by the Confederate forces in late 1861 in the aftermath of the Battle of Wilson's Creek.¹⁸¹

With the cooperation of Unionist evangelicals, federal troops sometimes seized the property of pro-Confederate denominational colleges for their own use, while insuring that these seizures ultimately redounded to the benefit of their supporters. William Jewell College's grounds were periodically used by the Union army during the war both as a hospital and a barracks, leaving some damage to the facility.¹⁸² In February 1862 the local Liberty Tribune, in the western part of the state, wrote that the Male and Female Baptist Seminary in Palmyra was

being converted into a hospital for the federal army. The Marion County institution was operated by the Bethel Association.¹⁸³ St. Charles College, on the other hand, was forcibly occupied by the military in 1862. Colonel Arnold Krekel, who led the force, was a graduate of the college and one of its curators. Krekel himself was a devoted Radical Unionist and, after being elected as the president of the 1865 Missouri Constitutional Convention, went on to be a federal judge. Krekel used his authority as the local provost marshal to eject its caretaker Tyson Dines to use the facility as a prison. Dines would later be arrested and exiled to the North.¹⁸⁴ Krekel, however, went a step further in order to ensure that the southern Methodists would not be able to regain the property after the war. Starting in 1863, he began to influence the state legislature to reissue the school's charter to transfer authority to him and the other loyal curators.¹⁸⁵

Northern Methodists made numerous attempts to take control of southern Methodist congregations, often with the help of the civil authorities like Arnold Krekel. The contentious relationship between both branches of Methodism during the 1850s fed into this trend. Bolstering this effort was the northern Methodist bishop from Indianapolis, Edward R. Ames, who was able to persuade Secretary of War Edwin Stanton to issue an order on 30 November 1863 that allowed him to take control of any disloyal southern Methodist congregation. Another order, Special Order 15, allowed Ames to replace the ministers in these churches. Many southern Methodists, citing postwar statistics, argued the order was a thinly veiled scheme to acquire property for the northern church in the South. Both orders originally applied to both Missouri and the Confederacy. They were subsequently published in the state's newspapers.¹⁸⁶ Missouri southern Methodist John Hogan soon went to Washington to plead for his denomination. Hogan, a part-time Methodist minister since 1825, was elected to Congress as a Democrat in 1864.¹⁸⁷ Lincoln, in a letter to Secretary Stanton, questioned the orders in light of the McPheeters' case.

Attorney General Edward Bates, moreover, debated their legality.¹⁸⁸ While he did not completely resend the orders, Lincoln modified it exempting Missouri, since it had a loyal government. In a letter to Hogan, Lincoln tried to defend the order, explaining “nor, as I was told by the Secretary [Stanton], was it ever intended for any more than a means to rally the Methodist people in favor of the Union in localities where the rebellion had disorganized and scattered them.”¹⁸⁹ Lincoln, nonetheless, did express reservations elucidating “even in that view, I fear it is liable to some abuses.”¹⁹⁰

Northern Methodists seized southern Methodist church property in response to opportunities that wartime transformations provided. A number of interrelated developments prompted some pro-Confederate congregants and ministers to abandon their churches. These included the turmoil of conventional battles in 1861-62 and 1864, the exposure of small towns and rural villages to the ravages of opportunistic banditry, Union gunboat supremacy on the Mississippi and Missouri after 1862, and the establishment of federal military and civil authority outside St. Louis. Church abandonment was especially common in the far western reaches of the state along the chaotic border of Kansas, in the especially war-torn southwest part of the state, and along the Mississippi River north of St. Louis. In areas where southern Methodist congregations disintegrated, their remaining numbers sometimes joined in fellowship with their northern counterparts, the denominational strife and the war notwithstanding. But northern Methodists steadily moved beyond the enclaves in which they had resided before the war to establish a virtual monopoly on Methodism in many of the river counties north of St. Louis. A prime example of this is the 1862 advances they made in Clark County, situated in northeast Missouri along the Mississippi River. Near the county seat of Kahoka, the northern Methodist congregants established a thriving congregation when they had enjoyed virtually no success in

that area before the war.¹⁹¹ Secretary of War Stanton's November 1863 order authorizing Bishop Ames to seize the property of disloyal southern Methodists ramped up the process. Before and after the order, however, northern Methodist congregants and ministers equally eager to seize upon opportunities consolidated their authority and took possession of church buildings, land, and town lots legally yet in the hands of southern Methodist trustees. They did so most notably in the busy commercial town of Independence, Jackson County, situated on the Missouri River bordering Kansas; the now sizable city of Springfield, Greene County, which straddled the war-ravaged Ozark highlands in the southwest corner of the state; the town of Macon, Macon County, situated in the plains of north-central Missouri; Plattsburg, Platte County, situated on the Missouri River near the Kansas border and the scene of intense guerilla fighting dating back to the post-1854 Border War; the small town of Fillmore, Andrew County, also located in the turbulent Platte country along the Missouri River next to Kansas.¹⁹² Northern Methodists assumed control of Salem Church in Pettis County, in west-central Missouri. Receiving little support from the local population and realizing that the federal military authorities were too far away to render much aid, they abandoned the property. The southern church was able to resist the efforts of the Methodist Episcopal Church to overrun their Saline County congregation at Arrow Rock. The buildings further south in California and Miami, however, were thought to have been burned by northern Methodists.¹⁹³

Shutting Down the Southern Religious Press

Union suppression of publications by pro-Confederate evangelicals in wartime Missouri certainly takes on considerable significance in light of the well-studied pattern in which Unionist mobs and United States Army personnel suppressed dissenters in the North. The quashing of pro-Confederate newspapers in Missouri by Union officers certainly implicated the basic

constitutional issues involved with the suppression of the Copperhead political speeches and secessionist newspapers in the rest of the North. But suppression of religious anti-Union newspapers in the state by United States authorities also implicated the right to free exercise of religion set out in the First Amendment. Since the revolutionary era, American political thinkers and jurists had been particularly adamant that the government should never shackle the freedom of political speech and religious expression, which they believed to be mutually interdependent.¹⁹⁴

Both oral and printed evangelical publications that seemed to express sympathy with the Confederacy powerfully fueled the animus of ordinary Missouri men and women swept up in war. Many of the socioeconomic and demographic transformations that allowed evangelical print culture to flourish in the state continued to make newspaper publications a powerful medium for the shaping of public opinion. This was especially so in St. Louis and in the river towns and county seats where they were published, at least in the early stages of the war. Even though evangelical papers were published in the commercial center in St Louis, they could still sway the opinions of ordinary men and women in the rural areas of the state. This power led Union officials to deem many southern-leaning sheets as threatening to the war in Missouri. When there remained some doubt on which side the majority of Missourians would fall in 1861, the weeklies edited by Robert P. Farris and David Rice McAnally continued to circulate throughout the state. Both men attempted to continue the oral spread of their theologies after their arrests by returning to their pulpits. McAnally even managed to compose several sermons while he was imprisoned.¹⁹⁵ Even after the manifestation of the chaos of the Civil War, many materials were still published. For instance, a number of auxiliaries of the American Bible Society continued to send funds to the national organization through 1863.¹⁹⁶ The Central Christian Advocate

published throughout the war. During March of 1862, it wrote in response to Confederate-sympathizers proclaiming “we beseech Almighty God to open the eyes of the understanding of these men, lead them to acknowledge and forsake their horrible sins; and may God have mercy on their souls!”¹⁹⁷

In 1862, pro-Union evangelicals sought to take advantage of Union military dominance in St. Louis to co-opt the tract and book operations of their pro-Confederate counterparts in the city. Northern Methodists attempted to gain control of the southern Methodist publishing house and book concern depository that was attached to the St. Louis Christian Advocate. Amid the rising determination of Union authorities to suppress the newspaper, the northern Methodists attempted to force the publishing house into bankruptcy and co-opt it. Since the northern Methodists did not have a depository in St. Louis in the early stages of the war, their goal was to transform a pro-southern operation into a pro-northern one. Fortunately for the southern Methodists, the book agent Patrick M. Pinckard discovered the plot and used his wife’s property holding to purchase the publishing house and save it from falling into northern hands. The northern Methodists with the cooperation of the military, nevertheless, were able to force a number of southern women from the Centenary Church in St. Louis wishing to purchase Sunday school books on Methodist theological tenets to justify themselves before the provost marshal. They were eventually allowed to buy the books.¹⁹⁸

As indicated, Union authorities were highly suspicious of the newspapers sponsored by Methodist and Presbyterian churches suspected of pro-Confederate sympathies. Suppression of these organs steadily became the order of the day. While the publication of newspapers continued unabated, the federal authorities were forced to endure the dissemination of pro-southern religious discourse to the larger evangelical communities throughout the state from St.

Louis. Given that St. Louis was under the control of the Union after the summer of 1861, the provost marshal was empowered to deal with anyone expressing pro-southern rhetoric and often used that authority to end the influence of these periodicals with their supporters.¹⁹⁹ McAnally, who wrote a number of articles in the St. Louis Christian Advocate deemed pro-Confederate, felt increasing pressure from Union supporters. McAnally, nonetheless, was far tamer in his writings than many other pro-southern evangelicals. In July of 1861, Unionist St. Louisans, who were jostling for control of the city and state, were no longer willing to tolerate a paper that invoked evangelical articles of faith to support the southern cause. That month a pro-Union mob, composed of Methodists and those unaffiliated with the denomination, threatened to destroy McAnally's house and church. Fortunately, a number of McAnally's supporters came to his rescue and the mob dispersed. Later that month, forty-four Union soldiers ransacked his house. In April of 1862 another group of federal troops destroyed much of his editorial office.²⁰⁰

The pro-Confederate publications of David R. McAnally led to the suspension of the St. Louis Christian Advocate by an order of Provost Marshal Barnard G. Farrar, Jr. McAnally was arrested on 24 April 1862 and his newspaper was suppressed for the remainder of the war. In the arrest order, it was alleged that

D. R. McAnally being the editor of a certain paper published in the city of St Louis known as the St Louis Christian Advocate, did at some time between the first day of June 1861, and the 1st day of May 1862, and while large number of persons were in rebellion against the government of the United States, so edit said paper . . . and published articles to encourage opposition to said government.²⁰¹

He cited a number of issues of the paper that heavily lambasted the federal government. After a brief trial, McAnally was granted a parole of honor on May 28th as long as he remained in St. Louis County.²⁰² Unionist evangelicals such as Charles Elliott and Galusha Anderson applauded these efforts.²⁰³ On May 10, 1863, however, McAnally was once again arrested and exiled to the

South. Three days later, a local man, E. Stafford, wrote Farrar's replacement, Franklin Dick, on McAnally's behalf.²⁰⁴ While Elliott questioned Stafford's loyalty, Dick revoked the sentence and the editor remained in St. Louis. He would only be allowed to publish the St. Louis Christian Advocate in 1865.²⁰⁵ On May 21st, nevertheless, the Missouri Democrat opined on McAnally's case saying "his paper, the Advocate, was a viper concern, and, while permitted by the military authorities to exist, did more, in an insidious way, to poison the public mind of Missouri toward the Government than almost any other treasonable agency among us."²⁰⁶

**The Hounding of Reverend Farris,
or, Mary Easton Sibley Evens Things Up**

Editor of the Old School St. Louis Presbyterian Robert P. Farris faced Unionist reprisals far more extensive than the sanctions imposed on McAnally. As discussed in a previous chapter, Farris came to St. Charles to assume the pastorate at the St. Charles Presbyterian Church in 1860. Originally from St. Louis and a graduate of Yale, he had served as the first pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Peoria, Illinois, through the 1850s. He left the city in 1859 in response to failing health.²⁰⁷ The religious and political influence of Farris as the editor of the Presbyterian and his position as the pastor of the St. Charles Presbyterian Church was considerable and authorities viewed his paper as a prime organ of rebellion. Many citizens loyal to the Union, by 1861, agreed with this view.

Mary Easton Sibley soon seized on the opportunity provided by the hard talk against the Reverend Farris to even some scores. He had, after all, been appointed one of the original trustees of Linden Wood Female College, after which Mary had been pushed to the margins of influence there, not to mention that he had consolidated Old School control of the St. Charles Presbyterian Church. In July 1861, while Union forces firmed up their occupation of St. Louis

and the surrounding area, Mary Easton went to Provost Marshal Farrar and accused Farris of slandering the federal troops encamped at St. Charles with the epithet “invaders.”²⁰⁸

Mary Easton Sibley’s charge of virtual treason against Farris registered unmistakably her deep loathing of slavery, its Old School Presbyterian apologists, and her sincere objections to secession. But it also advanced a cause much more personal than her denunciations of Farris likely indicated to the disinterested observer. Farris was the leader of the Old School Presbyterians in St. Charles and St. Louis, and his St. Louis Presbyterian had extended the voice of hardcore Old School Presbyterianism across the state and the region. By emphatically branding Farris a traitor, Sibley undercut, quite likely, the single most influential individual responsible for making policy at Linden Wood Female College in St. Charles – which she had continued to view as hers even after George Sibley had donated Linden Wood to the Old School St. Louis Presbytery and set up the Reverend Farris as one of its trustees eight years earlier. After Aunt Mary denounced Farris, just as she preferred, Union authorities placed control of the college under the auspices of the now ascendant New School faction of the St. Louis Presbytery. The Board of Directors discharged the venerable first president of Linden Wood College, Old School minister Abraham V. C. Schenk, and, in summer 1862, appointed in his place a staunch anti-slavery practitioner of New School Presbyterianism Dr. J. R. Barbour.²⁰⁹ George Sibley died on January 31, 1863, at age seventy-five, and enrollments at Linden Wood declined over the next two years, almost certainly a consequence of wartime economic instability and widespread uncertainty. But Mary Easton had shown that, even at age sixty-three, she was still a woman to be reckoned with.²¹⁰

Mary Easton Sibley and others who campaigned against Robert P. Farris ultimately spurred Union authorities to secure his removal from not only St. Charles and St. Louis but from

the state. Under growing pressure from Union partisans, the St. Louis Presbyterian failed in late 1861. Future circuit judge William W. Edwards, in his Fourth of July 1862 oration, accused Farris of publically praying “for Jeff Davis and the southern Confederacy.”²¹¹ In September of 1862, Union Provost Marshal Bernard G. Farrar, Jr., whose father was the former owner of James Farrar and patron of the African Methodist Church, had Farris arrested. Most Unionists in the area wholeheartedly supported his deportation.²¹² In early July 1862, Colonel Lewis Merrill held a military trial and sentenced Farris to confinement in the St. Louis Gratiot Street Prison before having him exiled to Chicago.²¹³

Loyalty Oaths and the Quandaries of Conscientious Objection

The conclusion of Methodist minister William Leftwich that state and federal authorities encroached on the religious liberty of evangelical clerics in Missouri during the Civil War was also grounded in his objections to the oaths of allegiance that Union authorities imposed on them. Nowhere did this practice, which pro-Confederate evangelicals were prone to despise, receive so much attention as in the case of the ongoing difficulties of Presbyterian minister Robert P. Farris. Shortly after William W. Edwards accused Farris of publicly praying for the Confederacy, the local provost marshal, Colonel Andrew Krekel, ordered Farris to take an oath of loyalty to the Union and pay a \$2000 bond. The pledge itself, a standard loyalty oath, certainly troubled Farris when he was forced to say he did

solemnly swear, in presence of Almighty God, that I will henceforth faithfully support, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Union of the States thereunder; and that I will, in like manner, abide by and faithfully support all acts of Congress passed during the existing rebellion with reference to slaves, so long and so far as not repealed, modified or held void by Congress, or by decision of the Supreme Court; and that I will, in like manner, abide by and faithfully support all proclamations of the President made during the existing

rebellion having reference to slaves, so long and so far as not modified or declared void by decision of the Supreme Court: So help me God.²¹⁴

The refusal of Farris to swear the oath of loyalty stigmatized him as a traitor. A Radical Unionist and devoted rationalist, Krekel, no doubt, savored the opportunity to cow the influential Presbyterian divine into submission to Union authority. He undoubtedly valued highly the effectiveness of the mandatory loyalty oath for singling out and dealing with rebels as subversive as Farris. But he adamantly refused to comply with the order on principled grounds, and Krekel ultimately proved unwilling to enforce it. A number of citizens persuaded Colonel Lewis Merrill to replace Krekel with Edward Harding, who had Farris brought to his headquarters. William Edwards and another member of Farris' congregation, Nathaniel Reid, did not substantiate their accusations. But Merrill questioned Farris himself and sentenced him to confinement in the Gratiot Street Prison in St. Louis until the end of military hostilities. Merrill imprisoned southern Methodist minister Tyson Dines and a layman, Carr Gamble, both from St. Charles, with the same order.²¹⁵ Farris was eventually released from prison but exiled to Chicago. It was only through the help of a Decatur, Illinois Presbyterian minister who he certainly knew from his previous assignment, F. N. Ewing, that he was able to secure the help of David Davis. He was an Illinoisan on the United States Supreme Court. Davis used his influence with the president to get Lincoln's signature on an order allowing for Farris and men in other similar circumstances to return home in December of 1862.²¹⁶ But Farris was a marked man. When Provost Marshal Franklin Dick got wind of Farris' imminent release, he wrote Lincoln to thwart it, arguing to the president that "Farris is one of the most impudent, persistent and ignominious Rebels in the State, and as a minister, he has wielded a powerful influence in the rebellion."²¹⁷ When Farris returned to St. Charles, another order was issued by Brigadier General Eugene Asa Carr ordering his arrest for aiding the enemy, but he was eventually released from custody on those charges.²¹⁸

Farris' congregant Nathaniel Reid, nonetheless, wrote a letter to the provost marshal on May 22, 1863 hoping for Farris' re-incarceration as a southern sympathizer. After his apprehension on those charges on 12 June, however, Farris was brought before an adjunct provost marshal, Lieutenant J. C. Dodge who released him saying in Farris' words "it was a great outrage that I was ever molested."²¹⁹

For devout evangelicals like the Reverend Farris, the strictures of the oath, in fact, created a deep moral dilemma the release from which imprisonment seemed a reasonable price to pay. Soon after General Merrill sent Farris to the Gratiot Street Prison, three of the ruling elders from his church, J. Johns, B. A. Alderson and Samuel S. Watson, wrote a letter to their fellow Presbyterian Governor Gamble on his behalf. They argued that the reason Farris had refused to take the oath was not because he was a Confederate sympathizer but "that he has some conscientious objections to taking the oath required of him."²²⁰ It seems highly unlikely that Farris had no sympathies at all for the Confederate cause. But any reservations about swearing loyalty to the Union, whether based on constitutional objections or simple resentment of Union militarism, rendered the taking of the oath one of the most egregious sins known to evangelical Protestantism at the time.

That the military imposition of an oath of allegiance to the Union constituted a violation of human dignity of the highest order for evangelical southern sympathizers can only make sense if one fathoms the full depth and breadth of mainstream Protestant belief on the question of oaths, North and South, at the time of the Civil War. Dating back to eighteenth century England, individuals typically associated with pietistic sects objected to taking loyalty oaths and were often imprisoned. Quakers, such as moralist Jonathan Dymond, cited their belief that oaths were immoral.²²¹ By the time that William Blackstone published his Commentaries (1765-69), English

authorities allowed those who conscientiously objected to oaths to make, instead, “solemn affirmations,” to fulfill the requirements. In America, loyalty oaths were required by some state governments during the Revolution. Congress, in February of 1778, stipulated that all military officers had to take such an oath.²²² In later conflicts, similar requirements were implemented for the military. The 1855 Missouri General Assembly approved a revision of the state code on oaths and affirmations, as they pertained to testifying in court and holding office, with comparable provisions.²²³ Many moralists gave credence to these oaths, arguing that it was perfectly acceptable for governments, which were divinely sanctioned, to require people to swear oaths to compel the proper performance of civil duties. Taking an oath was a highly solemn and sacred act because the oath, by virtue of its inherent requirements – called upon God to be a witness to the truth of the oath-giver’s words. Statute law in most American states, including Missouri, explicitly required that, to take an oath, one had to either be a Christian or at least believe in a Supreme Being – to ensure that one also believed in a future state of rewards and punishments. By the same token, to swear an oath and speak falsely, or promise falsely, was not only a violation of civil duty and secular law but the most contemptible insult of and worst sin against the Almighty.²²⁴

When imposed in Civil War Missouri, the requirement of a loyalty oath posed a crisis of conscience to ministers and other people of faith with the least bit of sympathy for the southern war effort – as suggested by the principled refusal of Farris to take it. For evangelicals with southern sympathies and integrity, a wartime loyalty oath virtually required them to incriminate themselves and run the risk of imprisonment. The forcible taking of an oath of loyalty to the federal government, and resistance thereto, implicated major issues of state encroachment on religious liberty. These violations were, conceivably, more egregious than the persecution of

ministers who published pro-southern opinions or the attempted actions of Secretary Stanton and Bishop Ames in Missouri, that is, helping the Union officials to seize pro-Confederate church property and replace pro-Confederate ministers with ones supportive of the Union. Evangelicals believed that a government-mandated oath trenched on religious freedom because to swear loyalty against conviction was a sin. After Governor Jackson was ousted, the Missouri State Convention implemented an oath in October of 1861 for public officials. The commander of the Department of Missouri, Major General Henry Halleck, duly enforced it.²²⁵ Halleck, however, went one step further in February of 1862 and issued General Order Number 29, which extended the convention's oath to a number of groups, including clergymen.²²⁶ Newspapers throughout the state printed the requirements. Without the oath, ministers could not perform functions for the state, such as marriages.²²⁷ For Unionist evangelicals, this obligation presented no problems. Southern-leaning ministers, such as Farris, on the other hand, had strenuous objections to the swearing of an oath of allegiance that he could not do in good conscious without committing a gross sin. Noted Presbyterian minister Benjamin M. Palmer, writing from Union-occupied New Orleans in 1863, reverberated that argument when faced with a similar oath.²²⁸

Evangelicals in Missouri often refused the oaths required by military officials out of a fear that they could not take them in good conscious, while others also deeply resented pro-Union officials for forcing them into this situation. The provost marshal records contain almost 14,000 citations of varying oaths. At least 1,100 were classified as loyalty oaths and another 8,000 as those of allegiance.²²⁹ Michael Fellman, in examining Missouri, came to the conclusion that a number of southern partisans, upon capture, simply took the oath required of them whether or not they could take it in good conscious. Fellman, however, does not distinguish between evangelicals and non-evangelicals.²³⁰ A number of evangelicals simply refused to take the oath

until coerced or imprisoned. George W. Houx, from Johnson County in the western part of the state, was an active Presbyterian and a Confederate soldier. While in Missouri during 1862, he was forced to take a loyalty oath, but crossed out certain sections in order to take it in good conscious.²³¹ Others, such as Methodist Emma English, from Lincoln County north of St. Louis, were unrepentant rebels. When questioned in September of 1863 on why she did not take the oath of allegiance, English responded “I understand the requirement of the oath of Allegiance to the U. S. I could not take it because I am a Southern Sympathizer and a Rebel from principle.”²³² After refusing to answer a number of the other questioned posed to her, English was exiled to the North, spending time in Illinois and Michigan.²³³ Henry N. Watts was a southern Methodist minister living in southeastern Mississippi County when he was apprehended by military authorities in July of 1863 and taken to Kentucky. Throughout the war Watts, at least officially, stayed out of politics and held that the “policy of the Church and the saving principles and power of the gospel of grace were more to him than all ‘the things which belong unto Caesar.’”²³⁴ While he took an oath to secure his release, he refused to take the military oath demanded of him, explaining that it “was as repugnant to his feelings as it was oppressive to the rights of conscience.”²³⁵

In March of 1864 General William Rosecrans, who had been in command of the Department of Missouri for about three months, angered many Missouri evangelicals when he issued his infamous General Order Number 61. Rosecrans, and his new provost marshal, Colonel John P. Sanderson, sought to repair their tarnished reputations by launching a fervent campaign against traitors in the state.²³⁶ Instead of simply requiring ministers to take an oath, it stipulated that the ordinary members of religious societies do the same. It demanded “as a condition precedent to such privilege of assemblage and protection, that each and every person attending

such Convention, Synod, Ministerium, Assembly, Conference, Council or by whatever name it may be called, and participating in the proceedings thereof, shall take and subscribe to an oath of allegiance”²³⁷ Henry Watts, one of many evangelical ministers outraged over the order, wrote Colonel Sanderson for additional information, hoping to avoid taking it. Sanderson, nonetheless, responded explaining that ministers did not have to retake the oath but “it is no less the determination of the undersigned to enforce a rigid compliance with the ordinance of the State Convention of June 10, 1862, requiring licensed and ordained preachers of the gospel to take the oath of allegiance”²³⁸ Knowing that many Missouri evangelicals were outraged by the order, Sanderson warned that those who did not take the oath “and who, under the pretense of preaching or worshiping God, meet really for seditious purposes, and, in truth, to desecrate and violate the laws of God and their country, can not [sic] be allowed so to meet or carry on their seditious purposes.”²³⁹ An article in the Liberty Tribune, moreover, backed up this interpretation of the order in Clay County. There, only those who had not already taken the oath fell under the order.²⁴⁰ Southern Methodists, attempting to meet in their annual conferences, were successful in convincing Rosecrans not to interfere with their meetings, assuring him that everyone in attendance had taken a prior oath.²⁴¹ Many in the denomination, nonetheless, were still angered by persecution through Order Number 61. William Leftwich summed up this sentiment declaring that “when State Conventions and military commanders in Missouri prepared political ‘test oaths’ for ministers of the gospel as a class, and ordered all non-juring ministers under disability, the object was not doubtful in the minds of those acquainted with the history of religious persecutions.”²⁴²

Pastor of the Hannibal Old School Presbyterian Church Aaron P. Forman pleaded with Attorney General Bates to intercede with the president on the behalf of the ministers of Missouri.

He represented Presbyterians throughout the state who echoed the Methodists' anger with Rosecrans' command. Explaining to Bates that he was a Union man throughout the war who kept his oath, Forman could not comply with the order since he did not "acknowledge the right of any power on earth to prescribe for me my qualifications as minister or member of a church court. This can be done only by Christ speaking in his word."²⁴³ Arguing that the oaths he and others had taken were sufficient to bind their consciences, he feared the repercussions of the act. In his view, the order disrupted the relationship between the church and state in Missouri since

it will tend to alienate the Christian people of the State in affection from the Government. It singles us out & holds us up as objects of suspicion. It strikes a blow at our religious rights, which are the dearest of all others. Hence it must tend to lessen our respect & love for the Government. . . . It will place us in the attitude of apparent opposition to the authorities – which we by no means desire.²⁴⁴

Others, Forman worried, might not be able to take the oath as "there are multitudes of us who cannot obey the order of General Rosecrans without a violation of conscience. And they will lay us liable to the charge of sympathy with the rebellion."²⁴⁵ To lessen the concerns of the civil authorities, Forman, acting as the stated clerk of the local Palmyra Presbytery, forwarded local Provost Marshal Major Cohen a list of several elders and ministers who had taken loyalty oaths.²⁴⁶ Bates, however, responded hoping that there would be no legal issues and wrote the St. Louis Presbytery urging them to correspond with Rosecrans "to stop this [sic] useless and wanton interference with the churches."²⁴⁷ Lincoln, also concerned about the matter, sent a letter to Rosecrans as well. Once again unwilling to interfere with his field leaders, the president wrote what he regarded as a social request instead of a command. Lincoln asserted that "I somewhat dread the effect of your Special Order, No 61 dated March 7, 1864. I have found that men who have not even been suspected of disloyalty, are very averse to taking an oath of any sort as a condition, to exercising an ordinary right of citizenship."²⁴⁸

Presbyterians both in favor and against the oath squared off at the October 1864 gathering of the Missouri Synod in Kirkwood, St. Louis County. Radical Union Presbyterians were in control of the body and proceeded to ensure that the attendees abided by the order. Several ministers and ruling elders sought to challenge the Radical majority. Samuel S. Watson, an elder from the St. Charles Presbyterian Church, attempted to present himself as a duly appointed representative of his congregation and was denied that right by the clerk of the synod since he did not have a certificate saying he took the loyalty oath. In his words, “I gave my name as the Representative of the St. Charles Church; but not having exhibited a certificate that I had taken an oath of allegiance, as required by a certain military order, the Synod refused to enroll my name among its members.”²⁴⁹ His pastor, Robert Farris, was treated likewise when he did not show a certificate. Charles Drake, attending the synod in his capacity as a ruling elder of the Second Presbyterian Church in St. Louis, responded to the refusal of Farris and Watson, along with several others, to abide by the Rosecrans order. He explained “it is, therefore, the law of the land, and everybody, every where [sic], under all circumstances, is amenable to it. It is, to me, the law of God.”²⁵⁰ Farris, who studied law under Senator Trusten Polk prior to his ordination, certainly knew the murky legal and religious ground with which Drake was basing his assertion. In his view, Farris could not carry out the order because he “could not with good conscience, practically admit that any civil or military power whatsoever has any right to prescribe the qualifications of members of Courts in the Church of Jesus Christ.”²⁵¹ Observers, such as William Leftwich, agreed with Farris’ characterization of the synod. Leftwich said “the members of the Synod who were Radical in politics hastily swallowed the oath and then leagued with the military authorities to oust from their seats and eject from the body those who preferred Christ as the Head of the Church to Caesar or Rosecranz [sic].”²⁵² Those who had not present papers to

satisfy the synod were subsequently ignored for the remainder of the meeting and were not allowed to participate as members.²⁵³

With the support of many in their congregation, Farris and Watson took their grievances against the synod to the General Assembly. The St. Charles Presbyterian Church sent a complaint on Samuel Watson's behalf to the national body in 1865 and Farris sent another as well. The church's judicial committee combined both cases, since they were virtually indistinguishable, but ruled against both Watson and Farris. William Henry Green, a professor at the Princeton Theological Seminary and chair of the committee, gave its report, which was adapted by the general assembly. In his estimation, notwithstanding the fact that they were ignored by the synod, the general assembly had no choice but to rule against Watson and Farris since it was "only a decision of the Moderator affecting the complainants, from which they made no appeal to the body of the Synod."²⁵⁴ A Louisville, Kentucky minister, Samuel R. Wilson, nonetheless, entered a protest of the decision into the record on the behalf of several other commissioners. Central to his point was that "the decision of the Moderator of the Synod being acquiesced in by the silence of the members became thereby the decision of the body itself, for which they are strictly responsible."²⁵⁵ While they may have harbored reservations on the Rosecrans loyalty oath, Wilson and his group did not take a side on its legality within the synod meeting. Instead, they hoped for a decision to clarify the role of the church in similar proceedings. Wilson explained that the assembly should have fully addressed the questions involved "and given so clear and unequivocal a deliverance in the premises, as would have satisfied the whole Church that it is their purpose to maintain the freedom of Christ's commonwealth, and to protect the ministers and elders of the Church in the enjoyment and

exercise of their constitutional rights.”²⁵⁶ In response, the committee reiterated its earlier ruling on the case.²⁵⁷

The Emergence of a New Civil Religion

By the end of the Civil War, Unionists and Radicals had employed military might and the power of revamped civilian government to impose on Missouri a new civil religion grounded fundamentally in abolitionist theology and related political ideals. The contentious antebellum question of whether republican and constitutional principles requiring the free exercise of religion should or could wall off abolitionist views from public policy on slavery was ultimately not answered by either church or civil tribunals or representative bodies. The established political processes of constitutional civil government had proved incapable of resolving the tensions between the old regime supported by pro-slavery evangelicals and the new order that religious anti-slavery evangelicals advanced. National ecclesiastical governments and those in Border States like Missouri had similarly shown themselves to be incapable of resolving the religious differences that undergirded the opposing world views of pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals. Raw military force, justified by Lincoln’s invocation of presidential war powers, in fact, worked the epochal transformation in social, civil, and political relations. Northern political calculations and public opinion provided the primary restraints on the employment of Union military power to construct permanent state and national policies that comported with abolitionist religious understandings of equality and individual liberty.

Evangelicals in Missouri perceived Unionist tactics as nothing less than tyranny. Pro-Union evangelicals who supported the Union took the view that the sinfulness of slavery was so extreme and politically inequitable that the federal government and its military properly intervened with unrelenting force. Noncombatants with southern sympathies who incurred the

wrath of Union military forces lodged strenuous complaints that Lincoln and the United States government had run roughshod over the constitutional right of a state to secede and of individuals to property in slaves. That Lincoln had acted extra-constitutionally as commander in chief became a truism among these individuals.²⁵⁸ But evangelicals with southern affiliations insisted with at least equal vigor that abolitionists and their Union allies had sabotaged the separation of church and state and trampled on their civil liberties, including freedom of speech, the press, and the free exercise of religion. Missouri southern Methodist minister William M. Leftwich concluded in his 1870 memoir that suppression of pro-Confederate evangelical newspapers and the imprisonment of ministers with southern affiliations during the war constituted an unprecedented descent into despotism. According to Leftwich, federal and state authorities had “inaugurated and legalized . . . a systematic proscription and persecution of ministers of the gospel, as a class.”²⁵⁹ In his view, “. . . her prison walls and military bastilles have re-enacted the scenes of persecution, and her officers, courts and mobs have repeated the history of religious intolerance and proscription we had associated only with the ignorance, superstition and tyranny of the long silent past.”²⁶⁰

Union leaders might well have justified the social, civil, and political revolutions wrought by the war by adverting to well-established, purely secular constitutional understandings. Liberties, including freedom of religion, had never been absolute in the Anglo-American legal and political tradition. Lincoln and his supporters in Missouri suppressed pro-Confederate evangelical religious practice because they deemed it a threat to the war effort and the sanctity of the Union. Leftwich, it seems, conveniently chose not to take into account that government officials had the authority to punish severely not only treason and rebellion, but also sedition and seditious libel, especially in time of war. Liberties had always been conditional and qualified by

the larger imperative of government to promote the public good. And state governments, including that of Missouri, had always been structured to reflect this imperative.²⁶¹ By late spring of 1865, African Americans in Missouri were, officially at least, a viable segment of the public – whose liberties, in accordance with the time-tested constitutional balancing of individual and public rights, trumped the demands of pro-Confederate partisans, religious and otherwise.

Union victory elevated to the status of a new civil religion abolitionist religious commitments to civil and political equality for African Americans and loyalty to the Union. Numerous historians, such as Steven E. Woodworth and Gary Gallagher, have investigated the way Union and Confederate soldiers alike marched to battle believing God was on their side, both believing that they were fighting a just war.²⁶² Union and Confederate soldiers in Missouri similarly placed a keen importance on their faith.²⁶³ According to historian Harry S. Stout, the sacred devotion of northerners and southern to their respective causes, the clash between contending faiths, and the horrific blood sacrifice, transformed a war fought for politics and necessity into twin moral crusade in which both sides fought under the banner of freedom. In this conception, the Civil War produced a unifying civil religion and new conceptions of nationhood.²⁶⁴ It is the contention here, however, that Union forces in Missouri employed overwhelming military might to establish a form of government thoroughly inimical to the social, civil, and political ideology that had sustained the state as an organic and hierarchically-structured slave society. Central to this complex of thought and devotion was pro-slavery evangelical religion, which had served in tandem with conservative versions of natural law, southern moral philosophy, and a combination of state and federal constitutional precepts to explain and justify the old regime. Radical political power and Union military forces in Missouri thus substantially undercut a religious worldview that United States leaders deemed inimical to

the institutionalization of abolitionist understandings of civil and political order – understandings that the contentious evangelical schisms from 1837 through 1845 had forged and strengthened. By the end of the war, United States forces had reorganized government so as to establish a new political orthodoxy, one constructed squarely on liberty for African Americans, patriotism, and loyalty to the Union. Before 1861, abolitionists had advocated equal civil and political rights for blacks in the name of right religion. By 1865, these beliefs and sentiments formed the core of a new, unitary, and solitary creed for bona fide citizenship. The bloody institutionalization of abolitionist civil and political relations invested loyalty to the Union with equally sacred meanings. For the victors at least, anti-slavery evangelical tenets of faith, undergirded by Providence, passed into the realm of universal moral truth well-tailored, along with the imperative of loyalty, to serve as undeniable, nonsectarian first principles of American liberty and government.

Conclusions

Anti-slavery Unionists in Missouri during the Civil War embraced the view that disloyalty to the United States and support of slavery were tantamount to sin, a position that northern evangelicals, Union troops, and Radical Republicans sought to impose as a new civil religion on southern evangelicals via wartime ecclesiastical sanctions and loyalty oaths. Such sentiments prompted Union authorities to muzzle the pro-slavery evangelical press, while spurring Unionist evangelicals to appropriate the church lands and buildings of their pro-slavery counterparts. Challenged in the courts by dispossessed southern evangelicals, these were seizures that local tribunals under Radical control generally ratified in the name of well-established rules of ecclesiastical law, constitutional doctrine, and equity jurisprudence. This variegated body of law, however, did not determine such outcomes as much as did the religious, social, and political

preferences of partisan judges. Their rulings, moreover, obscured the boundaries of church and state, while powerfully shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and the armed struggle.

The heightened ideological conflict generated by the evangelical schisms 1837-1845 fundamentally shaped the northern war effort in Missouri and the social, political, and ideological revolution that Unionist leaders imposed on defeated pro-Confederate partisans. While abolitionists in Kansas had established the conditions in which slaves began liberating themselves as early as 1854, African Americans in Missouri ultimately took the most decisive initial steps toward establishing on the ground abolitionist religious views that incorporated equality for African Americans. By the same token, anti-slavery evangelicals and their Radical allies in Missouri extinguished property in human beings. More than any other wartime development, this redefinition of fundamental liberties gave effect to the radical vision advanced by abolitionists in the state – an encompassing worldview resulting from schism-generated strife with pro-slavery evangelicals wedded to a theology that undergirded hierarchical and organic social, civil, and political relations. Continuing conflict in wartime Missouri between evangelical congregations and denominations took on harsh new features that included Union efforts to curtail accustomed religious liberty. United States authorities, the Union army, and Radical state officials combined with abolitionists to seize the lands and meeting houses of evangelicals suspected of Confederate sympathies or otherwise co-opted control of their churches. Union military forces joined with pro-Union evangelicals in an effort to destroy the religious belief and praxis they deemed inimical to the Union war effort. Pro-slavery evangelicalism and related views of social, civil, and political order were tantamount to treason in the view of most Union officials. Anti-slavery evangelicals were, consequently, often at the complete mercy of Union

officials, federal troops, and pro-Union Missouri militia units. The institutionalization of abolitionist understandings of civil and political equality entailed rigorous suppression of the accustomed liberty to express religious ideas. Printed publication of pro-slavery views no longer merited any consideration or constitutional protection. Union troops and irregular pro-Union partisans ruthlessly suppressed pro-Confederate evangelical newspapers. Lincoln justified these encroachments by invoking military necessity and his war powers as commander in chief. Union officials and Radical leaders in Missouri, furthermore, imposed a number of loyalty oaths on suspect citizens, including both ministers and influential evangelical laity – a practice that created distinctive dilemmas of conscience for them. With victory in 1865, Union military authorities and Radical state officials had succeeded in revamping government in ways that substantially undercut the worldview to which pro-slavery evangelicals had adhered. Union military supremacy, in Missouri and elsewhere, thus institutionalized a new civil religion for the nation. Abolitionist religious commitments to civil and political equality for African Americans and loyalty to a perpetual Union constituted its war-hardened core.

Notes

¹ Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the Year 1861 (Nashville, 1861), 302.

² Rev. W. M. Leftwich, D. D., Martyrdom in Missouri: A History of Religious Persecution, the Seizure of Churches, and the Persecution of Ministers of the Gospel, in the State of Missouri, 2 vols. (St. Louis, 1870), 1:396.

³ *Ibid.*, 1:394-97.

⁴ Union Provost Marshals' File of Papers Relating to Individual Citizens, F1266, B. H. Spencer, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.* The general's name is illegible in the letter.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Union Provost Marshals' File, F1266, B. H. Spencer; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:409.

⁹ Union Provost Marshals' File, F1266, B. H. Spencer; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:397-410.

¹⁰ The Indiana men who sent the letter were John W. Harrison, Dr. H. Labarre, Franklin M. McMurray, Dr. George W. Miller, James Knox, J. J. Billingsley, A. D. Billingsley. Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:410-15; Walter Rice Sharp, "Henry S. Lane and the Formation of the Republican Party in Indiana," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 7, No. 2 (Sept., 1920): 93-97.

¹¹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:415.

¹² Union Provost Marshals' File, F1266, B. H. Spencer.

¹³ James McPherson, in 1965, revealed the extraordinary contributions of African Americans to the struggle, as soldiers and otherwise, while also taking into account their shifting attitudes toward Lincoln and his measured emancipation proclamations. James M. McPherson, The Negro's Civil War: How American Blacks Felt and Acted During the War for the Union (New York : Pantheon Books, 1965). More recently, Joseph T. Glatthaar examines the heroism of African American troops in the Union Army, as well as their uneasy alliances with white officers. Joseph T. Glatthaar, Forged in Battle: The Civil War Alliance of Black Soldiers and White Officers (New York : Free Press ; London : Collier Macmillan, 1990).

¹⁴ Stephen V. Ash, The Black Experience in the Civil War South (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2010).

¹⁵ Fellman, "Emancipation in Missouri," 41, 44, 48, 50-51, 54, 56.

¹⁶ According to Hyman, "From Northern pulpits, ministers of all faiths and denominations poured hell-fire on the head of traitor. They furnished Holy Writ proof of the sacred nature of American government, and the duty of obedience to it which every citizen owes." State and federal authorities, as well as courts, sought to expose disloyal persons as "fomenters of disorder" and "moral lepers." Religion, patriotism, and the logic of events joined to pressure authorities for the tools to mark the Unionist from the traitor." Harold Melvin Hyman, Era

of the Oath: Northern Loyalty Tests During the Civil War and Reconstruction (New York: Octagon Books, 1978), iii-iv.

¹⁷ Ibid., 95-120; Harold M. Hyman, To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1959), 1-138.

¹⁸ Nerone, Violence Against the Press, 116-27, 226-29.

¹⁹ Nerone, Violence Against the Press, 116-27, 226-29.

²⁰ Richard B. Kielbowicz, "The Law and Mob Law in Attacks on Antislavery Newspapers, 1833-1860," Law and History Review, 24, No. 3 (Fall 2006): 559-63.

²¹ Historians have duly chronicled Union military policies that flouted constitutional protections of free speech and due process, including arbitrary arrests, the use of military commissions, and the associated suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by Lincoln in April 1861, which Congress approved in March 1863. Most historians have characterized Lincoln in heroic terms for his determined efforts to balance the exigencies of war against constitutional protections of individual liberty. Lincoln generally gets high marks for invoking his war powers as commander in chief and "military necessity" to permit his army officers to deal summarily with dissenting "copperhead" Democratic politicians and newspaper editors, immigrant draft rioters in the North, and Border State saboteurs. Eric Foner, The Fiery Trial Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010); James M. McPherson, Abraham Lincoln (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); William Lee Miller, President Lincoln: The Duty of a Statesman (New York: Random House, 2008); Richard Striner, Father Abraham: Lincoln's Relentless Struggle to End Slavery (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Doris Kearns Goodwin, Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005); Allen C. Guelzo, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004); William E. Gienapp, Abraham Lincoln and the Civil War: A Biography (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Allen C. Guelzo, Abraham Lincoln: Redeemer President (Grand Rapids: W.E. Eerdmans, 1999); Douglas L. Wilson, Honor's Voice: The Transformation of Abraham Lincoln (New York: Random House, 1998); William Shaw Paludan, The Presidency of Abraham Lincoln (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1994); Mark E. Neely, Jr., The Last Best Hope on Earth: Abraham Lincoln and the Promise of America (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993); James M. McPherson, Abraham Lincoln and the Second American Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Stephen B. Oates, With Malice Toward None: The Life of Abraham Lincoln (New York: Harper & Row, 1977). But see Mark A. Neely, Jr., The Fate of Liberty: Abraham Lincoln and Civil Liberties (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); James G. Randall, Lincoln the President, 4 vols. (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1945-53). The last volume of the forgoing set was completed by Richard N. Current. Benjamin Thomas, Abraham Lincoln: A Biography (New York: Knopf, 1952); James G. Randall, Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1926).

As with Dred Scott v. Sandford, historians who cast Lincoln in heroic terms generally dismiss the ruling of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney in Ex parte Merryman (1861), which condemned

Lincoln's suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Stone, Perilous Times, pp. 217-32; James M. McPherson, Tried by War: Lincoln as Commander in Chief (New York: Penguin Group, 2008), 28-30; Daniel Farber, Lincoln's Constitution (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 20, 47; Carwardine, Lincoln, 249-309. And see generally Allen C. Guelzo, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America (New York & London: Simon & Schuster (2004).

The voluminous body of work examining the question of civil liberties during wartime generally focuses on outspoken dissidents and the inherent tensions between protecting liberties of the press, speech, and association and the exigencies of national security. Most constitutional historians have concentrated on the persecution of loyalists during the American Revolution, Jeffersonian Republicans during the 1798 Quasi-War, criminal syndicalists, socialists, and anarchists during World War I, and communists during World War II and the Cold War era. See, for example, Geoffrey R. Stone, Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime: From the Sedition Act of 1798 to the War on Terrorism (New York & London: W. W Norton & Co., 2004), 3-14, 104-05.

²² As have numerous constitutional scholars, Curtis focuses on the case of Clement Vallandigham, an ex-Ohio congressman who was a vigorous opponent of the Lincoln administration and its promulgation of the war. After giving a vehemently anti-Lincoln speech, the outspoken congressman was arrested and placed on trial before a military commission. Vallandigham was eventually exiled to the Confederacy and soon found his way to Canada. But critics of the administration argued that Vallandigham's anti-war rhetoric was constitutionally-protected free speech. Others emphasized that Vallandigham had exercised a human right central to democratic government and that his arrest violated popular sovereignty. Lincoln's supporters, on the other hand, asserted that, in time of war, public speech that threatened the war effort should be quelled, relying on centuries-old common law libel doctrine that permitted publications having a "dangerous tendency" inimical to the public good. While Vallandigham's racist motivations were, unjustifiable in retrospect, the high regard many Americans had for free speech sustained energetic public criticism of repressive practices. Michael Kent Curtis, Free Speech, "The People's Darling Privilege," Struggles for Freedom of Expression in American History (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000), 300-56.

²³ Taking into account also the disproportionately large number of civilians arrested by Union authorities in Missouri, Neely concludes, the Lincoln administration failed miserably. Lincoln paid too little attention to the West in the first years of the war and, thereafter, acted with insufficient decisiveness to meet the extraordinary situation in the state. Once Confederate forces had been driven from Missouri, Lincoln could formulate no coherent policy other than that his military commanders "compel the excited people there to leave one another alone." Mark E. Neely, Jr., The Fate of Liberty: Abraham Lincoln and Civil Liberties (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 49-50. See also James F. Simon, Lincoln and Chief Justice Taney: Slavery, Secession, and the President's War Powers (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), 37, 38, 90, 98-104, 115, 183-84, 201-03, 219.

²⁴ See, for example, McPherson, Tried by War; Farber, Lincoln's Constitution; Simon, Lincoln and Chief Justice Taney; Brian McGinty, Lincoln and the Court (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

²⁵ St. Louis Republican, 8 January 1852; Kansas City Star, 2 July 1905; Wilbur H. Siebert, The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom (New York: Macmillan Co., 1898), 97-98, 147; St. Louis Weekly Pilot, 28 April 1855; A. A. Minick, "The Underground Railway in Nebraska," Collections of the Nebraska State Historical Society, ser. 2, vol. 2, p. 70; n. a., History of Clay and Platte Counties, Missouri (Platte City: Platte County Historical Society, 1885), 632; Missouri Statesman, 29 June 1855; Parkville Democrat, 16 June 1855; James Redpath, Public Life of Captain John Brown (Boston, 1860), p. 221; Missouri State Census, 1856; Senate Journal, 10th Assembly, 1st Session; House Journal, 20th Assembly, 1st Session, appendix, pp. 79-80; September 22 & 28, 1855, St. Joseph Commercial Cycle; William Kauscher, Oregon, Missouri, Fourth of July Speech, 1876, "Holt County During the War," William Hyde Scrapbook, volume on "Early St. Louis and Missouri," Missouri Valley Special Collections, Kansas City Public Library, Kansas City, Missouri; Harrison A. Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1914), 204-7.

²⁶ William E. Parrish, A History of Missouri. Volume III 1860-1875 (Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press, 1973), 89; Michael Fellman, "Emancipation in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 83.1 (Oct 1988): 49, 36-56.

²⁷ Parrish, A History of Missouri, 88.

²⁸ Eighth Federal Census, Population, p. 280; Report of the State Auditor of Missouri for 1865, p. 39.

²⁹ Parrish, A History of Missouri, 104.

³⁰ Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 206, 238-39.

³¹ William M. Paxton, Annals of Platte County, Missouri (Kansas City: Hudson-Kimberly, 1897) May 1864, 362.

³² *Ibid.*, 99; Rev. J. G. Foreman, The Western Sanitary Commission: A sketch of its origin, history, labors for the sick and wounded of the Western armies, and aid given to the freedmen and Union refugees, with incidents of hospital life (St. Louis, 1864), pp. 111-12.

³³ Parrish, A History of Missouri, p. 150.

³⁴ Fellman, "Emancipation in Missouri," 48.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 41, 44.

³⁶ John W. Blassingame, "The Recruitment of Colored Troops in Kentucky, Maryland, and Missouri 1863-1865," Historian 29.4 (Fall 1967): 533-45.

³⁷ Fellman, "Emancipation in Missouri," 47.

³⁸ Annals of Platte County, February 1 & April 1, 1865, 325, 327.

³⁹ Parrish, A History of Missouri, p. 105; Journal, Missouri State Radical Convention, 1863, p. 10.

⁴⁰ Fellman, "Emancipation in Missouri," 41, 44, 48, 50-51, 54, 56.

⁴¹ Quoted in Fellman, "Emancipation in Missouri," 51.

⁴² James M. McPherson, Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001), 525-26; Leon F. Litwack, Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery (New York: Knopf, 1979), 171, et seq.; Eugene D. Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made (New York: Random House, 1974), 110; Laura F. Edwards, Gendered Strife and Confusion: The Political Culture of Reconstruction (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 1-65.

⁴³ Laws of A Public and General Nature, of the Territory of Louisiana, the Territory of Missouri, up to the Year 1824 2 vols. (1842), 1: ch. 3, secs. 21, 22; Laws of the State of Missouri, 1825, vol. 1, p. 283, sec. 13.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 172; St. Louis Republican, 24 July 1841; Palmyra Missouri Whig and General Advertiser, 17 July 1841; St. Louis Bulletin, 13 September 1841; Session Laws, 1842, p. 133, secs. 1-3; Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri, 845, ch. 168, secs. 7 & 9; James S. Thomas Scrapbook, vol. 1, St. Louis Mercantile Library, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, Collection M-92; p. 26; House Journal, 13th Assembly, 1st Session, p. 332; Session Laws, 1846, p. 360.

⁴⁵ St. Louis Daily Union, 6 January 1849; Jefferson Inquirer, 17 December 1853.

⁴⁶ J. N. Holloway, History of Kansas from the First Exploration of the Mississippi Valley to its Admission into the Union (Lafayette, Ind.: James, Emmons, & Co., 1868), 97; Weston Platte Argus, 26 December 1856; Columbia, Weekly Missouri Sentinel, 28 April 1853.

⁴⁷ John W. Burgess, The Middle Period, 1817-1858 (New York, 1897), ch. 19; William F. Switzler, Illustrated History of Missouri (St. Louis, 1877), 282; Richmond Weekly Mirror, September 15, 1854; House Journal, 18th Assembly, 1st Sess., pp. 35-36; Siebert, The Underground Railroad, 194; M. S. Hardeman to George R. Smith, June 10, 1855, Smith-Cotton Family, Papers, 1834-1929, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, Collection 0399, Folder 1; Perley Ormond Ray, The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Its Origin and Authorship (Cleveland, 1909), 247.

⁴⁸ Platte County Self-Defensive Association, Benjamin F. Stringfellow, ed. Negro-Slavery, No Evil, or The North and the South (St. Louis, 1854), 1, 5-6.

⁴⁹ Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 173.

⁵⁰ Proceedings and Resolutions of the Pro-Slavery Convention, held at Lexington July 13 to 15, 1855 (St. Louis, 1855), 29.

⁵¹ Editorial in Richmond Weekly Mirror, 26 January 1855.

⁵² Proceedings and Resolutions of the Pro-Slavery Convention, 11.

⁵³ James Shannon, An Address Delivered Before the Pro-Slavery Convention of the State of Missouri, Held in Lexington, July 13, 1855 (St. Louis, 1855), 9.

⁵⁴ House Journal, 18th Assembly, 1st Session, p. 296, and appendix, p. 313, February 14, 1857; House Journal, 14th Assembly, 1st Session, appendix, p. 54; Senate Journal, 17th Assembly, 1st Session, appendix, p. 223; Senate Journal, 18th Assembly, 1st Session, p. 284; Senate Journal, 20th Assembly, 1st Session, app., p. 138; House Journal, 21st Assembly, 1st Session, appendix, p. 314; Session Laws, 1860, p. 90.

-
- ⁵⁵ Congressional Globe, 36th Cong., 2d Session, p. 356; 1860 United States Census, Population, p. xv.
- ⁵⁶ James McPherson, Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 356.
- ⁵⁷ Michael Linfield, Freedom Under Fire: US Civil Liberties in Time of War (Boston: South End Press, 1999), 23, 30-32.
- ⁵⁸ David Herbert Donald, Lincoln (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 314.
- ⁵⁹ Paxton, Annals of Platte County, Missouri (1897), p. 317; Vernon L. Volpe, "The Frémonts and Emancipation in Missouri," Historian 56.2 (Winter 1994): 330-347; Switzler, History of Missouri, 391; Parrish, A History of Missouri, 88.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ⁶¹ Stephen E. Abrose, Halleck: Lincoln's Chief of Staff (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962), 7, 11, 23, 60, 46, 75, 122, 146, 206; Ezra J. Warner, Generals in Blue: Lives of the Union Commanders (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964), 195-97; John C. Fredriksen, "Henry Wager Halleck," in Encyclopedia of the American Civil War: A Political, Social, and Military History, ed. David S. Heidler and Jeanne T. Heidler (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000), 908-911.
- ⁶² Henry W. Halleck, International Law; or, Rules Regulating the Intercourse of States in Peace and War (New York, 1861), 457; Elements of International Law and Laws of War (Philadelphia, 1866), 209.
- ⁶³ Michael Vorenberg, "Abraham Lincoln and the Politics of Black Colonization," Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association 14.2 (Summer 1993): 27.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., 28. On December 31, 1861, Lincoln signed an agreement with ambitious profiteer Bernard Kock, self-styled governor of à Vache Island, to establish a colony of freed American slaves on Ile à Vache, a dependency of Haiti. Jay Monaghan, Diplomat in Carpet Slippers - Abraham Lincoln Deals with Foreign Affairs (Indianapolis & New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1945), 272.
- ⁶⁵ Vorenberg, "Lincoln and Colonization," 23.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., 30.
- ⁶⁷ Parrish, A History of Missouri, 89; Donnie D. Bellamy, "The Persistency of Colonization in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 72.1 (Oct 1977): 1-24; Forty-Third Annual Report of the American Colonization Society, p. 3; Fortieth Annual Report of the American Colonization Society, pp. 16, 21.
- ⁶⁸ Jefferson Inquirer, 22 November 1845.
- ⁶⁹ Resolutions of the Methodist Episcopal Church Annual Conference, 1835; St. Louis Daily Evening Herald, 1 October 1835; J. Thomas Scharf, History of St. Louis City and County, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Louis H. Evarts & Co., 1883), 2:1757.
- ⁷⁰ Vorenberg, "Lincoln and Colonization," 25, 22-45; P. J. Staudenraus, The African Colonization Movement (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), 240-50.

-
- ⁷¹ Rev. James A. Lyon, An Address on the Missionary Aspect of African Colonization (St. Louis: T. W. Ustick, 1850), 20-21; Nathan Lewis Rice, Ten Letters on the Subject of Slavery Addressed to the Delegates from the Congregational Associations to the Last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, 2d ed. (St. Louis, 1856), 6, 91-14.
- ⁷² Shannon, An Address, 20. The theological, political, and constitutional arguments set out in Shannon's address were drawn directly from an essay he published while still the president of Bacon College in Kentucky. See James Shannon, The Philosophy of Slavery, as Identified with the Philosophy of Human Happiness (Frankfort, Ky., 1849), 11-12.
- ⁷³ Paxton, Annals of Platte County, 317; Switzler, History of Missouri, 391-392.
- ⁷⁴ Eugene H. Berwanger, "Lincoln's Constitutional Dilemma: Emancipation and Black Suffrage," Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association 5 (1983): 26 pars. 5 Sep. 2010, at <<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/jala/5/berwanger.html>>.
- ⁷⁵ Vernon L. Volpe, "The Frémonts and Emancipation in Missouri," Historian 56.2 (Winter 1994): 330-347.
- ⁷⁶ Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 234.
- ⁷⁷ Constitution and By Laws of the General Emancipation Society of Missouri, (St. Louis, 1862).
- ⁷⁸ Parrish, A History of Missouri, p. 89.
- ⁷⁹ Vorenberg, "Lincoln and Colonization," 30; Roy P. Basler, ed., Marion D. Pratt and Lloyd A. Dunlap, asst. eds., The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln, 9 vols. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953-55), 5:192.
- ⁸⁰ Vorenberg, "Lincoln and Colonization," 29.
- ⁸¹ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1862, p. 40.
- ⁸² Senate Journal, 22d Assembly, 1st Session (December 1862), pp. 13-15; Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1862, p. 40.
- ⁸³ The vote to table the measure passed 52 to 19. Journal, Appendix, and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City, June 2 to 14, 1862, p. 37; Journal, Appendix, and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City, June 2 to 14, 1862 (St. Louis, 1862), p. 19.
- ⁸⁴ The vote was 35 to 30. Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1862, pp. 45-46.
- ⁸⁵ Milton (of color) v. McKarney, 31 Mo. 175 (1860); Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 230-34.
- ⁸⁶ James G. Randall and David Donald, 2d ed. The Civil War and Reconstruction (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), 372-76, 397.
- ⁸⁷ House Journal, 22d Assembly, 1st Session, pp. 129-141; The same resolution passed in the Senate on January 26, 1863 26 to 2, with four members not present. Senate Journal, 22d Assembly, 1st Sen., pp. 115-140.
- ⁸⁸ Article 3, section 26: "The general assembly shall have no power to pass laws; First, For the emancipation of slaves without the consent of their owners, or without paying them, before such emancipation, a full equivalent for such slaves so emancipated; and, Second, To prevent bona fide emigrants to this state, or actual settlers therein, from bringing from any of the United States, or from any of their territories, such persons as may there be deemed to be slaves, so long

as any persons of the same description are allowed to be held as slaves by the laws of this state.” Mo. Const. of 1820.

⁸⁹ Journal, Appendix, and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City, June 15 to July 1, 1863 (St. Louis, 1863), pp. 1-5.

⁹⁰ Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, 1863, p. 12.

Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, 1863, pp. 24-25, 29, Appendix, p. 13.

⁹¹ Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, 1863, pp. 36-38, 47-48.

⁹² Ibid., pp. 3, 47-48

⁹³ Vorenberg, “Lincoln and Colonization,” 23-24.

⁹⁴ Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, 1863, pp. 28-29.

⁹⁵ Ephriam J. Wilson to General Odon Guitar, near Palmyra, July 27, 1863, Odon Guitar Papers, 1832-1865, State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts, Collection 0882, Folder 2; Fellman, “Emancipation in Missouri,” 43.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, pp. 234-38.

⁹⁸ Speech at Jefferson City, September 1, 1863; Charles Daniel Drake, Union and Anti-Slavery Speeches, Delivered During the Rebellion (Cincinnati, 1864), pp. 348-349.

⁹⁹ Speech at Jefferson City, September 1, 1863, in Drake, Union and Anti-Slavery Speeches, 348-49.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 348-357.

¹⁰¹ Charles Daniel Drake, Journal, Missouri State Radical Emancipation Convention, Jefferson City, Missouri, September 1-3, 1863, p. 26.

¹⁰² Ibid., pp. 27, 39-40.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁰⁴ Randal and Donald, Civil War and Reconstruction, 380, et seq.; Michael Vorenberg, “Abraham Lincoln and the Politics of Black Colonization,” Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association 14.2 (Summer 1993): 31.

¹⁰⁵ Parrish, A History of Missouri, p. 105.

¹⁰⁶ Drake, Missouri State Radical Emancipation Convention (1863), p. 162.

¹⁰⁷ Switzler, History of Missouri, 446.

¹⁰⁸ Session Laws, 1863, p. 108.

¹⁰⁹ Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 234, 239-40.

¹¹⁰ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, held at St. Louis January 6 to April 10, 1865, p. 453

¹¹¹ Journal and Appendix of the Missouri State Convention (St. Louis, 1865), pp. 13, 26-27, 281, 453. A manuscript copy written on parchment, perhaps the original, is in the Missouri Historical Society. On the back in red ink is the following: “Ordinance of Emancipation, Filed May 14th 1865, Francis Rodman, Secretary of State.”

¹¹² “Proclamation of Freedom,” January 11, 1865, reprinted from Miscellaneous Documents, No. 9, 38th Congress, 2d Session, House of Representatives, in n. a., “Missouri

History Not Found in Textbooks,” Missouri Historical Review 23.3 (April 1929): 509, 496-515.

¹¹³ J. G. Nicolay and John Hay, “Abraham Lincoln: A History. The Hampton Roads Conference,” The Century (October 1889): 846-52.

¹¹⁴ House Journal, 23d Assembly, 1st Session, p. 300; Senate Journal, 23d Assembly, 1st Session, p. 250.

¹¹⁵ Senate Journal, 23d Assembly, 1st Sess., p. 303; Session Laws, 1864-65, p. 134.

¹¹⁶ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1865, Appendix, p. 255.

¹¹⁷ Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 238-39.

¹¹⁸ Fellman, “Emancipation in Missouri,” 48.

¹¹⁹ U. S. Constitution, Amendment I. In Gitlow v. New York, 268 U.S. 652 (1925), the United States Supreme Court held that, under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, the First Amendment applied to the states.

¹²⁰ Mo. Const. (1820), Art. 13 Declaration of Rights, §§ 3, 4, & 16.

¹²¹ Mark E. Neely, Jr., The Fate of Liberty: Abraham Lincoln and Civil Liberties (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 49-50. See also James F. Simon, Lincoln and Chief Justice Taney: Slavery, Secession, and the President’s War Powers (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), 37, 38, 90, 98-104, 115, 183-84, 201-03, 219.

¹²² Neely, Fate of Liberty, 39.

¹²³ Nerone, Violence Against the Press, 116-27, 226-29.

¹²⁴ The oath was set out in its entirety as follows: “I, . . . , do solemnly swear (or affirm, as the case may be) that I will support, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of Missouri against all enemies and opposers, whether domestic or foreign; that I will bear true faith, loyalty and allegiance to the United States, and will not, directly or indirectly, give aid and comfort or countenance to the enemies or opposers thereof, or of the Provisional Government of the State of Missouri, . . . and that I do this with a full and honest determination, pledge and purpose, faithfully to keep and perform the same, without any mental reservation or evasion whatever. And I do further solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have not, since the 17th day of December, A.D. 1861, willfully taken up arms or levied war against the United States or against the Provisional Government of the State of Missouri. So help me God.”

For the full ordinance, see the website of the Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri, at

<http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/resources/civilwar/resources.asp?id=loyalty>>. See also Maxine Dunaway, Civil War period data from Thomas A. Peters ledger, 1861/62-1864, Polk County, Missouri: Including some Polk County loyalty oaths, 1862-64 (M. Dunaway, 1984).

¹²⁵ Baptists, other than those who were official delegates to the association meeting, frequently attended to hear the preaching. Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1861, 7;

W. Pope Yeaman, A History of the Missouri General Baptist Association (Columbia, 1899), 119-20.

¹²⁶ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:365-66.

¹²⁷ Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1862, 7.

¹²⁸ Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 123-24.

¹²⁹ Lewis, Methodism in Missouri 1860 to 1870, 70.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 354-59.

¹³¹ Ibid., 69-72, 93-94. Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the year 1861 (Nashville, 1861), 301-3; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the year 1862, (Nashville, 1862), 372; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the year 1863, (Nashville, 1863), 427-29; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the year 1864, (Nashville, 1864), 486-87; Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the year 1865, (Nashville, 1865), 541-43.

¹³² D. R. McAnally, The Life and Labors of Rev. E. M. Marvin, DD, LLD One of the Bishops of the M. E. Church, South (St. Louis, 1878), 178-81, 187-90; E. M. Marvin, Life of William Goff Caples of the Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (St. Louis, 1870), 261; Thomas M. Finney, The Life and Labors of Enoch Mather Marvin, Late Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (St. Louis, 1880), 177-78; Union Provost Marshal's File, Emma S. English, F1312.

¹³³ Centennial Addresses: Synod of Missouri, United States Central Church, Kansas City, October 12, 1932: 1832-1932 (Kansas City, 1932), 13.

¹³⁴ True Loyalty and Independence of the Church (St. Louis, 1865), 26-27; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:69-70.

¹³⁵ Centennial Addresses: Synod of Missouri, 13.

¹³⁶ Guerillas ran out of the county New School minister George S. Woodard. George S. Park, who once again resided in Platte County during the war, constantly begged for Union military assistance to counter guerillas, who devastated the area. W. M. Paxton, Annals of Platte County, Missouri, From its Exploration Down to June 1, 1897 (Kansas City, 1897), 963; The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies Vols. I-LXX (Washington, 1880-1901), 41:134-35.

¹³⁷ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:339.

¹³⁸ "The Burnings in Boone County," Missouri Statesman, 3 October 1862, p. 3; "Outrageous Conduct of Federal Troops . . .," Ibid., 26 September 1862, p. 2; "War in Boone County . . .," Ibid., 3 January 1862, p. 1; History of Boone County Missouri (St. Louis, 1882), 944-45, 1115-16.

¹³⁹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:340.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 1:339-40.

¹⁴¹ Fellman, Inside War, 193; LeeAnn Whites, "'Corresponding with the Enemy': Mobilizing the Relational Field of Battle in St. Louis," LeeAnn Whites, Alecia P. Long, eds., Occupied Women:

Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 2009), 103-16.

¹⁴² “Official Dispatch,” Liberty Tribune, 21 March 1862, p. 2.

¹⁴³ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:371.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 1:372.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 1:370-73; Union Provost Marshal’s File, Andrew Monroe, F1158.

¹⁴⁶ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:297-304; N. D. Starr, T. W. Holman, The 21st Missouri Regiment, Infantry Veteran Volunteers. Historical Memoranda (Fort Madison, Ia., 1899), 5-6, 8. On 5 August 1861 Green’s regiment was defeated at the battle of Athens in the northeastern corner of the state, a defeat that eventually allowed Union forces to secure the region.

¹⁴⁷ Marvin, Life of Caples, 176-77.

¹⁴⁸ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:135.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 1:134-38; W. H. Lewis, The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870 (Nashville, 1890), 187-90.

¹⁵¹ R. A. Austin Papers, State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts, Collection 2118, p. 14. The Provost Marshal papers list an oath to the Union taken by Austin prior to his assignment in Keytesville. Union Provost Marshal’s File, Robert A. Austin, F1220.

¹⁵² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:129-30.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 1:125-26; Lewis, Methodism in Missouri 1860 to 1870, 126-27.

¹⁵⁴ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:94; Cynthia DeHaven, Pitcock, Bill J. Gurley eds., I Acted from Principle: The Civil War Diary of Dr. William M. McPheeters, Confederate Surgeon in the Trans-Mississippi (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2002), 20-23.

¹⁵⁵ McPheeters had been pastor of the Old School Westminster Church but was retained when the congregation united with the New School Pine Street Church. While the combined congregation joined the Old School, they kept the larger Pine Street building. John S. Grasty, Memoir of Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D.D. (St. Louis, 1871), 108-9; Hyde, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 3:1805.

¹⁵⁶ Grasty, Memoir of McPheeters, 123.

¹⁵⁷ Union Provost Marshal’s File, F1371, Samuel B. McPheeters.

¹⁵⁸ Grasty, Memoir of McPheeters, 123-140. The men who wrote the letter were M. Simpson, W. W. Greene, Lesley Garnett, Robert Dougherty, James Dougherty and James Love. Apolline Blair referred to Greene as a southern-sympathizer in a letter to her brother Montgomery. Apolline A. Blair to Montgomery Blair, 29 December 1862, Abraham Lincoln Papers, Library of Congress, Washington D.C., at <<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/ammem/alhtml/malhome.html>>, accessed 5 May 2010. A description of the affair can be found in George M. Apperson, “Presbyterians and Radical Republicans: President Lincoln, Dr. McPheeters, and Civil War in Missouri,” Journal of Presbyterian History, 73, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 239-50.

¹⁵⁹ Missouri Democrat, 13 December 1862, p. 2; Grasty, Memoir of McPheeters, 141. Curtis, who often clashed with Missouri’s conservative government, was eventually removed from his

post. For a description of the events in light of the problems that Hamilton Gamble faced with General Samuel B. Curtis, see Dennis K. Boman, Lincoln's Resolute Unionist Hamilton Gamble, Dred Scott Dissenter and Missouri's Civil War Governor (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2006), 189-93.

¹⁶⁰ Union Provost Marshals' File, F1371, Samuel B. McPheeters; Samuel B. McPheeters, 19 December 1862, Lincoln Papers; Grasty, Memoir of McPheeters, 141-47.

¹⁶¹ Apolline A. Blair to Montgomery Blair, 29 December 1862, Lincoln Papers.

¹⁶² Franklin A. Dick to Montgomery Blair, 19 December 1862, Ibid.

¹⁶³ Dick was appointed provost marshal general of Missouri in November of 1862, replacing Farrar. Gari Carter, Troubled State: Civil War Journals of Franklin Archibald Dick (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2008), 90-91, 213-14.

¹⁶⁴ Grasty, Memoir of McPheeters, 152-53.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 159-61.

¹⁶⁶ Samuel R. Curtis to Abraham Lincoln, 28 December, 1862, Lincoln Papers; Samuel R. Curtis to Abraham Lincoln, 29 December 1862, Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Abraham Lincoln to Samuel R. Curtis, 2 January 1863, Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Ronald C. White Jr, Lincoln's Greatest Speech: The Second Inaugural (New York: Simon And Schuster, 2002), 129-43; Carwardine, Lincoln, 223-29, 274-79.

¹⁷⁰ Apolline A. Blair to Montgomery Blair, 29 December 1862, Lincoln Papers.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:99-100.

¹⁷³ St. Louis Citizens to Abraham Lincoln, 30 December 1862, Lincoln Papers.

¹⁷⁴ Charles D. Drake to Abraham Lincoln, 22 January 1863, Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Columbia Statesmen, 9 January 1863, p. 4.

¹⁷⁶ John Whitehill, et al to Abraham Lincoln, November 1863, Lincoln Papers; "Mr. Lincoln on 'Ecclesiastical Rights,'" Missouri Republican, 3 March 1864, p. 1.

¹⁷⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XVII A. D. 1863 (Philadelphia, 1863), 311-12; Jefferson City State Times, 6 October 1865, p. 2; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, I: 100-1; Grasty, Memoir of McPheeters, 331.

¹⁷⁸ Union Provost Marshals' File, F1237, ME Church, Chillicothe, MO.

¹⁷⁹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:377-80.

¹⁸⁰ Union Provost Marshals' File, F1237, Baptist Church, Springfield, MO.

¹⁸¹ M. M. Richardson, A Brief History of The First Baptist Church of Springfield, Missouri, 1852-1927 (Springfield, 1928), 8-9; Wayne C. Barte, A History of the First Baptist Church, Springfield, Missouri, 1852-1977 (Springfield, 1977), 5-9. The congregation's early records were destroyed in a fire in the late nineteenth century.

¹⁸² Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 854-55; Liberty Tribune, 12 April 1867, p. 2.

¹⁸³ Liberty Tribune, 7 February 1862, p. 2; Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 326.

-
- ¹⁸⁴ Union Provost Marshal's File, F1315, Robert P. Farris; Union Provost Marshal's File, F1588, R. P. Farris, Carr Gamble, Tyson Dines.
- ¹⁸⁵ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:73-75. Krekel's actions ushered years of litigation, which will be discussed in chapter seven.
- ¹⁸⁶ War of the Rebellion, 34:311, 452; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:257-60; Liberty Tribune, 4 March, 1864, p. 2. The order was reprinted from the St. Joseph Herald.
- ¹⁸⁷ William Hyde and Howard L. Conard, eds., Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference 4 vols. (New York, 1899), 2: 1035-36. Hogan was originally became a minister in Illinois and later relocated to St. Louis where he became a successful businessman. He retained his rights to preach, a practice referred to as "locating."
- ¹⁸⁸ Abraham Lincoln to Edwin M. Stanton, 11 February 1864, Lincoln Papers; Howard K. Beale, ed., The Diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866 (Washington, 1933), 351.
- ¹⁸⁹ Abraham Lincoln, 13 February 1864, Endorsement to John Hogan, Lincoln Papers.
- ¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.* Missouri southern Methodist viewpoints on the order can be found in Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:251-67.
- ¹⁹¹ Missouri East Conference, State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts, Collection 3727, Folder 274.
- ¹⁹² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:248-50.
- ¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 1:204-5.
- ¹⁹⁴ According to Declaration of Independence signer John Witherspoon, civil liberty and religious liberty were mutually interdependent. Encroachment on one necessarily led to encroachment on the other – and he pointed to the seventeenth century Stuart abuses as the best historical case in point. Jeffrey H. Morrison, John Witherspoon and the Founding of the American Republic (University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 35, 84-86, 91.
- ¹⁹⁵ Frances McAnally Blackburn Hilliard, Stepping Stones to Glory: From Circuit Rider to Editor in the Years in Between, Life of David Rice McAnally D. D. 1810-1895 (Baltimore: Gateway Press, 1975), 105-6.
- ¹⁹⁶ Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the American Bible Society (New York, 1862), Appendix: 18-20; Forty-Seventh Annual Report of the American Bible Society (New York, 1863), Appendix: 18-20.
- ¹⁹⁷ Elliott, South-western Methodism, 388.
- ¹⁹⁸ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:121-24.
- ¹⁹⁹ John Nerone, Violence Against the Press: Policing the Public Sphere in U. S. History (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 117.
- ²⁰⁰ Lewis, Methodism in Missouri 1860 to 1870, 82-83; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:120-21.
- ²⁰¹ Union Provost Marshals' Papers, F1155, D. R. McAnally.
- ²⁰² *Ibid.*

²⁰³ Galusha Anderson, The Story of a Border City During the Civil War (Boston, 1908), 215; Elliott, South-western Methodism, 385-89. Elliott wrote a lengthy editorial in the Central Christian Advocate condemning the St. Louis Christian Advocate after McAnally's initial arrest. Elliott, nevertheless, wrote a letter to Farrar urging McAnally's release after three southern Methodists approached him and said that McAnally's health was failing in prison. Elliott clearly did not condone McAnally's pro-southern theology but merely wanted his paper suppressed, not the editor dead in jail, which would lead to negative propaganda for the Union in throughout Missouri. Elliott, South-western Methodism, 389-90.

²⁰⁴ Union Provost Marshal's File, E. Stafford, F1155.

²⁰⁵ Hilliard, Stepping Stones to Glory, 106-7; Lewis, Methodism in Missouri 1860 to 1870, 80-81; Elliott, South-Western Methodism, 4, 426. Elliott, on the other hand, overworked himself by 1864 that he was forced to resign the Central Christian Advocate editorship and return to Iowa where he died five years later. Matthew Simpson ed., Cyclopedia of Methodism. Embracing Sketches of its Rise, Progress and Present Condition (Philadelphia, 1878), 337.

²⁰⁶ Missouri Democrat, 21 May 1863, p. 1.

²⁰⁷ Hyde, Encyclopedia of St. Louis, 2:731; Col. James M. Rice, Peoria City and County Illinois Vols. I-II (Chicago, 1912), I: 156-57; First Presbyterian Church, St. Charles, Missouri, Session Minutes, 1840-1864, State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts, C1365, 59. He also represented the Presbytery of Peoria at the 1854 General Assembly and was later moderator of the southern general assembly. Minutes of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School), 1854 (Philadelphia, 1854), 499, 659.

²⁰⁸ Union Provost Marshal's File, F1588, R. P. Farris, Carr Gamble, Tyson Dines, Missouri State Archives; Lawrence O. Christensen, William E. Foley, Gary R. Kremer and Kenneth H. Winn, eds., Dictionary of Missouri Biography (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 698-99.

²⁰⁹ Lucinda de Leftwich Templin, Reminiscences of Linden Wood College (St. Charles, 1920), 39, et seq.

²¹⁰ Thereafter, most people connected with the school apparently hoped that Mary Easton would go into a discreet and proper retirement, and tried to behave as if she had done so. Mary Ellen Rowe, "Mary Sibley: Genteel Reformer," in Yvonne Johnson, ed., Feminist Frontiers: Women Who Shape the Midwest (Kirksville, Mo.: Truman State University Press, 2010), 36, 40.

²¹¹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:86; William S. Bryan, Robert Rose, A History of the Pioneer Families of Missouri (St. Louis, 1876), 148.

²¹² Union Provost Marshal's File, F1315, Robert P. Farris. Provost Marshal General Bernard G. Farrar of St. Louis "gave orders in March 1862 not to allow a particular Protestant minister, a prisoner on parole, to preach in certain counties of the state." Neely, Fate of Liberty, 39.

²¹³ Farris returned home in December of 1862 but Union authorities continued to harass him at least through summer 1863. Lawrence O. Christensen, William E. Foley, Gary R. Kremer and Kenneth H. Winn, eds., Dictionary of Missouri Biography (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 698-99; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:86-90; Union Provost Marshal's File,

Robert P. Farris, F1315. ; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2: 88-89; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:90; Union Provost Marshal's File, F1315, Robert P. Farris.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid.; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:86-87.

²¹⁶ Union Provost Marshal's File, Robert P. Farris, F1315; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2: 88-89. Davis was Lincoln's campaign manager at the 1860 Republican Convention.

Carwardine, Lincoln, 108-11.

²¹⁷ F. A. Dick to Abraham Lincoln, 12 December 1862, Lincoln Papers.

²¹⁸ Union Provost Marshal's File, F1315, Robert P. Farris; Ibid., F1594, Rev. R. P. Farris, Carr Gamble, Rev. Tyson Dines.

²¹⁹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:90; Union Provost Marshal's File, F1315, Robert P. Farris.

²²⁰ Union Provost Marshal's File, F1315, Robert P. Farris.

²²¹ Jonathan Dymond, Essays on the Principles of Morality and on the Private and Political Rights and Obligations of Mankind (Philadelphia, 1896), 201-23.

²²² Harold M. Hyman, To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1959), 61-117; Legislative History of the General Staff of the Army of the United States (Washington, 1901), 12.

²²³ Mo. Rev. Stat. §117 (1856), 1105-7.

²²⁴ Ibid; Richard H. Rivers, Elements of Moral Philosophy, (Nashville, 1859), 241-46; Wayland, Elements of Moral Philosophy, 288-92.

²²⁵ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, Held at the City of St. Louis, October 1861 (St. Louis, 1861), 10; Anderson, Story of a Border City, 234-36.

²²⁶ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:177-78.

²²⁷ "Highly Important to Lovers and Preachers," Liberty Tribune, 4 July 1862, p. 1; "The Oath -- Who Must Take It?," Ibid., 11 July 1862, p. 2.

²²⁸ B. M. Palmer, The Oath of Allegiance to the United States, Discussed in its Moral and Political Bearings (Richmond, 1863), 11-21. Palmer was given an honorary LL.D by Westminster College in 1870 and was the first moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. Fisher, History of Westminster College, 201.

²²⁹ Union Provost Marshal's File.

²³⁰ Fellman, Inside War, 94.

²³¹ Ewing Cockrell, History of Johnson County, Missouri (Topeka, Ks, 1918), 552-54; Union Provost Marshal's File, G. W. Houx, F1343.

²³² Union Provost Marshal's File, Emma S. English, F1312.

²³³ Ibid.

²³⁴ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:422.

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Gerteis, Civil War St. Louis, 196.

²³⁷ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:64-65.

-
- ²³⁸ Union Provost Marshal's File, W. N. Watts, F1412. Watts' initials are listed incorrectly in the record.
- ²³⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁴⁰ "The 'Church Order,'" Liberty Tribune, 20 May 1864, p. 2.
- ²⁴¹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:66-69.
- ²⁴² Ibid., 1:428.
- ²⁴³ A. P. Forman to Edward Bates, 15 March 1864, Lincoln Papers.
- ²⁴⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁴⁶ The legible names in the report, besides Forman himself, were J. M. Travis, G. G. Muldrow, J. M. Nelson, James M. Vaughn, Jacob Newland, and James Stewart. Union Provost Marshal's File, A. P. Forman, F1611.
- ²⁴⁷ Forman lodged at Bates' home during the 1866 general assembly. Beale, Diary of Bates, 357, 559.
- ²⁴⁸ Abraham Lincoln to William S. Rosecrans, 4 April 1864, Lincoln Papers.
- ²⁴⁹ True Loyalty and Independence of the Church, 3.
- ²⁵⁰ Ibid., 13.
- ²⁵¹ Ibid., 4. Polk was serving as a United States Senator when hostilities began and was expelled from the Senate in 1862 for being a southern sympathizer. Columbia Statesman, 9 October 1863, p. 2.
- ²⁵² Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:69.
- ²⁵³ True Loyalty and Independence of the Church, 11-14.
- ²⁵⁴ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XXIV A. D. 1865 (Philadelphia, 1865), 543.
- ²⁵⁵ Ibid., 576. The other names on the petition were: A. V. C. Schenck (Missouri), Robert Morrison (Kentucky), Rutherford Douglass (Kentucky), W. Scott Harbison (Kentucky), Andrew Phillips (New York) and Harry C. Fries (Maryland).
- ²⁵⁶ Ibid., 578.
- ²⁵⁷ Ibid., 579-80.
- ²⁵⁸ William E. Dunning made the classic case in Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction and Related Topics (London: McMillan & Co., 1904), 24-59.
- ²⁵⁹ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (1865), 1:25.
- ²⁶⁰ Ibid., 1:25-26.
- ²⁶¹ Robert C. Palmer, "Liberties as Constitutional Provisions 1776-1791," in William E. Nelson and Robert C. Palmer, Constitution and Rights in the American Republic (Williamsburg: Institute of Bill of Rights Law, Marshall-Wythe School of Law, The College of William and Mary, 1987), 55, 62-64; William J. Novak, The People's Welfare: Law & Regulation in Nineteenth-Century America (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 13-17, 47-52, 149-89. Section 4 of the Missouri Constitution certainly secured to the individual religious freedom. But it did so only on the condition also

that he or “not disturb others in their religious worship.” Section 16 similarly guaranteed the rights of free speech and press but also held the individual “responsible for the abuse of that liberty.” Mo. Const. (1820), Art. 13 Declaration of Rights, §§ 4, 16.

²⁶² This work often emphasizes that religion offered soldiers succor or motivated them, on both sides of the conflict, to live up to the standards of their separate creeds – albeit, in the case of Confederate soldier, this was a tragic, misguided commitment. Current interpretations of the role of religion in the actual fighting of the Civil War emphasize the way the war pitted contending religious sensibilities against one another and energized and gave meaning to the conflict. Books produced in the last dozen years or so by Steven E. Woodworth and Gary Gallagher reveal the Civil War as a powerful religious experience for the troops who engaged in combat. Steven E. Woodworth, While God is Marching on: The Religious World of Civil War Soldiers (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003). Steven E. Woodworth and Gary Gallagher have written on the significance of Protestant religion in the lives of officers and ordinary soldiers on both sides of the conflict. Woodworth contends that the importance of Protestantism, including evangelicalism, in antebellum America was continued throughout the ranks during the war. Many individual soldiers placed a varying premium on their faith and embodied many of the common doctrines, such as providential theology, preached throughout the nation. Steven E. Woodworth, While God is Marching On: The Religious World of Civil War Soldiers (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001), ix-29. Gary Gallagher echoes these sentiments when discussing southern nationalism and the large-scale revivals throughout the ranks in 1863 and 1864. Gary W. Gallagher, The Confederate War: How Popular Will, Nationalism, and Military Strategy Could Not Starve Off Defeat (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1997), 49-53. Warren B. Armstrong has examined those who ministered to the soldiers in the Union through his book on the chaplaincy. Warren B. Armstrong, For Courageous Fighting and Confident Dying: Union Chaplains in the Civil War (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 1-15.

²⁶³ Private S. G. Bundy, for example, a northern Methodist who served in the Union Army, was highly critical of his southern brethren for what he viewed as their flawed religious beliefs. S. G. Bundy, Autobiography of S. G. Bundy, Missouri East Conference, State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts Collection, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, Collection 2385, p. 23. Ozias S. Middleton fought with the federals as well, continuing his northern Methodist faith as a minister after the war. Charles N. Dochterman, ed., Records from the Wyaconda Methodist Circuit (Des Moines, Ia.: Des Moines, Iowa : C. Dochterman 19--), 1. The Hunter family, in southwestern Polk County, was divided like many Missouri families. While all the sons practiced their Baptist faith as soldiers, Robert, George and Andrew fought with the Union while their brother James died of disease in 1862 as a member of the Confederate military. J. W. Haines, The History of the Polk County Baptist Association (Bolivar, Mo, 1897), 255-58. Northern Methodist A. N. Fields lobbied persistently to be appointed the chaplain to the federal Cape Girardeau post in southeastern Missouri in 1864. Union Provost Marshal’s File, A. N. Fields, F1317. While Woodworth and Armstrong discuss several Missouri soldiers and

chaplains, most military historians have not focused on the relationship between religion and the experiences of regular combatants in the war. For example see Richard W. Hatcher, William G. Piston, Wilson's Creek: The Second Battle of the Civil War and the Men Who Fought It (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); William Shea, Fields of Blood: The Prairie Grove Campaign (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

²⁶⁴ Harry S. Stout, Upon the Alter of the Nation: A Moral History of the Civil War (New York: Viking Press, 2006), xi-xxii, 425-456.

Chapter Seven

Reconstruction: Righteous Rulers and the Unrepentant

John Hill Luther, a Baptist minister residing in Palmyra, in northeastern Marion County, certainly approved of the actions of the Missouri Baptist General Association as it considered its postwar relationship with the state government in light of the arrest of numerous Baptist ministers. On August 19, 1865 the organization met in Booneville, a Cooper County community within the Boone's Lick. Even though the war had just come to a close, the summer of 1865 was still a trying time for Baptist ministers and their congregations around the state. In January of 1865 a convention opened that propagated a new constitution for Missouri. The document had gone into effect on July 4th. Seeking to significantly change the fabric of the former slave state, the Radical Unionist Party, controlling the convention, passed a number of measures that sought to deprive former Confederate-sympathizers of political power by forcing many Missourians to take an oath that they never supported the South. Including within these aspects of the constitution was a section that was dubbed the Test Oath. It proclaimed, in part, that no "person be competent as a bishop, priest, deacon, minister, elder, or other clergyman of any religious persuasion, sect or denomination, to teach, or preach, or solemnize marriages, unless such person shall have first taken, subscribed and filed said oath."¹ The previous month the state Baptists formed a committee to deal with the church and its relationship with civil authorities in light of the Test Oath. Luther was selected to be a member of this committee. Moving from the northeastern part of the state, the focus of the meeting was the group's report to the entire organization.² With the oath placing a number of their congregations in perilous straights as their ministers either could not take the oath in good conscience or refused to out of principle, the

association was forced into action. The committee on church and state expressed this outrage in its report. Expressing not only the oath's federal unconstitutionality, they proclaimed that

the Baptists hold no equivocal position on the relations sustained by the churches to the state. While they have taught for ages that christians [sic] owe allegiance to the civil government, in all things belonging to the temporal power, they have likewise held, that the state has no right to interfere with the freedom of conscience, the relations of the ministry to their congregations, and the absolute liberty of the churches in all matters of faith, worship and discipline. For these principles they have suffered in every country. . . . We can not [sic], therefore, but express sorrow, that the new constitution of the state of Missouri requires of our ministry a certain oath before they can lawfully discharge the duties of their sacred office.³

The strife caused by the Test Oath soon arrived at Luther's doorstep. Where he lived in Marion County was largely controlled by a Radical government and was a ripe place for enforcement of the provision. Luther, a notable preacher in the area, was arrested for preaching without taking the oath and brought in front of the Marion County Circuit Court. Interspersed in the docket that day were thirteen other ministers who also had not taken the oath. To add insult, they were summoned to court along with a number of common criminals including a bawdy house operator and a man who sold liquor on a Sunday. Seeing the men arrested with the ministers the anti-Radical Liberty Tribune commented that "it furnishes an apt illustration of the present condition of Missouri under Radical rule."⁴ Luther, having posted a \$1,000 bond, was released with a trial scheduled for the following February. By that point, however, the United States Supreme Court had handed down a decision that invalidated the segments of the Missouri Constitution that contained the oath, ensuring that Luther's case would not go to trial.⁵

Luther certainly was a worthwhile target for a number of reasons as he had been a southern-sympathizer and published the newly established Missouri Baptist Journal. While he had been born in Rhode Island and attended Brown, Luther began his ministry in Georgia and

South Carolina before relocating to western Missouri in 1857. Even though he was of northern origins, he wrote a letter to the Liberty Tribune in August of 1861 explaining that the notion of southern victory in the Civil War was hard to resist for “Slavery is clearly of divine origin.”⁶ During the fighting, however, Luther was forced to relocate to more peaceful environs in Palmyra. With the state lacking a Baptist periodical after the previous newspapers failed, Luther began publication from Palmyra of the Missouri Baptist Journal in January of 1866. He quickly collected 1,000 subscriptions to his sheet. A significant voice among the state’s Baptists, to Luther, the Missouri Test Oath was little different than the persecutions undertaken by the Star Chamber of Early Modern Britain. In the view of the local Palmyra Spectator, his arrest in part was to threaten the editor of a religious paper that was critical of the oath as it lamented “When such men are victims of such grand juries, and at the mercy of such officials, what may we hope for the future?”⁷

Thesis

Radical Republicans in Missouri during Reconstruction, with a new state constitution, disqualified ministers of the gospel from preaching for failure to take a Test Oath professing present and past loyalty to the Union -- while northern evangelical church leaders made a declaration of loyalty and a profession that slavery and slaveholding amounted to sin a litmus test for church membership. Widespread opposition to the Test Oath, on the ground that it infringed upon the liberties of conscience and free speech, produced the 1867 ruling of the United States Supreme Court in Cummings v. State of Missouri. This decision overturned the Test Oath, undercut the Radical redefinition of Protestant faith and citizenship, and provided the legal grist with which southern evangelicals, aided by state courts once again sympathetic to this white majority, reclaimed the church lands and buildings that Union soldiers, Radicals, and their

northern evangelical allies had seized during the war. As before and during the Civil War, high-profile litigation over church property reflected less the imperatives of church, civil, and constitutional law than the social, religious, and political preferences of judges. These disputes further clouded the boundaries of church and state, while further shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and emerging civil religions among both former Confederate and Union supporters.

Continuing ecclesiastical ruptures in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches during Reconstruction in Missouri both reflected and reinforced the fundamental differences in theological and political understanding of northern and southern evangelicals about the morality of slavery and loyalty to the Union. Such differences drove the process of Radical Reconstruction and hastened its demise. The incidents surrounding Missouri Baptists and the Test Oath were indicative of the difficulties that the southern-leaning evangelicals in the state faced during Reconstruction. The years immediately after the Civil War saw continuing intense strife among former supporters of the Confederacy and victorious Radical Republican rulers and their supporters. With the Test Oath, Radicals sought to impose on a largely southern-oriented population a retrospective, solemn vow of allegiance that could not be conscientiously made by those who believed that slavery and slaveholding had been consistent with Protestant faith and that natural law, Scripture, and the Constitution had justified secession. By the same token, the Test Oath required of southern evangelicals a sworn declaration of adherence to novel articles of faith and good citizenship constituting the prime features of a new civil religion initially advanced by Union authorities during the war: the conviction that African Americans deserved and should have equal civil and political rights and that support of slavery and disloyalty to the Union amounted to both sin and treason. Church property provisions included in the new state

constitution placed particularly onerous burdens on Roman Catholics, who joined with southern evangelicals in denouncing the Radicals. But the effort of Republicans to impose their intertwined political and religious views on the southern-affiliated residents of the state served most powerfully to exacerbate the strife among evangelical Protestants that had begun over the moral question of slavery decades earlier.

Equally divisive were the efforts of leaders in the northern-affiliated Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches to set up, as a litmus test for church membership, a declaration that disloyalty, slavery, and slave-owning amounted to egregious sin – a move that further alienated their southern brethren and generated more ecclesiastical ruptures. Successful challenges to the Test Oath in the courts, based on the claim that the oath encroached on civil and religious liberties, culminated in the 1867 decision of the United States Supreme Court in Cummings v. State of Missouri. While the case dealt with the refusal of a Roman Catholic priest to submit to the Test Oath, the ruling of the Court that the oath breached the United States Constitution worked fundamentally to strip the Radical redefinition of Protestant faith and citizenship of its legal and constitutional foundations.

As Liberal Republicans and Democrats in Missouri seized political power from the overreaching Radicals, the ruling in Cummings threw explosive tinder on the principle flashpoint of contention between southern and northern Presbyterians and Methodists -- their ongoing litigation over the ownership and control of disputed church property. This litigation laid bare a new phase in the intra-denominational and intra-congregational strife that had divided evangelicals in the state since the initial national schisms in the period 1837-1845. The resurgence of southern Democratic power and a return to peacetime standards of jurisprudence by 1873, generally speaking, produced judicial outcomes that placed in the hands of southern

evangelicals the church-owned buildings and lands that Radical Republicans, Union military forces, and their northern evangelical allies had seized during the war. These outcomes, to say the least, did nothing to endear the recently-crushed southern evangelicals to their ecclesiastical nemeses. While Congress, President Ulysses S. Grant, and the Republicans had formally re-established the Union, evangelicals in the State of Missouri continued to be divided – but now over an even more complex set of religious, institutional, and political differences.

Literature Review

Scholarship on Reconstruction dating back a century provides a number of useful starting point for assessing the extent to which the evangelical schisms drove the process of Radical Reconstruction in Missouri and hastened its demise. At the onset of the twentieth century, historians William Dunning and Claude G. Bowers argued that Radical Reconstruction was one of the darkest chapters in American history. In the Dunning School view, southerners should have never been exposed to supposed northern vengeance and “black misrule.” Both Walter Fleming in his The Sequel of Appomattox (1919) and E. Merton Coulter in his The South During Reconstruction 1865-1877 (1947) discuss what they deemed to be northern interference in southern ecclesiastical relations, a consequence of the effort by northern leaders to remake the churches of Dixie in the image of those in the victorious North.⁸

Historians from the late 1920s through the 1980s engaged in thoroughgoing debates over the success or failure of the Republicans during the period, while emphasizing much more than before the active role that African Americans played in the process.⁹ Eric Foner advanced the thesis that Reconstruction was a bold, if not heroic, attempt to remold the South’s culture – but that the program failed when northerners were sidetracked by fears of class warfare brought on by rapid industrialization, urban growth, and a flood of threatening immigration.¹⁰ A handful of

scholars, including not only William Dunning but also legal historians Harold Hyman and William C. Harris, have explored the question of whether the Radical Republican imposition of test oaths on former pro-Confederates, in Missouri and elsewhere, constituted violations of civil liberties.¹¹ But articles by Phillip J. Avillo, Jr., and Martha Kohl, written in 1976 and 1994 respectively, treat the Test Oath primarily as a political development the imposition of which lost Radicals the votes they needed to win control of the state and sustain their agenda.¹²

Historians of religion in the United States have, especially in the last several decades, examined carefully the role that white evangelical religion played during Reconstruction. A notable early development in this regard was Ralph E. Morrow's Northern Methodism and Reconstruction (1956), which focused on how the MEC sought to construct a national Methodist denomination by expanding its presence in the post-war South.¹³ Writing in 1990, Victor Howard concludes that the Radical Republicans were theologically driven in their attempts to remake the South in the image of the North and grant freedoms to African Americans.¹⁴ Ward M. McAfee explains how religion was a key component of northern plans to use the public school system to Americanize the increasingly foreign-born population. Evangelicals greatly feared the influx of immigrants from overseas, especially the large numbers of Roman Catholics.¹⁵ W.E.B. DuBois, Ralph Marrow, and Edward Jervey, examined how disagreement between southern and northern evangelicals over church property rights became a paramount issue as the South struggled to rebuild from the war – especially when white evangelicals contemplated the role of the freedmen.¹⁶

Historians of Missouri politics have generally cast the Radical Republicans in ways that reflect the larger twentieth-century historiography of Reconstruction. Writing in 1914, Harrison Anthony Trexler described the Radicals in positive terms, emphasizing how their 1865 state

constitutional convention eliminated slavery even before the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment.¹⁷ Thomas S. Barclay, however, identified the southern clergymen who were arrested and persecuted under the oath.¹⁸ William Parrish's Missouri Under Radical Rule (1956), the most detailed study of the era, argues that the excesses of the Radicals in Missouri eventually undermined their political agenda.¹⁹ R.S. Douglas, J. Gordon Kingsley, and Frank C. Tucker, have described in broad outline the impact of Radical Republican policies on the continuing denominational divisions among evangelicals in Missouri.²⁰

Drake's Constitution: Testing Loyalty and the Purge of Secesh Ministries

In January of 1865 the Missouri Constitutional Convention convened at the Mercantile Library Hall in St. Louis to advance the Radical Unionist Party's militant, evangelically-inspired religious and political agenda. The Radicals, firmly in control of the state, were aligned with the corresponding Radical segment of the national Republican Party which sought to implement similar aims during Reconstruction. Former Union officer Arnold Krekel was the convention president while noted Presbyterian Charles D. Drake was its vice-president and primary driver. Other Presbyterians, such as George Strong, served as the chair of the committee that drafted the ordinance on emancipation.²¹ While the convention was called to consider changes to the state constitution, Drake sought to use the Radical majority to write a new constitution for Missouri. Drake himself had been working on ideas for this document since his trip to Baltimore and Washington D.C. for the Republican Convention in June of 1864, five months before the delegates were even elected. As one of the few Radicals at the convention with extensive legal experience, Drake quickly took charge of the convention and its efforts. His influence was so

pronounced that the text was often referred to as “Drake’s Constitution,” by both its supporters and opponents.²² Missouri was not unlike other Border States in having a constitutional convention and preempted the federal government by abolishing slavery as its first act in January of 1865. But hers went beyond the other states in that besides providing for disfranchisement of disloyal white men and emancipation, it mandated a number of governmental and educational reforms, including provisions for equal access to the courts and schools for the freedmen. The freedmen, however, were not granted the right to vote.²³ Even with the large number of men who were disenfranchised, the constitution was only narrowly ratified when Secretary of State Francis Rodman tallied the votes on July 1st. Thanks to the military vote, it obtained a 1,862 majority out of 85,478 voters. It went into force on July 4th via Governor Thomas Fletcher’s proclamation.²⁴

Among the objectives of the Radicals who dominated the 1865 constitutional convention was the development of amendments that restricted the elective franchise to those who had been loyal to the Union during the Civil War. Critical to the success of the Radical agenda in this regard was the Missouri Test Oath. The oath sought to enforce provisions in the Constitution that deemed

At any election held by the people under this Constitution, or in pursuance of any law of this State, or under any ordinance or by-law of any municipal corporation, no person shall be deemed a qualified voter, who has ever been in armed hostility to the United States, or to the lawful authorities thereof, . . . or been in the service, of the so-called “Confederate States of America” . . . nor shall any such person be capable of holding, in this State, any office of honor, trust, or profit, under its authority; or of being an officer, councilman, director, trustee, or other manager of any corporation, public or private, now existing or hereafter established by its authority; or of acting as a professor or teacher in any educational institution, or in any common or other school; or of holding any real estate, or other property, in trust for the use of any church, religious society, or congregation.²⁵

To ensure that these prohibitions were enforced which restricted the ability of southern-sympathizers to vote, hold office or to be employed as lawyers, teachers and ministers they were required to take the Test Oath. The person thus swore

that I have never, directly or indirectly, done any of the acts in said section specified; that I have always been truly and loyally on the side of the United States against all enemies thereof, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States, and will support the Constitution and laws thereof, as the supreme law of the land, any law or ordinance of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; that I will, to the best of my ability, protect and defend the Union of the United States, and not allow the same to be broken up and dissolved, or the Government thereof to be destroyed or overthrown, under any circumstances, if in my power to prevent it; that I will support the Constitution of the State of Missouri; and that I make this oath without any mental reservation or evasion, and hold it to be binding on me.²⁶

The Test Oath was adopted by the Missouri Constitutional Convention On April 8, 1865 to implement a policy of disfranchisement of those who had actively participated in the rebellion. It restricted voting rights to those who had been Union loyalists through the war.²⁷ The Test Oath worked in tandem with new registration process, described by the new constitution, which empowered voter registrars to require registrants to take the oath. This clause was soon put into effect with a statute. The oath itself, in the eyes of observers such as Baptist minister Galusha Anderson, was an outgrowth of the 1862 wartime oath imposed by the State Convention and General Henry Halleck which was also retrospective.²⁸

Nationally, Congress mandated various oaths to restrict pro-Confederates throughout the Civil War and Reconstruction. The Ironclad Oath was passed in July of 1862 for federal government employees, lawyers, and elected federal officials. The oath required a person to swear he had never taken up arms against the Union or supported the rebellion nor given or exercised or attempted to execute the functions of any office under the Confederacy. The

retrospective feature was what made this oath “ironclad.” During the war, however, political prisoners and prisoners of war were often released upon taking an “oath of allegiance,” which was not retrospective but rather prospective. Radical Republicans applied the Ironclad Oath to southern voters in the 1864 Wade-Davis Bill, but President Lincoln exercised a pocket veto over it. Both Lincoln and his successor Andrew Johnson rejected the retrospective oath and wanted southerners to swear a prospective oath, that is, one in which they would swear to support the government of the United States in the future. This “amnesty oath” was a prime feature of Lincoln’s so-called “ten percent plan” for restoration of the Union which was included in his December 1863 Proclamation for Amnesty and Reconstruction. In this alternate proposal that the Wade-Davis Bill sought to supplant, only ten percent of southern voters were required to take a loyalty oath – not a majority as in the other legislation. With a bill passed in March 1867, Radical Republicans banned anyone from both voting in the election of delegates to state constitutional conventions and the subsequent ratification of such constitutions if they were prohibited from holding office under section three of the pending Fourteenth Amendment. These exclusions applied to any subsequent elections within a state but were less comprehensive than the ones that the Ironclad Oath imposed.²⁹

Through Reconstruction Radical Republicans in many former slave states imposed retroactive loyalty oaths. Oaths had been in place in the Border States during the fighting and were instrumental in providing Republican majorities in Congress. At the heart of most of these oaths anyone who had sympathized with the South or served as a Confederate soldier could not hold office. Actual disfranchisement varied between the states, with the Carolinas, Georgia, Florida and Texas exercising little enforcement. Arkansas and Alabama disqualified only those who fell under the fourteenth amendment. Louisiana expanded this provision to include editors

and ministers and those who supported secession but allowed those men to take an oath favoring Radical Reconstruction to remove the disability. While former Confederate general Charles J. Faulker was able to get the West Virginia State Supreme Court to readmit him to the bar in 1866, the state legislature soon rewrote the provisions which were subsequently upheld by the court in 1869.³⁰ In Maryland there were a number of loyalty oaths in place during the war. At its conclusion, the Radical Republicans in the state passed a registration law which gave them the power to deny the right to vote to any citizen that did not satisfactorily demonstrate that he had not been a Confederate supporter. Marylanders, such as former Lincoln postmaster general Montgomery Blair, brother to Missouri's Frank Blair, sought to repeal the oath. In 1867, however, the state ratified a new constitution which eliminated many of the harsher provisions in the earlier 1864 document.³¹

Compared to other oaths enacted throughout British and American history, including the Civil War, the Missouri Test Oath was extremely strict and encompassing. Oaths had a long and often oppressive history in Britain and occupied a contentious place in early American history. While religious tests and loyalty oaths remained in some places after the Revolution, they were eschewed by the founders because of their notorious history in Britain. None of these earlier oaths in American history, which were often temporarily in place during the Revolution, were either as extensive or retrospective as the Missouri one. The congressional Ironclad Oaths of 1862 and many of the state loyalty oaths during Reconstruction were retrospective as well. But according to historian Harold M. Hyman, the Missouri oaths were far more extensive than even the Ironclad Oath.³² While the Test Oath was not a religious test, which only allowed adherents of a certain sect to hold office and participate in government, it was still aimed, in part, against ministers of certain southern-oriented denominations. An editorial in the Missouri Baptist

Journal agreed with this fact.³³ Religious tests had been in place in England to limit the rights of those, such as Roman Catholics and dissenters, who did not ascribe to the Church of England. While they were eliminated by the U. S. Constitution, individual states only gradually excised the tests from their books.³⁴

Drake wrote the majority of the provisions dealing with the various loyalty oaths himself, expanding similar provisions of the 1864 Maryland State Constitution which was put in place by Radical Unionist elements in that state. In Missouri, like many other southern states, the Radicals controlled politics on almost every level of the state. Only in certain conservative counties were they not supreme. Nationally, on the other hand, Presidents Lincoln and Johnson were able to constrain their efforts to enact a more stringent oath – at least until the Radical Republicans achieved a supermajority in Congress after 1866. Unlike oaths imposed by Congress, which focused on lawyers, federal officials and eventually voters, the Test Oath was far more stringent and targeted clergymen – along with a long list of professionals who could not engage in their chosen occupations or hold corporate property. Louisiana was the only other state to target ministers but did not go as far as Missouri by including a provision to allow them to remove their disability.³⁵

Drake and his fellow Radicals relied on rigid loyalty requirements to target disloyal southern sympathizers in their effort to build a new civil religion, especially among evangelical ministers – whose influence could shape public opinion and values. Drake and the Radicals realized that the clergy, along with lawyers and teachers, were educated and locally influential orators who could speak openly and print their ideas. They believed that evangelical ministers were the most disloyal among ex-Confederates and targeted them appropriately.³⁶ For instance, the Radical Hannibal Courier styled many of these ministers as “a corrupt rebel priesthood

“revealed” in prayer, and Almighty God was daily and hourly to uphold the tattered remnant of barbarism – the foul and blighting course of human slavery.”³⁷ While both the 1820 and 1865 constitutions established religious freedom while banning state-supported churches and religious qualifications to hold office, the 1865 document allowed the state to restrict the practices of individuals to preach and hold property in trust for congregations via the Test Oath.³⁸ By doing so they sought to create a Missouri where obligation to freedom for blacks, ultimate moral condemnation for supporting slavery or having owned slaves, and loyalty to the Union as both articles of faith as required for church membership and political orthodoxy. As the southern worldview was crushed in this process, many Radicals hoped that those men and their families would leave the state, allowing for Missouri’s transformation from a Trans-Mississippi slave-state polity into a northern, Midwestern one. The Test Oath, both retroactively and prospectively, forced its taker to adhere to this ideal as anyone who had ever adhered to the southern religious and political worldview fell under the oath’s grasp. As James M. McPherson argues, with the Union victory in the Civil War not only were festering antebellum issues resolved but American society and its ideals were transformed through this new civil religion which improved it for the better.³⁹

Contrary to Drake’s wishes, the convention as a whole expanded the provisions of the oath. Drake himself initially desired the oaths only to apply to ministers when performing marriages, as those were the only functions within the purview of the state. William H. Folmsbee of Gallatin motioned that “teach or preach” be added to the prohibitions of ministers who did not take the oath to more fully target disloyal ministers and teachers. Folmsbee, moreover, was among a number of participants in the convention who resented the turmoil their homes were thrown into as a result of the guerilla war in western Missouri. A physician, Folmsbee was born

in Ohio and came to Missouri in 1859 after practicing medicine in Iowa. After serving two stints in the Union Army, he was elected as a Radical to the Missouri General Assembly in 1862. Even though Drake himself voted against Folmsbee's proposal, it passed overwhelmingly.⁴⁰

Notwithstanding the expansion of the disabilities imposed by the Test Oath, southern Methodist minister William Leftwich theorized that the non-amended draft would have still be problematic in the disabilities it placed on southern evangelical ministers. He wrote that "this amendment did not very materially affect the disabilities imposed by the original draft."⁴¹ For instance, a gentleman from Jefferson City, J. M. Siebert, in retrospect maintained it was exceedingly difficult to find a minister to marry him and his wife as a result of the Test Oath – further illustrating the centrality of the marriage provision.⁴² After a series of additional amendments, Drake moved that the vote be called on the section, which subsequently passed.⁴³

A provision of the 1865 Missouri Constitution disqualifying disloyal church property trustees empowered Unionist evangelicals to consolidate and build on the gains they had made at the expense of their southern brethren during the war. Strife between northern and southern evangelicals over the ownership of church property had been at the center of congregational and denominational schisms for at least a quarter of a century. Unionist evangelicals had seized or taken control of substantial amounts of church property during the war. Typically divided and aligned with opposing factions, church members who held property in trust for congregations were invariably at the center of these disputes, especially when they ended up in the courts. An act of the general assembly passed on March 23, 1863 had declared that officers or trustees who had not taken an oath of loyalty forfeited their positions. Drake's constitution contained a number of stipulations that dealt with church property, going far beyond its 1820 predecessor. Anyone violating the section on citizenship by having supported the Confederacy would be

prohibited, in part, from “holding any real estate, or other property, in trust for the use of any church, religious society, or congregation.”⁴⁴ As a result, any trustee who had been disloyal could be ousted from his position within his congregation.⁴⁵ This provision thus allowed Unionist elements to retain control of church property they had acquired during the war at the expense of their pro-Confederate counterparts. Equally important, it empowered Unionist factions take control of all remaining congregational property in the state at the expense of their now disqualified brethren. The initial draft of the Declaration of Rights did not contain any of these provisions. St. Louisian Isidor Bush, a Prague-born Jew who fled to the United States after the failed 1848 Revolutions, offered the provisions on the convention floor. Bush, however, was one of the more moderate members of the convention who ran afoul of Drake. The Declaration was enhanced in subsequent drafts presented by Knight G. Smith, a Virginia born physician from Princeton in northern Missouri. Drake aided in this endeavor.⁴⁶

New constitutional provisions effectively mandated that only ordinary church members who had been loyal to the Union could hold property in trust for congregations. By the end of the antebellum period, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ministers, in their capacity as pastors, had typically decided who were to be named trustees to hold church land and buildings for congregations. Ministers usually ensured, furthermore, that they were among those so appointed and that they presided over boards of trustees that also included laymen. A novel provision of the 1865 constitution prohibited ministers, sects, and denominations from holding property in trust for individual churches, congregations, and societies. But it permitted individuals other than ministers, not disqualified because of disloyalty, to serve as holders of the property of individual churches, congregations, and societies in trust. In essence, the new constitution disqualified all ministers and disloyal laypersons from serving as trustees, leaving only loyal laity qualified to do

so. It would seem that such strictures also applied to the trustees of church property-holding corporations, which the new constitution permitted for the first time.

Unionist evangelicals among the northern Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists favored the oath because they placed a premium on loyalty as a matter of faith and good citizenship, which was fundamental to the new civil religion. Evangelical proponents of the Test Oath backed Drake's Constitution, arguing that it was needed in light of the vast numbers of those who had been disloyal during the war. They praised the provisions mandating that only ordinary church members who had been loyal to the Union could hold such property in trust for congregations. The Presbytery of Northern Missouri, meeting in November of 1865, voiced their support for the constitution. In their strongly-worded opinion, the actions of disloyal men and women justified the convention's actions in the spring as they would help rid the denomination of these members. Most agreed with the resolution

that those ministers who have prostituted their offices to the dissemination of treason and support of the rebellion have manifestly made it the duty of the State to protect itself against such perversion of the office of Christian ministry, and that therefore we justify that part of our State Constitution which requires ministers of the gospel, as citizens to take its oath of loyalty before performing the duties of their offices.⁴⁷

Northern-leaning evangelicals often won over the Radical press who applauded their support for the intertwined articles of religious and political faith about slavery, secession and loyalty to the Union. The Jefferson City Missouri State Times was grateful for their actions, writing "How different is their fervent loyalty from the treason that protrudes in the hypocritical cant of some of their brethren about the abridgment of civil liberty."⁴⁸ The northern Methodists in northern Missouri voiced their support for the Test Oath.⁴⁹ Meeting in St. Joseph earlier in the year, the full annual conference also professed their continued devotion to the state

government.⁵⁰ There were ministers who put into practice their willingness to take the oath, such as Joseph P. Fenton. He wrote the Missouri Democrat soon after it went into effect asserting that all of the local Presbyterian ministers around Franklin County, west of St. Louis, followed the regulation.⁵¹

A significant minority of Baptists in the state supported the Test Oath and the actions of the Radicals in power. Galusha Anderson strongly backed the oath and only expressed some reservation on how it was implemented.⁵² Meeting in Hannibal in September, the Unionist Baptists in the state formed their own state association in order to create a group who would be in favor of the Radical articles of faith concerning society. They became an auxiliary of the northern American Baptist Home Missionary Society. Calling themselves the Missouri Baptist State Convention, they had up to one hundred congregations around the state and sought to recruit African Americans into their fold. Ministers on their executive committee were spread throughout the state in regions where there was significant Unionism through the war. Anderson was the first moderator of the convention. The Missouri Democrat styled the body as “loyal pastors in council.”⁵³ It further proclaimed “we rejoice at the movement of the Baptists of Missouri. They have put themselves, as a religious body, unmistakably on the side of loyalty to the National Government.”⁵⁴

Missouri’s pro-southern denominations resisted the Radicals and expressed their opposition to the Test Oath almost immediately after its passage. Like the war-era oaths, many ministers and rank and file evangelicals held that the Test Oath violated the liberty of conscience of anyone who was forced to swear them. Many former Confederates, in fact, could not take it in good faith. As a result, national periodicals such as the Nation “reported that Missouri clergymen were more opposed to the oath requirement than any other group.”⁵⁵ Baptist and secular

publications lambasted the Test Oath and spread the word of the perceived injustices throughout the country. Like their counterparts in the antebellum era, many Missouri Baptists read these newspapers and knew their leaders' thoughts on the oath. The Missouri Baptist Journal was one such sheet. It began publication in January of 1866 from Palmyra in part to resist the measure. Editor J. H. Luther said "to all intents and purposes there was a state church, a court party, a sect, if you please, recognizing in Caesar, rather than in Jesus Christ, the head of religion."⁵⁶ An article that E. S. Dulin of Lexington wrote against the oath in the Journal was published in the western Missouri Liberty Tribune in January 1866. That same paper, moreover, reprinted the state-wide general association's condemnation in September.⁵⁷ Kentucky Baptists expressed similar concerns in their Baptist Monthly. W. Pope Yeaman, who would later relocate to Missouri, shared Missourians' abhorrence of the Test Oath, authoring the journal's piece condemning it. Yeaman argued against it on principal, an argument that many former-Unionists who opposed the constitution used as well. For Yeaman, not only was the oath problematic but the efforts to restrict the ability of non-loyal evangelicals to hold property was also problematic. He explained "the new constitution of the state of Missouri, forced upon the people of the state without their consent, is nothing more than a systematic oppression and persecution of the ministry of the gospel, under color of law. The spirit and letter of the document clearly evince the character of its authors – ignorance, fanaticism and narrow-mindedness. . . ." ⁵⁸ He furthermore explained on how it rested on dubious constitutional grounds, saying it "is an ex post facto law, hence contravenes the constitution and laws of the United States."⁵⁹

Similar to the Baptists, the Methodists spoke out against the new constitution. Minister Andrew Monroe was able to get the Missouri Annual Conference together in June of 1865, days before the election results were tallied. Meeting in Palmyra, the twenty-one ministers were

unwilling to condemn the oath outright, for fear of retribution, though there was much talk against it at the assembly. Individuals were allowed to refuse it out of conscience, which most did after it went into effect.⁶⁰ Even without the outright condemnation, the pro-Radical Missouri Democrat lambasted the conference and its resistance to the Radical evangelical ideals, writing “now every man, woman and child of ordinary intelligence knows that any loyal member of that organization abandoned it at the commencement of the war.”⁶¹ The Democrat made comparable comments about analogous actions by the St. Louis Annual Conference.⁶² Many Methodists certainly agreed with William Leftwich’s denunciation. Leftwich, moreover, went one step further and declared his confusion in the matter as “It would be presumption, in a work of this character, even to attempt a presentation of the processes by which this instrument proposes to reach the rights and wrongs of suffrage in a manner intelligible to the ordinary reader.”⁶³

Southern-leaning Presbyterians in the state also opposed the oath. Radical Presbyterians lost control of the state synod when it assembled in October of 1865. Even though there were Unionists among their number, some of these men rejected the Radicals and took their power away in the synod. Electing as its moderator Robert P. Farris, who had ran afoul of Union military authorities and northern Presbyterians during the war, a number of ministers spoke out against wartime suppressions and the new constitution. There were, nonetheless, a number of the delegates who did not subscribe to the dominant viewpoint.⁶⁴

Individual Missouri Baptist ministers, in the crosshairs of the provision, felt its hand against their pulpits. Radical sheriffs and judges throughout the state were more than willing to enforce the new regulations, especially in their strongholds in northeastern and western Missouri. In the northwest part of the state, a grand jury was convened in Daviess County against B. F. Kenny, an eminent Baptist minister who had refused the oath. After passing three indictments

against him, the sheriff was dispatched to arrest him. He forced the sixty-one year-old man to ride ten miles to the county seat Gallatin in the dark. The Missouri Republican, no friend of the Radicals or their constitution, commented “the brutality of the officer arresting him is in keeping with the character of the charge.”⁶⁵ About fifty miles to the southwest, James Hughes of Plattsburg was arrested in January of 1866. A Unionist but not a Lincoln supporter, unlike many of the other violators, he preached from his pulpit “that this test oath was an interference with the rights of conscience. I also persuaded my brethren of the ministry not to take the test oath as a qualification to preach; that by so doing they acknowledged the supremacy of Caesar's government over that of our Lord's.”⁶⁶ James Green, a minister in Marion County was arrested for failing to take the oath in August of 1865. The arrest was subsequently reported throughout the state.⁶⁷ J. H. Luther, who also preached in the same county, was held for \$1000 bond in his case after refusing to take the oath.⁶⁸ Other ministers were remembered fondly by their congregations and families for refusing the oath. A few miles south of J. H. Luther was minister Christy Gentry. His daughter Evotia explained that “he was fearless. He preached without taking the Test oath. When his son, Christy, said Papa, don't go, your life may be in danger, the father said, Son, I do not believe that they will hurt me. The Lord has called me to preach.”⁶⁹ Gentry evaded the authorities in Ralls County prior to his death in March of 1866.

Presbyterians began to violate the Test Oath soon after it went into effect in September of 1865. Dissident Robert P. Farris was one of these men, and in November of 1865 he was indicted in St. Charles County for preaching without taking the oath.⁷⁰ In western Missouri, Presbyterian J. L. Yantis preached to his Lexington congregation without the obligation.⁷¹ The day the requirement went into effect, George Harlan wrote a letter voicing his opposition. Harlan, a Presbyterian minister, was teaching in southeastern Farmington on a break from preaching and

was thus still subject to it.⁷² For southern evangelicals, like many of these Presbyterians, to be accused of disloyalty, like being accused of having owned slaves, was to be accused simultaneously of sin and political heresy. Southern evangelicals could confess and repent (by taking the oath) or they could defy the new civil religion. Those targeted included most of the southern-affiliated evangelicals in the state.

Continuing their opposition to the Drake constitution, Methodist ministers violated the oath like their Baptist and Presbyterian brethren. Barry Hill Spencer, who suffered at the hands of Union authorities during the war, was again arrested in 1866. He explained that “I believed it to be wicked thus to surrender the claims of Christ to the demands of Caesar, and resolved, at the hazard of fines and imprisonments, yea, even of life itself, that I would refuse compliance with this unrighteous requirement.”⁷³ Josiah McCary, a Methodist minister, was arrested in west-central Missouri. McCary had returned to what remained of his farm in Warrenton after being driven from his circuit just east in Pettis County during the war. He lamented “who would, who could have believed, until it actually did take place, that such instruments of torture should ever be invented in the State of Missouri by authority of law, so called, as have been put in operation to punish men for opinion's sake?”⁷⁴ In northeastern Missouri, William A. Tarwater was apprehended three times for preaching in violation of the constitution, the third with James Penn, who had numerous troubles on account of alleged pro-Confederate sympathies in 1863. Notwithstanding the courts, Tarwater was almost mobbed twice. After his second arrest, a brief article was written in the Liberty Tribune quoting him as saying “‘The Gospel is not bound’ – men will continue to proclaim it, despite test oaths, and bolts and bars.”⁷⁵ The Missouri Democrat took a far different view when it opined “were we to credit the assumption of some men professing to speak in its name, we should be forced to believe that the church [is] the . . .

mother of disloyalty in Missouri.”⁷⁶ Not all of those who were arrested were by any stretch southern-sympathizers. Baptist minister A. H. Dean was a Union major during the war. Notwithstanding his veteran status, he refused the oath and was subsequently jailed in western Cass County.⁷⁷

Loyalty oath prosecutions in the period 1865-1869 appear to have been most numerous in those parts of the state where northern evangelical sentiment was most widespread and in areas where religious contention over the issues of slavery and disunion was the most volatile. While the entirety of the state cannot be searched, the Missouri Judicial Index provides listings for fourteen counties. Four of those counties witnessed prosecutions for ministers not taking the Test Oath and subsequently performing acts in violation of the constitution.⁷⁸ In southwestern Dade County Samuel Mitchell was tried for preaching without taking the oath in 1866.⁷⁹ Madison County, in the southeastern lead belt, brought two ministers to court, Lewis Tucker in 1865 and John S. Frasier in 1866.⁸⁰ Another southeastern county, Scott, indicted L. F. Aspley in 1867 for violation of the oath. By far, however, the largest prosecutor of cases dealing with the Test Oath was Cape Girardeau County, also in the southeastern part of the state. In 1865 Ashael Munson, James Knowd and William Woodward were tried for violating the oath. The following year James Proctor was arrested and cases dealing with James Murphy and Patrick O’Regan were eventually appealed to the Missouri State Supreme Court which ruled in their cases in March of 1867.⁸¹ In addition, Cape Girardeau County, which had a significant enclave of Roman Catholics, witnessed eleven priests and religious sisters being taken to court for violating the oath. While his list certainly contains some errors, historian Thomas S. Barclay only found thirty-six specific indictments in twenty-eight counties. Only four of the individuals he listed have cases listed in the judicial index while one is a probably repeated on his list. Of the

ministerial affiliations Barclay could ascertain, seven Baptists, two Presbyterians and eight Methodists were prosecuted. In addition, he listed eight Catholic clerics. Of the cases not already mentioned, in northwestern Missouri there was one prosecution in Andrew County, two more in Gentry County, and two in Linn County. Barclay also found three cases in western Johnson County. South of St. Louis in Jefferson County there were four ministers brought before the courts and three additional men faced charges in east central Montgomery County. In Cape Girardeau County Barclay listed two additional reverends who were not in the court records. Within northeastern Missouri there were two cases in Lewis County and another in Knox County. By far the most prosecutions were in Marion County where there were fourteen. There was one trial in south central Moniteau County. Finally, Barclay did find one case within the Boone's Lick – a single minister was brought to trial in Cooper County.⁸² While many areas of the state simply ignored or delayed enforcing the law, in some places the southern evangelicals targeted by Drake's Constitution certainly were not preaching as they struggled to rebuild following the Civil War, leaving no one to prosecute.

The Radicals imposed standards not only for right religion but good citizenship, especially upon those who sought to hold offices of public trust – and the disloyal suffered the consequences of their actions in this connection. The provisions of the Constitution punished all who rejected presently – or had previously rejected – these religiously-grounded articles of political faith. One of the more important legal cases dealing with the Drake Constitution's oaths featured Alexander J. P. Garesché, a St. Louis area lawyer who was a vehement Confederate and refused to take the oath. Attempting to try a case in the St. Louis Circuit Court, State ex rel Conrad v. Bernoudy, the court questioned him rather or not he took the oath and refused to allow him to litigate the case upon hearing that he was in violation of the new constitution. Appearing

before the Missouri State Supreme Court in propria persona to represent himself, Garesché filed a motion to vacate the order and judgment against him. He attempted to argue that he should be allowed to practice for the lawyers' oath was illegal and unconstitutional. Criticizing Garesché for the brevity of his brief, Judge Nathaniel Holmes dismissed his motion in a September 1865 ruling and held that abjuration of secession and strict loyalty to the Union served properly to identify the "moral character" requisite for serving as a lawyer, or officer of the court.⁸³

The court that heard Garesché's case was firmly under the control of the Radical Unionist government. Many of the Radical leaders thought that the state supreme court was one of the greatest roadblocks to their program. On March 17, 1865 the constitutional convention passed the so-called "ousting ordinance" which declared every judgeship and most county offices vacant, allowing the governor to fill the offices with his own appointees. With many of the office holders unable to take an oath without committing perjury, Governor Fletcher had a number of replacements to appoint. The state supreme court and many men who lost their offices, nonetheless, unsuccessfully fought the ordinance. As it did not have to be approved by the voters, it went into effect on the first day of May and Fletcher began to subsequently fill the vacated offices. With the sitting court of Barton Bates, William V. N. Bay and John D. S. Dryden no longer in office, Fletcher appointed three loyal Radicals as their replacements. Onto the court came Walter L. Lovelace, the Speaker of the Missouri State House of Representatives, and a lawyer from east central Montgomery County who was in his early thirties. Originally from Virginia, his father had been a Baptist minister. Joining him was a noted St. Louis litigator Nathaniel Holmes. Serving as Chief Justice was David Wagner of northeastern Lewis County, who originally came to Missouri from Pennsylvania. This court began its work in a special June 1865 term a few weeks before the constitution went into effect on July 4th.⁸⁴

Radical Constitutionalism and the Protestant Agenda: Property Taxation and the Roman Catholic Church

The new Constitution of Missouri allowed the state the power to tax church property, provisions that Drake and others intended to use to persecute the Catholic Church. Drake, moreover, reasoned that some form of additional taxation was needed to repay state debts incurred by the war. Article One, Section Twelve of the constitution limited church lands to five acres in the country and one acre in town. Section Thirteen limited gifts and sales of property to the regulations in the previous section.⁸⁵ Drake relished the new church property tax clauses since they gave him an opportunity to put his intense anti-Catholicism into practice. Drake hoped that the Catholic Church's vast property holdings would be taxed, contributions limited, and its clergy would be restricted by the Test Oath. Attempting to rationalize Catholic opposition, he claimed in retrospect that "with the hierarchy of that huge political organization, and inevitably, therefore, with the whole body of their lay adherents, either of these things was enough to damn any constitution that man could make containing it."⁸⁶ Anti-Catholicism still played well for the Radicals in the rural areas of Missouri where those sentiments were popular even though they generated significant opposition from the Roman Catholic population in the state.⁸⁷ Some properties held in trust for evangelical churches certainly subject to taxation under the 1865 constitution. But evangelical leaders in Missouri did not criticize the new tax provision heavily. Most of them were primarily concerned the Test Oath. Catholic leaders, however, cried foul over the church tax provisions of the new constitution, given the vast amounts of taxable real estate and improvements owned by the Catholic Church in Missouri, amounting to about \$1,391,632 in 1860. Since the beginnings of French settlement Catholics had settled in the state but rapidly increased with the arrival of European immigrants – mainly from Ireland and Germany in the

1840s. The 1850 census found sixty-five buildings with 26,402 accommodations which increased ten years later to 38,826 seats along with 88 churches. In many instances, however, multiple Sunday masses allowed for more adherents than there were pews. While the heaviest concentrations of Catholics were around St. Louis and St. Charles counties, they were spread throughout the state.⁸⁸

Shrouded in controversy and confusion, church taxation was never fully implemented by the Missouri General Assembly as some feared, notwithstanding some attempts in 1866. In the spring of that year the Missouri State Senate began work on Senate Bill 125 which dealt with the collection of revenue. After it was sent to the House, it recommended an amendment which eliminated the possibility of taxes on religious property and a number of additional charitable concerns. Two Radical members of the committee dealing with the measure, John Dugge and Charles Howland, disagreed with the amendment and submitted a report to the entire lower chamber. In their view the Constitution was not up for debate on this issue. Linking it to the antebellum debate over slavery, they criticized their fellow committee members saying “We all have seen that political prejudices have influenced their view of law and justice in the Dred Scott case, so might religious predilections dim their views in this case.”⁸⁹ Both men feared that in light of the opposition to the Test Oath by Missouri’s religious bodies, the outcome would reflect poorly on the Radicals.⁹⁰

The controversial effort to authorize church taxation failed to pass the Missouri state legislature and was eventually abandoned. Senators John Dugge and Charles Howland further argued that the proposed amendment did not exclude all religious denominations, such as Catholics, which they viewed as unfair.⁹¹ An article quoted by the Liberty Tribune from the St. Louis German language newspaper Anzeiger des Westens accused the Radicals of using the

ecclesiastical ownership of property among Catholics instead of lay trustee control as a pretext to taking over their lands. Proclaiming the injustices of the Radicals, the paper elucidated its belief that one of these travesties was that churches could not be exempted from taxation as a result of the constitution. It concluded by asking “What do these Puritans care for the Constitution? They would not only renew the Civil War between the North and the South if they could, but they would not be afraid to kindle a religious war!”⁹² While a brief statement appeared in the Liberty Tribune during September lamenting church taxation, the issue took a back seat after 1866. No further attempts to implement any such plan seemingly gained any traction throughout the state and merited significant press coverage.⁹³

Missouri’s Catholics, well aware of the historical attacks levied against them and hostility within their home state, resented the Test Oath. Beginning in the sixteenth century after the English Reformation, the government sought to disqualify Roman Catholics by establishing religious tests that would work hand in hand with loyalty oaths. Many of these acts were enforced to varying degrees in the North American colonies. Oftentimes those who supported establishment through the period after the Revolution sought to maintain these tests and oaths.⁹⁴ All of these earlier provisions often led to a great deal of Catholic resentment towards the Missouri Test Oath as many feared a return to the long history of persecution. While these provisions were not employed in Missouri prior to the 1860s, anti-Catholicism was continuously on the rise since the dawn of Protestant settlement in the state. With the growing European Catholic immigration into the state after the 1840s many evangelicals, Drake included, increasingly dreaded the threat to Protestant Christianity and Anglo-Saxon racial purity. Many Missouri Catholics were certainly sensitive to this view, enhancing their dislike of the Test Oath.

Perceived wartime disloyalty, moreover, affected not only the Radical desire to punish Catholics but individuals' willingness to flout the oath. Drake, similar to other Radicals, linked his dislike for Catholicism with wartime disloyalty when he said in his autobiography that "next, in unbroken column, was the whole Roman Catholic population, implacably hostile to the Constitution, not only because of their universal disloyalty, but, also, because, first, under the Constitution, the vast property of the Roman Catholic Church in Missouri would be subject to taxation."⁹⁵ Peter Kenrick, the Irish-born archbishop of the Archdiocese of St. Louis whose jurisdiction comprised the entire state of Missouri, had been officially neutral during the war. He allowed other Catholics to support the respective sides. In this official policy he may have been influenced by his attendance at Maynooth in Ireland which, at the demand of the British, required an oath of its students not to participate in politics. In reality, however, Kenrick most likely supported the Confederacy. On the other hand, many of his German parishioners were vehemently pro-Union but a large number of the Irish Catholics in Missouri supported the Confederacy as they associated the North's effort to remake the South with Britain's effort to subjugate and dominate Ireland. Some, like John B. Bannon, a Catholic priest in the archdiocese, became Confederate chaplains. Bannon eventually went to his native Ireland in an attempt to gain Irish support for the Confederacy. With the inability of many Catholic clergy to take the oath and others who refused it out of principle, the magazine the Nation reported among Missouri's clergy ". . . Catholics were most opposed to the oath."⁹⁶

The 1865 constitution placed intense pressures on the Catholic clergy to dispose of most of the church property in the state or convey it to lay Catholics deemed loyal by state officials. Its provisions prohibited ministers, sects, and denominations from holding property in trust for individual churches, congregations, and societies – while permitting individuals other than

ministers, not disqualified because of disloyalty, to serve as holders of the property of individual churches, congregations, and societies in trust. Bishops and parish priests thus could no longer, as required by canon law and Vatican policy, hold Catholic Church property in trust for dioceses and parishes. The 1865 constitution disqualified disloyal Catholic laypersons from serving as trustees, just as it disqualified disloyal evangelicals. The new constitution thus left only loyal Catholic laypersons to hold property in trust for the church. New constitutional strictures permitting church corporations similarly placed pressure on the Catholic clergy either to divest the church of its holdings or convey church property to loyal Catholic lay persons. While the 1865 convention voted to continue the 1820 constitutional proscription of religious corporations, it made an exception for religious bodies seeking to establish a corporation for the purposes only of holding church property in trust. But the amount of land that fell within the bounds of the law was limited to one acre in the city and five in rural areas. All gifts and sales to religious bodies had to comply with this regulation. Under these mandates, bishops and parish priests could convey only a small segment of Catholic Church property in the state to incorporated lay trustees deemed loyal by state official and leave the vast majority of it in the hands of unincorporated lay trustees so approved.⁹⁷

Led by Archbishop Kenrick and their political leaders, Missouri's Catholics fought back against the Test Oath. It would be a case dealing with a Roman Catholic priest that would lead to the rescinding of the Test Oath. Kenrick told his priests to oppose it and offered instructions for the inevitable problems that would result from these actions. He wrote "since under the new Constitution, a certain oath is to be exacted of Priests . . . they can in no wise take, without a sacrifice of ecclesiastical liberty, I have judged it expedient, to indicate to you my opinion in the matter, that you may have before your eyes, a rule to be followed, in this extraordinary matter."⁹⁸

St. Louis physician Moses Linton was elected to the convention on the Radical ticket, but personally opposed Drake and eventually voted against the constitution. Linton, a Roman Catholic, summed up his opinion of it when it was purported he said that “it tears ministers of the Gospel from their pulpits, unless they will take an oath which the consciences of thousands of men will recoil. It enters the sanctuaries, and sits upon the holy vessels.”⁹⁹

Kenrick’s official condemnation of the oath led to the arrest of a number of Catholics for refusing to take it. Historian Thomas Barclay listed eight priests who were arrested for violating the oath. John J. Hogan, who would be named the first bishop of the new western Missouri see of St. Joseph in 1868, was arrested while serving a parish in Chillicothe. Hogan, a firm Unionist during the war, dressed in his clerical best, carried a bible and a crucifix as he was taken to the courthouse by the arresting sheriff. Hogan, however, was one of many not indicted in Livingston County. His congregants from neighboring Linn County, nonetheless, met in Brookfield and condemned the arrest and the oath.¹⁰⁰ Fr. Miller, a priest in Jefferson City was arrested soon after the oath went into effect in September of 1865.¹⁰¹ Another, Fr. Valtman, was apprehended in eastern Washington, Missouri in October of 1866.¹⁰² In Cape Girardeau County five priests who taught at St. Vincent’s College in Cape Girardeau were arrested for violating the oath in what became known in the lore of the school as the “night the faculty went to jail.” During the war the college had lost a number of its students as the school was split between its loyalties. The trial for the five men, however, was continuously postponed and did not occur once the oath was ruled unconstitutional in 1867.¹⁰³ Priests and ministers were not the only religious church authorities implicated under the Drake Constitution. Also in Cape Girardeau, nine Catholic Sisters of Loretto, who taught at St. Vincent Young Ladies Academy, were indicted for teaching without taking the oath at their southeastern Missouri school. Two of them, Sister Augusta and

Sister Margaret, were eventually arrested while the remainder eventually fled the court's jurisdiction.¹⁰⁴

The Intrepid Father Cummings:

Demise of the Test Oath and the Radical Republicans

The case which would nullify the oath involved the young pastor of St. Joseph Catholic Church in northeastern Louisiana, Missouri, John A. Cummings. Celebrating mass in September of 1865 without taking the oath, he was promptly arrested and brought before the Pike County Circuit Court with Radical Thomas J. C. Fagg as the judge. While he did not preside over the case, Fagg had been instrumental in throwing his weight on the side of the northern Methodists in their property dispute during the war in Louisiana. He was far from alone in his political sentiments in Pike County. Cummings originally pled guilty, but after Fagg asked him if he had anything to say he began to denounce the oath as a violation of the law and a persecution of the Catholic Church. As the Catholic community in Louisiana was primarily composed of recently arrived Irish immigrants, anti-Catholicism was nothing new for Cummings and his flock. Several lawyers who were present could not bear what was going on and eventually convinced Judge Fagg to have Cumming's plea changed to not guilty. Robert A. Campbell, a Union veteran and prominent Presbyterian who did not share the Radical sentiments of many in power in the county, offered to defend the priest. The next day Cummings was convicted of violating the oath and fined the \$500 required by the Constitution. A motion to set aside the verdict arguing the oath ran contrary to the federal constitution was quickly denied.¹⁰⁵ Cummings, refusing to pay the fine or allow his friends to do so, was imprisoned in the Pike County Jail. In the meantime the notoriety of the case spread throughout the nation, even appearing the New York Observer.¹⁰⁶ An anonymous writer to the Missouri Republican remarked after witnessing the proceedings that

“Once in awhile indicrous [sic] scenes occur in the most sacred places and under the most solemn circumstances – the temple of worship, the halls of legislation, and the Courts of Justice.”¹⁰⁷ Certainly growing anti-Catholicism, a consequence of both immigration and cultural patterns, increased the keen public interest in the Cummings case. For instance, the fiercely Radical Bethany Tribune, in northwestern Missouri, asserted that both Cummings and John Hogan “have no redeeming quality in their religious character. The hottest corner of hell [is] awaiting such preachers.”¹⁰⁸

Cummings’ case was soon appealed to the Missouri State Supreme Court as his lawyers sought to counterbalance the state’s assertions that the regulations of the oath were needed to suppress problematic ministers. Arguments were made to the Governor Fletcher’s handpicked Radical court of Wagner, Lovelace and Holmes. Robert Campbell continued to represent Cummings and argued that the oath trampled upon the freedom of religion established in the state and federal constitutions. He explained to the judges that by limiting those who could preach individuals “are not free to worship according to the dictates of their OWN consciences, but they are directed by the consciences of those who . . . controlled the administration by adopting the Constitution.”¹⁰⁹ Campbell sought to further demonstrate that the Test Oath also constituted an ex post facto law as it necessitated the person taking it to swear to past disloyalties. The oath, furthermore, also constituted a bill of attainder since it assumed that all of the ministers were guilty and should be required to take it or face some form of punishment from the state. In both ways it violated the federal constitution.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, the counsel for the state, E. P. Johnson, contended that the Test Oath was not an ex post facto law as it did not seek to punish past offenses but those who violated the present law. Johnson took a far narrower view of a bill of attainder than Campbell holding since no aspect of the constitution allowed the

legislature to declare a person attainted and take their property. Finally, Johnson emphasized that ministers and priests had the power to shape public opinion and sentiment for or against the government. What they preached mattered and could undermine the authority of government and, in time of war, help bring it down. As a result, the state was required to regulate the freedom of religion, but in doing so did not trample upon one's freedom of conscience. The Declaration of Rights in the state constitution simply spelled out freedoms that enabled "a right to worship the Supreme Being according to dictates of one's heart . . . the doing or forbearing of which is not prejudicial to the public weal."¹¹¹

The Radical-dominated high court was more than willing to render a verdict in support of the Test Oath. Noting the manner of the court's creation by the Radicals, the Missouri Republican remarked during the initial stages of the appeal that "Governor Fletcher is in the city, but we do not certainly know whether they have concluded upon giving orders to his Supreme Court as to what the opinion shall be given in the case of Rev. Mr. Cummings" ¹¹² Judge David Wagner, writing for the court on 30 October, rejected the argument that the oath was both a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law. The court denied the former assertion explaining that as a bill of attainder dealt with punishing offenders by acts of the legislature in the absence of a trial for a capital offense; the penalty for violating the oath did not reach that threshold. Similarly, the lesser accusation of the act being a bill of pain or punishment did not apply as Cummings' estate was not confiscated. Since the Test Oath was implemented for future protections, neither was it an ex post facto law that punished for past offenses.¹¹³ The judges did not view the oath as breaching any segment of the Declaration of Rights in the 1865 Constitution. Instead, they invoked the enhanced powers of the state that many Radical Republicans sought to use during Reconstruction. Holmes said "we do not see that any one is

forbidden to enjoy the fruits of his labor; but in doing so he must conform to the law. The State asserts her superior control over all her citizens.”¹¹⁴ Finally, the judges rejected any contentions that religious liberties were being trampled upon by using existing Sunday laws and state regulations of religious worship, saying that “there is no intermeddling with the natural and indefeasible right to worship God according to the dictates of the conscience.”¹¹⁵ In this view the guarantees of religious freedom within the state constitution were adequate. But at the same time the state could regulate religion, as it was doing so through the Test Oath. It simply ensured that any abuses were avoided as qualifications to fundamental liberties were a long-standing tradition in the Anglo-American constitutional tradition.

The case was quickly appealed to the United States Supreme Court which eventually ruled in favor of Cummings. While he was not actively involved with the case after the first appeal, a chance encounter Cummings had with Frank Blair on a boat on the Mississippi River helped set up his legal team for the high court. Blair, a fervent Unionist during the war, split with the Radicals over their vindictive policies. He called for both a mass convention opposing it as he helped to formally organize the primary Radical opposition with the Conservative Unionist Party and himself challenged the voter disfranchisement to the United States Supreme Court. Blair arranged for his brother and former Lincoln postmaster Montgomery to take the case in part to endear himself to Maryland’s Catholics, where he had political aspirations. Joining Blair was Maryland’s United States Senator Reverdy Johnson, a conservative Democrat who opposed some of the harsher aspects in his state’s constitution. David Dudley Field, a noted trial attorney was the final member of the team. Before the war, he championed codification of the common law in the name of democracy and advocated the study of law as a “legal science,” one that, however, acknowledged the beneficial influence of Christianity upon the English common law of

personal rights. He was a member of the Republican Party until about 1876.¹¹⁶ Missouri United States Senator John B. Henderson, who was present at the initial trial, along with George Strong, represented the state in Washington. In essence, both sides largely replicated the arguments that were presented to the Missouri State Supreme Court. Justice Stephen Field wrote the opinion of the court, which rejected the ruling of the Missouri court and their definition of a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law but avoided discussing the religious aspects of the case. The justice explained that the Test Oath requirement was a bill of attainder or pains and penalties no matter how it was viewed – both of which were prohibited by the federal constitution as “there would be the legislative enactment creating the deprivation without any of the ordinary forms and guards provided for the security of the citizen in the administration of justice by the established tribunals.”¹¹⁷ Field, moreover, wrote how the oaths required in the constitution were ex post facto laws as

they are aimed at past acts, and not future acts. . . . The framers of the constitution of Missouri knew at the time that whole classes of individuals would be unable to take the oath prescribed. To them there is no escape provided; to them the deprivation was intended to be, and is, absolute and perpetual. To make the enjoyment of a right dependent upon an impossible condition is equivalent to an absolute denial of the right under any condition, and such denial, enforced for a past act, is nothing less than punishment imposed for that act. It is a misapplication of terms to call it anything else.¹¹⁸

The court was not unanimous, nevertheless, as the other Lincoln-appointed justices on the court, Chief Justice Salmon Chase, David Davis, Noah Swayne and Samuel Miller dissented.¹¹⁹

The outcome in favor of Cummings was a curious result since five of the nine justices had been appointed by Lincoln. Chief Justice Chase was Lincoln’s former Secretary of the Treasury and was nominated upon the death of Roger Taney in order to placate the Radical wing of the Republican Party. While Noah Swayne had been born in Virginia, the anti-slavery Quaker

eventually relocated to Ohio. David Davis was born in Maryland but was a friend of Lincoln from Illinois. Samuel Miller, originally from Kentucky moved to Iowa as a result of his anti-slavery views. While Stephen Field had been nominated by Lincoln, he was a Unionist Democrat, appointed in part to achieve sectional and ideological balance as he was a Californian. Field's ideology proved to be the deciding factor as the remaining justices, John Wayne, Samuel Nelson, Robert Grier and Nathan Clifford, had served on the Taney Court and was appointed by Democrats.¹²⁰

The decision undercut the power of the Radicals to punish and silence southern evangelical clerics and signaled the direction the high court would gradually begin to take in moving away from Radical Reconstruction. In rendering their verdict, the justices rejected the arguments made in part by George P. Strong. He maintained the Test Oath was justified as the Radicals were engaged in a "fierce war of opinion" against many Missourians who committed treason. Strong held that ministers fell into this category as "even the minister of heaven, forgetting of what world his Master's kingdom was, went forth to perform the part allotted to him in this great work of iniquity."¹²¹ Instead, the justices in the majority rejected the notion that the restrictions within the Test Oath were needed and therefore stretched the definition of ex post facto law, as set out in the Constitution, to achieve a pre-determined result. This result was one that, of course, also worked in favor of southern sympathizers – including southern evangelical ministers. While the high court had generally tolerated Lincoln's expansive wartime powers, after the conclusion of the fighting, the justices began to limit these powers. In Ex parte Milligan (1866) the Court found that the president could not impose martial law upon the citizens and suspend the writ of habeas corpus. At the same time, moreover, with the end of slavery the unleashing of corporate development in the United States the nation's high court gradually

moved towards dealing with business concerns. Making use of its right to interpret the recently-ratified Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, in the 1883 Civil Rights Cases, the court limited the ability of Congress to provide full access to public accommodations under its 1875 Civil Rights Act.¹²²

Justice Samuel Miller, who wrote the dissent, denied that loyalty oaths, including the Missouri Test Oath, were unconstitutional under either the United States Constitution or the constitution of the state of Missouri. Miller wrote the dissent for Ex parte Garland to apply also for the Cummings case. Garland involved a former Confederate Senator from Arkansas, Augustus Hill Garland. He was disbarred, notwithstanding his pardon by President Johnson, because he could not take a congressional loyalty oath swearing he had never served in the Confederate government. In that case the court also ruled the oath ex post facto and a bill of attainder. Miller's dissent deals with the arguments made by Cummings' lawyers that the Test Oath encroached on the sanctity of the ministerial profession and violated religious freedom. According to Justice Miller, the United States Constitution provided no power to its judiciary to restrain a state from exercising exclusive power over the subject of religion. In his view the framers of the 1865 Missouri Constitution were fully authorized to declare "that no priest of any church shall exercise his ministerial function, unless he will show, by his own oath, that he has borne a true allegiance to his government."¹²³

Chief Justice Salmon Chase joined in Miller's dissent, but gradually backed away from the harsh loyalty oaths and Reconstruction policies. Besides William Seward, Chase had perhaps done more against slavery than any other major member of the Republican Party. According to Chase biographer John Niven, the Chief Justice generally held that while harsh oaths and loyalty measures could be justified in wartime, they were not needed once the fighting had ceased.

While he generally mitigated his positions out of political expediency, he and the others justices still experienced some flak from Congress even with their dissent. Chase gradually drifted further from Radical Reconstruction and after presiding over the Senate impeachment trial of President Johnson. Two weeks after the president's acquittal during the contentious trial he wrote New York Democratic leader August Belmont, elaborating his views and the proper roles of loyalty oaths in postwar America. He explained

Congress was right in not limiting, by its reconstruction acts, the right of suffrage to whites; but wrong in the exclusion from suffrage of certain classes of citizens and all unable to take its prescribed retrospective oath, and wrong also in the establishment of despotic military governments for the States and in authorizing military commissions for the trial of civilians in time of peace. There should have been as little military government as possible; no military commissions; no classes excluded from suffrage; and no oath except one of faithful obedience and support to the Constitution and laws, and of sincere attachment to the constitutional Government of the United States.¹²⁴

In Cummings v. Missouri, the United States Supreme Court did not strike down the Missouri Test Oath as a violation of religious liberty, if only because it lacked the constitutional power to do so. The vital question in the case was this: Could a state government during peacetime ban from the pulpits ministers either unable or unwilling to swear past and/or future loyalty? During the Civil War, the publication of religious ideas that justified slavery, secession, and disloyalty had posed a very real threat to the very existence of Border State governments that had to contend with substantial rebel populations. Yet the Supreme Court of Missouri was never once called upon to decide if its mandatory wartime oath of loyalty required of ministers violated the freedoms of speech and conscience protected by the constitution of the state. To strike down that oath would have substantially compromised the ability of the state to protect its people and preserve itself, a vital interest that jurists, lawmakers, and political leaders deemed far superior to that of preserving individual civil liberties. But such dire circumstances did not justify the

decision of the Missouri Supreme Court in Missouri v. Cummings. The war had passed, as had the requisite justification for any mandatory oath designed to identify and silence those who had harbored disloyal sentiments or engaged in acts of disloyalty. Conservative critics of the Test Oath in Missouri thus deemed it an unnecessary, if not vindictive, Radical measure. The United States Supreme Court, however, was powerless to strike down the Missouri Test Oath as an unwarranted violation of free speech and the free exercise of religion protected by the First Amendment. In 1866, at least, that provision of the federal Bill of Rights placed limits only on the Congress, not on the government of a state. The Court was thus spared the politically-thankless task of declaring in what circumstances, exactly, a state government would be justified in denying hallowed civil liberties to secure its survival and the welfare of the people. But the position that Father Cummings had argued all along, that the Test Oath constituted an ex post facto law, provided the Court a minimally plausible substitute rationale for striking it down. The federal constitution, like the constitution of Missouri, explicitly prohibited states from enacting such legislation. All that was needed to get the job done was a little judicial ingenuity to bring the Test Oath within the definition of such a law.¹²⁵

Missouri's newspapers were not shy about divulging their opinions before and after the case's outcome was known, seeking to advance their view of the Test Oath. Discussions on the case moved throughout Missouri, even before it was officially decided. Justices on the high court, however, often divulged opinions before they were officially announced. The Cummings case was no different, with the outcome being known as early as the spring of 1866, playing a role in the election later that year, a fact the conservative Springfield Southwest Union Press noted in June.¹²⁶ In July an article in the St. Louis Dispatch, which was reprinted in the Cape Girardeau Weekly Argus, made similar assertions.¹²⁷ In January of 1867 the leading papers in

St. Louis were the first to get wind of the actual ruling and commented accordingly. The Missouri Democrat, outraged by the decision, condemned the logic of majority regarding the oath as ex post facto and a bill of attainder. In essence agreeing with the dissent, it opined that “the pretended principle upon which the majority based their decision, though so utterly absurd to scarcely deserve mention, would extend equally every application of the Oath.”¹²⁸ Its prime competitor, the Missouri Republican, delighted by the outcome of the case, proclaimed the same day

while the opinion is of universal importance and value, since it reinforces by new argument and illustration certain provisions of the fundamental Law of the Republic to secure the liberties and franchises to the people from outrages from their legislators, yet is posses for us in Missouri a particular value, since it strikes down by a fatal blow and instrument of political and religious tyranny by which many thousands have been deeply wronged by the Radical faction of the State.¹²⁹

Even though the decision had implications for other professionals, such as lawyers, who were required to take an oath, the Republican focused on its religious significance. Conservative papers outside of St. Louis, like the Liberty Tribune, Columbia Statesman, or Jefferson City People’s Tribune, cheered the decision. Radical sheets, such as the Jefferson City Missouri State Times condemned the verdict. Many published the opinion in detail, or like the Liberty Tribune, discussed what the St. Louis papers had to say on the case.¹³⁰

The southern faithful within the three denominations heartily celebrated the Cummings decision. As might be expected, the St. Louis Christian Advocate gloried in the high court’s rendering of the decision. Assuming that the readers knew the details of the case, the initial article only said, inaccurately, that the case overturned every aspect of the oath. At the same time, however, McAnally “We feel deeply humiliated in glancing at the dissenting opinion, the constitution and the principles of the law are all ignored. . . .”¹³¹ An article in the following week praised the changes that the court enacted in Missouri as it rendered its judgment. McAnally,

contrasting his earlier articles in November of 1865 with his editorial, revealed in the fact that he and his fellow evangelicals would no longer be persecuted under the Radical Test Oath. He wrote, “now that the deliverance hath been wrought, and we are once more permitted to pursue our work as ministers of Christ without the threat of bonds and imprisonments hanging over us, let us devoutly recognize the overruling Providence of our Heavenly Father.”¹³² The editorial concluded by hoping that the editors of the Presbyterian and Baptist Journal would comment on the matter. While copies of the Baptist and Presbyterian periodicals in the state are no longer exist for that year, most sources convey the satisfaction that the women and men who feared the oath felt when it was finally overturned. Duncan, in his History of the Baptists in Missouri, sums up this sentiment when he wrote “there was general rejoicing over all the land.”¹³³

The precedent established by the United States Supreme Court in Cummings led to the overturning of convictions of many others in Missouri. Methodist divine David H. Murphy had been among the evangelical clerics tried in Cape Girardeau County for violating the oath. The county, with a Radically-controlled judiciary, had been more than willing to prosecute many of the cases brought before it. Murphy, assigned to the Jackson Circuit, had been very successful in gaining new converts – 135 in late 1865 and early 1866. Perhaps this success encouraged his prosecution, which took place in front of the circuit court in December of 1865. While his council attempted to file a demurrer to object to the prosecution, it was overruled and he was convicted and fined \$500 as proscribed by the law. Murphy’s case received some notoriety around the state.¹³⁴ Most of the litigation had been purposefully delayed in circuit courts around the state to avoid ruling on the oath for clergy and other professions. After the ruling in Cummings, most courts simply abandoned such prosecutions. With the Radicals in control of the judiciary in Cape Girardeau County, Murphy had been convicted of preaching without taking the

oath and was forced to appeal. Murphy's case, and that of several others who had been convicted, were appealed to the Missouri State Supreme Court which ruled in October of 1867 after delaying for most of year.¹³⁵ Judge Holmes, who authored the previous opinions about the provision, wrote for the court in a series of cases dealing with lawyers, teachers and ministers. In light of the Cummings decision, the state court had little choice to rule on the constitutionality of the Test Oath and throw out the convictions, which Holmes did in his decision. While Holmes could not fully accept the logic of Justice Field in overturning his previous ruling on the matter or the wisdom State Constitutional Convention in crafting the provision, he had significantly changed his thinking on the matter – similar to Chief Justice Chase after Johnson's impeachment trial. For Holmes, no longer could the necessities of suppressing disloyal ministers overrule the requirement that judges allow the implementation of fair laws. He thus concluded by writing "it may be said to be the especial duty of the judiciary, which sits as it were upon an eminence, remote from the storm and turmoil of political antagonisms, serenely to maintain a watchful care over those great principles of law and liberty which lie at the foundation of the republic."¹³⁶ For the other judges on the court, David Wagner and Thomas Fagg, now a member of the court after Lovelace's death, Holmes' reasoning was a step that was too far for them to take. The outcome of the Murphy case received some ink in Missouri's secular papers as sheets like the Liberty Tribune mentioned the positive outcome for the minister.¹³⁷

The reversals wrought by the overturning of the Test Oath placed Missouri Radicals in an especially vulnerable position given the distinctive species of Reconstruction that was implemented in Missouri. In the view of the United States government, at least, Missouri had remained in the Union through the Civil War. After Radical Republicans swept to power in Congress in the 1866 fall elections, consequently, they refrained from implementing the regime

of Reconstruction in Missouri that they imposed on the other former slaveholding states. Officially, at least, Missouri was not subjected to military rule or United States Army occupation through to the collapse of congressional Reconstruction in 1876.

The Radical Republicans in Missouri began to lose their total dominance of the political field shortly after the Cummings decision. Those opposing the Radicals had fought an uphill battle because of the disfranchising power of the Test Oath. The Conservative Union Party, formed to fight the Radicals, fared poorly in the 1866 election and quickly disintegrated. With the help of Frank Blair and others the Democrats began to reorganize within Missouri, but scored only a few victories over the next two years. On the other hand, liberals within the Radical Party began to separate from the core of the organization in the spring of 1867 as they opposed the African American enfranchisement provisions. In part, they hoped to gain harmony in the state by rejecting greater rights for blacks. This controversy was only removed when Congress passed the Fifteenth Amendment, ending racial voting restrictions, and sent it to the states in 1869. While Governor Fletcher rarely found himself within the mainstream of the Radical Union Party – he was not able to lead its liberal element. It would take the leadership of German émigré Carl Schurz along with B. Gratz Brown and others to mold the internal opposition into the Liberal Republican Party that was able to compete in the 1870 election. Many within the Radical ranks resisted Drake's leadership while scores of Germans chafed under his nativist sentiments and others still under his anti-Catholicism.¹³⁸

Impeding the Liberal Republican ascendancy was the slow demise of the Test Oath. Many conservatives had hoped that the United States Supreme Court decision would in effect lead to the overturning of the oath in its entirety, but those laws would only be eliminated in 1870. The nation's highest tribunal allowed the state to maintain the voting requirements in

Drake's Constitution. While the Missouri Republican and other newspapers had speculated that the oath for voters might be overturned after the decision in Cummings v. Missouri, a test case filed by Frank Blair, Blair v. Ridgley, failed in front of the Missouri State Supreme Court in March of 1867. Blair had originally filed this case to whip up sentiment against the Radicals and hoped for a positive outcome from the United States Supreme Court in time for the 1868 election, during which he was the Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee. Radical leader Charles D. Drake argued for the defendants on the both the state and federal levels. The case, however, was delayed, and the court effectively upheld the ruling with a 4-4 deadlock in 1870. The state General Assembly, nevertheless, moved forward with three constitutional amendments which eliminated the "ironclad" features of the oath for voting, the rarely-enforced juror portions and the requirements for office holding, functioning as a corporate trustee or black office holding. The amendments passed the state legislature with only a handful of hardcore Radicals, primarily from southwestern Missouri, voting against the measure. They were easily ratified by the electorate in 1870. Restrictions placed in the constitution on church property were less controversial by 1870 and thus ignored in these amendments.¹³⁹ Nationally, moreover, Congress passed a federal Amnesty Act in 1872 which removed voting restrictions and office-holding disqualifications from all but 500 ex-Confederate military leaders.¹⁴⁰

Missouri's 1870 election spelled the end of the power of the Radical Union Party within the state and the eventual return of Democratic control. The newly formed Liberal Republican Party campaigned on a platform which emphasized the re-enfranchisement of whites and a general reconciliation within the state. State-wide Democrats, on the other hand, adapted a so-called "possum policy" in which they were generally inactive on the state level but competed primarily in local General Assembly and congressional races. While the recently enfranchised

African American voters cast their ballots for the Radical ticket in most locals, the Liberals were able to easily win the governorship with B. Gratz Brown crushing incumbent Radical governor Joseph McClurg. The Democrats, however, were able to win four of the nine congressional seats (they did not contest four of the remaining seats) along with control of the House of Representatives and effective control of the Senate. With Radical rule clearly at an end, Drake resigned his seat in the United States Senate in November after securing the Chief Justiceship of the United States Court of Claims.¹⁴¹

A New Wave of Church Property Litigation and the Vindication of Southern Evangelicals

The general tendency of the ruling in Cummings to provide renewed vigor to the litigation efforts of southern evangelicals to obtain their seized land and buildings does not appear to have manifested itself among Baptists as much as it did among Methodists and Presbyterians. Through the war, Missouri Baptists had mostly remained affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention. With the establishment of the Missouri Baptist State Convention in 1865 about a hundred congregations spread throughout the state joined the American Baptist Home Missionary Society and other northern associational efforts. While the precise numbers are difficult to determine because of the postwar chaos, several hundred congregations remained in the Missouri Baptist General Association and aligned with the southern Baptists as a whole. Notwithstanding this split, there was virtually no high profile litigation between members of individual Baptist congregations. The Baptists were a heavily rural denomination. And it seems quite likely that congregants in the rural countryside were not as concerned with property and church edifices as were middle class congregants in the more urban areas of the state. In rural precincts, land was less expensive, and a minority could easily build or obtain their own edifice.

Some urban congregations, like Galusha Anderson's Second Baptist Church in St. Louis purged its pro-southern members during the war, leaving little dissent after its conclusion. Without the necessity of appealing to higher ecclesiastical judicatories, unlike the Methodists and Presbyterians, drawn-out congregational and denominational disputes over church property were less likely among the Baptists. Finally, the speed in which both factions were able to establish a workable modus vivendi with one another, in contrast to the success of other denominations in this regard, may have halted any litigation.

Missouri's Methodists remained divided into northern and southern camps through Reconstruction, ensuring that there was no quick resolution to many of the wartime property disputes. The MEC had attempted to take control of several churches throughout the state during the war when wartime conditions had allowed them to reverse the antebellum persecution they suffered. With wartime conditions hampering the ability of the courts to decide cases, the conclusion played out in Reconstruction Missouri. Even though MEC Bishop Edward Ames' plan to seize MECS churches where alleged disloyal congregants worshiped was not undertaken in Missouri, there were still fears in late 1865 that it might be implemented. David Rice McAnally, writing in the St. Louis Christian Advocate, referenced the 1853 Smith v. Swormstedt case which the United States Supreme Court decided a property dispute over the Book Concern in favor of the MECS. He said that "Once more, good Bishop, you know very well that the question as to whom these churches rightfully belonged was settled several years ago by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States."¹⁴² In the months after the MEC began to return much of this property throughout the South to the MECS, save some where the congregants were still undergoing litigation.¹⁴³ While the MEC had the assistance of the military to hold southern property during the war, once the fighting ended this aid was withdrawn.¹⁴⁴

Individual cases often broke in favor of the southern Methodists as the Union assistance that was now withdrawn with the return of much of Missouri to civilian control denied the northern church a crucial bulwark that the courts were not willing to provide. In northeastern LaGrange the bill that the MECS trustees had filed against MEC minister W. C. Stewart and his MEC supporters that had seized their edifice had made little progress in court. After the war and in possession of the building, the northern church attempted to delay the suit as long as possible. In February 1867 the case finally went to trial in Shelby County, as the venue was changed from Lewis County. With the northern church attempting to change the venue once again, it was eventually settled out of court. The southern church was given a portion of the two town-lots and the newer church edifice while the MEC congregation retained the older building and the remainder of the property.¹⁴⁵ In Independence, on the western border with Kansas, the MECS faced constant troubles with the fighting in that part of the state. Union troops had allowed the MEC to take control of the impressive church and parsonage in that town. But as the northern church was unwilling to contest the lawsuit that the MECS had filed they simply gave back the keys to the buildings. The congregation in Lexington, also in the western part of the state on the edge of the Boone's Lick, experienced a virtually identical situation.¹⁴⁶ Within Lafayette County, where Lexington was located, the Radicals had a very well-publicized dispute with the circuit judges who refused to give up their seats after the Ouster Ordinance. After the 1866 election, moreover, there were riots in the county.¹⁴⁷ Further west, in Kansas City, a handful of MEC adherents had also used the military situation to take control of the MECS church there. Like in nearby Independence and Lexington, the MEC were unable to defend their seizure of the building in court and turned the edifice back over the southern Methodists in the spring of 1866.¹⁴⁸

In Booneville, a Cooper County community within the Boone's Lick, litigation not only progressed through the local courts but to the Missouri State Supreme Court which ruled on the case. There the northern Methodist minister, John N. Pierce, attempted to seize the MECS building by petitioning the Cooper County Court in February 1866. Pierce was subsequently able to gain an order to expel the southern Methodist trustees, Richard H. Howard and Obadiah Edwards, from the congregational property. The court claimed that the title was in possession of the county, justifying the action. Without their building, the Methodists were forced to worship first in the Presbyterian Church and then in a hall donated by a non-religious man. When the circuit court resumed its session in May of that year, they quashed the order. Pierce, unable to obtain a stay to avoid the edifice returning to the southern Methodist trustees, appealed to the state supreme court without otherwise contesting the action barring him from taking the church. Issuing its ruling during the July term, notwithstanding the lack of information they had about the litigation, the high court determined that the county court exceeded its jurisdiction and validated the circuit court ruling against Pierce. Both Nathaniel Holmes, who wrote the decision and David Wagner, who concurred, separated the case from any religious litigation that had taken place either nationally or in Missouri and did not attempt to apply disloyalty provisions against the MECS or mention the denomination by name. While both judges, along with Walter Lovelace who was dying and unable to be in court, were Radical Unionists, they viewed this case as a relatively simple case where the initial order for Pierce to seize the property was illegal which his lack of substantial action besides his appeal to the high court confirmed.¹⁴⁹

The extended ordeal of the Methodist St. Charles College proved to be a far more complicated case as the continuation of the property that had been seized during the war and the Radical attempts to maintain control of the school played out in front of the state's highest

tribunal. While the northern Methodists supported the effort to strip the MECS of the school, non-Methodist Radicals were prominent in the proceedings as well. The Reverend William H. Anderson had been appointed president of St. Charles College by the Missouri Conference of the MECS in September 1859.¹⁵⁰ Arnold Krekel, who was a Union officer during the war and president of the state constitutional convention, had both seized the school from the MECS and attempted to place the board of curators under Radical control. Krekel, a graduate even though he was not Methodist, was also a curator prior to the school's temporary wartime closing. Using the fact that not every curator was a member of the MECS and the college received a charter from the Missouri General Assembly, he sought to have this charter modified in 1863. With a number of curators being unable to take the State Convention's March 23, 1863 oath that officers or trustees who had not taken an oath of loyalty forfeited their positions, Arnold Krekel arranged for the amending of the college's charter on December 11, 1863 to allow loyal curators to be appointed as replacements. With the amended charter, several Radicals, who were not all Methodists as the original board members, were appointed as curators including Charles Drake, Moses Linton and Nathaniel Reid. Drake and Linton were members of the state constitutional convention while Reid had sent a letter to the provost marshal against Robert P. Farris. Neither of the three gentlemen, moreover, along with some of the other appointed curators, were Methodists.¹⁵¹

In March of 1867 a quo warranto proceeding styled State ex rel. Pittman v. Adams was initiated in the St. Charles County Circuit Court by several southern Methodists to recover the property and reopen the institution. Included among the plaintiffs were Bishop Enoch M. Marvin, noted Methodist ministers Andrew Monroe, Joseph Boyle and David Rice McAnally, and former United States Senator and Confederate general Trusten Polk.¹⁵² In bringing their case

to the court, the southern Methodists argued that they were entitled to the property that they once controlled. They further claimed that the board of curators never accepted the changes passed in 1863 as the majority never voted upon them. Krekel, who drove most of the early takeover, was named to the federal bench by President Lincoln in 1865 and did not figure into the litigation. Their opponents contended that as a result of the loyalty oath requirement instituted during the war, the curators did not have a quorum to transact business, requiring the additional appointments which eventually gave the Radicals control of the school. Both the circuit and district courts, controlled by Radicals, ruled against the southern Methodist faction. The appellate district court was established by the 1865 constitution and was composed of the circuit judges in a particular region of the state. The goal of this new judicial creation was to ensure that the Missouri State Supreme Court would not have to hear every appeal.¹⁵³

The case was eventually appealed to the Missouri State Supreme Court who returned custody of the property to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The court heard oral arguments and rendered its decision in the October Term of 1869. Thomas Bruere, arguing for the northern group, asserted that the December 11th action amending the charter was valid. At the same time, he insisted an amendment to the charter in 1847 which allowed the relators to obtain their positions as curators with the approval of the MECS was contrary to the original charter. Its founder George Collier did not intend it to become a purely a theological institution.¹⁵⁴ E. A. Lewis, while continuing the appellants' previous arguments, countered that the 1847 amendment could not be used to alter the charter in the manner in which Krekel and others had it done in 1863 to allow the new curators to be appointed.¹⁵⁵ Judge Philemon Bliss wrote for the unanimous court. Bliss had been a Republican congressman from Ohio during the 1850s and arrived in Missouri after serving as the Lincoln-appointed Chief Justice of the Dakota

Territory Supreme Court during the war. Besides David Wagner, who was drifting into the Liberal Republican camp by 1869, Warren Currier, an influential judge from St. Louis, was also a member of the high bench. Currier, an influential Congregationalist in the city, was elected in 1868.¹⁵⁶ Bliss' decision held that the original 1837 charter did not intend the school to become so intimately connected with the MECS or any other denomination. As a result, the 1847 amendment was invalid, as was the curators' acceptance of it. He wrote that the "alleged acceptance of the amendment of 1847, to the charter of St. Charles College, gave it no validity; that the amendment had not become necessary to further the objects of the charity, but its direct tendency was to change the principles of its administration; and that, in consenting to it, the board of curators went beyond their powers."¹⁵⁷ Bliss further linked the case to the Cummings decision, which overturned the test oath as a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law, since the oath used to remove the curators was similar and fell under that precedent. While the act in March 1863 taking control of the grounds from the disloyal curators was a logical action in wartime, when those conditions were no longer present as they were in 1869, Bliss asserted that the property had to be returned at the conclusion of the fighting – a similar logic that Wagner used in his Murphy decision. Even with the 1847 act invalid, as Bruere had asserted for the respondents, the court did not have the power to overrule it. The Missouri General Assembly, however, simply did not have the authority to empower Krekel's trustees and as a result, ordered the return of the college to the original southern Methodist-leaning curators.¹⁵⁸

Presbyterian Church property disputes and related litigation in Missouri during Reconstruction stemmed critically from the ideological conflicts and institutional ruptures that had divided the denomination from the 1837 schism through the Civil War years. Having declared its loyalty to the Union in 1861, the Old School General Assembly of the Presbyterian

Church of the United States of America became, after the Civil War, increasingly intolerant of its ministers who still rejected their pro-Union pronouncements and theology. To this extent, the Old School Presbyterian Church had moved several steps closer to their New School counterparts with whom they had parted ways in 1837 and who had had organized themselves into a church by the same name at about that time. By 1865, the New School Presbyterians who had rejected the national organization's anti-slavery stance and formed the United Synod of the South in 1857 had merged with the pro-slavery Old School Presbyterians who had established the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America in 1861. This southern merger, too, denominated itself the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. While affiliated with identically-named churches, northern and southern Presbyterians had little desire to reunify in 1865 because wartime hostilities continued to fan the flames of sectional hostility.¹⁵⁹ In 1865, most pro-southern Presbyterians in Missouri, as in the Border State of Kentucky, were associated with the northern-dominated Old School General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. During the war, Missouri Presbyterians had little choice but to retain that affiliation. By the same token, they had, for years, endured the heavily pro-Union pronouncements of the leaders of that church. Few Missouri Presbyterians were affiliated with new Presbyterian Church comprising the old United Synod of the South and the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. There were only a about two dozen or so New School congregations in Missouri at that time, that is, congregations connected to the northern-dominated New School Presbyterian Church of the United States.¹⁶⁰

Reconstruction-era litigation between Presbyterians in Missouri over church property turned critically on the determination of the northern-dominated Old School Presbyterian Church to make contrition over slavery, support of the Confederacy, and Ironclad loyalty to the Union

litmus tests for church membership. In 1865, Presbyterians in Missouri and Kentucky affiliated with that became thoroughly exasperated with such pronouncements – which came most forcefully and explicitly in the form of a “deliverance” in 1861 known as the Gardiner Spring Resolutions. The resolutions, passed by the General Assembly at the beginning of the war, required all Presbyterian ministers and members within the Old School to swear political allegiance to the federal government. At the heart was the “obligation, to promote and perpetuate, so far in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions.”¹⁶¹ As a result, the Presbyterians took the unprecedented step of requiring all members to support the government and its undertaking during the war, which soon came to include the elimination of slavery in addition to the upholding of the Union. Shortly thereafter, in December of 1861, the members of the Old School in states under southern control formed the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. While the deliverance passed the general assembly, six protests were entered into the official record. Charles Hodge, both a firm Unionist and president of Princeton Theological Seminary, authored one of the protests which condemned the resolutions for injecting the church into what he held as the major political question of the era – states’ rights versus a strong federal government. The problem for Hodge and others was not loyalty to the Union but that the General Assembly was now interjecting itself into the political realm, rejecting the right of orthodox Presbyterians to practice their faith. Hodge said that “we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due, and its rights to make that decision a condition of membership in our Church.”¹⁶²

In the summer of 1865, southern Presbyterians in Kentucky authored the Declaration and Testimony, which voiced the strenuous objections of many Presbyterians in the Border States to the deliverance. Without the ability to join the recently created southern Presbyterian Church, Presbyterians in states like Missouri and Kentucky had to remain in the Old School General Assembly which held to the Spring Resolutions. While dissent from the deliverance was initially tolerated, from either those who rejected the principal or loyalty to the federal government, by 1865 all Presbyterians were forced to subscribe to it and the resulting Unionism it proscribed. No longer could anyone who was not firmly loyal to the government, tolerated secession or slavery remain a Presbyterian in good standing. One such preacher, James H. Brookes of St. Louis, remarked that “every minister was now required not only to accept the deliverance, but to cooperate actively in the execution of every doctrinal and ecclesiastical decree.”¹⁶³ For many in the Louisville Presbytery, these actions of the General Assembly were too much to endure and in September 1865 they ratified the Declaration and Testimony. Its author was Samuel R. Wilson, a minister. In the mind of Wilson, and the eventual signers of the document, instead of preaching the gospel, as was the church’s mission, the General Assembly was forcing its membership to abide by its views on loyalty to the federal government and anti-slavery, a point Hodge had condemned four years earlier. The question of the role of states’ rights could not be decided by an ecclesiastical body. Wilson wrote “the action of the Assembly in the premises does not only decide the political question referred to, but makes that decision a test of membership in our Church, is no less clear.”¹⁶⁴ As a result, the Presbyterian Church faced utter ruin as the policies of the General Assembly went far enough to subvert the teachings of the Gospel and the relationship between servants and masters, a hallmark of antebellum southern thought. Thus, the Declaration proclaimed

Such, then, is the alarming, unhappy and ruinous condition to which our beloved Church has, with a rapidity unparalleled, at length arrived. The ancient landmarks of Truth and Freedom which our fathers set amid the raging storm of persecution have been swept away. The infallible oracles of God have been abandoned for the purblind leadings of natural instinct and the uncertain teachings of human reason.¹⁶⁵

The harsh language of the Declaration and Testimony soon drew condemnation from the Old School General Assembly as the declaration won supporters throughout Missouri and Kentucky. Ministers in both states voiced their backing. While the Louisville Presbytery was the only body whose members had signed the document en mass by the time that the general assembly met in St. Louis in May 1866, it received a harsh rebuke from most of the Old School general assembly commissioners. Many within the organization wanted the Louisville Presbytery dissolved, which led to the passage of the Gurley Ipso Facto Resolution. The resolution was named in honor of Phineas D. Gurley, the pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington, D. C., where the Lincolns earlier attended. It declared that any presbytery or synod which allowed those who had signed the document to hold seats in their body would be dissolved.¹⁶⁶ In pursuance of this resolution, members of the St. Louis Presbytery loyal to the Old School Presbyterian Church declared the presbytery dissolved in September 1866 and promptly declared themselves the new St. Louis Presbytery. The members of the embattled St. Louis Presbytery who supported the Declaration and Testimony ignored these proceedings altogether and continued to view themselves as the legitimate one, creating two presbyteries.

The Declaration and Testimony ultimately produced intra-denominational conflict that spurred southern Presbyterians in Missouri to secede from the northern dominated Old School General Assembly. Many individuals throughout Missouri began to sign onto the Declaration and Testimony even after the general assembly passed its resolution dissolving presbyteries that enrolled any signers of the document. In October 1866 the Missouri Synod met in Booneville

with a number of men who had voiced their approval of the document. The synod, nonetheless, was not unanimous in its support as St. Louis minister Samuel J. Niccolls attempted to purge of those who had signed the Declaration and Testimony. In light of the controversy, James H. Brookes moved that the synod be adjourned and reconvened the next year. J. P. Finley, who was the moderator of the synod, did not conclude the meeting but instead reopened it the next day. While Niccolls once again attempted to make his motion an elder, D. H. Bishop, moved to table it and substituted one proclaiming “That the brethren referred to are not slanderers, schismatics, and rebels against ecclesiastical authority, but have simply exercised a great protestant right and discharged a solemn duty.”¹⁶⁷ In clear violation of the Gurley Ipsa Facto Resolution, the synod voted to offer seats to those who had officially marked themselves in favor of the document. The ministers and elders who supported the general assembly were forced to meet on the front lawn and reestablished the Missouri Synod loyal to the national body. At the 1867 meeting of the Old School General Assembly in Cincinnati two sets of commissioners presented credentials from six of Missouri’s eight presbyteries. The remaining two presbyteries sent no delegates who were recognized by the larger body. The General Assembly adopted unanimously a committee report that recommended the Missouri delegates who signed the Declaration and Testimony be excluded. The resolution effectively delegitimized the majority of Missouri Presbyterians but left the door opened for those who were excluded to rejoin the national church.¹⁶⁸

The excluded southern Presbyterians in Missouri formed an independent synod as a continued protest to the actions of the Old School General Assembly. Meeting in Lexington in October of 1867, the synod, which had been officially dissolved by the General Assembly, voiced its opposition to the national body. They said we “notice with great pain that the General Assembly of 1867 fully endorses the oppressive and unconstitutional acts of the Assembly of

1866 known as the ipso facto ordinance. They not only re-assert the principles of that dangerous assumption of power, but require us to carry them out by dissolving our time honored and constitutional organization. . . .”¹⁶⁹ As a result, the group proclaimed itself the only legitimate Presbyterian branch in the state. St. Louisan S. J. P. Anderson, who had been a pro-southern minister during the war, led the committee who authored the synod’s declarations.¹⁷⁰ The organization that was formed often referred to itself as the Old School Synod in Missouri.

Conflict over the property of individual Presbyterian congregations and institutions was a key problem during the struggle as a series of lawsuits were filed across the state as a result of this split. Blaming those aligned with the General Assembly for the majority of the litigation, the Missouri Presbyterian remarked in late 1867 that “Our radical opponents are greatly excited about the loaves and fishes. So indignant are they, because the true Presbyterians of Missouri do not turn over to them our churches and schools, that they affect a holy horror while glibly charging us with sordid purposes and covetous hypocrisy.”¹⁷¹ While the northern General Assembly continued to hope for some sort of larger reunification, the independent synod examined unifying with its southern counterpart. Aaron Forman, a minister dispatched to the southern body in 1867, told them that the Missouri synod needed to remain independent for the immediate future. His fear was that in light of the ongoing property struggles Missouri Presbyterians would suffer. The Kentucky synod and its presbyteries, nonetheless, united with the southern general assembly two years later in 1869.¹⁷²

The Declaration and Testimony produced a controversy between its supporters and detractors in northeastern Missouri for control of the First Presbyterian Church in the town of Memphis, Scotland County. The congregation, founded between 1844 and 1845, was able to construct its edifice in 1863. Like many other rural Presbyterian congregations in Missouri, the

Memphis church had difficulty procuring a pastor. George Van Eman, who lived in nearby Iowa, was called to the pastorate in Memphis during 1865. While he initially preached every Sunday, Van Eman soon limited his services to twice a month since he began serving a congregation in his home state as well.¹⁷³ Certainly for those who signed the Declaration and Testimony, the fact that their minister was from a northern state was highly problematic. While his first year as minister went well, tensions began to escalate in 1866. According to one of the ruling elders, J. L. Fullerton, a large majority of the membership believed Mr. Van Eman's course to have been harsh, unwarranted and directly calculated to bring disaster upon our beloved church."¹⁷⁴ Even with these problems, the pastor refused to leave the congregation, which further divided the congregation with a majority against Van Eman. The anti-Van Eman/General Assembly faction soon attempted to offer a compromise, albeit one that would not settle the property question which now became an issue with the divided congregation. In a circular that was entered into evidence, they proposed "to reunite in the Sabbath school, and that the said majority should be allowed to occupy the church on the Sabbaths when Mr. Van Eman should be absent, proposing at the same time that this arrangement should not be constructed by them as settling the question of the right of property."¹⁷⁵ Contracting W. W. Robertson to preach for them, the majority attempted to use the church building on the alternate Sundays, but Fullerton refused to give them the key.¹⁷⁶

The intra-congregational conflict at the First Presbyterian Church in Memphis escalated in early summer 1867. Van Eman and Fullerton were ousted by a faction composed of Alex Walker, Charles Martin and Addison Logan. The latter men were ruling elders who had signed the Declaration and Testimony against the General Assembly. Walker, Martin and Logan broke into the church building to gain possession of the edifice in June of 1867 and announced they

had changed the lock on June 5th. Prior to that point both Van Eman and Fullerton were in control of the key to the property. After Martin, Walker and Logan's group took the building; tensions continued to escalate as each side attempted to prove that they had the right to the property. The Presbytery of Palmyra, controlled by the Declaration and Testimony faction, officially recognized Walker and his followers at their 1867 meeting and had the resolution printed in the Missouri Presbyterian.¹⁷⁷ Another group of Presbyterians in line with the General Assembly, and claiming to be the duly qualified presbytery in turn deemed, that Fullerton and Van Eman "represent as the only church of Memphis having any connection with this presbytery, or any authority over the property belonging to said church."¹⁷⁸ While the Declaration and Testimony segment offered to jointly occupy the facility after they ejected Van Eman and Fullerton, the two men filed suit in the Scotland County Circuit Court in 1869. They soon asked for a change of venue which was granted south to Knox County, where the jury trial commenced the same year. The turmoil of the war had given the Radicals a slim majority in Scotland County where the Democrats had been dominant before the war. But in Knox County the Whigs had some success prior to their party's collapse and the Radicals had a two to one majority in the elections, giving Van Eman and Fullerton a greater chance at success. Hearing the case was Elias V. Wilson, who took David Wagner's judgeship when he was appointed to the Missouri State Supreme Court. Wilson, a native of Ohio, had immigrated to Knox County after serving in the Mexican War and was a Whig before becoming a staunch Unionist and Radical.¹⁷⁹

At trial, Van Eman and Fullerton prevailed. In this case the legal action was an unlawful entry and detainer, a common law civil action for legal possession of land. Throughout the trial, both sides tried to cast doubt on the other's legality. In light of their condemnation by the Palmyra Presbytery, the plaintiffs called another minister from nearby Kirksville, J. S. Boyd,

who testified that under his recollection of Presbyterian law that when elders, such as those on the defense, are disqualified they lose their rights within the church after they broke from the General Assembly.¹⁸⁰ A member of the congregation, Betsy Waymur, testified for the plaintiffs that she did not see the defendants at the church until after they took possession of the building.¹⁸¹ On the other hand, they countered by offering the original deed of the church into evidence – which listed their names as elders and thus lawful owners of the congregational property.¹⁸² Unfortunately for their case, however, Addison Logan was forced to testify that Fullerton was an elder, notwithstanding their attempts to discredit him. Logan further explained that Fullerton “had occasionally kept one of said keys and opened, admitted to and closed the church after services”¹⁸³ Van Eman explained in his testimony that “Fullerton had the key with the understanding between him and me that it was not to be opened without the consent of both of us. It was never opened by anyone without our consent up to 4th June.”¹⁸⁴ The jury found in favor of the plaintiffs. The court awarded the plaintiffs thirty-five dollars in damages for the defendants’ original break-in into the church.¹⁸⁵

The defendants, led by Walker and supports of the Declaration and Testimony, appealed to the Missouri Fourth District Court, which decided in their favor. It was composed of Judge Wilson, along with George H. Burckhart and A. D. Bolb, who was the court’s president. The court held that the plaintiffs did not need to demonstrate their right to the property since it did not apply in an instance of forcible entry and detainer. Specifically, at trial, in overruling Walker and the defense’s objections and allowing their opponents’ jury instructions in this regard, the lower court erred and the decision was therefore overturned. The right to the property, which Van Eman and Fullerton argued was based on their continuing relationship with the General Assembly, was the basis for their jury instructions. The other faction, however, was in schism

from the General Assembly. Walker's faction, on the other hand, asserted that their objections should have been sustained on these instructions since the right to property was not part of the law a forcible entry and detainer – a point the district court agreed upon. At trial, moreover, Walker and his co-defendants explained in their jury instructions that Van Eman's group must have had control of the property on June 4, 1867 to prevail, the day before Walker announced they changed the lock. They did not want the jury at the trial court to rule on who actually owned the property, which was immaterial to the outcome. These instructions said "Unless the plaintiffs show to the satisfaction of the jury that they were, on the 4th day of June, 1867, in the exclusive possession of the property in question, and that their possession was lawful; that the defendants entered into and detained the same from them, and that the entry and detainer were unlawful, they can not [sic] recover, and the verdict should be for the defendants."¹⁸⁶ The district court, therefore, agreed that this was all that was required and found in their favor.¹⁸⁷

The litigation in Van Eman v. Walker concluded when the case was decided by the Missouri State Supreme Court who handed down a decision in favor of Van Eman and Fullerton. After they appealed the case, the high bench of Wagner, Bliss and Currier, who had decided the St. Charles College case, gave their unanimous verdict in the October Term of 1870. Warren Currier, writing for the court, essentially agreed with the district court's logic in that the right to property was not needed in a forcible entry and detainer case, citing multiple court rulings to that effect. Currier and the other judges, however, held that even in light of that fact the jury instructions that Walker and the other defendants gave went to the extent of what the law allowed and were not objected too as the jury still found in favor of Van Eman and the other plaintiffs. As a result, the original verdict in favor of Van Eman had to stand since the jury found in his favor even with the defense's jury instructions.¹⁸⁸

The Declaration and Testimony controversy produced its next major litigation in St. Charles, where competing southern and northern ministerial factions had claimed to constitute the St. Louis Presbytery since September 1866. Linden Wood Female College, in St. Charles west of St. Louis, was embroiled in a dispute over who could appoint the school's trustees and therefore control the school. Samuel S. Watson, who had taken his grievances over the loyalty oath to the Old School General Assembly during the war, had, been one of the key benefactors of the institution, along with close friends and school founders Mary and George Shipley.¹⁸⁹ After the Shipleys endowed the college, they placed authority to appoint trustees in the hands of the St. Louis Presbytery, which was enshrined in the school's charter from the state. Watson was incensed that the Declaration and Testimony faction of the St. Louis Presbytery had, in April 1867, appointed new trustees for the school. Watson and his competing faction had declared itself the bona fide St. Louis Presbytery under authority of the 1866 ispsso facto order of the Old School General Assembly months before, counteracting the claims of the other division of Missouri Presbyterianism. Watson's faction, of whom the General Assembly recognized as the legitimate St. Louis Presbytery, claimed the authority to appoint these trustees. Watson initiated quo warranto proceedings in 1869 to have the St. Charles County Circuit Court declare that the St. Louis Presbytery he supported possessed the exclusive right to select the members of the board.

Leading the opposition was none other than persistent thorn in the side of northern Presbyterians Robert P. Farris. He and his fellow members of the Declaration and Testimony faction soon filed an appeal and took the case to the Missouri State Supreme Court. The court heard arguments during the October term of 1869. Demonstrating the importance they placed in this case, Farris and the other appellants contracted the firm of Samuel Glover and John R.

Shepley along with Lackland, Martin, Lackland and Lewis. James R. Lackland, the primary partner in the second firm, and Samuel Glover were both former circuit court judges and leading litigators in the state.¹⁹⁰ Using the 1844 New York State case of Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches, which authoritatively set forth the implied trust theory, the lawyers held that “no property right or power can be derived from a violation of the laws of a church by any party.”¹⁹¹ The attorneys for the appellants, furthermore, asserted that the courts could control or examine issues of church property. They cited a number of cases to this point, including Smith v. Nelson, the New York segment of the litigation over the Methodist Book Concern, to demonstrate how the in the case of a division of a larger ecclesiastical body, that the dividing body could have a share of the property it was entitled too.¹⁹² They contended, moreover, that the General Assembly lacked the ability to dissolve synods or presbyteries as they did under the Gurley Resolutions. While the General Assembly could exclude synods as they did in the 1830s over theology, Farris and his supporters claimed that political issues, such as slavery and loyalty, did not allow synods or presbyteries to be expelled from the general body. And, moreover, the General Assembly could not possess original and appellate jurisdiction in a matter, as they did in this situation.¹⁹³

Their opponents, Watson and his supporters, centered their argument on the concept that the General Assembly, as the ultimate ecclesiastical authority, had the right to dissolve the St. Louis Presbytery which the courts were bound to respect. H. Hitchcock and J. C. Orrick presented the case for Watson. If the presbytery was legally dissolved, Farris and his co-litigants had no right to appoint any directors for the school. Hitchcock and Orrick contended that the General Assembly possessed this power as it was spelled out in the Confession of Faith, Form of Government and Book of Discipline. These documents were not contracts but rather “the formal

statement of those tenets concerning religious faith, practice, and discipline, which the members of said church believe to be set forth in the revealed will of God, and to which, as a matter of conscientious obligation alone, and not for any consideration known to the law, they engage, when they unite with the church, to conform.”¹⁹⁴ The two lawyers cited a number of precedents that they asserted held that the courts must accept the decision of the church organization, in this case the General Assembly.¹⁹⁵

Writing for a unanimous Missouri State Supreme Court, David Wagner essentially agreed with the arguments that Watson’s lawyers presented to the body in that they were the legitimate group in control of the school and handed down the court’s decision in their favor. After recapping the Declaration and Testimony controversy, the judge noted that one of the St. Louis presbyteries, whom Farris was a member, had not been represented in the General Assembly since 1868. Wagner rejected the appellants’ assertions that the General Assembly followed due process according to Presbyterian law and gave the excinded members ample opportunity for defense. In his view, it “possesses the unlimited control of superintending the concerns of the whole church, and of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations. It combines within itself all the branches which constitute the elements of a complete government, namely: executive, legislative, and judicial.”¹⁹⁶ For precedent on this point, he cited the 1838 decision of Commonwealth v. Green that the General Assembly has before exercised the right to expel subordinate organizations that it held to be heretical and that the courts in upheld this right. Using Harmon v. Dreher (1841), Shannon v. Frost (1842), Gibson v. Armstrong (1847), Wagner further substantiated this argument, essentially agreeing with Watson’s lawyers. Since Farris and his supporters were members of a body that had ceased to cooperate with the General Assembly, Wagner held that leaving Watson and those aligned with that body in control of the school was

the only legal recourse.¹⁹⁷ In power over Linden Wood and hoping to avoid future legal problems, Watson and the other trustees had the college's charter amended in 1870 to provide their elections by completed by the Missouri Synod, not the St. Louis Presbytery.¹⁹⁸

It seems quite likely that Radical politics figured in the decision of the Missouri Supreme Court. While David Wagner was closer to the Liberal Republicans than he was to the Radicals by the time the case was decided in 1870, he was still a Republican, as were his fellow judges, Philemon Bliss and Warren Currier. All of the three judges had been elected while the Radicals were in control of state politics. Under well-established Anglo-American rules of equity, churches organically tied to larger ecclesiastical bodies were bound by the decisions and rules of those larger bodies. According to the deference doctrine, well established since at least the 1830s, the secular courts were to employ church rules to decide controversies over church property. They were to decide if larger church judicatories had abided by those rules in proceedings implicating rights of ownership to such property. Judge Wagner and the Missouri Supreme Court certainly purported to render a decision in Missouri, ex. Rel. Watson v. Farris, et al. that simply implemented the Presbyterian Form of Government. The court was correct insofar as it held that the General Assembly, generally speaking, had the constitutional power to determine whether a presbytery was still part of the larger General Assembly, which by 1870 had reunified between the Old and New Schools. On the other hand, the decision disregarded altogether the arguments of Farris and his associates that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church had expressly declared that its General Assembly had no power to dissolve its connection with a presbytery because of the position such a body took on the issue of slavery. It is quite possible that the Missouri Supreme Court was simply doing its best simply to apply the well-established deference rule. On the other hand, the outcome comported with the political

preferences of the Radicals sitting on the Court at that time. Key pre-war judicial rulings, such as Commonwealth v. Green (1838), Smith v. Swormstedt (1853) and Gibson v. Armstrong (1847) had similarly purported simply to defer to church judicatories and church rules of government. But the federal and state courts in these cases had actually misconstrued such rules to vindicate southern evangelical church property rights. In 1869, Unionist Republicans on the Missouri Supreme Court used the same standard of review to turn the tables.

The imbroglio over the legitimacy of the St. Louis Presbytery produced another controversy between two factions of the First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles. The smaller segment, comprised of twenty-two women and men and aligned with the General Assembly, was led by Samuel Watson and brought a lawsuit to court in 1871 against the majority which favored the Declaration and Testimony. The latter faction of forty-nine Presbyterians was led by John Garvin were the defendants in the litigation of Watson, et al. v. Garvin, et al.¹⁹⁹ It was alleged by the plaintiffs in bringing their suit that the larger portion of the congregation led by Garvin refused to let them worship and forced them to do so elsewhere – with its own minister. The defense countered and explained to the court that the other group was allowed to continue to worship at the expansive property. Both groups sent commissioners to the St. Louis Presbytery which had been formed upon the order of the General Assembly. Per their command, Watson and his supporters were declared the legitimate powers in control of the congregation while Garvin and the majority were excluded for their support of the Declaration and Testimony. The plaintiffs, still not in control of the property, filed suit in the St. Charles Circuit Court. They based their argument in the deference doctrine as expressed in State of Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris, et al as “Civil Courts cannot look beyond the decrees of ecclesiastical judicatories and overhaul their decisions.”²⁰⁰ In their view, Garvin’s segment had broken their connection of the

Presbyterian Church by meriting expulsion from their support of the Declaration and Testimony. To support their point the St. Louis Presbytery, duly recognized by the General Assembly, had declared them the official successors of the original congregation, leaving them the only ones who could possess the property.²⁰¹ Garvin and his supporters, using the same attorneys that Farris had used in the Linden Wood College case, asserted that there was nothing in the original deed of the church that dictated the allegiance of the congregation with any superior body, such as the northern General Assembly. Since the Gurley Ipsa Facto Resolution did not excommunicate any of the defendants from being Presbyterians, they were still able to hold the property as dictated by the deed. Watson won a settlement in his favor in both the St. Charles Circuit Court and after Garvin's appeal at the Sixth District Court – both of which were controlled by Radical judges that were sympathetic to their case. With these judgments the plaintiffs were to gain full power of the congregational property.

The Missouri State Supreme Court ruled on the case in 1871 and found in favor of Garvin's Declaration and Testimony faction – reversing the decisions of the lower courts. This was the first of two rulings, and made by the court when it was under Radical domination prior to the Democrats taking power before the second ruling in 1873. Philemon Bliss wrote the decision as Warren Currier and David Wagner concurred. Bliss separated the property concerns in this case from what he referred to as ecclesiastical concerns that were at the heart of State of Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris. As a result, they counteracted the claims presented by Watson's faction as the plaintiffs but more importantly allowed them to rule in favor of the Declaration and Testimony segment under Farris. Using the deference doctrine, Bliss explained that in the earlier case the court was bound to respect the relations of the Presbyterian Church which dictated the appointment of trustees for Linden Wood College by a presbytery recognized

by the General Assembly. He wrote “In the case before referred to (State, &c. vs. Farris), we considered the extent to which we will go in passing upon Watson, et al. v. Garvin, et al. the regularity of the action of ecclesiastical bodies, and held that in ecclesiastical matters we will treat such action as conclusive as to the ecclesiastical relations of subordinate bodies.”²⁰² Bliss thus took the narrow reading of the Gurley Ipsa Facto Resolution that Garvin’s faction argued for and asserted that since it contained no language which eliminated the ministerial character of the clergy or deposed individual congregations, the members of the Garvin faction were still part of the church – also contrary to what the plaintiffs argued. Bliss referenced a number of case holdings, including the 1838 Pennsylvania case Commonwealth v. Green to explain the power of the General Assembly to, among other things, cut off lower bodies, as it did with the four synods. For Bliss, the connection that the First Presbyterian Church of St. Charles had with the General Assembly was one which dealt with “the right of the local church to hold the church property under a change in ecclesiastical relations, where no condition of subjection to or connection with any particular general organism is expressed in the grant or others wise, but where such church is in fact and by its constitution a constituent part of a general body, and is dependent upon and under the control of the higher judicatory of that body.”²⁰³ While not totally separate from the higher bodies, the property deed did not necessitate a connection with a higher body within the Presbyterian Church. The General Assembly, furthermore, cut off the St. Louis Presbytery and the members of the congregation did not voluntarily abandon it, which would have changed the nature of the case. As a result, Bliss could not rationalize taking the property away from Garvin’s Declaration and Testimony faction which had been cut off from the General Assembly and reversed the decisions of the lower courts giving Watson exclusive control. He explained to that point

I have never known a case in any civil court, where it has been held that a resolution of a high ecclesiastical judicatory cutting off a lower one, whether by direct expulsion or conditional dissolution like the ipso facto ordinance, operates as a confiscation of the property of the local congregation held for their own use with no special trust, in case they do not withdraw from such excised body, or that it operates as a transfer of such property to new organizations created under authority of the excising power.²⁰⁴

On retrial of Watson v. Garvin before the Missouri State Supreme Court in 1873, the Court ruled in favor Garvin's Declaration and Testimony faction once again. In this instance, however, the Court went a step further than the original 1871 ruling, completely overturning the Radical-controlled court's earlier decision in Missouri ex. rel. Watson v. Farris. In doing so it engaged the challenge of interpreting the legal effect of a recently-rendered United States Supreme Court in Watson v. Jones. That decision had dealt directly with fortunes of the Presbyterian Church in the Border States. The church was wrought with discord by the Declaration and Testimony upheaval, and property disputes arose in individual congregations in Kentucky as they did in Missouri. The suit centered on the Walnut Street Presbyterian Church in Louisville. The Declaration and Testimony (Watson) faction, the minority of the congregation, was composed of the majority of the ruling elders and trustees and thus held the property. The Jones group, loyal to the General Assembly, was the lion's share of the membership. After a series of lower court litigation, the United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Jones segment of the congregation. The high court, in its ruling written by Justice Samuel Miller, correctly pointed out that state supreme courts had, for decades, abandoned the implied consent doctrine that was inherited from British jurisprudence and embraced the deference rule. The court held that, in a hierarchical denomination like the Presbyterians, the decisions of the highest judicatory were binding on its subordinate bodies. Miller explained when Watson and his supporters eventually aligned with the southern General Assembly "they have first erected themselves into a new organization, and have since joined themselves to another totally different,

if not hostile, to the one which they belonged when the difficulty first began.”²⁰⁵ The court then ruled for Jones since “Under any of the decisions which we have examined, the appellants, in their present position, have no right to the property, or to the use of it, which is the subject of this suit.”²⁰⁶

Following the 1873 retrial of Watson, et al. v. Garvin, et al., the Missouri Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Garvin faction by rejecting the authority of Watson v. Jones. That decision seemed to constitute the leading authority for the resolution of property disputes among factions of a congregation tied organically to a larger ecclesiastical body. n organically organized church.²⁰⁷ In rejecting Watson v. Jones, Judge Adams, like Philemon Bliss had two years earlier, embraced the deference rule as it was concerned with ecclesiastical relations in the general sense. But where he and the Democratic court differed from the rulings of the earlier court was that Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris and Watson v. Jones had no bearing on the case in hand as it dealt with local church property. What troubled Adams about the earlier decision in Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris was that in applying the deference rule it yielded too much authority to decide legal matters to ecclesiastical bodies, where the civil courts were to decide property matters. In his view only the courts could decide which faction could control church property. Adams lambasted the United States Supreme Court for its decision in Watson v. Jones, asserting that it did not have jurisdiction as the case should have been decided by a lower court in Kentucky. With his rejection of these other decisions in hand, Adams was free to find in favor of Garvin and the other supporters of the Declaration and Testimony, thus granting them full control of the property. Demonstrating the political divide between the old court and the new one, Judge Wagner, however, provided a simple dissent in which he did not agree with the majority and their attempt to distinguish the present case from Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris

and Watson v. Jones. In his mind the holdings of both cases applied in this situation, something that he and Adams did not see eye to eye.²⁰⁸

The changed composition of the Missouri Supreme Court, quite likely, figured critically in its decision. By the time the Court decided Watson, et al. v. Garvin, et al in 1873, it was composed of conservative, Democratic judges, who had replaced the Radical judges with the exception of David Wagner. In the elections held after September 1870, the Democrats, no longer needing the Liberal Republicans for support regained control of most Missouri counties, completing their political redemption. In 1872 the court had been enlarged to five judges in an effort to increase Democratic power on the court while responding to the ever increasing case-load – a fact even referenced in the decision. Washington Adams wrote the opinion of the court. Originally from Kentucky, he made his home in the Boone’s Lick town of Booneville, in Cooper County. His fellow Kentuckian, Henry M. Vories, lived in northwestern St. Joseph. Thomas Adiel Sherwood, born in Georgia, whose father Adiel was a noted Baptist divine, lived in Greene County in southwestern Missouri. Like Adams and Vories, he too was a Democrat. Finally, William Barclay Napton was on the court. He had been a pro-slavery stalwart during the antebellum era and was the author of the notorious Jackson-Napton Resolutions, which supported the expansion of slavery throughout the Union. Expelled from the high court in 1861 after he refused to take a pro-Union oath, he began his final period on the high bench in 1873.²⁰⁹

The reliance of the Missouri Supreme Court in Watson v. Garvin on the deference rule, as in Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris, in reality provide the court broad latitude and almost unlimited discretion to reach an outcome meeting the preferences of its majority. The judges in both the 1873 and 1869 decisions claimed to follow the law in applying the deference rule, even though they reached different conclusions in both cases. Thus, the court had the unlimited

prerogative to make pronouncements about fundamental church law as well as deciding ecclesiastical constitutional questions and the winners and losers in the controversies that stemmed from these conflicts. As a result, Missouri's high court could change its views as the political winds moved from the backs of the Radicals to the Democrats by 1873 and determine that the Presbyterian General Assembly had not abided by its own rules of government when it resolved to dissolve any presbytery that accepted a member who had signed the Declaration and Testimony.

With the state no longer at war, judges began to apply the rule of law in a more even-handed manner so that southern evangelicals prevailed more often in court over their northern counterparts who had often seized their property. Traditionally the judiciary had been the most conservative element in Missouri politics. The shift back to political normalcy as Radical power was destroyed led first to the growth of the Liberal Republicans and then the Redemption by conservative Democrats. As the Democrats won elections and as a result control of the courts, along with the legislature and governor's mansion, they began to uphold the traditional protections of civil liberties, which included religious freedom. This conclusion is supported by rulings by David Wagner, as he drifted into the Liberal Republican camp, and the Democratic judges in the 1870s. At the same time, Democratic judges may have wanted to fortify embattled southern evangelicals within the state.

Conclusions

Radical Republicans in Missouri during Reconstruction, with a new state constitution, disqualified ministers of the gospel from preaching for failure to take a Test Oath professing present and past loyalty to the Union -- while northern evangelical church leaders made a declaration of loyalty and a profession that slavery and slaveholding amounted to sin a litmus

test for church membership. Widespread opposition to the Test Oath, on the ground that it infringed upon the liberties of conscience and free speech, produced the 1867 ruling of the United States Supreme Court in Cummings v. State of Missouri. This decision overturned the Test Oath, undercut the Radical redefinition of Protestant faith and citizenship, and provided the legal grist with which southern evangelicals, aided by state courts once again sympathetic to this white majority, reclaimed the church lands and buildings that Union soldiers, Radicals, and their northern evangelical allies had seized during the war. As before and during the Civil War, high-profile litigation over church property reflected less the imperatives of church, civil, and constitutional law than the social, religious, and political preferences of judges. These disputes further clouded the boundaries of church and state, while further shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and emerging civil religions among both former Confederate and Union supporters.

The continuing ecclesiastical divisions in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches of Missouri during Reconstruction both reflected and reinforced the basic differences in theological and political understanding of northern and southern evangelicals about the morality of slavery, secession, and loyalty to the Union. Through the period, these ideological differences fundamentally shaped the process of Radical Reconstruction and spurred its collapse, while further exacerbating the divisions among white evangelicals in the state.

Under the influence of St. Louis delegate Charles D. Drake of St. Louis, Radical Republicans in Missouri crafted a new state constitution in 1865 that disqualified ministers of the gospel from preaching if they had not sworn an oath of present and past loyalty to the Union. The same constitutionally-mandated Test Oath stripped southern Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians who could not take it the oath in good conscience of the right to vote, hold office,

or own church property as trustees. The Test Oath and strict church property provisions in the new state constitution targeting Roman Catholics certainly fanned old animosities. But Radical Unionists sought primarily to employ the Test Oath to impose on southern evangelicals, as the first principles of a new civil religion, the proposition that those who had supported slavery, secession, and the Confederacy were moral reprobates and unworthy of citizenship and full membership in church organizations. Northern evangelical leaders in the state similarly made a declaration of loyalty to the Union and a profession that slavery and slaveholding amounted to sin a litmus test for church membership. The Test Oath prompted deep resentment among southern evangelicals in the state.

The ruling of the United State Supreme Court in Cummings v. State of Missouri alleviated the plight of southern evangelicals but also fueled further divisions within the three major Protestant churches. A large number of pro-southern ministers objected to the Test Oath on the ground that it infringed upon the liberty of conscience and free speech guaranteed by the Constitution of Missouri. In response to the refusal of Roman Catholic priest John Cummings to submit to the oath, the United States Supreme Court struck it down in 1867 as unconstitutional. The ruling thoroughly undercut the Radical redefinition of Protestant faith and citizenship of its legal and constitutional foundations, providing southern evangelicals a sense of vindication. But the high court victory also stirred the pot of contention among northern and southern evangelicals centered on denominational and congregational church property disputes that dated back to the war. While Liberal Republicans and Democrats displaced the Radicals in state government, the ruling in Cummings provided the legal grist with which southern evangelicals reclaimed the church lands and buildings that the Union soldiers, Radicals, and their northern

evangelical allies had seized during the war. Republicans had formally re-constructed the Union, but evangelicals in Missouri were now divided more than ever.

Notes

¹ Mo. Const. of 1865, art. I, § 9.

² The committee consisted of William Carson, John Hill Luther, Nathan Ayers, J. S. Green, R. M. Rhoades, Samuel C. Majors, O. P. Moss, E. I. Owens and X. X. Buckner. Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1865 (St. Louis, 1865), 13-14; W. Pope Yeaman, A History of the Missouri Baptist General Association (Columbia, Mo, 1899), 126.

³ Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1865, 13-14; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 126-27.

⁴ “Odd Criminal Docket,” Liberty Tribune, 10 August 1866, p. 1;

⁵ *Ibid*; R. S. Duncan, A History of the Baptists in Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1888), 926.

⁶ “Probabilities of Southern Success,” Liberty Tribune, 16 August 1861, p. 2.

⁷ Duncan, History of Missouri Baptists, 790-92, 926. Quote is from 926.

⁸ In Coulter’s view, the northern Methodists were the primary culprits in this regard. According to Fleming, hardening evangelical views on sectional issues eliminated any chance of a reunification of the Methodists and Presbyterians. William A. Dunning, Reconstruction, Political and Economic 1865-1877 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1907); Walter Fleming, The Sequel of Appomattox (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919); Claude G. Bowers, The Tragic Era (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929); E. Merton Coulter, The South During Reconstruction 1865-1877 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1947).

⁹ Historians from the late 1920s through the 1980s engaged in thoroughgoing debates over the success or failure of the Republicans during the period. Progressive-era historians countered Dunning School arguments to stress the accomplishments of Reconstruction and the positive role that African Americans played during the period. Beginning in the late 1920s, historians influenced by Progressive thinking began to reject Dunning School arguments. These revisionists emphasized the economic issues of Reconstruction and rejected the concept that the era was a morality play of sorts between “evil” Radical Republicans and “good” Democrats. These scholars moved away from the racist assumptions of their predecessors. Works such as W. E. B. Du Bois’ Black Reconstruction in America elucidated that the racial bias of Dunning School historians. Du Bois insisted that such racism obscured the positive role blacks played in the era – especially through the black church. W. E. B. Du Bois Black Reconstruction in America (New York: Russell and Russell, 1935).

Scholars like Francis B. Simkins argued that there were a number of positive achievements in the era that helped to rebuild the South. Francis B. Simkins, “New Viewpoints in Southern Reconstruction,” Journal of Southern History 5, (February 1939): 49-61. Revisionists like Otto H. Olsen and Allen W. Trelease rejected the notion of the carpetbagger and scalawag and that Reconstruction governments were incompetent. But they also pointed out that political corruption during the period was not limited to the South. Otto H. Olsen, “Reconsidering the Scalawags,” Civil War History 12, (December 1966): 304-20; Allen W. Trelease, “Who Were the Scalawags?” Journal of Southern History 29, No. 4 (November 1963): 445-68. Revisionists

further argued that Reconstruction failed because the freedmen and other southerners were not provided adequate economic means, such as land, to begin life as independent citizens. They denied that the Radicals had ruined state finances. Historians Vernon L. Wharton, Willie Lee Rose and Joel Williamson amplified on the limits that many African Americans faced during Reconstruction. But they also acknowledged the importance of religion in the life of many blacks. Vernon L. Wharton, The Negro In Mississippi 1865-1890 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947); Willie Lee Rose, Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964); Joel Williamson, After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction, 1861-1877 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965). For a synthesis of the Revisionist arguments see J. G. Randall, David Donald, The Civil War and Reconstruction, Second Edition (Boston: Little Brown, 1969). See also Howard K. Beale, The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction (New York: F. Ungar Publishing Company, 1930); C. Vann Woodward, Reunion and Reaction: The Compromise of 1877 and the End of Reconstruction (Boston: Little, Brown, 1951); Robert Sharkey, Money, Class, and Party: An Economic Study of the Civil War and Reconstruction (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959).

By the 1970s, historians hewing to the intellectual parameters of the new social history grew increasingly critical of the failure of the Radicals to provide lasting benefits for African Americans. Historians writing after the late 1950s took a generally positive view of Reconstruction but spent a greater amount of energy examining some of the limits and flaws of the program. Focusing on the racial injustices in the United States at mid-century, beginning in the late 1950s historians began to emphasize more the moral failure of Reconstruction. Kenneth M. Stampp led the way. With the advent of the new social history, historians such as James McPherson began to look at the period in terms of historic white racial prejudice. James H. McPherson, The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); Kenneth M. Stampp, The Era of Reconstruction (New York: Knopf, 1965). Historians, such as Robert Sharkey and Irwin Ungar moved away from strictly economic arguments and cast the Radical Republicans as split on a number of issues. Robert Sharkey, Money, Class, and Party: An Economic Study of the Civil War and Reconstruction (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959); Irwin Ungar, The Greenback Era: A Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964). State studies similarly calibrated the successes of the Radical Republicans. For Missouri see William E. Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 1865-1870 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1965). By the 1970s, many began to grow increasingly agitated about the racial situation after the Civil Rights Movement, they began to incorporate this pessimism into their work. Allen W. Trelease, George C. Rable, Michael Perman and William Gillette asserted that there was little progress made in race relations as a result of changes attempted during the fragile period of Reconstruction. Allen W. Trelease, White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction (New York: Greenwood Press, 1979); George C. Rable, But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of

Reconstruction (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984); Michael Perman, Reunion Without Compromise, The South and Reconstruction, 1865-1868 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); William Gillette, The Retreat from Reconstruction, 1869-1879 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979).

¹⁰ The Republicans failed to achieve any real lasting success in the South, and African Americans did not receive the full political and civil equality that they desired. A variety of economic crises, such as the depression of the 1870s, allowed the Redeemers to gain control of the South. Combined with the drop in worldwide demand for cotton and the factionalism and corruption of the southern state governments, Reconstruction's failure was almost assured. Foner briefly discusses the strictness of the Missouri Test Oath. But this discussion is part of a larger presentation emphasizing the political implications of the oaths. Eric Foner, Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution (New York: Harper and Row, 1988).

In the last several decades historians have ably explored the struggles of the freedmen to obtain civil and political rights and how black religion and churches were an important part of that effort. See Laura Edwards, Gendered Strife and Confusion: The Political Cultural of Reconstruction (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997); Nina Silber, The Romance of Reunion, Northerners and the South, 1865-1900 (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Julia Saville, The Work of Reconstruction, from Slave to Wage Laborer in South Carolina, 1860-1870 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Steven Hahn, A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration (Cambridge: Belknap Harvard University Press, 2003).

¹¹ The racist presuppositions that undergirded the Reconstruction histories of William Dunning and his followers have been thoroughly and properly rejected. Few, nonetheless, would now take exception to the proposition that Dunning raised a legitimate question when he lambasted the Radical Republicans for denying white southerners their constitutional liberties with loyalty oaths. Others working in the Dunning School tradition also pointed to the congressionally-mandated Test Oath as an example of the excesses of Radical Republicans. Dunning praised the decision of the United State Supreme Court that limited the Missouri Test Oath. Fleming, The Sequel of Appomattox; Bowers, The Tragic Era; Coulter, The South During Reconstruction 1865-1877; Dunning, Reconstruction, 89. In the 1950s, historians took up once again the question of whether the Radical Republicans had crossed constitutional boundaries to deny residents in reconstructed states their civil liberties. The surge of interest in the topic was largely a consequence of Cold War loyalty oaths that were used by authorities to hound out communists. In discussing the Missouri Test Oath, legal historian Harold Hyman concludes that it was the harshest of any of the national or state loyalty oaths implemented during the 1860s. At the same time, Hyman emphasizes that ministers were often its most fervent opponents. Harold Melvin Hyman, Era of the Oath: Northern Loyalty Tests during the Civil War and Reconstruction (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954); *Ibid.*, To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959, 251-67; *Ibid.*, A More Perfect Union: The Impact of the Civil War and Reconstruction on the Constitution (1973).

Writing in 1997, William C. Harris's With Charity for All made the point that Lincoln believed that the retrospective oaths imposed by the Radical Republicans were "un-Christian." William C. Harris, With Charity For All: Lincoln and the Restoration of the Union (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1997), 141.

¹² Martha Kohl, "Enforcing a Vision of Community: The Role of the Test Oath in Missouri's Reconstruction," Civil War History, 40, no. 4 (December 1994): 292-307; Phillip J. Avillo Jr., "Ballots for the Faithful. The Oath and the Emergence of Slave State Republican Congressmen, 1861-1867," *Ibid.*, 22, No. 2, (June 1976):

¹³ While this plan was met with harsh southern hostility and limited success, northern- and southern-affiliated Methodists eventually learned to co-exist. Ralph E. Morrow, Northern Methodism and Reconstruction (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1956).

¹⁴ Victor Howard, Religion and the Radical Republican Movement, 1860-1870 (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1990).

¹⁵ Ward M. McAfee, Religion, Race, and Reconstruction: The Public School in the Politics of the 1870s (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998). Contributors to Vale of Tears: New Essays on Religion and Reconstruction, such as David T. Gleeson and Kent A. McConnell, discuss the unique position of the Catholic Church in the Reconstruction South. Gleeson's work in particular focuses on the persistent unity among Catholics in the period. Edward J. Blum, W. Scott Poole, eds., Vale of Tears: New Essays on Religion and Reconstruction (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2005).

¹⁶ In his Black Reconstruction in America, W. E. B. DuBois examined instances where white congregations directed church land and buildings to African Americans. Some of this property was held in trust for black congregants after they had paid for it, while other white congregations arranged for the freedmen to use plantation churches. DuBois, Black Reconstruction in America, 492.

Ralph Morrow's Northern Methodism and Reconstruction explores first how the MEC sought to use the wartime order rendered by Bishop Ames to gain possession of church buildings in the South. Once Lincoln ordered the return of the seized property to the MECS, they continued to fight their southern counterparts in every possible realm, especially the courts. Morrow, Northern Methodism and Reconstruction, 63-76. Edward Jervy adds that many northern Methodists feared the return of the planter elite to power in the South because they might lose their lands and buildings. Edward D. Jervy, "Motives and Methods of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Period of Reconstruction," Methodist History, 4.4 (July 1966): 17-25.

¹⁷ Harrison Anthony Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865 (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1914), 231-40. Walter Stevens stressed seven years later the efforts of Lincoln to encourage the unification of political factions of Missouri, notwithstanding the test oaths that Radical Republicans instituted during the war and the Drake Test Oath. Walter B. Stevens, Centennial History of Missouri (The Center State): One Hundred Years in the Union, 1820-1921 (St. Louis and Chicago; The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1921).

¹⁸ Thomas S. Barclay, "The Test Oath for Clergy in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 18, No. 3 (April 1924): 345-81.

¹⁹ While many Missourians agreed that the ex-Confederates needed to be contained, most did not agree with the program that the Radicals advanced. Parrish's discussion of the Missouri Test Oath is limited to its political ramifications. Parrish, Missouri Under Radicals Rule. James Neal Primm argues that, although the Grand Army of the Republic was instrumental in promoting the Radical Union Party in Missouri, the society collapsed once the party fell from power and the specter of rebellion was gone. James Neal Primm, "The G. A. R. in Missouri, 1866-1870," Journal of Southern History 20, No. 3 (August 1954): 356-75. David D. March, in his 1950s studies of Charles D. Drake, largely paints the Radical chieftain and his troubling personality as the driving force behind the vengeful policies that drove his party from power. March, however, casts Drake's Presbyterian faith as a secondary consideration. David D. March, "The Life and Times of Charles Daniel Drake" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1949); *Ibid.*, Charles Daniel Drake of St Louis (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society, 1953); *Ibid.*, "Charles D. Drake and the Constitutional Convention of 1865," Missouri Historical Review, 48, No. 2, (January 1953): 110-23.

²⁰ Retaining the traditional focus on denominational leaders and the alignments and re-alignments of denominational organizations, the work of Baptist historians R. S. Douglass and J. Gordon Kingsley examine how the Missouri Test Oath hampered southern evangelicals in the state. Their work reveals the substantial difficulties southern Baptists faced in rebuilding after the devastation of the war. Douglass and Kingsley also explore thoroughly how Missouri Baptists during Reconstruction split into competing general associations organized along sectional lines. R. S. Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists (Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1934); J. Gordon Kingsley, Frontiers: The Story of the Missouri Baptist Convention (Jefferson City: Missouri Baptist Historical Commission, 1983).

Frank C. Tucker, in his work on the Missouri Methodists, similarly chronicles the continuing post-war struggle between the northern and southern branches of that denomination through Reconstruction. Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939, A Brief History (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966).

²¹ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, Held at The City of St. Louis, January 6 – April 10, 1865 (St. Louis, 1865), 25-26; Galusha Anderson, The Story of a Border City During the Civil War (Boston, 1908), 342-45. For a description of the election of 1864 that led to Radical control of the convention see William Frank Zornow, "The Missouri Radicals and the Election of 1864," Missouri Historical Review, 45, No. 4, (July 1951): 354-70.

²² Charles D. Drake, "Autobiography," State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, Collection 1003, Folder 37, pp. 1054-56; March, Drake and the Constitutional Convention, 110-23.

²³ Mo. Const. of 1865; Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 14-35; Foner, Reconstruction, 42.

²⁴ Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 48, 60.

²⁵ Mo. Const. of 1865, art. II, § 3.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, art. II, § 6.

²⁷ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1865, p. 453; Harrison Anthony Trexler, Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865 (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1914), 238-39.

²⁸ Galusha Anderson, The Story of a Border City During the Civil War (Boston, 1908), 352.

²⁹ William A. Russ Jr., “The Lawyer’s Test Oath During Reconstruction,” Mississippi Law Journal, 10, no. 2 (February, 1938): 154-67; Hyman, To Try Men’s Souls, 251-66.

³⁰ Philip J. Avillo, Jr., “Property and Race: The Dilemma of Slave-State Republican Congressmen and the Origins of Reconstruction, 1863-1867,” Southern Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the South, 23 No. 2, (1984): 125-144; *Ibid.*, Ballots for the Faithful, 164-74; Hyman, Era of the Oath, 100-1, 116.

³¹ Asper, “Loyalty Testing in Maryland,” 107-9. For more discussion see Francis D. Wormuth, “Legislative Disqualifications as Bills of Attainder,” Vanderbilt L. Rev., 4, no. 3 (April 1951), 603-6; John H. Faltys, “Constitutional Law – Elections – Validity of Candidate Oath and Pledge,” Nebraska L. Rev., 31, no. 1 (November 1951), 101-2; Philip P. Houle, “Forgive and Forget: Honoring Full and Unconditional Pardons,” Maine L. Rev., 41, no. 2 (1989), 276-77; Mark A. Weitz, “‘I Will Never Forget the Name of You’: The Home Front, Desertion, and Oath Swearing in Wartime Tennessee,” Tennessee Historical Quarterly, 59, No. 1, (March 2000): 38-59; Eric Foner, Reconstruction, 60-61, 324; David Donald, Jean Harvey Baker, and Michael F. Holt, The Civil War and Reconstruction, (New York: Norton, 2001), 580; William Harris, With Charity for All: Lincoln and the Restoration of the Union (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1997).

³² Hyman, Era of the Oath, 97.

³³ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 920.

³⁴ Matthew W. Cloud, “‘One Nation, Under God’: Tolerable Acknowledgment of Religion or Unconstitutional Cold War Propaganda Cloaked in American Civil Religion?,” Journal of Church and State, 36, No. 2, (Spring 2004): 311-40.

³⁵ Md. Const. of 1864, art. I, § 4; Lewis D. Asper, “The Long and Unhappy History of Loyalty Testing in Maryland,” American Journal of Legal History, 13, no. 2 (April 1969): 103-9.

³⁶ Drake, Autobiography,” 1058, 1082-88.

³⁷ “From the St. Louis Dispatch. Bad Spirit of the New Constitution Party,” Liberty Tribune, 2 February 1866, p. 1.

³⁸ Mo. Const. of 1865, art. XIII, § 4-5; Mo. Const. of 1865, art. I, § 9-11.

³⁹ S. B. Laughlin, “Missouri Politics During the Civil War,” Missouri Historical Review, 24 (October 1929), 99; Barclay, “Test Oath for Clergy,” 345; James M. McPherson, “The Civil War and the Transformation of America,” William J. Cooper, Jr., and John M. McCardell, Jr., eds., In the Cause of Liberty: How the Civil War Redefined American Ideals (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), 1-9; Beth Barton Schweiger, “Mark A Noll’s ‘The Civil War as a Theological Crisis’,” Fides et Historia, 39.2 (Summer 2007): 29-34.

⁴⁰ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1865, 211; The History of Daviess County Missouri . . . (Kansas City, Mo, 1882), 538-39; Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 29.

-
- ⁴¹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:237.
- ⁴² Jefferson City Daily Tribune, 18 May 1893, p. 4.
- ⁴³ Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1865, 212; Kohl, Enforcing a Vision of Community, 292-307.
- ⁴⁴ Mo. Const. of 1865, art. II, § 3.
- ⁴⁵ John W. Whitehead, "Tax Exemptions and Churches: A Historical and Constitutional Analysis," Cumberland Law Review, 22, no. 3 (1991-92): 536-42.
- ⁴⁶ Missouri Constitutional Convention Journal, 104-5, 117-19, 183-85.
- ⁴⁷ Missouri State Times, 21 November 1865, p. 1.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., 17 November 1865, p. 2.
- ⁵⁰ Liberty Tribune, 17 March 1865, p. 2.
- ⁵¹ "The Oath Takers," Missouri Democrat, 4 September 1865, p. 1.
- ⁵² Galusha Anderson, "The Test Oath of Missouri," The Baptist Quarterly, 1, (July, 1867): 297-98.
- ⁵³ "Missouri Baptist Convention," Missouri Democrat, 6 October 1865, p. 3; "Local Pastors in Council," ibid., 10 October 1865; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 133-34.
- ⁵⁴ "Missouri Baptist Convention," Missouri Democrat, 6 October 1865, p. 3.
- ⁵⁵ Hyman, Era of the Oath, 110, citing Nation, September 14, 1865.
- ⁵⁶ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 920. Copies of the Baptist Journal have not been located as the sheet merged with the Baptist Record in St. Louis in 1867. Ibid., 901.
- ⁵⁷ "Opinion of Rev. E. S. Dulin on the Test Oath. Published in the Missouri Baptist Journal," Liberty Tribune, 26 January 1866, p. 1; Ibid., 15 September 1865, p. 2.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., 920-21.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., 921; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 129.
- ⁶⁰ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:308-16.
- ⁶¹ "The Late Southern Methodist Conference," Missouri Democrat, 4 September 1865, p. 2.
- ⁶² "The Oath Vindicated by its Enemies," ibid., 28 August, 1865, p. 2.
- ⁶³ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, II: 231. The St. Louis Christian Advocate did not resume publication until September of 1865 and was unable to comment over the proceedings of the convention when it took place.
- ⁶⁴ "Meeting of the Presbyterian Synod," Missouri Democrat, 12 October 1865, p. 4; "The Presbyterian Synod," ibid., 13 October 1865, p. 3.
- ⁶⁵ Duncan, History of Missouri's Baptists, 921. The piece was published in the Missouri Republican and Missouri Baptist Journal.
- ⁶⁶ Rev. W. M. Leftwich, D. D., Martyrdom in Missouri: A History of Religious Persecution, the Seizure of Churches, and the Persecution of Ministers of the Gospel, in the State of Missouri . . . 2 vols. (St. Louis, 1870), 2:374.
- ⁶⁷ Liberty Tribune, 10 August 1866, p. 1.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 129.

⁶⁹ Wiley Jones Patrick, The History of the Salt River Association, Missouri (Columbia, 1909), 96.

⁷⁰ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:91-93.

⁷¹ Liberty Tribune, 22 September 1865, p. 2. The article was obtained from the Lexington Express.

⁷² Presbyterian Church in Farmington Missouri, Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Missouri Institute of Science and Technology, Rolla, Missouri, Collection R114, Folder 10.

⁷³ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:416.

⁷⁴ W. H. Lewis, The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870 (Nashville, 1890), 52.

⁷⁵ Liberty Tribune, 13 April 1866, p. 2; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:386-93.

⁷⁶ "Dishonoring the Church," Missouri Democrat, 26 August 1865, p. 2.

⁷⁷ "The Radical Party Against a Preacher," Southwest Union Press, 4 August 1866, p. 1; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:414.

⁷⁸ This assessment is based on county court of common pleas and circuit court records and case files of the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, 1865-69, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri. The selected local venues and associated trial court records for inclusive years are as follows: Cape Girardeau County Circuit Court 1865-69; Carter County Circuit Court, 1867-1869; Cole County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Dade County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Lawrence County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Madison County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Mississippi County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Oregon County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Oregon County Justice of the Peace Court, 1865-69; Perry County Justice of the Peace Court, 1865-69; Phelps County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Saline County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Saline County Justice of the Peace Court, 1865-69; Scott County Circuit Court, 1865-69; Stoddard County Justice of the Peace Court, 1865-69; Stone County Circuit Court, 1865-69. The trial court minute books and case files for the counties and periods referenced above are either on microfilm at the MSA, Jefferson City, or available only at the MSA, St. Louis. For each of the counties and periods see also the Missouri Judicial Records Database, MSA, at <http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/judiciary/allcourts/default.asp>.

⁷⁹ State of Missouri v. Samuel Mitchell, Dade County Circuit Court, 1857-1899, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri.

⁸⁰ State of Missouri v. Rev. Tucker Lewis, Madison County Circuit Court, 1810-1918, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. John S. Frasier, *ibid.*

⁸¹ State of Missouri v. Asheal Munson, Cape Girardeau County Circuit Court, 1799-1869, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. William Woodward, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. James Knowd, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. James Proctor, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Patrick O'Regan, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. David Murphy, *ibid.*

⁸² Barclay, "The Test Oath for Clergy," 372. Barclay lists prosecutions as follows: Andrew, Jesse Bird; Cape Girardeau, O'Regan, D. H. Murphy, P. A. Ryan, McGerry; Cooper, Hillner; Gentry,

J. B. Christie, J. A. Mumpower; Jefferson, W. G. Walker, W. O. Gibson, Henry Brockhager, D. J. Marquis; Johnson, A. Munson [in Cape Girardeau County], D. H. Murphy [repeated], three Catholic priests; Knox, Joseph Metcalf; Lewis, James Penn, A. Munroe; Linn, W. Perkins, W. E. Dockery; Madison, J. S. Frazier, Marion, H. A. Bourland, J. S. Green, twelve others; Moniteau, W. M. Robertson; Montgomery, B. H. Spencer, S. W. Cope, O'Neil.

⁸³ Missouri v. Alexander J. P. Garesché, 36 Mo. 256.

⁸⁴ W. V. N. Bay, Reminiscences of the Bench and Bar in Missouri (St. Louis, 1878), 445, 573-4; William E. Parrish, A History of Missouri: Volume III: 1860-1875 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001), 122-23, 126-27, 233, 235.

⁸⁵ Mo. Const. of 1865, art. 1, § 12-13. Radical officials could have used the new taxing power to punish disloyal evangelical congregations. States and the federal government, nonetheless, continued the tax exemptions for ecclesiastical properties in the postwar period in most places outside of Missouri. John W. Whitehead, "Tax Exemptions and Churches: A Historical and Constitutional Analysis," Cumberland Law Review, 22, no. 3 (1991-92): 536-42.

⁸⁶ Drake, "Autobiography," 1098.

⁸⁷ Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 41-42.

⁸⁸ University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Center, "Historical Census Browser," (2004, accessed 24 March, 2011).

⁸⁹ Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri at the Adjourned Session of the Twenty-Third General Assembly . . . (Jefferson City, 1866), 774.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² "Taxation on Churches," Liberty Tribune, 23 March 1866, p. 4.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 21 September 1866, p. 2.

⁹⁴ Cloud, "One Nation, Under God," 311-40; Thomas Noel Stern, "William Penn on the Swearing of Oaths: His Ideas in Theory and Practice," Quaker History, 70, No. 2, (Fall 1981): 84-98; Jeffrey J. Crow, "Tory Plots and Anglican Loyalty: The Llewelyn Conspiracy of 1777," North Carolina Historical Review, 55, No. 1, (Jan. 1978): 1-17.

⁹⁵ Drake, "Autobiography," 1098.

⁹⁶ Hyman, Era of the Oath, 110, citing Nation, September 14, 1865; John J. O'Shea, The Two Kenricks . . . (Philadelphia, 1904), 297; William Barnaby Faherty, Exile in Erin: A Confederate Chaplain's Story: The Life of Father John B. Bannon, (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 2002); William Barnaby Faherty and Kevin Laheen, The Fourth Career of John B. Bannon: St. Louis Pastor, Southern Chaplain, Confederate Agent, Irish Jesuit Orator (Portland, OR: C&D Publishing, 1994); Rev. B. J. Blied, Catholics and the Civil War (Milwaukee: Private edition, 1945), 37; David T. Gleeson, "No Disruption of the Union" The Catholic Church in the South and Reconstruction, Blum, Vale of Tears, 168; William Barnaby Flaherty, SJ, American Catholic Heritage: Stories of Growth (Kansas City, Mo: Sheed and Ward, 1991), 80.

⁹⁷ Mo. Const. of 1865, art. I, § 12-13; Louis Thomassin, Vetus et nova ecclesia disciplina circa beneficia et beneficiaries (Paris, 1678-79); Wernz, Jus Decretalium, III (Rome, 1908); Sägmüller, Kirchenrecht (Freiburg, 1909); Laurentius, Instit. juris eccl. (Freiburg, 1908).

⁹⁸ William Johnson, "Missouri Test-Oath," The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1912), at <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14538a.htm>> (accessed 29 July 2010).

⁹⁹ Drake, "Autobiography," 1085; Journal of the Missouri State Convention, 1865, 247; William E. Parrish, "Moses Lewis Linton: Doctor of Epigrams," Missouri Historical Review, 59, No. 3, (April, 1965): 293-301.

¹⁰⁰ Liberty Tribune, 8 December 1865, p. 1; Jefferson City Daily Tribune, 8 September 1892, p. 4; "From the St. Louis Guardian, Religious Liberty," Cape Girardeau Weekly Argus, 22 March 1866, p. 1.

¹⁰¹ Liberty Tribune, 22 September, 1865, p. 2.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 19 October, 1866, p. 1.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 29 June, 1866, p. 2. For a brief history of St. Vincent's College see Records of St. Vincent's College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, DeAndreis-Rosati Memorial Archives, DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois, at <<http://library.depaul.edu/collections/DRMAPdf/StVincentsCollegeCapeGirardeau.pdf>>, accessed March, 26, 2011.

¹⁰⁴ Johnson, "Missouri Test Oath;" O'Shea, Two Kenricks, 297; State of Missouri v. Sister Aidian, Cape Girardeau Circuit Court, 1865, Cape Girardeau County Circuit Court, 1799-1869, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City Missouri; State of Missouri v. Sister Augusta, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Sister Louisea, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Sister Lucy, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Sister Magdelan, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Sister Molina, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Sister O'Bene, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Sister Margaret, *ibid.*; State of Missouri v. Sister Olympia, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ Transcript of Record, Cummings v. State of Missouri, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277 (1867), pp. 3-5; Johnson, "Missouri Test Oath."

¹⁰⁶ The article of 28 September was reprinted in St. Louis. Missouri Republican, 3 October 1865, p. 1; Harold C. Bradley, "In Defense of John Cummings," Missouri Historical Review, 57, No. 1 (January 1962): 1-15. Very little is known about Cummings specifically other than his assignments as a priest. He had attended St. Vincent's College which also served as a seminary at the time.

¹⁰⁷ "Persecutions of a Catholic Priest – A Scene in Court," *ibid.*, 21 September 1865, p. 2; Columbia Statesman, 22 September 1865, p. 1; Donald Rau, "Cummings v. Missouri: Three Cheers for Father Cummings," Supreme Court Historical Society. Yearbook, 1977, 20-28; Harold C. Bradley, "In Defense of John Cummings," Missouri Historical Review, 57, no. 1 (October 1962): 1-15.

¹⁰⁸ Liberty Tribune, 23 March 1866, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹ Missouri v. Cummings, 36 Missouri 265.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 265-69.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 270.

¹¹² “Trial of J. A. Cummings,” Missouri Republican, 19 October 1865, p. 2. The judges were David Wagner, Walter Lovelace and Nathaniel Holmes.

¹¹³ Transcript, Cummings v. Missouri, pp. 7-8.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹¹⁶ William E. Parrish, Frank Blair: Lincoln’s Conservative (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1998), 236-37; *Ibid.*, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 57-58; A. P. Sprague, ed., Speeches, Arguments, and Miscellaneous Papers of David Dudley Field, 2 vols. (New York, 1884), 1:517-533.

¹¹⁷ 71 U. S. 323.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 327.

¹¹⁹ Field was joined in the majority by Nathan Clifford, Robert Grier, Samuel Nelson and James Wayne. While Field and the minority justices were all Lincoln appointees, the majority were holdovers from the Taney Court. *Ibid.*, 332.

¹²⁰ Wayne was born in Georgia and was nominated by Jackson. Nelson, born in New York, was nominated by John Tyler. Grier, born in Pennsylvania, was nominated by James K. Polk. Clifford was born in New Hampshire and was nominated by James Buchanan.

¹²¹ Cummings v. Missouri, 71 U.S. 277, 306.

¹²² Ex parte Milligan, 71 U. S. 2 (1866); Civil Rights Cases, 109 U. S. 3 (1883)

¹²³ Ex parte Garland, 71 U.S. 333, 398 (1867).

¹²⁴ J. W. Schuckers, The Life and Public Services of Salmon Portland Chase, (New York, 1874), 585; Salmon P. Chase to August Belmont, May 30, 1868; John Niven, Salmon P. Chase: A Biography (Oxford University Press, 1995), 398-432.

¹²⁵ Prior to the 1890s the Supreme Court held that the Bill of Rights only restricted the federal government. The First Amendment guarantee of free exercise of religion was “incorporated” against the states in Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296 (1940) and the guarantee of freedom of speech was “incorporated” against the states in Gitlow v. New York, 268 U.S. 652 (1925).

¹²⁶ “Test Oath Decided Unconstitutional,” Southwest Union Press, 16 June 1866, p. 1; Peter G. Fish, “Secrecy and the Supreme Court: Judicial Indiscretion and Reconstruction Politics,” William and Mary Law Review, 8, no. 2 (Winter 1967): 225-41. The aged Justice Robert Grier was the source of the leak.

¹²⁷ “The Test Oath Cape Girardeau Weekly Argus, 12 July 1866, p. 4.

¹²⁸ “A New Infamy,” Missouri Democrat, 19 January 1867, p. 1.

¹²⁹ “U. S. Supreme Court,” Missouri Republican, 19 January 1867, p. 1.

¹³⁰ “The Test Oath Cases Decision of the Supreme Court . . .,” Missouri Democrat, 19 January 1867, p. 2; “U. S. Supreme Court . . .,” Missouri Republican, 19 January 1867, p. 1; Jefferson City State Times, 25 January 1867, p. 1; Missouri Statesman, 25 January 1867, p. 2; Liberty Tribune, 25 January 1867, p. 2; *Ibid.*, 1 February, 1867, p. 2; People’s Tribune, 30 January 1867, p. 1.

-
- ¹³¹ “Test Oath,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 16 January 1867, p. 6.
- ¹³² “To the Christian Ministers in Missouri,” *ibid.*, p. 4.
- ¹³³ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 926.
- ¹³⁴ Missouri v. Murphy, Cape Girardeau County Circuit Court, 1799-1869, Missouri State Archives; “Religious Intelligence,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 14 November 1866, p. 4. A reprint of an article sent to the Missouri Presbyterian by A. Munson appeared in the St. Louis Christian Advocate which listed Murphy as one of the ministers convicted from Cape Girardeau County. “The Preachers and the Test Oath,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 27 June 1866, p. 4. Murphy, however, eventually returned to preaching prior to his appeal being heard by the state’s high court. A February 1867 notice in the Cape Girardeau Argus had him at one of the local Presbyterian houses of worship on March 17th. Cape Girardeau Argus, 28 February 1867, p. 2.
- ¹³⁵ “Religious Intelligence,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 14 November 1866, p. 4.
- ¹³⁶ 41 Mo. 340 (October 1867).
- ¹³⁷ Liberty Tribune, 8 November 1867, p. 2.
- ¹³⁸ Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 228-67, 272.
- ¹³⁹ Blair v. Ridgley, 41 Mo. 63 (March, 1867); Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 236-37, 272-73, 278-84.
- ¹⁴⁰ Foner, Reconstruction, 504-5.
- ¹⁴¹ Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 300-26.
- ¹⁴² “Bishop Ames Proposition,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 25 September 1865, p. 2.
- ¹⁴³ Morrow, Northern Methodism and Reconstruction, 39-41.
- ¹⁴⁴ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:208-12.
- ¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 1: 194-204; “Methodist Church Property Surrendered,” Missouri Republican, 18 January 1867, p. 2. The article was from the Kansas City Advertiser.
- ¹⁴⁷ Parrish, A History, 235.
- ¹⁴⁸ “From Missouri – Letter 3,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 31 May 1866, p. 5.
- ¹⁴⁹ Decision of the Court by Nathaniel Holmes, Pierce v. Howard and Edwards, Missouri State Archives, pp. 1-5; Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:231-40; Lewis, Methodism in Missouri, 217-20.
- ¹⁵⁰ Liberty Weekly Tribune, September 30, 1859, p. 1, c. 5
- ¹⁵¹ The other curators included John Adams, George A. Buckner, Peter Hansen, Robert Bailey, Sr., Theodore Bruere, Henry Borgman, Benjamin Emmons, Jr., W. B. Adams, James H. Robinson, Henry A. Clover, Dr. John Conzelman, and Frederick Muench. While little has been found about these men, they were all Radical Unionists of some sort. Arnold Kregel, John Orrick and Edward A. Lewis remained as they were loyal trustees. Bill, Record, State rex el. Pittman v. Adams, Supreme Court of Missouri Case File, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri, p. 1.
- ¹⁵² Those filing on behalf of the MECS also included David K. Pittman, Asa N. Overall, Daniel A. Griffith, Samuel Overall, Norman Lackland, Lloyd Dorsay, Wrenshall D. Fielding, John A.

Talley, James S. M. Gray, Thomas W. Cunningham, James Campbell, Robert B. Frazier, Richard E. Bland, Dennis McDonald, John W. Robinson, John Atkinson and Edward A. Lewis. Marvin was named a bishop in 1866. Ibid.

¹⁵³ Mo. Const. of 1865, art. VI, § 5, 12.

¹⁵⁴ Brief of Thomas Bruere, Record, State, ex rel., Pittman v. Adams; State, ex rel., Pittman v. Adams, 44 Mo. 570 (1869).

¹⁵⁵ Brief of E. A. Lewis, Record, State, ex rel., Pittman v. Adams.

¹⁵⁶ George Crawford Adams, A Christian Lawyer: A Sketch of the Life and Work of Hon. Warren Currier (St. Louis, 1893).

¹⁵⁷ Decision of the Court by Judge Philemon Bliss, *ibid.*, 7.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

¹⁵⁹ Given that both the Old School General Assembly and New School General Assembly in the North had supported the Union during the Civil War, they were well situated to make common cause against the vanquished South after its conclusion. The two churches voted in 1869 to reunite as the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the name both schools had claimed after the 1837 schism. The reunited General Assembly convened in 1870.

But Old School Presbyterians from the Border States, who generally had supported slavery but favored the Union, especially those in Kentucky and Missouri, found the new arrangement difficult to swallow. They had protested the pro-Union and anti-slavery pronouncements of the general assembly during and after the war and, beginning in 1865, signed a document condemning the general assembly known as the Declaration and Testimony. As the northern Presbyterians were negotiating their reunification these members formed independent synods during the late 1860s. After 1875 many of these Presbyterians felt compelled to join either the northern or southern churches depending on their sectional orientation during the war. The southern and northern churches remained separate through, till the 1980s. Samuel Miller, The Presbyterian Reunion: A Memorial Volume, 1837-1871 (New York, 1871), 246-315; David Riddle Williams, James H. Brookes: A Memoir, Published for Dr. Brookes' family. (St. Louis, 1897), 102-5; J. Treadwell Davis, "The Presbyterians and the Sectional Conflict," The Southern Quarterly, 8, no. 2, (January 1970): 124, 128-33. The two general assemblies remained separate until 1983, long after both denominations had expanded into the other section.

¹⁶⁰ Joseph H. Hall, Presbyterian Conflict and Resolution on the Missouri Frontier (Edwin Mellen, 1988); George M. Apperson, "Presbyterians and Radical Republicans: President Lincoln, Dr. McPheeters, and Civil War in Missouri," American Presbyterians 73 (Winter 1995): 239-249; Milan James Kedro, "The Civil War's Effect upon an Urban Church: The St. Louis Presbytery Under Martial Law." Missouri Historical Society Bulletin 27 (April 1971): 173-193; *Ibid.*, "The Civil War's Effect upon an Urban Church: The St. Louis Presbytery Under Martial Law," at <<http://www.mindspring.com/~raleigh1/civilwar.html>>.

¹⁶¹ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (Old School) (Philadelphia, 1861), 45.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 339.

-
- ¹⁶³ David Riddle Williams, James H. Brookes: A Memoir, Published for Dr. Brookes' family (St. Louis, 1897), 103; John S. Grasty, Memoir of Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D.D. . . . (St. Louis, 1871), 303.
- ¹⁶⁴ Grasty, Memoir of McPheeters, 307. The book published the Declaration in its entirety. The pamphlet itself is very rare today.
- ¹⁶⁵ Rev. George Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 1860-1870 (Columbia, Mo, 1898), 129-37.
- ¹⁶⁶ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School) . . . 1866 (Philadelphia, 1866), 345-49.
- ¹⁶⁷ One Hundred Years Presbyterian Church of U. S. in Missouri, 14.
- ¹⁶⁸ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1867 (Philadelphia, 1867), 334-40. Lafayette, Palmyra, Potosi, St. Louis, South West Missouri and Upper Missouri sent multiple sets of commissioners while the Presbyteries of Wyaconda and Missouri sent no commissioners that were recognized by the General Assembly. Ibid., 306.
- ¹⁶⁹ "Action of the Synod of Missouri on the Minutes of the General Assembly," Missouri Presbyterian, 18 October 1867, p. 2.
- ¹⁷⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁷¹ "The Property Question," ibid., 20 December 1867, p. 2.
- ¹⁷² "Rev. Mr. Forman's Report," ibid., 20 December 1867, p. 2; Henry Alexander White, Southern Presbyterian Leaders (New York, 1911), 357.
- ¹⁷³ Testimony of Fullerton, ibid., p. 29; Minutes of the General Assembly, 1868, 857.
- ¹⁷⁴ Testimony of Fullerton, Record, Van Eman v. Walker, p. 43; Van Eman v. Walker, 47 Mo. 69 (1870).
- ¹⁷⁵ Circular Read Before Jury, ibid., p. 38.
- ¹⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁷ "Presbytery of Palmyra," Missouri Presbyterian, 18 October 1867, p. 2.
- ¹⁷⁸ Minutes of Presbytery of Louisiana, Record, Van Eman v. Walker, p. 48.
- ¹⁷⁹ Change of venue put forth, ibid., p. 12; William Dawson for Plaintiffs, ibid., p. 50; History of Lewis, Clark, Knox and Scotland Counties, Missouri . . . (St. Louis and Chicago, 1887), 452, 633-46, 1140.
- ¹⁸⁰ J. S. Boyd Recalled, Record, Van Eman v. Walker, p. 53.
- ¹⁸¹ Betsy Waymur for the Plaintiffs, ibid., 52.
- ¹⁸² Defendants' Testimony, ibid., p. 57.
- ¹⁸³ Logan for Defendants, ibid., pp. 60-61.
- ¹⁸⁴ Testimony of Van Eman, Record, Van Eman v. Walker, Missouri State Archives, p. 25.
- ¹⁸⁵ Van Eman and Fullerton were asking for forty dollars in damages. Jury Verdict, ibid., p. 20.
- ¹⁸⁶ Defendant's Instructions to the Jury, ibid., p. 68; Plaintiff's Instructions to the Jury, ibid., p. 64.
- ¹⁸⁷ Decision of the Fourth District Court by Judge Bolb, ibid., pp. 1-4.

¹⁸⁸ Decision of the State Supreme Court by Warren Currier, *ibid.*, pp. 1-4. Currier cited Krevet v. Meyer, 24 Mo. 107 and Beeler v. Cardwell, 33 Mo. 84.

¹⁸⁹ Lucinda de Leftwich Templin, Reminisces of Lindenwood College: A Souvenir for Homecoming (St. Charles, Mo, 1920), 8.

¹⁹⁰ State of Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris, et al., 45 Mo. 183 (1869). Lackland had attended Marion College and studied law under Charles Drake. W. V. N. Bay, Reminiscences of the Bench and Bar in Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1878), 291, 298-303.

¹⁹¹ Brief of Glover and Shepley and Lackland, Martin, Lackland and Lewis, Case File, State of Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris, Missouri State Archives, p. 1.

¹⁹² Robertson v. Bullions, 9 Barb. 64 (N. Y. 1850) In the case the court held that religious societies are not ecclesiastical corporations in the English sense but rather civil corporations governed by the law. (1425, 1435)

¹⁹³ Brief of Glover et al, State of Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris, pp. 1-3.

¹⁹⁴ Brief of Hitchcock and Orrick, *ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁹⁵ A citation was listed for Robertson v. Bullions, which was discussed above. Additional cases that were discussed in chapter two include Harmon v. Dreher (1841), Shannon v. Frost (1842), Gibson v. Armstrong (1847), Commonwealth v. Green (1838) *Ibid.*, pp. 1-7.

¹⁹⁶ Decision of the Court by David Wagner, *ibid.*, p. 1.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹⁹⁸ de Leftwich Templin, Reminisces of Lindenwood College, 49.

¹⁹⁹ Watson, et al. v. Garvin, et al., 54 Mo. 353 (1873).

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 371.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 371-74.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 357.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 365.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 366.

²⁰⁵ Watson v. Jones, 80 U. S. 734.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.* See chapter two for more discussion of the various types of church property instances.

²⁰⁷ But because the decision did not, strictly as a matter of constitutional law, restrict the action of state courts, some lower courts limited its applicability or rejected it. Roger William Bennett, "Church Property Disputes in the Age of Common-Core Protestantism": A Legislative Facts Rationale for Neutral Principles of Law," Indiana L. J. 57 (1981-82): 166-71; Troy Harris, "Neutral Principles of the Law and Church Property in the United States," Journal of Church and State 30.3 (Summer 1988): 516-21; Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 727 (1871). See also Kent H. Roberts, "Constitutional Guidelines for Civil Court Resolutions of Property Disputes Arising from Church Schisms," Mo. L Rev. 45 (1980): 520-21; Thomas W. Cunningham, "Constitutional Law – The First Amendment – The Role of Civil Courts in Church Disputes," Wi. L Rev. 1977 (1977): 907-13; John E. Fennelly, "Property Disputes and Religious Schisms: Who is the Church?," St. Thomas L. Rev. 9 (1997-98): 319-22; Allen R. Friedman, "Church Property Dispute Resolution: An Expanded Role for Courts after Jones v. Wolf?," Georgetown

L. J. 68 (1979-80): 1142-46; Michael William Gallegan, “Judicial Resolution of Intrachurch Disputes,” Columbia L. Rev. 83 (1983): 2009-11; “Judicial Intervention in Church Property Disputes – Some Constitutional Considerations,” Yale L. J. 74, (1964-65); “Enforcing Conditions Placed on Gifts to Religious Institutions – Judicial Interference with the Free Expression of Religion,” BU. L. R. 49 (1969); Robert S. Peters, “Limitations on the Courts in Resolving Church Property Disputes,” Tenn. L. Rev. 36 (1968-69); Marvin Quattelbaum, “Constitutional Law – Freedom of Religion – Limitation on Courts in Intra-Church Property Disputes,” S. Car. L. Rev. 21 (1969): 443-46; Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 727 (1871).

²⁰⁸ Watson v. Garvin, 374, 384-85.

²⁰⁹ Howard L. Conrad, editor, Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference, vols. 1-5 (New York, 1901), 1:10, 154; R. I. Holcombe, editor, History of Greene County Missouri (St. Louis, 1883), 580-82; Christopher Phillips, The Making of a Southerner: William Barclay Napton’s Private Civil War (University of Missouri Press, 2008).

Chapter Eight

Ecclesiastical Standoffs, Freed People, and the Rigors of Redemption

On the night of June 23, 1872, a group of seven white men with blackened faces entered the home of Thomas Calahan, a northern Presbyterian minister attending to his sick wife. Callahan lived with his family outside the town of Centerville, Reynolds County, situated in the Ozark Mountains of southeast Missouri. The mob, which included Reynolds County Sheriff James H. George, was composed entirely of Ku Klux Klan members. After throwing Calahan's wife out of her bed, the Klansmen rampaged through the house, seized Calahan, and forced him to march a half-mile into a wooded area. There, they stripped off his shirt and gave him seventy-five lashes with a hickory withe on his bare back, a time-tested method of community regulation employed in the Ozarks known as "slicking."¹ After applying the lashes, the mob ordered Calahan to leave the county within ten days or else face certain death. Calahan remained undaunted. Trekking 120 miles to a rail line in the town of Rolla, he took the train to St. Louis where he filed a complaint with United States Marshal Newcomb. Shortly thereafter Newcomb ordered the arrest of the mob but could only locate and apprehend Sherriff George and two other of its members. Released on bail, the three men returned to Reynolds County to await trial.²

The Klansmen believed they had ample reason to target Calahan. A recent migrant from Clinton County, Iowa, Calahan was a Radical Unionist and had served in the United States Army as a chaplain during the war. Calahan had lived in Reynolds County only for a few months. But he knew enough about his new environs to write the Radical newspaper in nearby Iron County, the Ironton Enterprise, two days before the Klan assaulted him, about the mysterious recent burning of the Reynolds County courthouse. The Reverend Calahan did not name the culprit in

his editorial piece. But he asserted that the man who had been accused of the crime, Marion Johnson, was innocent and that the arson had been committed to cover up a Democrat Party ring of corruption.³ In all likelihood, this published letter led to the events of June 23rd. Calahan was a northern-leaning clergyman whose faith greatly informed his Radical politics. His activism, in this connection, was entirely unacceptable to most of the white residents in Reynolds County. A southern Democrat paper, the Ironton County Register, published an editorial declaring that Calahan was a missionary to the freed people in the area – another damnable offense.⁴

Klan-driven violence persisted in Reynolds County while conservatives denied the outrages and Radicals, locally and nationally, sought to publicize them. Overwhelmingly Democratic, Reynolds County was becoming even more so because local residents had made successful efforts to drive out African Americans and Radicals. The Ironton Enterprise brought attention to this fact, declaring that virtually no blacks remained in the county. Editorial pieces in the Register duly countered with an explanation that at least two blacks, in fact, remained within its borders.⁵ Outside of Iron County, Radical-leaning sheets derided its conservative whites for their violence. According to an article published in the Missouri Democrat “the cause of justice and civilization demands that the perpetrators of these dark deeds should be punished, and it is only through the Press that the authorities can be brought to a realization of the situation, and induced to discharge their duties in the premises.”⁶ These bold demands found a national audience in the pages of the New York Times as well as in other big-city newspapers further east.

By the early 1870s the Radicals were virtually out of power in Missouri, and the Democrat Party was well on its way to re-establishing its dominance. While Governor B. Gratz Brown was a Liberal Republican, the Democrat lambasted him for failing to discharge his duty

to protect the citizens of the state from Klan violence. The Radical Republicans remained strong nationally, and Brown was the nominee of the Liberal Republicans for vice president of the United States. Consequently, Radical newspapers, such as the Times, were more than willing to illuminate the partisan chaos that had erupted in Missouri on his watch. Undeterred by national criticism of Klan violence in southeast Missouri, the Ironton County Register continued to deny that the Klan had even organized in that part of the state. It published, for example, an article entitled “The Missouri Democrat as a Liar – What it Knows About Ku-Kluxing.” The same piece supported the lashing of Calahan, maintaining that mob violence was sometimes necessary to deal with intermeddling Radical ministers from the North. In reference to Calahan and another victim of Klan violence, William Lawson, the editorial declared that “Calahan and Lawson were whipped, and deserved it too. We don’t generally approve of that sort of thing, but there are instances in which you cannot correct abuses by law, and its devilishly hard to stand by and have your dearest rights overridden, simply because the scoundrels who are injuring you have no property or character or anything else to care for. . . .”⁷

The conflict between the Reverend Calahan and the Ku Klux Klan in Reynolds County continued. KKK operatives, in all likelihood, murdered his friend, Marion Weeks, who had testified in behalf of Calahan in St. Louis. Weeks was a well-informed deputy postmaster in the Reynolds County village of Reece’s Mill and knew very well that he might pay with his life for speaking out. Those who committed the murder were never identified or prosecuted.⁸ At the same time, Sherriff George, it seems, used his influence to thwart anti-Klan efforts, a practice that soon prompted his critics to declare that he was a major leader of the local KKK chapter. Armed with these facts, the Missouri Democrat concluded, “thus the tide of anarchy sets over Reynolds County, causing men, whose only offense is their loyalty, to flee, and placing their

lives and comfort at the disposal of bloody and powerful foes.”⁹ Calahan campaigned to secure a finding that George was guilty of Klan-related violence. In response, editors of the Ironton County Register took another shot at the Presbyterian divine: “Now sir, it is not a little strong that this Rev. gentleman, who appropriates the funds of the colored man for his own use, who has been kicked out of the Presbyterian Church for conduct unbecoming even a sinner. . . .”¹⁰

The Ku Klux Klan attack on the Reverend Calahan and the various high-profile conflicts stemming from it were indicative of the persistent refusal of southern partisans in Missouri to accept the reformist impositions of righteous Radical Republican rulers. Most white southerners in the state refused to accede to Radical demands that they atone for the sins of slaveholding and disloyalty or to accept equal civil and political rights for recently emancipated African Americans. Klan terror commonly punished northern evangelical clerics such as Thomas Calahan, who had hoped to promote what they believed to be positive spiritual regeneration and political change. Such vigilantism commonly sidestepped the due sanctions of law and order. Calahan said as much when, in a letter published in the Ironton Enterprise, he averred that the men who killed Weeks would never be brought to justice.¹¹

Southern white men who formed the various “klaverns” in Missouri were among those who most militantly refused to comply with Radical demands for change. Even after Radical Republicans lost their grip on the reins of state power in the late 1860s, some Liberal Republican and Democrat officials were unwilling to face down the Klan or did so in a way that was purposely ineffective. Southern Democrats relied on Klan violence to secure their return to power. And the targeting of northern evangelicals who sought to implement Radical reforms was one of the central features of “Redemption.” In this context, there was little hope for northern and southern evangelicals to reconcile.

Thesis

New civil and political liberties for Missouri African Americans during Reconstruction secured for them the right to worship independently and the means to protect their church property -- but black believers abandoned white-controlled churches in droves, created their own Baptist and Methodist organizations, and faced down the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan to nurture distinctive faiths that nurtured African American advancement. After political “Redemption” in 1875, white evangelicals remained ecclesiastically divided over the religious and political meanings of slavery, secession and disloyalty. New and delimited evangelical understandings of Divine Providence arose in step with decreasing confidence in the efficacy of state-generated social reform.

During Reconstruction in Missouri, northern and southern Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians recovered from the ravages of war and increased their memberships in ways that more than kept pace with the rapidly-growing population of the state, a consequence of new railroads and industrial development that generated large-scale immigration from further east and north. In this context, relatively well-to-do middle-class Presbyterian societies recovered much more quickly than did rural evangelical congregations. But these same transformations generated a relative decline in southern Methodist numbers, while increasing most the size of northern Methodist and Baptist churches and a notable rural-urban divide among the latter.

White evangelicals remained divided over the intertwined moral and political questions of slavery, secession and disloyalty. While northern and southern evangelicals agreed to co-exist peacefully, no ecclesiastical reconciliations occurred among them. Commemoration of wartime heroes and victims, on both sides of the aisle, powerfully reinforced antagonistic understandings of religion, politics, and the past. Southern and northern evangelicals perceived the extended

revivals that took place during Reconstruction primarily in terms of sacrifice and spiritual rebirth. Reconstruction also saw a key modulation in white evangelical faith arising as a consequence of the schisms and sectional struggle they helped to produce. New and delimited understandings of Divine Providence, which prompted evangelicals now to look only to the past for signs of God's intervention, could no longer provide rosy and confident predictions of social and political transformation. This was a view that coincided with a decreased willingness on the part of most evangelicals to support social reform and their growing desire to separate religion from civil government.

By virtue of the 1865 Radical Constitution and the Civil War Amendments, African Americans secured not only emancipation but the right to worship independently and the civil and legal rights to protect their church property. African Americans walked away from white dominated religious societies and formed their own Methodist and Baptist organizations, a process that constituted, by far, the most dramatic schisms to occur in post-Civil War Missouri. Black believers relied on their new churches to provide education for their children, rather than send them to the poorly funded public schools. Black congregants and their religiously-affiliated Radical allies also faced the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan. Notwithstanding these depredations, the distinctive religious commitments of black believers undergirded their continuing efforts in behalf of African American socioeconomic, civil, and political advancement.

"Redemption" began to re-establish southern Democrat Party rule as early as 1871. The conservative 1875 Redeemer Constitution consummated it, undercutting the power of the state to tax and to incur indebtedness for the support of the new common school system and railroad expansion. It also banned the use of tax dollars to fund parochial schools, a slap at the Roman Catholics who had dared to challenge the teaching of the Protestant faith in public school

classrooms. Equally important, the new constitution jettisoned entirely features of the 1865 “Drake Constitution” that had made past loyalty to the Union a litmus test of citizenship and, effectively, stripped white southern evangelicals of political power and important civil and religious liberties. Union partisans, Radical Republicans, abolitionists failed in their campaign to impose upon white southerners a new civil religion making repentance for slaveholding and loyalty to the Union fundamental articles of faith and political orthodoxy.

Literature Review

Especially in the last three decades, historians have shown that religion constituted an integral feature of the prime social and cultural transformations that occurred during Reconstruction. Eric Foner concludes that the collapse of Reconstruction resulted, in part, from white Protestant fears of massive Roman Catholic immigration and related anxieties about class conflict.¹² According to Ward McAfee, such anxieties informed a number of Radical Republican programs, especially education, to remake the South in the image of the North.¹³ Victor Howard argues that the same liberal theological tenets that had undergirded abolitionism also underwrote many of these programs.¹⁴ Edward Blum concludes that white Protestant religion made inter-sectional political reunification possible by producing a common set of theological principles compatible with racial segregation.¹⁵

Historians Eugene Genovese and Edward Blum suggest that southern and northern evangelicals during Reconstruction understood their spiritual and worldly circumstances in terms of the rewards and punishments that Divine Providence meted out for keeping or abandoning Christian duties and for supporting or not the sectional cause approved by him.¹⁶ Charles Reagan Wilson and Paul Harvey hold that defeated southerners believed that God continued to favor the South and that a thoroughly conservative evangelicalism remained central to southern culture

and civic life.¹⁷ Beth Barton Schweiger shows that, beginning in Reconstruction, the terrible impact and memory of bloody fratricidal war undercut evangelical millennial beliefs and understandings of divine providence in ways that spurred the secularization of American society.¹⁸

A number of historians have explored the relationship of evangelical religion in the post-war South with distinctive forms of southern reaction to defeat and Radical efforts to remake the region. Scholarly work has examined extensively the “religion of the Lost Cause,” efforts to memorialize its heroes and perpetuate Old South evangelical morality, and the relationship of the Ku Klux Klan to such efforts.¹⁹ Historian W. Scott Pool breaks new ground by tying the depredations of the Klan to the persistent influence of southern evangelical sentiment and articles of faith.²⁰

Historians and other scholars of American religion generally agree that Reconstruction did not mend the schisms within the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches. Ralph E. Morrow argues that the leadership of the Methodist Episcopal Church sought to aid the Reconstruction of the South and construct a national Methodist denomination that would extend into the region. He also suggests that southern and northern Methodist churches began at least to co-exist peacefully during the 1870s.²¹ But most who have studied the question conclude that, while some evangelicals in both North and South earnestly sought reconciliation, pre-war, wartime, and Reconstruction-era strife left prohibitive mutual animosities on both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line that made a reunification of the three major denominations well nigh impossible. Ellwood Smith, in particular, emphasizes that the Methodists remained the most thoroughly divided.²² Church historians focusing on Reconstruction in Missouri have generally

chronicled the expansion of Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian memberships in the state, while glossing over continuing theological and organizational divisions.²³

An abundance of scholarship, dating back at least a century, has explored the efforts of African Americans to establish their own churches after the Civil War.²⁴ More recent scholarship examines the deliberate self-segregation of black evangelicals, before and after Redeemer state governments imposed racial segregation on the South. This body of work emphasizes that the freed people established religious societies that, along with other voluntary black organizations, nurtured their own understandings of Christian faith and advanced their own community interests and civil and political rights.²⁵

White Evangelical Church Recoveries and Denominational Cease Fires

The Baptists in Missouri increased their numbers substantially in the decade following the Civil War. In 1866, before African Americans had completely abandoned the denomination, there were 44,877 Baptists in the state, a slight increase from the 42,060 prior to the onset of wartime hostilities. In 1870 there were 69,904 white Baptists in the state or about four percent of the state population. In 1860 Baptists were 3.6 percent of all Missourians. A number of congregations folded in the 1860s. But postwar expansion, included the founding of dozens of new Baptist organizations, helped account for the 1,184 Baptist churches numbered in the census of 1870, a marked boost from the 713 in 1860 and the 749 in 1866. According to the 1870 census, there were 145,360 seats in the state's Baptist churches, roughly the same as in 1860 and room for 8.4 percent of the state population. Certainly the destruction of property and the time it took for poorer, rural congregations to purchase edifices for themselves contributed to this stagnation in light. While the total membership rose in 1870, so did the number of ministers

throughout the state. In 1860 there were 401 ministers, 432 in 1866 and 704 four years later. While the persecution unleashed by the Test Oath hampered the ability of the ministers to perform their duties, by 1870 this was not an issue. Ministers, nonetheless, remained at a premium in many of the more rural congregations through the nineteenth century. Numbers continued on the upswing until the end of Reconstruction in 1876. The 1,156 churches had 78,738 members, or about an eleven percent increase from 1870. While the fervor of postwar revivals had died down somewhat, they continued into the early 1870s, driving numbers higher. Ministers only saw their numbers go up to 777 in 1876, leaving many smaller congregations without a full time minister. Northern and southern Baptists did not differentiate between themselves in the enumerations, most likely to inflate their combined numbers, but the relative strengths of their strongholds throughout the state demonstrate that both groups experienced growth. Numbers went up in St. Louis County, a bastion of the northern faction. Previously under-populated areas, such as the Ozarks and northern portion of the state, in which the Radicals had organized settlement, also saw an increase in their Baptist populations. While Baptists continued to be sizable in the Boone's Lick, that southern-leaning region of the state experienced modest development.²⁶

As was the case with the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, a hefty segment of the increase in Baptist Church membership was attributable to rapid immigration from further east and north. During the war there was certainly a drop in population and there were fears immediately after the fighting ended that the exodus from the state would continue. Both Radicals and conservatives took steps to promote immigration after 1863. These settlers arrived, from both domestically and abroad. Unclaimed lands were touted to both eastern and European migrants, especially Germans. Almost all of the desirable tracts in northern Missouri were

claimed by 1868, leaving only some land in the southern Ozarks. The state remained predominately rural, but the new rail lines that the Radicals helped to establish, in tandem with the Missouri River, basically linked St. Louis with the growing towns of Kansas City, St. Joseph and Springfield. Radical plans to industrialize, modernize and eventually northern-ize Missouri slowly came to fruition. St. Louis lost preeminence to Chicago because Missouri's railroad building lagged behind that of other states and the city had been cut off from river traffic during the war. Even so, its population almost doubled to 310,825 by 1870. Kansas City, while nowhere close to St. Louis, grew to 32,254 inhabitants thanks to the railroads and a thriving livestock industry. Rail links also aided St. Joseph and Springfield, which was also helped by the developing iron and coal industry in southwestern Missouri. The state's population swelled by 539,283 people, or forty-five percent. This was far greater than the twenty-two percent increase in the national population. By 1870 Missouri's population had increased to 1,721,295.²⁷

Scarce resources and a leadership focused on building urban congregations made it difficult for southern-leaning Missouri Baptists in the hinterlands to rebuild their societies after the war. The devastation of the fighting had left many of Baptist churches in disarray and the southern-oriented Missouri Baptist General Association poorly situated to provide much assistance. The Test Oath did not make matters any easier. Radicals sought to purge the state of those they perceived as southern sympathizers, a group in which Missouri Baptists were over-represented. In 1865 the assembly of the southern General Association omitted to prepare a membership list. The committee on feeble churches reported that "the prostrate and dormant condition of many of our churches imperatively demands of us, at this time, to send living ministry among them, to awaken them and build up the waste places of our Baptist Zion."²⁸ A year later the same committee gave a report that the association needed to direct its limited

resources to the more populous centers of the state. But association emissaries implored Baptists across the state to build Sunday schools and ensure that candidates for the ministry spent time in college. Individual congregations, such as the Saline County Zoar Baptist Church in the Boone's Lick, received strongly-worded letters to maintain their Sunday schools.²⁹ Notwithstanding that most Baptist societies continued to be situated in rural villages and small towns, Baptist leaders sought to advance an agenda better suited to the rapidly-growing urban centers of the state.³⁰

Recovery was especially challenging for less affluent southern Baptist congregations in rural villages and small towns that had been prime targets for Unionist reprisals. The Hebron Association, in southeastern Missouri, had no intelligence on five of the eight churches within that organization when it met in 1866.³¹ The Shoal Creek Association suffered from some of the worst of the guerilla war, and many of its southwestern Missouri congregations could not reconvene until 1867.³² A little further to the east, the First Baptist Church of Springfield lost the use of its building after fighting commenced. Used as a school for blacks in 1865, the congregants did not immediately regain control of the structure from the federal forces who had seized it. By July of 1866, however, repairs had been made and E. Alward, a minister from Topeka, Kansas, was obtained to preach.³³ In western Missouri, the Pleasant Grove Baptist Church in Platte County was forced to construct a new list of members after the war. The minutes recorded the resolution saying in part "Whereas Pleasant Grove church in her visible membership for the past four years has materially diminished; and whereas we have been wholly unable to note the particular causes . . . and do not know the whereabouts of the deportment of the members . . ." ³⁴ Congregants of the Boone's Lick First Baptist Church in Otterville were similarly scattered about during the fighting.³⁵ The elders of the General Association appear to have worried about the circumstances of congregations situated in southwestern Missouri, which

had been especially devastated by the wartime conflict. In 1868, B. McChord Roberts wrote to denominational leaders that, in reference to Greene County, “Those Southern and border counties . . . if neglected a year or two longer, will, I fear, be lost to us forever.”³⁶

After the demise of the Test Oath, southern Baptists in Missouri began to reorganize, rebuild, and establish new societies. In the southern and western rural areas of the state, congregations cropped up one by one, replicating the pattern of pioneer church building that had been common in Missouri decades earlier.³⁷ Local societies, with damaged houses of worship, began to pick up the pieces. Pleasant Grove Baptist Church in Platte County, for example, decided in January of 1867 that the time had come either to repair or rebuild their meeting house. Like many other Baptist congregations in the late 1860s and early 1870s, the members decided that they would get more for their money if they scrapped their damaged structure and build anew. Four members donated the needed sum of almost \$4,000. Congregants Virginia Holland and Sue Brock selected the chandeliers for the impressive new edifice.³⁸ In October 1867, in Callaway County, “Sister Nancy” donated land to the Grand Prairie Baptist Church for a much needed new graveyard.³⁹ Almost moribund southern Baptist societies in the Cape Girardeau Association came back to life beginning in 1867.⁴⁰ They organized a revival and even put on temperance lectures in February 1868 and November 1869.⁴¹ Some village and small town southern Baptist congregations certainly benefitted from immigrant arrivals. But most relied on revivals to sustain or build up their numbers.⁴²

Northern Baptist societies grew more quickly than did those of their southern counterparts. Baptists with northern and middle-class orientations tended to establish themselves in growing towns and cities – a development that spurred a rapidly developing rural-urban divide among Baptists. Membership lists grew in step with urban growth fueled by immigration, which

gave rise, for example, to the prosperous Walnut Street Baptist Church in Kansas City.⁴³ In St. Louis, the newly-organized Women's Baptist Missionary Society in 1872 held its first meeting at the Second Baptist Church. One of many evangelical women's organizations, the BMS dedicated itself to coordinating missionary work among a number of growing northern Baptist congregations in the city. The Second Baptist Church, in fact, tended to lead the way in building up the northern Baptists in St. Louis. In 1867, missionary outreach organized the Carondelet Baptist Church. A Sunday School mission coordinated by St. Louis Baptist women also soon helped to organize the Lafayette Park Baptist Church. In 1870, B. F. Edwards, a prominent member of the Second Baptist Church, along with the Reverend J. R. Dower of Abilene, Kansas, established the Wetzel Memorial Baptist Church in Kirkwood, a growing suburb just outside of St. Louis.⁴⁴

A northern-oriented Missouri Baptist State Convention coalesced shortly after the war and attempted to construct a loyalist state-wide association that would help remake Missouri in the image of the North. At their organizing convention in 1865, the Unionist Baptists estimated that there were only fifty qualified ministers who had taken the Test Oath and duly qualified to preach the gospel. There were, furthermore, only about a hundred congregations holding regular services. These ministers at least constituted some of the core who aligned themselves with the convention. Its members hoped that, by proclaiming their loyalty, they would be able to rebuild a suitably reformed Baptist denomination in Missouri. By the same token, the association effectively institutionalized the theological position that slaveholding and support of slavery and the Confederacy constituted sanction-worthy sins. Ministers and messengers were listed as residing in areas where there had been a significant amount of pro-Union fervor during the war. Support was the heaviest in the St. Louis area, northeastern Missouri, and the western part of the

state. The churches represented were mostly comprised of urbanites either in Missouri's burgeoning cities or larger towns. There were almost no ministers or messengers from the Boone's Lick or from the rural hinterlands where the southern Missouri General Association held sway. Like Galusha Anderson, many of the leaders had immigrated to Missouri from the east.⁴⁵

The rise of the Baptist State Convention spurred the establishment of new middle-class congregations in the urban areas of the state. Galusha Anderson used his position as pastor of the St. Louis Second Baptist Church to bolster the Baptist State Convention by expanding the denomination in the city. Through his help, the organizers of Carondelet Baptist Church established their congregation in 1867.⁴⁶ In Kansas City, Jonathan Fuller, who presided over a divided First Baptist Church during the war, took the opportunity to lead out a minority of northern Baptists to establish the Walnut Street Baptist Church in 1866. Fuller was also one of the organizers of the new State Convention which met in his church the same year.⁴⁷

When the Baptist State Convention held its 1866 meeting, thirty-nine new congregations had been organized. Some, like the Walnut Street Church, were formed by northern Baptist minorities who had withdrawn from largely southern-Baptist congregations. But many were simply newly established societies in urban places where there was a strong Unionist presence, such as St. Louis or the growing town of Kansas City. The organization had the benefit of being an auxiliary of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society and their missionaries – one of the national organizations from which the Southern Baptist Convention had withdrawn.

While northern Baptist missionaries began to trickle into the state after 1862, they steadily grew in number after the organization of the Baptist State Convention. Twenty-four men were sent to Missouri during 1866 under the auspices of the society and twelve more arrived the following

year. These individuals represented far more than the one missionary the Southern Baptists were able to send to the state. Many of the missionaries worked among African Americans, but several helped organize new congregations composed of whites. Overall, the state-wide organization was making progress, though a large percentage of the funds were raised in the commercial stronghold of St. Louis.⁴⁸ With the support of northern Baptists in the city, the northern-oriented American Baptist Publication Society opened a St. Louis depository in November 1868, the first major Baptist institution of its kind in Missouri. A northern Baptist leader in the state remarked, in 1869, “that we hail with gratitude the establishment within the past year, of a Branch House of the American Baptist Publication Society at St. Louis.”⁴⁹

Divided Missouri Baptists began to attempt to reach a mutual accommodation sooner than did other deadlocked evangelicals for a number of reasons. First, Baptist congregations had not been numerous or large in urban areas before the war. With southern Baptist rural strongholds firmly in the hands of the southern General Association, the ability of the northern State Convention to expand further in these precincts was severely compromised, notwithstanding the progress it had made in 1865 and 1866. With African Americans more interested in forming their own congregations, rather than forming societies that would join the convention, a rural path to expansion never materialized. As a result, in late 1866 and early 1867 some of the leaders of the State Convention began to correspond with their counterparts in the General Association to better distribute their limited funds and avoid replicating their efforts.

By early 1867, the Baptist State Convention had abandoned its effort to force southern Baptists to repent for their support of slavery and the South during the war. In the first year or two of its existence, the Missouri Baptist State Convention had sought to impose, as articles of faith, a belief that slavery and disloyalty were grievous sins. But with the judicial overturning of

the Test Oath, the State Convention receded from brandishing this position. Second, some of the intensely ideological early leaders of the State Convention, such as Galusha Anderson, had left the state. Anderson, exhausted from his pastorate, had moved to Massachusetts to a professorship at Newton Theological Seminary during April 1866. His departure constituted a substantial loss to the northern organization. But, in the circumstances, it also provided an opportunity for the northern Baptists in the state to refrain from maintaining publicly their judgments of southern Baptists regarding slaveholding and support of secession.⁵⁰

At the 1867 State Convention meeting, its leaders presented a letter to the membership explaining a proposal by which the State Convention and the southern-oriented Missouri General Association would merge. The letter lamented the duplication of missionary efforts in the state and other programs that undercut the effectiveness of the State Convention. Many within the membership, however, opposed affiliating with the General Association because the southern Baptists had refused to accept, much less confess, the sins of slaveholding and disloyalty. The State Convention, nonetheless, conveyed a series of resolutions to the southern Baptists concerning the proposed merger, including one that, basically, insisted that the northern-oriented St. Louis Baptist association retain a leadership role in any consolidated association. Another communiqué stressed the importance of recognizing the equality of whites and blacks, asking southern Baptist leaders for “a clear recognition of the baptistic doctrine that all Baptists, without reference to race or color, have an equal right to the participancy in our counsels, immunities and privileges.”⁵¹

The State Convention and the General Association consolidated under the umbrella of the older and larger General Association. Under the terms of this arrangement, individual congregations could send funds to whichever national organization they chose. Unlike the

Methodists and Presbyterians, the traditional form of Baptist congregational government, which preserved inviolate the complete autonomy of individual Baptist societies, made this distinctive arrangement possible. The northern State Convention dropped its demands that, as a condition of membership in the consolidated General Association, southern-leaning Baptists profess to believe that slaveholding and support of the Confederacy constituted sins. This appears to have conciliated the southern Baptist membership, notwithstanding the fact that northern Baptists in Missouri had supported the Test Oath and its enforcement only a year earlier. In recognition of this, the successor of Galusha Anderson at the St. Louis Second Baptist Church, the Reverend A. H. Burlingham, could explain nine years later how he had declared, on the eve of consolidation, in an address to the State Convention, "Let us make no demands; let us require no conditions. Rather, let us go out to the General Association and knock and they will receive us."⁵²

As agreed, northern- and southern-oriented congregations in the consolidated Missouri General Association sent funds to aid other Baptists in both the North and the South at least to the end of Reconstruction. The consolidated General Association, in due recognition of the beliefs and sentiments of new northern members, abandoned its status as a subsidiary of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1869. But southern Baptist congregations in Missouri, which constituted a majority in the state and in the General Association, exercised their prerogative to continue sending funds to the SBC. Northern Baptist congregations in the consolidated General Association, which were mostly situated in St. Louis, Kansas City, and other urban areas, typically sent their money to the northern-oriented American Baptist Home Missionary Society and other northern-oriented national Baptist organizations. In a few rural precincts of the state, where northern and southern Baptists were not numerous enough to support separate local societies, these mixed congregations sent funds to both the SBC and the ABHMS.⁵³

As did Missouri Baptists, Methodists in the state increased their memberships after the war. Census takers in 1870 did not distinguish between the MECS and MEC. But an uptick in the construction of church edifices led to an increase in northern Methodist accommodations by 35,000 seats to 185,420 – room for 11 percent of the state’s population. By 1870, there were 1,066 Methodist societies in the state. Taking the MEC and MECS together, the total of 67,496 members constituted a twenty percent increase from 1860. But as an overall percentage of the state population, the 3.9 percent in 1870 was significantly less than that 4.6 percent in 1860. Much of this change can be attributed to the failure of the MECS to increase its membership in the 1860s.⁵⁴

The remarkably rapid expansion of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Missouri during Reconstruction soon made this northern-oriented denomination far more influential in the state than it had been before the war. Northern Methodist membership grew from 6,116 members in 1860 to 25,308 ten years later, a 313 percent increase. The numerous advantages accruing from rapid immigration from the North and from Radical support during the war certainly spurred this growth. Free to expand their denomination, and often at the expense of the MECS, the results appeared clearly in the denominational tabulations. At the same time, some Methodists “defected” from the MECS to the MEC. Numerous references are made to these individuals in a number of MECS publications. For instance, the discussion of the Samuel Headlee murder in the St. Louis Christian Advocate made mention that several members of the mob had been members of the MECS prior to switching over to the MEC. While desertions led to some of the increase, MEC congregations were often formed side by side with MECS churches in the 1860s and did not become exclusive places of Methodist worship. As with the Methodists in Webster County during the Headlee incident, the MEC only made inroads and often as the smaller group, they did

not wipe out the MECS or convert many in its ecclesiastical or lay leadership. Regions of Missouri that had little in terms of MEC infrastructure in 1860 soon had competing congregations by the end of the war and amid the increase in northern immigration. The immigration from further east and north that aided northern Baptists certainly fueled the MEC expansion. Northern Missouri, the area around Kansas City and St. Louis became stronger in their Methodist adherence – all places that were northern-ized in the late 1860s. This growth was illustrated in the division of the northern annual conference into two bodies 1868, reflecting its greater importance in the state and at least a partial vindication of the Radicals.⁵⁵

As a matter of demographics rather than by virtue of Union army and Radical repression, the northern Methodist church became a true rival of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. A number of church property disputes resolving in favor of the MEC provided the wherewithal to establish congregations in a number of locations. LaGrange, for example, which did not have a MEC contingency prior to the war, had a significant northern Methodist after prevailing in court. In western Missouri, the northern church purchased half of the debt on the building at Plattsburg and ensured they could split occupancy with the southern Methodists in perpetuity. The Plattsburg High School that the MECS oversaw in the same town was procured by the denomination and continued as a MEC institution through the 1870s. In north-central Missouri town of Macon City the northern Methodists were able to obtain the edifice outright, as they were in northwestern Fillmore. An antebellum building established as a mission for African Americans in Glasgow was procured for the MEC as well. Glasgow was on the Missouri River in the Boone's Lick. The latter congregation, however, likely preferred being aligned with the MEC, expediting the process.⁵⁶ Others who had once been southern Methodists before 1861 but remained loyal to the Union certainly were willing to join the MEC in the areas they established

new congregations. In their pre-war strongholds, such as St. Louis, the northern Methodists expanded further. During the early 1870s, R. S. Stubbs was appointed as an agent of the church extension society and Sabbath school union of the MEC. With the assistance of several wealthy citizens, including a woman referred to as Mrs. Kennedy, who initially allowed the congregation to meet in her home, what became St. Luke's M. E. Church was formed.⁵⁷ A church in northeastern Scotland County constructed a small chapel named in honor of early Methodist bishop Francis Asbury. While the congregation and nearby circuit remained small, one of its early ministers Ozias S. Middleton was a Union corporal in the Civil War.⁵⁸

As indicated, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which had steadily increased its membership in the decade and a half preceding the war, lost members in the 1860s. The MECS infrastructure was in tatters by 1865. While there were 48,158 southern Methodists in 1860, there were only 42,188 in 1870 – a twelve percent decline. The tremendous pressure Union officials placed on the southern Methodists through the 1860s accounts for the decrease. Wartime anti-MECS vigilantism and Radical attempts to suppress the ministries of MECS also played an important role in producing the decrease.⁵⁹

The postwar period started very poorly for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Missouri. Many MECS schools and churches had been closed during the war. The Test Oath, before its demise, kept MECS ministers from preaching or holding regular worship services. Both MECS annual conferences were near collapse. The MECS Missouri Annual Conference and the MECS St. Louis Annual Conference faced a daunting task if they were to recover. The St. Louis Annual Conference was composed of congregations in the city and all of those situated south of the Missouri River. Congregations north of the river were situated in the Missouri Annual Conference. The churches and quarterly conferences in St. Louis were intact, as were

those in parts of the Ozarks. But the houses of worship and schools of many congregations in southwestern Missouri and around Kansas City had been devastated.⁶⁰

Slowly but surely, the southern Methodists in Missouri revitalized the MECS infrastructure, including its newspaper. In 1866, a majority of MECS ministers were able to attend the meeting of the Missouri Annual Conference for the first time in years. At the meeting, they had no choice but to clear their books of some of the preachers who had left the state during the war, and they had to face the hard fact that some congregations were defunct. But the proceedings were generally optimistic. While Central College in Fayette was heavily in debt, the finances of both annual conferences improved in the year immediately following the war. The St. Louis Christian Advocate, which had incurred significant debt in 1865, had stabilized its fiscal situation and swung back into action. With the Reverend David R. McAnally serving once again as editor, Union authorities allowed publication of the paper to renew after about September 1865. One committee report maintained that “never before was this paper so popular, and deservedly so as is in the present.”⁶¹ As had been the case before the war, the St. Louis newspaper re-emerged as the prime voice of the MECS in public debate with the MEC-controlled Central Christian Advocate.

Old MECS societies began to grow and new ones took root after the Test Oath was adjudged unconstitutional and the Radical Republicans began to lose power. Southern Methodist congregational strongholds in the Boone’s Lick and along the Mississippi River had not totally crumbled as a consequence of anti-MECS repression. A series of revivals that swept the state, beginning in 1865, fueled the revitalization of these societies. The revivals also spurred the expansion of both MECS annual conferences. The number of MECS congregations in the Ozarks and western Missouri began to increase.⁶² By November 1865, each weekly issue of the St. Louis

Christian Advocate contained numerous reports from Southern Methodist ministers who had become publicly active again. Consider the March 1866 comments of the Reverend B. F. Burns regarding a revival that affected his charge in the town of California, Moniteau County, situated in central Missouri. According to him, southern Methodism had begun to rise above its difficulties, as “the ‘old ship of Zion,’ in California, is still above the wave. Despite the surging waves of political agitation and persecution, she has breasted the storm and now sails upon a calm sea.”⁶³ This ebullient report did not escape the notice of northern Methodist observers. In a piece appearing in the MEC-controlled Central Christian Advocate, future MEC bishop and New Orleans missionary John Newman lamented, or perhaps warned, that “The Methodist Church, South, is being rapidly reorganized.”⁶⁴

To a large degree, the re-establishment of southern Methodism in Missouri was the consequence of difficult efforts made by determined members of local societies. Amid continuing Union occupation and stern Radical rule, disorganized MECS members in St. Louis began discreetly forming a new congregation in 1864. The constituents of two small chapel societies, Asbury and Christy, voted to combine and form a new parish. Official repression and related organizational difficulties delayed construction of the building until 1867, at which time the society was able to secure a \$67,500 loan to fund the project. While the debt remained a drain on operations for several years, construction was complete by 1869. The congregation rapidly expanded its membership and came to be known as St. John’s Methodist Episcopal Church, South.⁶⁵ In Creve Coeur, a growing suburb of St. Louis, MECS members similarly raised funds from 1867 to 1870 to construct a new house of worship.⁶⁶ In 1867, Southern Methodists in the northeastern County of Lewis held their first successful quarterly conference since the beginning of the war.⁶⁷ As the high tide of Radical repression and war fever slowly ebbed, MECS members

re-emerged in villages and small towns across the state to establish altogether new societies. Such was the case of a congregation that appeared in the rural southeastern Missouri village of Sands in 1869. The group worshipped initially in an old log schoolhouse.⁶⁸ In rural Clark County, situated in the northeast part of the state, the following year, MECS members established a new society and built a church, which soon forged networks of cooperation and mutual aid with other rural congregations in the area.⁶⁹ The rapid increase of congregations in Southwest Missouri, by 1876, laid the foundation for the creation of a new MECS Southwestern Annual Conference in the state.⁷⁰

With the Test Oath having been declared unconstitutional in March 1866, and with Radical-controlled state authorities on their side, the MEC stepped up its attempts to eliminate the other wing of Methodism in Missouri. In southwestern Webster County, a mob led by northern Methodists murdered MECS minister Samuel Headlee in 1866 – provoking outrage among both Methodists and non-Methodists. The Missouri Conference lamented in their official minutes that “persecutions of no ordinary character, and annoyances and trials particularly severe have multiplied in Missouri the past year. . . . Some have been driven out of their pulpits and churches by armed mobs and others deterred from attending their appointments by armed mobs.”⁷¹ One target of such persecution was the Reverend H. H. Hedgpeth while he was officiating at a service in Nodaway County in the northwestern corner of the state in July 1866. During his sermon, several northern Methodists and Radicals approached the preacher and informed him that, as a southern Methodist minister, he was supposed to carry with him at all times a paper certifying he had taken the Test Oath. Correctly informing the gentlemen that there was no such regulation, they proceeded to disrupt the meeting; Hedgpeth had little choice but to cancel it. In his words “they at once abandoned all pretext of enforcing law, and resorted to

threats of mobs and secret assassination.”⁷² The protracted legal battle between northern and southern Methodists for control of St. Charles College and similar struggles in Lewis, Jackson, Lafayette, and Cooper counties only hinted at the larger intra-denominational struggle that persisted well past the conclusion of the war. For about two years, enforcers of the Test Oath particularly targeted southern Methodist ministers because so many of them had acted upon Confederate sympathies during the war.

In the year and a half following the Civil War, northern Methodists attempted to convince the leaders of the two southern Methodist annual conferences that their absorption into the MEC was the only viable option available to them. Such a step may or may not have had the potential to stabilize the denomination as a whole. In any case, it would have required MECS ministers and congregants to accept MEC articles of faith declaring slaveholding and disloyalty grave sins, beliefs that, for several years, the Test Oath underwrote with the power of civil law.⁷³ Unlike the Baptists, southern Methodist congregations would not have the prerogative to believe as they so chose on these questions. Those who professed otherwise would have been expelled. MEC minister John H. Cox, for example, fully embraced these principles. Cox was active in the Radical Party in northeastern Missouri and, as a Union officer in the war, had harassed Baptist minister William Cleveland.⁷⁴ Leaders of the MECS Missouri Conference explained that it still preferred “to maintain the separate and distinct identity of the M. E. Church, South, at all hazards, give the leading reasons for it, and then adopt such measures as would inspire confidence, revive our cherished forms, reconstruct our organization, infuse every where a resuscitated organic life . . . and rehabilitate our peculiar institutions and organs.”⁷⁵ The leadership of the Missouri Conference and the St. Louis Conference rebuffed further MEC attempts in 1866. The MECS-controlled St. Louis Christian Advocate reminded its readers that

there would be little gained by reunification.⁷⁶ The Reverend McAnally published a piece in the Advocate in September 1866 reminded his readers that most members of the MEC took the view “that the South is not of the same political faith with them.”⁷⁷

Patterns of recovery and growth among Missouri Presbyterians during Reconstruction were, to an unusual degree, tightly interwoven with numerous ecclesiastical reconfigurations that took place from 1861 through 1869. The Old School Presbyterian Church in the United States had declared its loyalty to the Union and condemnation of slavery in 1861. This was a move that had spurred the formation of a southern Presbyterian Church at about that time, known during the war as the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. After the war, the southern Presbyterian Church boldly called itself the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Hardly situated to join with the general assembly of that church during the war, southern Presbyterians in Missouri established themselves as an Independent Synod in 1867. New School and Unionist Presbyterians formed the competing Missouri Synod, which joined the Old School General Assembly after its delegates declared loyalty to the Union in 1861. The bulk of the Missouri Synod membership resided in venues where New School strength had been established for decades. The Presbytery of Palmyra and the Presbytery of St. Louis, however, were deeply divided over whether to affiliate with the Independent Synod or the Missouri Synod. As discussed in a previous chapter, competing factions within each of these presbyteries claimed to be the legitimate body in each case by the late 1860s.⁷⁸ After the Old School Presbyterian Church declared its loyalty to the Union and took an increasingly critical position toward slavery and disloyalty in 1861, far fewer contentious theological differences stood in the way of mending the 1837 rift with the New School Presbyterian Church, which had formally condemned slavery in 1857 and declared its support for the Union from the beginning of the war. Consequently, the

Old School General Assembly and the New School General Assembly reunited in 1869. In 1870, the recombined church called itself the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. In essence, by 1870, there was a northern-oriented Presbyterian Church by this name and a southern-oriented Presbyterian Church by this name.

In regions of Missouri where there was strong support for the Confederacy, very few Presbyterian congregations aligned themselves with the Old School General Assembly after it adopted an anti-southern position in 1861. This included much of the territory of the Presbytery of Lafayette, which was situated in the western Boone's Lick, and other areas where southern guerillas were active. As a result, most of its members signed onto the Declaration and Testimony in summer 1865 against the pro-Union stance taken by the Old School General Assembly and eventually joined the Independent Synod.⁷⁹

Notwithstanding the turmoil over the formation of the Missouri Independent Synod in 1867, many of the churches in the state affiliated with it were able to recover rather quickly from the Civil War. The substantial wealth and earning power of town-dwelling, middle-class Presbyterians, generally speaking, helps to account for this. Reports published in both the Missouri Presbyterian and the southern Methodist St. Louis Christian Advocate bear out this conclusion.⁸⁰ The Boone's Lick Augusta Presbyterian Church in Callaway County renewed the growth in membership that it had seen prior to 1861.⁸¹ To the east, in Montgomery County at Price's Branch, southern Presbyterians organized a new church in 1867. Ruling elder Virgil Alexander Price had fought in the Confederate Army. The congregants met for prayer and Sunday services in their homes, lacking the funds to construct a house of worship.⁸² In the town of Memphis, Scotland County, the Declaration and Testimony faction that had lost their church property case before the Missouri Supreme Court managed to erect a new brick edifice in 1871.

Valued at \$5,000, the new house of worship was much more elaborate than the one they lost as a consequence of their failed litigation.⁸³

Prior to the unification of the New School Missouri Synod with the Old School General Assembly in 1869, its presbyteries and churches took advantage of Union military occupation, Radical political dominance, and rapid immigration from the North to grow their memberships. Having been strongly identified with the anti-slavery movement for decades, the New School Presbyterians were perfectly happy with the Radical agenda. New School growth exploded in the state, increasing from a meager eight congregations to sixty-one at the time of the reunification. Most of the increase was in regions of the state where there had been a great deal of Unionist and anti-slavery sentiment. New churches opened throughout western Missouri; ministers such as Timothy Hill labored for the denomination in places such as rapidly-growing Kansas City.⁸⁴ The loyal women and men of the Presbytery of Lafayette, along with ministers such as George Miller, had to reorganize almost from scratch after a majority of the Presbytery signed the Declaration and Testimony, which the southern Presbyterians issued in summer 1865. Miller explained that immigration from northern states was crucial to increasing membership in the church. In his words, “immigration poured in and gave us about all the material we had to build with.”⁸⁵

In 1870, the overall Presbyterian membership in the state was most concentrated in St. Louis, with about 3,000 communicants in the city. Presbyterian congregations were also in the towns situated in its western, southwestern and northeastern precincts. There were approximately 75,000 Presbyterian Church seats in the state in 1870, a substantial increase from the total of 47,000 seats in 1860.⁸⁶ Presbyterian numbers were most thin in the southeastern part of the state.⁸⁷ In 1870, southern Presbyterians in Missouri formed a new Presbytery of Ozark, which

comprised twenty-four churches and 630 members throughout the southern counties of the state.⁸⁸ In 1870, the Old School membership of the northern General Assembly in Missouri included 5,281 members in 117 congregations. The New School membership of the northern General Assembly in the state included sixty-one congregations and 2,402 members.⁸⁹ Combined, there were 7,683 members within the 178 northern synod churches, or about one half of one percent of the state population. This figure, which does take into account the southern-oriented Independent Synod, was roughly the same as the total Presbyterian population in 1860.

The reunified northern-oriented General Assembly built up its membership in Missouri by reconstituting old congregations and establishing new ones. In Hannibal, the First and Second Presbyterian churches, which had split during the 1837 schism, were both in favor of the reunified northern-affiliated Presbyterian Church. Seeing little reason, theologically or otherwise, to remain divided, they reunited in 1873.⁹⁰ In north-central Missouri, the Palmyra Presbytery formed the First Presbyterian Church in Laclede when it sent two ministers – J. P. Finley and A. Steed. The congregation, established in 1866, remained with the northern General Assembly after the split.⁹¹ Other congregations suffered the loss of members as southern-leaning Presbyterians left their congregations which supported the northern General Assembly. For instance, in northeastern Knox County members of the Presbyterian Church in Newark fled their congregation in the 1860s. Since there was no other local Presbyterian congregation to join, many joined the MECS. Even with this disruption the congregation's minister, Thomas H. Tatlow, was able to form new churches in both nearby Edina (1865) and Knox City (1869). In Edina, moreover, a frame church was constructed in 1872 at a cost of \$3,000.⁹² In western Missouri, northern Presbyterian numbers were on the upswing as new congregations organized in a number of towns where there was significant northern sentiment. And this was so even in

cases when they could not immediately construct a house of worship. George Miller explained that in 1866 western Cass County Presbyterians formed a small society that met in the log home of Mrs. Morrows in a village that became the town of Creighton. Five years later, in nearby Raymore, a congregation began to meet in a fourteen by twenty foot railroad depot until it gathered funds for a house of worship in 1876.⁹³

At the close of Reconstruction, both the synod affiliated with the northern Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the synod united with the southern Presbyterian Church in the United States had increased their memberships. By 1876, the synod included in the northern church was slightly larger. By 1876, there were 10,614 Missouri Presbyterians, constituting a synod, that were included in the reunified northern General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States within 208 congregations. While St. Louis remained a stronghold of northern Presbyterianism, membership had also increased in the western and southwestern portions of the state.⁹⁴ Radical policies that had, before the 1869 reunion, provided an open field for the New School certainly helped increase these numbers, as had immigration, especially to St. Louis and Kansas City. By 1876, the remaining congregations in Missouri, constituting a synod, had merged with the General Assembly of the southern Presbyterian Church in the United States. At this time, there were 8,225 members. Southern Presbyterians were spread across the towns of Missouri but mostly concentrated in the Boone's Lick.⁹⁵ The southern Presbyterians had enjoyed the advantage in some areas of Missouri after the Declaration and Testimony controversy, especially in western areas of the state. But a persistent deficiency in governmental support worked to their disadvantage.

At the congregational level, the interaction of New School and Old School Presbyterians in Missouri after the war featured a mix of cautious cooperation and mutual recriminations. To

some extent, southern and northern Presbyterian congregants in Missouri provided assistance to one another notwithstanding sectarian strife at higher ecclesiastical levels. And this was so even before the reunification of the Old School General Assembly and the New School General Assembly in 1869. Take, for example, staunch Unionist and Presbyterian minister George Miller. He hailed from the Old School General Assembly but publicly expressed his gratitude for the support that New School members provided him and his presbytery for their missionary work in western Missouri beginning in 1866.⁹⁶ But, in the same year, a minority of fervent New School members objected to any cooperation whatsoever with Old School missionary efforts.⁹⁷ Some of the New School congregants in the rural St. Louis County Rock Hill Presbyterian Church withdrew and formed the Webster Groves Congregational Church in 1866.⁹⁸

After the Independent Synod withdrew from the Old School General Assembly in 1867, its delegations openly condemned the theological positions to which the southern Presbyterians had adhered before and during the Civil War. Similarly to the declarations of New School members going back decades, the official position of the Old School General Assembly after 1861 was that slaveholding and secession constituted egregious sins. Such denunciations continued, albeit more problematically, after the United States Supreme Court ruled the Test Oath unconstitutional in 1867. Litigation between divided congregants over church property in the Memphis First Presbyterian Church and the lengthy struggle between northern and southern Presbyterians for control of Linden Wood Female College and the St. Charles Presbyterian Church constituted only the most litigious facet of intra-denominational strife that persisted in the state. A majority of the Presbytery of Lafayette strongly supported the Declaration and Testimony, while a minority, including the Reverend George Miller, supported the northern-oriented General Assembly. Miller had no desire to align with Presbyterians who had rejected

the right of the national body to express its loyalty to the federal government.⁹⁹ Many Presbyterians who condemned the Declaration and Testimony vilified the resulting Independent Synod. One anonymous commentator remarked after reading the 1867 resolutions of the synod that “The report which their committee made on the minutes of the General Assembly, puts a pious gloss over schism, but it cannot conceal the reality from the discerning. Sooner or later it must wear off, and the unvarnished reality will be apparent to all its folly and wickedness.”¹⁰⁰ Others, in response to the course of the Independent Synod, concluded publicly that the effort of the General Assembly to establish the preeminence of northern Presbyterian theology on the question of slavery and secession was entirely justified. One such article appeared in the Western Presbyterian in Louisville, Kentucky. According to the piece, “Such exhibitions of temper by our enemies afford us additional evidence that we are pursuing the right course.”¹⁰¹

Those within the Independent Synod continued to defend their position and placed the blame on Presbyterians allied with the reunified, northern-oriented General Assembly. St. Louis was the venue for publication of the Missouri Presbyterian, an organ edited by pro-slavery Presbyterian stalwart the Reverend Robert P. Farris and in league with the Independent Synod. Farris published articles in favor of the synod and against the northern General Assembly. The Independent Synod proclaimed, in reference to such contributions, “we consider the Missouri Presbyterian of vital importance to our success in the present crisis of the history of our beloved Church.”¹⁰² Samuel Laws, a New York minister, wrote a letter to the body in 1872 declaring that the northern General Assembly was primarily to blame for the split.¹⁰³ The Sixteenth and Walnut Street Church in St. Louis passed a resolution supporting the Independent synod in 1873. It said “We stand, therefore, precisely where we stood previous . . . determined to know neither North nor South in the Church of God; refusing to consult our natural inclinations in seeking to

promote the interests of His Kingdom; and anxious to avoid even the appearance of being controlled by political prejudices or sectional sympathies in our association with other Christians.”¹⁰⁴ Its pastor, James H. Brookes had led a colony out of the Second Presbyterian Church in St. Louis, the home church of Charles D. Drake, after he clashed with the Radical leader and his supporters in the congregation. In Drake’s view, the new congregation that Brookes helped found was “composed almost entirely of disloyalists and conservatives. . . .”¹⁰⁵ While many in this new church, including Brookes, supported the Union, they believed that the northern Presbyterians were going too far in their efforts to punish the South and therefore subscribed to the Declaration and Testimony.¹⁰⁶

An 1872 effort on the part of the northern General Assembly to reconcile with the Missouri Independent Synod, for the most part, met with rejection and failure. In that year, the northern church sent representatives to the Missouri Independent Synod to seek reunification on mutually acceptable terms. The northern delegation conveyed that the northern General Assembly was willing to set aside its erstwhile demand for southerners to embrace its position on disloyalty and slavery. The St. Louis and Palmyra presbyteries, both members of the Independent Synod, were situated in areas that had witnessed significant Unionist and Radical support. Some members of these two presbyteries were interested in uniting with the northern General Assembly.¹⁰⁷ James H. Brookes, the pastor of the Sixteenth and Walnut Street Church in St. Louis, led a delegation from that society to the 1874 northern General Assembly meeting, also in St. Louis. Brookes recapped the division and explained how his church and others within the Independent Synod had remained orthodox Presbyterians. He explained that his faction hoped to join the northern church “partly by reason of their unwillingness to abandon the position they have consistently and steadfastly maintained; partly by reason of their desire to avoid even the

appearance of being controlled by political prejudices and sectional sympathies, partly by reason of their confidence in the soundness, and piety, and magnanimity of the great body of their Northern brethren. . . .”¹⁰⁸ Brookes did not accept the proposition that he had committed moral error by supporting the Declaration and Testimony, and the General Assembly did not require him to do so. Instead, they unanimously extended an olive branch to Brookes and his group.¹⁰⁹ The Sixteenth and Walnut Street Church one of the largest in the state with 903 members thus joined the northern General Assembly.¹¹⁰ Other than the St. Louis Sixteenth and Walnut Street Church, however, there was little movement from the Independent Synod to the northern General Assembly. Few congregations within the synod were willing to accept the offer made by the northern delegation.¹¹¹

The strong preference of those within the Independent Synod to remain without a national allegiance began to wane in the early 1870s, and the majority joined the southern Presbyterian Church in the United States in 1874. Southern Presbyterians had not acceded to any of the northern Presbyterian demands that they admit their sinfulness in having supported slavery or the Confederacy. Nor did they acquiesce to the attempts of their opponents to northern-ize the state or place much stock in the willingness of some northern Presbyterians to abandon the demand that southern Presbyterians repent for their sins. While being aligned with a national body provided a number of advantages in a hierarchically-organized denomination, property and institutional concerns had kept the men and women of the synod committed to independence. Members of the Independent Synod remained unwilling to admit that they had been wrong to secede from the northern General Assembly. They continued to agree among themselves years afterwards that their actions had been, more or less, coerced by its illegal holdings. The independent synod had been in periodic discussions with the southern General Assembly since at

least 1867. That year, minister Aaron P. Foreman was dispatched to the Nashville meeting of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, that is, the southern General Assembly that had formed in 1861. Foreman explained that what had kept the Independent Synod from uniting with southern church were property concerns and a hope by many that the northern Presbyterians would drop their demands that the Independent Synod admit that their support of the Declaration and Testimony had constituted theological error.¹¹² By 1873, most of the major church property battles had been or were well on their way to being resolved. But there was little chance that the northern church would recognize the validity of southern Presbyterian theology. That year a majority of the Independent Synod voted to send a delegation to the southern Presbyterian Church in the United States to seek admission into that body. The southern church was more than willing to accept these Presbyterians and did so in 1874.¹¹³ Most of the presbytery and synod records remained with those who joined that denomination.¹¹⁴ Aside from the Sixteenth and Walnut Street Church of St. Louis, the vast majority of Presbyterians within the Independent Synod united with the southern General Assembly.

The Song of Freedom and the Formation of Independent African American Churches

The Radical 1865 Missouri Constitution established a number of important civil rights for African Americans that substantially enhanced their capacity to maintain their own religious forms of worship and institutions. Most important, the 1865 Constitution empowered African Americans to worship how they chose, without white supervision or interference. Set out in the Declaration of Rights, Article One, Section Three spelled out these fundamental liberties in unequivocal terms. The section specifically declared that no one, regardless of “color” could “be restricted in the exercise of religious worship.”¹¹⁵ As a result, the power of African Americans to

form their own congregations and inter-church agencies was established in the fundamental law of the state.

The Radical Constitution also provided means for African Americans to protect the church property of black congregants. The new Constitution permitted African Americans, for the first time, to hold property in trust for congregations. Ordeals such as that which had beset James Farrar, Ralph Harrison, and Lewis Jones and other St. Louis African Methodists before the war would become, under the law at least, a thing of the past. Article One, Section Three allowed blacks to testify in all legal proceedings, regardless of the racial heritage of litigants, defendants, and witnesses. Drake and other Radicals had staunchly supported this provision, while conservatives had unsuccessfully sought to circumscribe the expansion of black civil rights. Among other important benefits accruing from this change was the power of black trustees to testify in courts of law to defend the property rights of endowed African American religious societies.¹¹⁶

As a matter of law, at least, the establishment of a new bi-racial public school system allowed black teachers the prerogative of providing regular and religious instruction to black students. Article Nine Section Two of the 1865 Constitution declared that funds were to be provided from property taxation in proportion to the black population in a specific county. As was common in public schools across the nation, however, local school boards and teachers had the prerogative to make the Protestant Bible and a curriculum that inculcated “nonsectarian” evangelical tenets of faith a basic part of the curriculum.¹¹⁷ Before the Civil War, white Missourians had generally denied African American slaves formal education. Most freed people saw the new school system as a great boon. Black women and men clearly saw the advantages for education to better their lot in the face of racial discrimination.

Voting rights for black men, under the letter of the law at least, provided them a meaningful role in the making of policy regarding schools and other institutions affecting the lives of African Americans. Charles Daniel Drake and other Radicals opposed the granting of suffrage to black men. Drake, while not against black suffrage per se, believed that Missouri African Americans, as of 1865, were simply not well enough educated to make virtuous use of the franchise. Black voting rights were not popular among whites across the state. Drake, among others, feared that the voters would not approve the Constitution if black voting rights were included. The German Radicals rejected this compromise and continued to argue for black suffrage.¹¹⁸ Notwithstanding conservative rebuffs, they continued to press for voting and office holding privileges for African Americans. The freedmen themselves also pressed for greater equality, forming organizations such as the Equal Rights League. A number of African American ministers, such as AME preacher Moses Dickson helped found the group. Leading black Missourians, such as James Milton Turner, went throughout the state to further their cause. With the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, in February 1850, African Americans were at last guaranteed the right to vote and hold office in Missouri.¹¹⁹ During the 1870 election all political parties in Missouri, from the Radical Republicans to the liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats, courted the black vote. Clinging to power tenuously, Radicals hoped that James Milton Turner would help them win the lion's share of the 20,000 new voters.¹²⁰

At least to the end of Reconstruction, African Americans in Missouri relied mostly on their own churches, rather than tax-supported public schools, to provide education for their children. The Missouri General Assembly gradually, but haltingly, appropriated funds for black public schools. The Western Sanitary Commission in St. Louis made efforts to situate black

ministers in the new schools. But public primary and secondary education for African Americans developed very slowly in the period. Only about thirty-four percent of black children were enrolled in public schools by the end of Reconstruction. Inadequate public funding left more than a few black communities, especially outside of St. Louis, little choice but to establish their own private elementary schools and secondary schools. Black churches put on fairs and other events to raise money to support these new institutions. Some African American ministers in St. Louis set up schools for black youth in the basements of their church buildings. In 1877, inadequate public funding finally prompted the Reverend S. P. Anderson, pastor of the Central Baptist Church, to lead a contingent of black congregants to a meeting with the local school board to demand monies that had been promised. Agents of the Freedman's Bureau certainly provided needed aid for recently freed slaves. But the amount of assistance it could or was willing to channel into black education was very limited. Freedman Bureau authorities relocated its Missouri agency from Jefferson City to Little Rock, Arkansas, further undercutting initiatives to set up black schools with public funds. Freedman's Bureau leaders took the view that former slaves in Arkansas, whose numbers were much greater than in Missouri, had superior claims to bureau resources.¹²¹ To some extent, quite similarly, this decision reflected the policy taken by federal authorities in Missouri during the war to provide only limited help to the slaves in the state.¹²²

Continuing white prejudice against the former slaves and the resistance of most white taxpayers to increasing the size of state government certainly undercut the expansion of civil and political rights for blacks in Missouri during Reconstruction. Even so, constitutional changes and new policies instituted initially by the Radicals included new religious liberties and improvements in education for African Americans that, in fact, brought a substantial part of the

abolitionist agenda to fruition. Abolitionists, including most notably New School Presbyterian and MEC ministers and theologians, had reconfigured evangelical faith to make social and political equality for African Americans part of Christian doctrine.

Notwithstanding the mass exodus of slaves from Missouri shortly before and in the last several years of the Civil War, the field of operation for the establishment of new black religious societies and institutions remained extensive during Reconstruction. The African American population in the state sustained itself as a percentage of the total population in the years following the war. African Americans constituted about seven percent of the general population in 1870. These 118,071 women, men, and children constituted roughly the same number of slaves and free blacks residing in the state in 1860. Nonetheless, the 1870 black population, as a percentage of the whole, had declined about three percent since 1850, the consequence of massive outmigration of slaves in the six years preceding the Civil War. African American religious organization was limited to areas of the state, typically urban ones, where their numbers were sufficient to maintain relatively secure communities and congregations. Over twenty thousand African Americans lived in St. Louis County, and another five thousand in the Kansas City area. Black populations in both cities had increased significantly from 1860. Many more freed people remained in the Boone's Lick region and others, north and south along the Mississippi River, where slavery had been widespread, leaving only a handful of African Americans throughout the rest of the state.¹²³

White northern Baptists sent missionaries to evangelize among the newly-emancipated slaves of Missouri at the end of the war. Many of those whom the American Home Baptist Missionary Society sent to the state labored, at least in part, among the freed people. The Reverend Galusha Anderson addressed the society when it met in St. Louis at the Second Baptist

Church in 1865. Overjoyed at the success of Unionist forces and earnestly looking to the future for African Americans, he said “When we invited you, we were a slave State, and the smoke of battle still hung thick over our borders; but we greet you, thank God! Amid the dawning light of peace, in free Missouri. The foot of no bondsmen presses the soil of this mighty commonwealth.”¹²⁴ Anderson’s Baptist State Convention resolved at its 1865 meeting “That many thousands of freedmen in Missouri . . . should secure the fostering care of the Convention. . . . [and] That the colored Baptist churches of the state are invited to send delegates to represent them in this body, and to co-operate with us in the work of evangelization.”¹²⁵

Galusha Anderson’s invitation was, undoubtedly, sincere. And the principles of full equality for African Americans embraced by many white delegations of the State Convention certainly comported with the preferences of the freed people, Baptist and otherwise. But no black emissaries appeared at the Baptist State Convention during its three years of existence, notwithstanding its overtures, most of which occurred in 1865. The Missouri Baptist General Association also sought to bring black Baptist congregations into their association. But, given the southern orientations of the mostly rural whites constituting the association, that the black Baptists declined the invitation is not at all surprising. It is fairly clear that there was notably little interest among black Baptists to join the General Association.¹²⁶ And other white-dominated Baptist missionary societies fared little better at enlisting black societies through Reconstruction.¹²⁷

White Methodists fared little better than their Baptist counterparts in bringing black congregations into their church. Similarly to the white Baptist societies affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention, the MECS leadership appears to have made relatively few efforts to meet black Methodists on equal terms. Virtually no black Methodist congregations could see

fit to join with a denomination that had been, in African American quarters, notorious in its support of slavery and black subordination. The General Conference of the MEC, on the other hand, eagerly sought to enlarge its African American membership in the South after the Civil War. At its first postwar general conference in 1868, the northern Methodists encouraged donations to their newly established Freedmen's Aid Society. They also touted the work of the American Colonization Society to send blacks back to Africa to evangelize the continent. The General Conference, however, dropped colonization from its docket at its session four years later.¹²⁸ Amid competition with the AME Church, the northern Methodists had a limited amount of success garnering new black congregations. As had been the case in northern states before the Civil War, black Methodists generally agreed to affiliate with the MEC only if the church leadership agreed to appoint black pastors.¹²⁹ Newly empowered African Americans no longer had to tolerate appointment of white pastors or inequitable property arrangements involving white co-denominationalists. African Americans in the town of Huntsville, Randolph County, situated in the Boone's Lick, were not at all reluctant to register their displeasure when they lost \$100 as a consequence of seven northern Methodists, six men and one woman, reneging on a promise to construct a building. But black societies that had been affiliated with the MEC before the war, such as Union Memorial Church in St. Louis, commonly remained part of that church.¹³⁰

White Missouri Presbyterians had no luck at organizing black churches and only a little success at maintaining a small number of African Americans in their bi-racial congregations during Reconstruction. Since the early nineteenth century, there had always been a small number of African Americans in Missouri Presbyterian congregations. Neither Old School nor New School Presbyterianism had ever resonated much with blacks. There were several reasons for

this. First, the Presbyterian Church gained members primarily from the town-dwelling middle class, a limited group which included relatively few African Americans. As had long been the case in the United States, the Presbyterian style of worship did not appeal to blacks. Certainly some Presbyterian ministers preached often with deep emotion. But Presbyterians continued not to cultivate the dynamic and enthusiastic interaction between preachers and congregants that was more common in the Baptist and Methodist churches. Neither the southern nor northern Presbyterian white leadership organized black congregations in Missouri. On the other hand, subsidiaries of the northern church in Missouri, such as the Presbytery of Ozark, sponsored a standing committee for outreach to the freed people through Reconstruction and to the end of the nineteenth century.¹³¹ The congregations within the presbytery, largely composed of whites, were able to attract a few African American members even after white Baptists and Methodists had utterly failed to increase their African American memberships. Two black women and one black man, for example, joined the overwhelmingly white Concord Presbyterian Church of Callaway County, situated in the Boone's Lick, in the late 1870s.¹³² Virtually all-white Mount Horeb Presbyterian Church similarly counted one or several black members in the period, including the former slave Maria, who had been a founding member of the congregation.¹³³

Black congregations that had been independent prior to the Civil War sustained themselves during Reconstruction. James Farrar and the other St. Louis African Methodists who lost their Green Street house of worship in 1846 ultimately named their new society Union Memorial Methodist Church. Farrar had served the black congregation as an ordained deacon. But the MEC installed its first black pastor at the church in 1865 – the Reverend E. W. S. Peck, who came from Baltimore. Continuing under the northern Methodists, the black congregation was able to purchase yet another new building for \$10,000 and moved in during August of

1873.¹³⁴ The Central Baptist Church, also in St. Louis, expanded both its membership and ministries throughout the period. Under the leadership of S. P. Anderson, the congregation was one of the primary organizers of a Sunday school convention for African Americans in the city. Central's female congregants, furthermore, organized a Samaritan Relief Society in 1871. As there were a number of migrants passing through the city, the organization was greatly needed. Owing to the controversy from their separation from the First African Baptist Church, the congregation had developed a close relationship with the white Second Baptist Church, which continued even after 1865. The Central congregation was a colony from the First African Baptist Church. But the African Church opposed the formation of the new church. Consequently, the relationship was often strained, prompting the Central Baptist to cooperate, as equals, with the white Second Baptist when they needed to work with another religious group. In retrospect, Central minister George Stevens commented, "From the first the Second Baptist Church (White) and the Second Baptist Church (Colored, now Central) of St. Louis had been intimately related."¹³⁵

African Americans in Missouri abandoned white-controlled churches, a process that began even before the end of the war. This out migration was gradual and took place over several years within most churches. The record books of the white churches documented the process.¹³⁶ The First Baptist Church in western St. Joseph realized in 1863 that their black members wanted in their own organization. On December 6th, Adam Demit was ordained a minister and the First African Baptist Church was organized. He and others "were dismissed by letter from the First Baptist Church."¹³⁷ By 1872 their property was valued at \$1,200.¹³⁸ In the Boone's Lick, the Callaway County Grand Prairie Baptist Church lost its black members too. There were three blacks, two women and a man, who joined the congregation in the late 1860s. Dudley Harris, the

man who joined, however, left in November 1867 with his wife and daughters, who were already Baptists. Several other African Americans left the congregation in late 1867 and early 1868.¹³⁹ The Cold Water Baptist Church, in rural St. Louis County, witnessed its black members leaving as well, along with many whites.¹⁴⁰ In southern Boone County, the New Salem Baptist Church encouraged its black congregants to leave and form their own body. At a meeting it was resolved “we believe it to be the religious interest of the church, for the colored members to be organized as a separate body; therefore, resolved that we hereby detach them from us and enroll them on a separate church book, thus organizing them into an African Church of New Salem.”¹⁴¹ Southern Methodist leader found ways to explain such losses. An 1870 article in the St. Louis Christian Advocate plainly stated that African Americans were duped by the northern Methodists to leave the southern churches as “Its colored members were obtained by deceitful cajolery or iniquitous slander. . . .”¹⁴²

At the same time African Americans left the bi-racial churches founded in the antebellum period, they began to create their own congregations. Within the Boone’s Lick, the Boone County town of Columbia saw the beginnings of what became the Second Baptist Church. The Missouri Statesman noted in 1870, about four years after their founding, its members had purchased a lot and were collecting subscriptions to erect a building. Of the project, the paper said “This is a praiseworthy object and we hope that they succeed.”¹⁴³ The building was finished three years later. In the southern portion of the county, thirty-two men and women who had left the New Salem and Little Bonne Femme Baptist churches purchased small piece of land in 1866 and later constructed a log building on four acres of property five years later. The congregation was later known as the Log Providence Missionary Baptist Church.¹⁴⁴ Southwestern Missouri observed the formation of the Second Baptist Church of Neosho in 1876. Three lots were quickly

purchased and a structure was constructed for the use of these black Baptists.¹⁴⁵ Many of the rank and file church-goers were grateful for the new houses of worship, such as Hannibal resident William Black, who said as much in retrospect.¹⁴⁶

African American Methodists established their own Methodist societies, mostly apart from any affiliations with the MEC or MECS. Many of the refugees from the MECS joined independent black Methodist denominations such as the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church or the African Methodist Episcopal Church, Zion. While the AME Church had some congregations established in Missouri prior to the Civil War, their numbers greatly increased at the onset of Reconstruction. There had been a Missouri Annual Conference that embraced the southwest down to Louisiana since 1855. That jurisdiction was gradually shrunk until it contained only Missouri by 1873.¹⁴⁷ For instance, in Kansas City, a number of African Americans who had lived at a camp during the war did not want to become Baptists and eventually organized the Allen Chapel AME Church.¹⁴⁸ Columbia saw the organization of the St. Paul AME Church during the 1860s.¹⁴⁹ At its 1866 General Conference, the MECS began the process of establishing a separate general conference for its black members, in essence, dividing their own denomination. With five annual conferences organized four years later, black Methodist chronicler C. H. Phillips explained that the southern national body moved for these Methodists “to call a General Conference to be holden next winter for the purpose of organizing them into an entirely separate Church”¹⁵⁰ In December, delegates from eight annual conferences met in Memphis and organized the Colored Methodist Episcopal (CME) Church. While the denomination was an independent body, the MECS did not entirely abandon the CME Church, continuing to exhibit paternalistic feelings towards it.¹⁵¹ The organizing conference did include a strong presence from Missouri. A small joint annual conference was formed with

Kansas only in 1873, before and after which they made slow progress in gaining adherents in the state.¹⁵²

Having rejected invitations to join the two white Baptist associations in Missouri, African American Baptists energetically organized their own state-wide associations. African American Baptists in south-central Jefferson City wanted to establish their own organization free from white interference as early as 1860. They eventually elected their own deacons and trustees, worshiping in a small frame building until purchasing a larger edifice in 1865. Officially they formed the Second Baptist Church.¹⁵³ A September 1865 meeting of African American Baptists in the northwestern town of Chillicothe witnessed the establishment of the North Missouri Association, which was composed exclusively of black congregations. Embracing all of the state, the organization sought to “promote the preaching of the Gospel in the State, and thorough evangelization of the race.”¹⁵⁴ After experiencing rapid growth for five years, the organization split into two districts, with the Missouri River the official dividing line. The district south of the river came to life officially in 1871. Another group, the Union Baptist Association, was founded in St. Louis in 1869. Likely with the First African Baptist Church as its primary driver, the messengers came from congregations primarily surrounding St. Louis. First African’s pastor, Emanuel Cartwright, was the first moderator. By 1871 there were twenty-five member churches, with only two from western Missouri in Cass County and a few situated around Jefferson City in the middle of the state.¹⁵⁵ Nationally, African American Baptists from Missouri, Kansas and other regions in the West, representing 500 churches, convened in Jefferson City in 1874. The meeting was an outgrowth of the Baptist General Association of the Western States and Territories which was founded the prior year. The group was attempting to establish a seminary in Kansas City.¹⁵⁶

Some white evangelical congregants disapproved the separate religious societies that departing black members established and joined. Consider, for example, the reluctance of the Zoar Baptist Church in the Boone's Lick. This Saline County congregation acknowledged its losses, explaining "During this period there have been a great many dismissed by letter to go into organize new churches the last of which was to form a colored church in 1866."¹⁵⁷ The black church that these men and women joined, however, proved unacceptable to the white congregation since "by the lack of discipline & proper regulations in said new church some of its members are living in open violation of the word of God & said new church entirely failing to deal with said members they also preaching an professing doctrines that we believe not to be according to the word of God."¹⁵⁸ Available minute books do not specify the transgressions, but it seems likely that records showing that women and men had been guilty of living in "open violation of the word of God" almost certainly referred to unmarried couples who had been cohabiting. In any case, the black church was not disciplining these members. While most scholarship indicates that the former slaves got legally married as soon as possible after emancipation, for whatever reason some were taking their time in Saline County. Since Zoar had lost its church-book, it demanded that the former black members identify themselves and rejoin the congregation. None followed the order.¹⁵⁹

The religious beliefs and sentiments of African Americans in Reconstruction-era Missouri intertwined spiritual and worldly goals in behalf of African American advancement. Historian James H. Cone, who first articulated the historical development of Black Liberation Theology, maintained that African American ministers in the post-Civil War South failed to convey to their congregants a sufficient theological break from white Protestant interpretations of scripture that had cast the plight of African Americans as a fate ordained by God, that is, a

punishment meted out by Divine Providence.¹⁶⁰ African American evangelicals in postwar Missouri certainly continued to evangelize similarly to their white counterparts. Black Baptists and Methodists organized church government in ways similar to their all-white equivalents. In the smaller towns and rural areas of the state, white racism severely limited the public activities of black ministers and congregants. And postwar black ministers and adult black male laity usually denied African American women formal leadership roles in local societies and denominational organizations. But postwar black ministers in Missouri do not appear, in the least, to have acted in accordance with a theology of racial culpability or divinely-ordained subordination. As was the case in other former slaveholding states, according to historian James T. Campbell, black Protestantism in postwar Missouri was marked, first and foremost, by a powerful separatist impulse dedicated to racial uplift.¹⁶¹ In St. Louis, where a free black community had existed for decades, black ministers and congregants were openly active. The established black congregations in the city had a number of the few prominent black businesspeople within their ranks and could accomplish far more as a result than their counterparts in so-called “outstate” areas. For instance, within St. Louis, the Baptists formed a Sunday school association during the late 1860s, much as their white counterparts sought to accomplish in their own congregations.¹⁶² African American church-goers thus embraced a set of beliefs and sentiments that did not draw lines separating piety from what they perceived to be the moral obligations of religious societies and members to promote the social, economic and political equality and collective advancement of the black community.

African American churchgoers and ministers played the primary role in developing self-help organizations for black communities. Churches were on the forefront of establishing educational institutions. The major black churches in St. Louis, such as the African Baptist,

Central Baptist, Pleasant Green Baptist, St. Paul AME and the Union Memorial Methodist, to which the Green Street congregants relocated after losing their property, were on the forefront of fighting for black civil rights in the city. Black ministers also played a crucial role in organizing lodges and fraternal organizations, many with major religious underpinnings. William Parrish dubbed Missouriians “joiners” for the substantial increase in fraternal memberships during Reconstruction. For example, Moses Dickson, a former slave who became an AME minister reformed the Knights of Liberty, an anti-slavery organization that he had helped lead, before the war, into the International Order of Twelve of the Knights and Daughters of Tabor. “Tabor” refers to a mountain where the Israelite Judge Deborah defeated the Canaanites and some traditions assert that Christ was to have been transfigured on it.¹⁶³ In any case, the members of the fraternal benefit society worked strenuously in behalf of equal rights for blacks. The Taborians, moreover, subscribed to numerous religious tenets. A manual the Dickson published in 1894 detailed the requirement that a member believe in God and support the central government along with a number of devotions for use in the individual temples. Finally, the rituals of the order were imparted as religious lessons.¹⁶⁴

Historians have not generally characterized the wholesale withdrawal by African Americans from predominantly white churches in the former slave states as “schisms.” But the refusal of recently-freed black Protestants in Missouri to remain affiliated with white-dominated churches and the establishment of their own churches constituted schisms in every sense of the word. Black Protestant Christianity in Missouri certainly drew deeply on African understandings of spirituality and beliefs and rituals that African Americans had developed autonomously in bondage over many generations.

The withdrawal of African American congregants from the white churches, beginning in the Civil War, constituted ecclesiastical ruptures substantially informed by the intertwined social, civil, political, and religious ideas that abolitionists, including African American freedom fighters, had articulated for decades. In many important respects, African American Methodists and Baptists had, by the beginning of Reconstruction in Missouri, adopted the more egalitarian and democratic understanding of faith, society, and government that abolitionists had advanced since the mid-1830s. The withdrawal of church-going freed people was a consequence of their rejection of a white evangelical world view and, in the case of the conservative MECS and SBA-affiliated congregations, theology that largely retained an organic and hierarchical view of society in which social and political relations were defined by differences in gender, race, and class.

As was the case for former slaves in the Deep South during Reconstruction, church-going freed people and their Radical allies in Missouri faced the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan and other so-called “white line” organizations. Established in 1866 in Tennessee as a fraternal order of middle class ex-Confederates, it quickly evolved into a terrorist group that sought to disrupt elections in the South to ensure Republican defeat. Although it was present throughout most of the South, including Missouri, most local Klan groups did not cooperate with one another beyond the local level. But the Klan earned its infamy by harassing African Americans and Radicals. Missouri Governor Thomas Fletcher began to express concerns publically about the secret order of nightriders in 1868. Klan chapters had become active not only in southern Missouri, as noted by Klan-fighter Colonel William Monks in his memoirs, but also in the Boone’s Lick counties of Callaway, Cooper, and Saline. In October 1871, Liberal Republican Governor B. Gratz Brown called out the militia to deal with the terrorism of the KKK in

southeastern Stoddard and Dunklin counties.¹⁶⁵ The Klan frequently targeted ministers who touted Radical Republican policies, such as Presbyterian minister Thomas Calahan in southeastern Reynolds County. The KKK also resorted to harassment, intimidation, and vandalism to thwart the organizational efforts of church-going African Americans. Klansmen, for example, threatened black congregants in the town of Allenville, situated in the Mississippi River County Cape Girardeau, with severe reprisals if they did not cease and desist in their efforts to build a house of worship and a school.¹⁶⁶ On Christmas Day 1871, a mob of Klansmen rode through the town of Marshall, Saline County, situated on the Missouri River in central Missouri, declaring before assembled onlookers their intention to rid the county of all African Americans. Ensuing violence resulted in the death of at least five men.¹⁶⁷

Newspaper reportage of Ku Klux Klan activity in Missouri, including that of the St. Louis Christian Advocate, featured a combination of debate over the actual presence of the Klan in the state, discussion of related federal policy, and political opportunism. In 1871 the Liberty Tribune lamented a report it received from the Missouri Democrat that arrests had been made involving the KKK in South Carolina. The editor had hoped the Republicans would show the bankruptcy of their views by undertaking a futile quest to root out the Klan with martial law. The article concluded that “All that was needed was to give the administration enough martial law rope to hang itself with, and now it backs down from the task.”¹⁶⁸ In southeastern Missouri, an editorialist in the Ironton County Register characterized the anti-Klan laws passed by Congress in 1871 as abridgements of the United States Constitution. According to this contributor, “Nothing can be more patent to any fair-minded man who looks calmly, dispassionately, and disinterestingly upon our present political situations, than the fact that we have departed in a remarkable degree from the ideas of the early founders of the republic.”¹⁶⁹ When its Radical

competitor the Ironton Enterprise raised the alarm following the KKK assault on the Reverend Thomas Calahan, the Register thundered that “The Enterprise is a LIAR, and is not believed by a single white citizen of Arcadia Valley, outside a “ring” of about eight persons, every one of them would like to have a number committed every day of the week in order that they might make political capital thereof.”¹⁷⁰ The MECS St. Louis Christian Advocate, in an 1868 article, expressed doubts about the existence of the Klan in the state, while criticizing the Grand Army of the Republic, the Union Veteran’s organization and a frequent target of the paper, for having become overly involved in politics on the side of the Radicals.¹⁷¹ As Reconstruction came to a close, the conservative Hannibal Clipper included an editorial explaining how northern Methodists had responded to the diminishing efforts of the national government to suppress Klan activity in the South. According this piece, a New England annual conference had issued a report critical of federal government policy that, effectively, allowed Klansmen to hold official positions in the government.¹⁷²

Adding insult to injury, white conservative leaders publicly declared that hysterical African Americans only imagined that the Klan was operating in Missouri. That most African Americans had formed their own congregations certainly spurred racist whites to harass their religious meetings and vandalize their houses of worship and schools. The acts of terrorism that blacks suffered at the hands of the Klan certainly contributed to their fear of the organization. But the most typical position that conservative white leaders took in response to reports of KKK attacks on African Americans was that their African heritage made them a highly superstitious people and thus predisposed to transform unfounded rumors into actual KKK sightings. The Cape Girardeau Weekly Argus came to such a conclusion in its discussion of a seemingly disrupted black settlement in southeastern Missouri. The paper explained that “Negroes are a

superstitious race. The Mythical order known as the Ku-Klux-Klan, which has created a sensation everywhere in the South, has worked upon their fears to such an extent as to keep them on a look-out for a band of horsemen clad in steal, silver, and gold.”¹⁷³ Editorials featured in the Liberty Tribune made similar comments in an 1869 edition of the paper.¹⁷⁴

Understandings of Faith, Society, and Polity that Continued to Divide White Evangelicals

By the end of Reconstruction, northern and southern white evangelicals in Missouri had learned to co-exist peacefully under conditions freely and mutually established. Historian Edward Blum explains that, while an ever-growing segment of northern white Protestants began to look favorably upon the white residents of the South in the first decades after the Civil War, southern Protestants desired strongly to maintain their ecclesiastical independence.¹⁷⁵ Historian Ralph Morrow concludes that southerners learned to tolerate northern Methodists during Reconstruction but generally in step with the removal of federal troops.¹⁷⁶ Reconstruction in Missouri featured important examples of this measured live-and-let-live policy. By 1876, northern and southern Baptists in Missouri co-existed within a single, state-wide association. Tensions between members of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, diminished substantially after 1870.¹⁷⁷ Also indicative of this pattern was the relatively civil dialogue that took place between representatives of the northern Presbyterian General Assembly and the Independent Synod in 1874. Consider also the comments of Presbyterian divine George Miller. Notwithstanding his resentment of the South during the Civil War and for several years thereafter, he had no complaints about northern and southern evangelicals establishing new churches, at least in large metropolitan areas such as Kansas City.¹⁷⁸

But no fundamental reconciliation had occurred between northern and southern white Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians by the close of Reconstruction. Northern and southern evangelicals in Missouri had, by the end of the period, essentially, agreed to a “cease fire.” Vicious public name calling, charges of heresy, and sectarian vigilantism had largely become a thing of the past. White evangelical denominations increased their memberships, albeit mostly by virtue of rapid immigration. Northern and southern Baptist congregations in Missouri joined in a single statewide organization but retained their affiliations with larger northern- and southern-oriented organizations. As loosely-affiliated societies, they reserved their right to support either northern or southern national organizations, as well as their traditional right to maintain their own articles of faith and modes of worship. After the southern Methodist church rejected the northern Methodist offer to receive its members into the MEC, mutual resentments among members of both branches did not abate. By 1867, the two wings of the Methodist Church in Missouri had become, in the view of many at the time, irreconcilable. The schisms in all three churches persisted and, in the case of the Presbyterians, grew more pronounced – fractures that the withdrawal of black congregants into their own churches only accentuated. Equally important, there was no actual coming to terms on the intertwined theological, social, and political questions that had divided northern and southern Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in the state for decades. Church leaders and rank and file members on both sides of the sectional divide in each case simply decided to stop publicly antagonizing one another. And it certainly should be allowed, in this connection, that Christian principles of forbearance quite likely had a lot to do with this mutual decision.

By the end of Reconstruction, the Radicals and their abolitionist allies had largely failed in their effort to impose upon white southern evangelicals what amounted to a new civil religion

making condemnation of slaveholding and disloyalty prime articles of faith and political orthodoxy. Pro-southern partisans in Missouri had no choice but to accept the emancipation of African American slaves. But they continued to nurture their own religious and political beliefs about secession and support of the Confederacy.

Radical and abolitionist views on the questions of slavery and disloyalty, nonetheless, flourished in post-war Missouri. The Radicals and their business allies succeeded admirably in organizing railroad-building projects that rapidly channeled northern migrants and liberal-minded immigrants from central Europe into the growing cities and towns of the state. That Radical and abolitionist articles of faith and understanding of the war strongly appealed to these arrivals account for their acceptance among a growing segment of the general population much more than the energetic efforts of Radicals and sectarian stalking horses to impose them on the defeated white southerners.

Missouri Presbyterians continued to embrace antagonistic views of one another as they consolidated their ranks within competing northern and southern general assemblies. As the Independent Synod, which had withdrawn from the northern General Assembly, moved toward joining the southern General Assembly, the synod's periodical opined in the matter. The Old School Presbyterian, still edited by the Reverend Robert P. Farris, said "let us go South, because, not only shall we neither sacrifice nor imperil any principle, but thus there shall be one less division in the Presbyterian family – and because the majority prefer it" ¹⁷⁹ Farris and many of his supporters were incensed by the continued efforts of the northern Presbyterians to reunify the church on their terms. St. Louis minister James H. Brookes and a rump of the Independent Synod sought to join the northern General Assembly. Radical-leaning secular sheets, such as the Missouri Democrat, maintained that Brookes spoke for most of the synod. Inherent in this

assertion was the proposition that many who had sided with the southern-leaning Independent Synod now admitted that they had been wrong to oppose the pronouncement of the northern General Assembly that their previous support of the Confederacy had been sinful. Farris quickly rejoined that Brookes represented only a member of a small minority: “He does not speak for our Synod, and much less our Assembly.”¹⁸⁰ Brookes, moreover, had never apologized for his previous actions per se. Subsequent articles in the paper condemned not only Brookes for his efforts to effect reconciliation but also those of Charles D. Drake, the Radical leader who was an ardent supporter of reunion.¹⁸¹

Evangelical newspapers in Missouri highlighted continuing theological differences that divided northern and southern Methodists. The St. Louis Christian Advocate ran a number of articles that disparaged their northern counterparts. Thomas Finney, who father John had helped turn out the African American congregants in the Green Street Church, was the editor of the paper briefly during Reconstruction. An 1870 piece describing the plight of former wartime Copperheads who had become southern Methodists in Illinois, laid out the opinion of most southern Methodists on the MEC and how they proselytized. It wrote that “Northern Methodist aggression in the South opened its way at first at the point of the bayonet. It required churches by spoliation.”¹⁸² As that piece alluded, church property litigation helps focus on how northern and southern evangelicals continued to disagree on the questions of whether southern evangelicals had committed sin by holding slaves, support of secession and the Confederate cause amounted to disloyalty. A number of MECS publications shortly after war lamented how the land of the Puritans had, in the hands of the Radical Republicans, gone from being the religious cradle of the nation to one that had perverted the faith.¹⁸³ Methodist minister Enoch Mather Marvin, who worked behind southern lines during the war, was elected a MECS bishop in 1866. Writing in

1870, he rejected any notion that the southern Methodists should simply make peace with their denominational antagonists. Instead, they should hope that their northern brethren would realize the sinfulness of their past actions. He explained this point saying “The maudlin sentiment that would daub over the great public crimes committed by the highest dignitaries of the Northern Methodist Church and their representatives in the South and along the border, is not charity. It is at best a clumsy counterfeit of that chief of the virtues. True charity will seek to bring them to confession and recantation of their deeds.”¹⁸⁴ Southern Methodists in Missouri were more than willing to remain a denomination separate from the MEC.

Through at least the mid-1870s, the publications and writings of southern and northern evangelicals in Missouri continued to express deeply conflicting understandings of the religious and political issues that separated them. Consider William Leftwich’s Martyrdom in Missouri. Compiled during Reconstruction and published as two separate volumes in 1870, this well-documented work told the stories of evangelicals, mostly ministers, harassed by Union authorities and the Radicals. According to Leftwich, the persecution that he and his fellow southern evangelicals had suffered during and after the war was the symptom of a government that had not respected divinely-ordained principles that mandated both government support of the Christian religion and freedom of conscience. In this regard, he concluded that, “There is no perfect government without God.”¹⁸⁵ Through the second volume of his work, which he focused on the Test Oath and other Radical outrages, he constantly compared what he deemed to be the extra-constitutional methods of Drake and his supporters to the tyrants of history.¹⁸⁶ Northern Methodists and Radical Republicans, to no surprise, immediately rejected Leftwich’s arguments and sources, claiming that he had made up or exaggerated many of the accounts included in his book.¹⁸⁷ But Methodists were not the only ones implicated in Martyrdom in Missouri. Lucilla

Payne, for example, had written and submitted the original article included in the work about her father, Disciples of Christ minister Augustus H. F. Payne, whom she alleged was murdered by Union troops in 1863. Baptists and Presbyterians, with documented accounts provided by persons other than Leftwich, appeared throughout as both southern victims and northern villains. In 1870, the Liberty Tribune republished a segment from the book that had originally appeared in the western Missouri St. Joseph Gazette.¹⁸⁸

Texts written to commemorate southern heroes who had faced Unionist and Radical reprisals in Missouri powerfully reinforced divergent evangelical understandings of faith and the past. It seems quite likely that the Ku Klux Klan in Reconstruction-era Missouri drew at least some of its impetus from the hierarchical organic social and political order that pro-slavery evangelical interpretations of scripture and moral philosophy had undergirded for decades.¹⁸⁹ But the discourses of southern evangelical leaders intended for public consumption did not usually rely directly on such texts to justify the lost regime or to denounce the hardships imposed on them by Unionists and Radicals.¹⁹⁰ As was the case in other former slaveholding states, southern evangelicals and conservative political leaders in Missouri set about constructing an intertwined religious and political narrative glorifying their struggle against the forces of “northern aggression.” As several historians have emphasized, Leftwich’s Martyrdom in Missouri (1870) was one of the prototypical texts giving rise to the discursive construction of and evolving southern folk memory intertwined with the so-called “religion of the Lost Cause.” The foundation of his work were the myriad accounts in which Unionist forces, sometimes working with northern evangelicals, arrested, detained, assaulted, and sometimes killed southern evangelicals suspected of disloyalty -- the veracity of which there is little reason to doubt. The characterization of such actions as unjustified religious persecution, a different question, was

entirely of a piece with his charge that Union authorities had lapsed into tyranny and despotism. Leftwich honored and commemorated those who had suffered, especially those who were martyred, to protect the sanctity of the southern churches. He wrote that “A pure, unsecular Christianity owes much to the moral heroism of the Missouri ministry.”¹⁹¹

Inherent in the theological underpinnings of the Lost Cause narrative in Missouri was the belief that the South had been justified on religious, moral, and constitutional grounds to secede. The military defeat of the South did nothing to change this. To help promote this narrative, the St. Louis Christian Advocate began to advertise southern literature commemorating the war. For instance, in 1875, an article appeared in the paper lauding a book written by Baptist Confederate Chaplain J. William Jones entitled Remembrances of General Robert E. Lee. Casting Lee as the archetypal southern gentleman of deep Christian faith, the book helped to establish him as a central figure in the religion of the Lost Cause that took root in Missouri.¹⁹²

Evangelical understandings of Divine Providential retained considerable power to divide evangelicals in Missouri in the years immediately following the Civil War. Through the radical phases of Reconstruction in Missouri, its most publicly visible political leaders routinely invoked evangelical articles of faith, including divine providence, to justify and advance acceptance of new policies. Radical Governor Thomas Fletcher made frequent use of the notion of providence in his speeches. He began his inaugural address by proclaiming the task that God has placed on the state. He said that “God has permitted us a political triumph, bring with it the solemn responsibility of promoting those great principles by an enforcement of the fundamental law for securing peace, happiness and prosperity of the people of the state.”¹⁹³ Later in the same speech he explicitly referenced Providence as he invoked the same idea.¹⁹⁴ Nine days later, when he issued the official proclamation ending slavery in Missouri, Fletcher again began by ascribing

emancipation to the wisdom of Providence.¹⁹⁵ In his view, Union victory was God's reward for righteous abolitionist action against slavery, of course, only in the view of some abolitionist ministers and lay people. As the state began to recover from the war later in his term, Fletcher attributed it to Divine Providence. He said in his 1867 message to the General Assembly that "we are favored by Providence with prosperity in every branch of industry and all the varied interests and pursuits of our people."¹⁹⁶ Other Radical leaders also referenced Providence in their official writings. For instance, George Smith, performing duties as Acting Governor in April of 1866, issued a day of fasting and humiliation to beg God to deliver Missouri from the famines affected much of the country. Alluding to the Israelites fleeing from the Egyptians in the book of Exodus, he said "it becomes us to supplicate that we be spared by the averting hand that guided the children of Israel through the Red Sea into the Promised Land, and that hath at all times led and protected those nations that forget not God."¹⁹⁷ Fletcher's successor, Joseph McClurg also invoked the concept of providence during his two year term as Missouri's chief executive. These included Thanksgiving proclamations and thanking Providence for timely rains.¹⁹⁸

The workings of Divine Providence could explain to northern-oriented ministers the hardships that southern ministers faced after the war – they were being punished. Some northern ministers took the view that the Civil War had been a punishment of the nation as a whole for slavery and mistreatment of blacks. Others singled out the South as the targets of this divine retribution. Galusha Anderson in an 1867 piece published in the national Baptist Quarterly once again relied on Providence to discount the complaints of his fellow Baptists that they were being persecuted by the Test Oath. He pointed out that these were the same men that had merited God's wrath by perpetuating Missouri's slave society that denied blacks religious equality and silencing prophets, such as Elijah Lovejoy, who attempted to call the to repent for her sin.

Anderson said “but God no longer able to endure this legalized inequity swept it away and so turned the wheel of his providence that those in Missouri who denied freedom of religion to others have experienced, on account of their disloyalty, an abridgement of their soul-loyalty.”¹⁹⁹

In 1866, some Missouri commentators, including northern and southern evangelicals, attributed their divergent political fortunes to Divine Providence. The MECS St. Louis Christian Advocate publications contained instances in which contributors invoked Providence. For examples, in a series of articles printed in the fall of 1866 to condemn northern evangelicals, the paper featured a set of sermons by a New York Methodist minister who, at a revival, had invoked Providence to spur greater national unity and commerce.²⁰⁰ The editor of the Liberty Tribune, however, invoked divine intercession to explain the impact of the war on the general government. According to him, if Abraham Lincoln had been more of a friend to the Radicals, the federal government would have become more centralized than it had, in fact, become. The federal government had been spared this tyrannous fate because “Providence had not so willed.”²⁰¹ In 1866 the same paper concluded that Andrew Johnson was the instrument that thwarted the Radical power – power that God did not ordain. An article explained that “Fortunately for the country and the future of its institutions, a just and wise Providence interfered to save us, and today through Andrew Johnson, God in tumbling down and trampling under foot what he has not planted, the Radical power.”²⁰²

Revivals

Ecclesiastical ruptures and divergent understandings of Protestantism that divided northern and southern evangelicals in Missouri did not translate into a diminished interest in matters of faith among the converted or the un-churched population. Reconstruction in the state featured an extraordinarily large number of protracted religious revivals, especially involving

those who were members of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches. Arising mostly in rural village and small town venues where southern evangelicalism held sway, congregants struggling to rebuild their churches seized on peacetime stability to rebuild their spiritual lives.²⁰³

Some southern evangelical leaders cast their revivals in terms of both a backward-looking providential understanding of the war and as part of an ongoing battle between the southern faithful and the satanic forces of Radical rule. Often these surges in religiosity occurred as southern evangelicals fought the Test Oath. For instance, in northeastern Missouri, William A. Tarwater, a southern Methodist minister, began a revival in Canton only to be interrupted by the county sheriff who unsuccessfully attempted to arrest him.²⁰⁴ According to the Reverend William Pope Yeaman, the mysterious workings of God alone could account for the loss of faithful southerners during the war. In his words, “The visitations of Providence removed some of the staunch supporters and honored members of the organization.”²⁰⁵ But Yeaman also adverted to the trials and tribulations of southern Baptists in their ongoing struggle with Union occupation and Radical rule, concluding that the revivals

were especially interesting and encouraging as signifying an emergence from the darkness into which a rare and fearful war had cast the Lord's Zion in Missouri, there came clouds to remind the faithful that the subjects of the Kingdom of the Captain of Salvation must not expect uninterrupted ease beneath the frowning ramparts of Satan, and in a land where sin reigns to disturb the peace for which they fight; but that they must endure hardness as good soldiers, and persistently fight the good fight of faith.²⁰⁶

Southern evangelicals who participated in revivals appear to have commonly viewed the powerful up swell of religious fervor in terms of sacrifice and rebirth. Consider the massive revival that took place in the southwest Missouri town of Washbourne, Barry County, in 1868. Church chronicler Robert S. Duncan commented that the revival was, in one respect, emblematic of the times. In his words, “the preceding year was almost unprecedented for ingatherings . . .”

Organized by local Baptist ministers, the Washbourne revival was so large that Duncan compared it to the Holy Spirit's descent among the Apostles at Pentecost.²⁰⁷ His allusion to Pentecost was quite apt in the circumstances. For southern evangelicals in Missouri, at least, collective rededication to the church brought the Holy Spirit to believers who had suffered and been reborn in Christ, similarly to the way his resurrection had brought the Holy Spirit to the Apostles.

The largest revivals that northern evangelicals sponsored during Reconstruction suggest that even those who had rejoiced in Union victory sought earnestly to renew their faiths. In St. Louis, northern Baptist minister J. V. Scofield, brother of Union General John Scofield, organized a number of revivals at his Third Baptist Church, an effort that grew his membership sufficiently to provide the funds necessary for the building of a new house of worship. In early 1874, St. Louis had its first citywide interdenominational revival at which the featured speaker was the Reverend Edward Payson Hammond, well-known evangelist and New School Presbyterian from Connecticut. Because of the crowds the revival drew, organizers had little choice but to hold meetings at DeBar's Grand Opera House.²⁰⁸

The report of northern Presbyterian minister George Miller on the revival he organized in about 1869 reflected both his sense that God had generously renewed his spirit and postwar Missouri's rapid population growth and economic development. Miller's newly-established First Presbyterian Church in the town of Greenwood, Jackson County, grew by leaps and bounds in the late 1860s because of its situation on a newly-built railroad line. He tripled the membership of his congregation from twenty to sixty women and men. Miller's health had failed him in 1867, and he was not able to preach until 1870. Under these circumstances, he attributed his successful revival and the attendant increase in church membership largely to God's willingness to receive

him once again into his good graces. In his words, “The Lord had again graciously owned me and my poor service, and restored me to the joy of his salvation.”²⁰⁹ Similarly to some of his southern evangelical counterparts, Reverend Miller viewed the revival primarily in very personal terms of rebirth.

White Evangelicals, Divine Providence, and the General Opposition to Social Reform

A tentative, back-ward looking mode of Providential thinking shaped the way at least southern evangelicals perceived the upsurge in revivalism after the Civil War. But faith in divine intercession appears to have lost much of its power among Missouri church leaders to warrant predictions of future social and political developments. A general loss of confidence in this longstanding prime article of faith was particularly evident among southern evangelicals, many of whom appear to have lost confidence in the notion that God, when he saw fit, intervened in the world to reward the faithful and punish the wicked or that such intercession would inevitably provide a future divinely-ordained religious, social and political order. That the Confederacy had met with defeat, at least, suggested that the Almighty had chosen not to intervene decisively in its behalf and, at the worst, that he had lent his might to the forces of the Union. Ministers were, generally speaking, much less willing to purport to know divine preferences, reasoning, and future developments than they were before the war. With his frequent denunciation of “politico-religious fanatics” in Martyrdom in Missouri, the Reverend William Leftwich drew into question the capacity of the individual to discern the mysterious intervention of the Almighty into worldly events and even denounced those who continued to purport to be able do so.²¹⁰ An 1866 sermon published in the St. Louis Christian Advocate engaged these questions with a discussion of the foreknowledge of God. Its ponderous language clearly differentiated between events about

which human beings could know and developments in the future, which only God could predict. Included in the same issue was a short poem also dealing with Providence but emphasizing that individual believers could only be certain that some day they would perish on earth and meet their maker.²¹¹

By the early 1870s, northern and southern evangelicals in Missouri invoked Divine Providence less frequently and confidently to explain political events than they had a decade earlier. Liberal Republican Governor B. Gratz Brown invoked Divine Providence in his public addresses far less than did his predecessors.²¹² His Democrat Party successors, Silas Woodson and devout Baptist Charles Henry Hardin, further skirted discussion of its venerable workings on most occasions while in office. Newspapers followed suit beginning most notably in the early 1870s. References to God and Providence increasingly only appeared in articles focused on religion, which became less and less common in the secular sheets, and in obituaries. By the end of Reconstruction, few editors and politicians made reference to Providence. Reportage in both the Liberty Tribune and St. Louis Christian Advocate bears out this conclusion. In the 1860s, both papers had commonly featured editorials and political addresses that invoked divine intervention.²¹³

New understandings of Divine Providence among southern evangelicals that discounted their capacity to predict how the Almighty might reward the faithful sapped the hopeful millennialism that had marked their earlier social reform efforts. The death of reform idealism on the heels of the Civil War was certainly, to some extent, attributable to the inability of American religious leaders to fashion a common morality that could respond effectively to fundamental social and political problems.²¹⁴ But the loss of confidence among southern evangelicals in Missouri that the hand of Providence would pave the way for a new dispensation

on earth was palpable in ministerial writings and sermons.²¹⁵ Take, for instance, the sermon that southern Methodist minister William Prottzman gave at the 1866 St. Louis Annual Conference, which convened about two months after the murder by MEC partisans of his friend the Reverend Samuel Headlee. Prottzman based his sermon on Revelations 6: 9-11, which described how the apostle John saw a vision of all in human history who had been martyred. The fatalism of the sermon was palpable. In his eulogy of Headlee, the Reverend Prottzman opened by saying “Life exhibits but little more than a funeral procession, where friend follows friend, weeping to-day and wept for to-morrow.”²¹⁶ Those who delivered sermons and ministerial addresses before and early in the war had confidently claimed to know God’s purpose. Prottzman simply accepted His will. According to him, “We bow not only most humbly to the will of God to-day, and turn our eyes away from our affliction to Him who gave and has taken away.”²¹⁷ Prottzman’s sermon conveyed the growing sense among his fellow southern Methodist ministers that they did not, in fact, possess a superior understanding of God’s mysterious design. It also exhibited a loss of confidence that He would reward the just and punish the wicked in this world. This new sense of inexorable and unknowable fate, to some extent, harked back to the stoic Calvinism of anti-mission southern Baptists described quite well by historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown.²¹⁸

Diminished confidence among northern evangelicals that God was willing to intervene in their behalf appears to have correlated with their reduced sense of assurance that they might perfect this world, with social reform or otherwise, to spur the Second Coming. It seems quite likely that, to some extent, northern evangelicals in Reconstruction Missouri circumscribed their reliance on Divine Providence, in part at least, because radical social reform had proved too obviously a threat to social order and the cohesiveness of the nation.²¹⁹ In any case, northern ministers in the state expressed growing doubts about “post-millennial” theology, which held

that believers would, with God's assistance, establish a thousand-year-long holy kingdom on earth to be followed by the return of Jesus Christ. Some, such as the Reverend James H. Brookes, pastor of Walnut Street Presbyterian Church, rejected "post-millennial" eschatology and embraced its "pre-millennial" counterpart, which held that Christ would return to Earth prior to the beginning of the millennial kingdom. Brooks adopted this view after a great deal of soul-searching and scripture-reading in the years following the war.²²⁰ In reference to the post-millennial interpretation of end times described in the Book of Revelation, Brookes explained that "no allusion was ever made to it in the course of my imperfect theological training."²²¹ He continued to express adherence to pre-millennialism to the end of his ministerial career and, by the same token, abandoned for its remainder a theological rationale that had undergirded northern evangelical reform for decades.²²²

More evangelical and secular leaders in Reconstruction-era Missouri than before the Civil War began to condemn the intermixing of evangelicalism with party politics and discussions of government policy. All too clear to political leaders and editorial commentators was the fact that conflicting evangelical pronouncements as to individual liberties and the proper social, civil, and political organization of society had played a major role in producing the spawning sectional discord and the Civil War itself. After experiencing the carnage of war, many wanted simply to put the past behind them. Continuing evangelical conflict over the issues of slavery, secession, disloyalty, and the proper course for the nation could do little to ease social discord and political tensions. In Watson v. Jones, Justice Samuel Miller and six other justices expressed deep regret that, because northern and southern Presbyterians had not resolved their differences, the United States Supreme Court had no choice but to involve the power of the federal government in the ongoing ecclesiastical dispute.²²³ The Missouri Republican excoriated

a report from the New York Journal of Commerce criticizing southern evangelicals for political preaching: “It is painful that it should become necessary for the secular presses of our country to rebuke ecclesiastical bodies, but it is.”²²⁴ The St. Louis Christian Advocate thoroughly condemned political preaching through Reconstruction. Upon an article from the Knoxville, Tennessee Free Press reaching the paper, asserting that politics and religion are properly merged together, the Advocate issued its condemnation. Demonstrating that the schism was alive and well, the paper also asked the question whether or not the writer was a northern Methodist.²²⁵ While the paper was in favor of larger Sunday school organizations, an anonymous reader under the name of “Junius” suggested that these bodies were not needed. In part, Junius explained that the chances that politics and religion would cause a significant problem for the church as they merged through the larger association.²²⁶ Others, such as the conservative editor of the Columbia Statesman, William F. Switzler, lamented the intrusion of Radical church authorities into the arena of public policy making.²²⁷

Redemption

Fatigue among most white Missourians with Radical reform certainly provided the critical context for “Redemption” in Missouri. But that process also turned on the electoral defeats that Radical Republicans incurred in the late 1860s and, beginning in early 1871, the political ascendancy of the southern Democrats. In spring 1874, they secured a popular majority to authorize a constitutional convention.²²⁸ Meeting in Jefferson City in May 1875, all but seven of the sixty-eight constitutional delegates were members of the Democrat Party – a complete reversal from 1865. At least thirty-five of the sixty-eight had either fought for the Confederacy or had sympathized with its cause. Some had served its government, such as convention president and ex-Confederate Senator Waldo P. Johnson. Only fourteen of the remaining delegates were

firmly identified with support of the Union during the Civil War. As historians Floyd C. Shoemaker and William Parrish suggest, the 1875 Constitution of Missouri was the work of Redeemers no less than the similar conservative counter-revolutions that took place at about the same time in the former slaveholding states that had experienced congressional Reconstruction.²²⁹

The new Constitution framed by Johnson and his colleagues was the product of a powerful reaction to what Missouri Democrats undoubtedly viewed as Radical misrule and tyranny. Democrats excised features of the 1865 “Drake Constitution” that had disfranchised former Confederates or otherwise targeted southern sympathizers. One section provided such persons complete amnesty from criminal prosecutions.²³⁰ A section in the new Bill of Rights conspicuously omitted to allow the government to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, which had facilitated the detention of southern sympathizers during the war, even during cases of rebellion or invasion.²³¹ As historians Lawrence O. Christensen and Gary R. Kremer emphasize, the Redeemer Constitution that Johnson and the other delegates produced also reflected a visceral condemnation of the expanded state government and centralized rule that the Radicals had advanced in disregard of Missouri traditions placing a premium on limited and local government.²³² The new 1875 Constitution, consequently, placed myriad restrictions on the power of the General Assembly to raise revenue via property taxation and to incur debt, which had helped to fund the new public school system. New provisions also denied the General Assembly the power to grant the credit of the state to secure loans for private enterprises, such as railroad corporations.²³³ Given the ratification of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Missouri delegates to the 1875 convention understood quite well that they could not reverse African American emancipation or deny the

franchise to black men.²³⁴ But new constitutional provisions made voter registration complicated and, to some extent, would negatively affect a relatively uneducated black electorate in years to come.²³⁵ The 1875 Constitution also renewed that feature of the 1865 Constitution providing publicly-funded education to African American children – but, as before, only in racially-segregated schools.²³⁶ After its ratification in fall 1875, the new Constitution empowered the resurgent Democrat Party in Missouri to construct a regime of Jim Crow and maintain control of its government to the end of the nineteenth century.²³⁷

The rubric “Redemption” appears quite apt, in its Biblical sense, to describe the conservative revolution wrought by the 1875 Missouri Constitution. Historian Paul Harvey argues, regarding the return of home rule in the former slaveholding states, that the word signified the washing away of sins – those of the white South – by the blood that Unionists and Radical Republicans had spilled to advance their unholy causes.²³⁸ Historian Daniel W. Stowell concludes similarly that, because evangelical religion provided white southerners a common lexicon for public debate, they naturally adopted the term “Redemption” to describe their liberation from the yoke of the North.²³⁹ In any case, a preponderance of the delegates to the 1875 Missouri convention was clearly well situated to view their task in this scriptural light. Eleven delegates were members of the Presbyterian Church. Eight were Baptists, while eleven adhered to the Methodist Church. Overall, about two-thirds were church members or otherwise expressed a favorable view of Christianity.²⁴⁰ The preamble of the 1875 Constitution included an explicit acknowledgment of the Deity: “We, the people of Missouri, with profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and grateful for His goodness, do, for the better government of the State, establish this Constitution.”²⁴¹

The 1875 Constitution reversed entirely those enactments of the 1865 charter that had, all at once, made loyalty to the Union and moral condemnation of slavery a litmus test of viable citizenship and stripped white southern evangelicals of political power and important civil and religious liberties. The Bill of Rights set out in the 1875 Constitution retained all of the provisions of its 1865 predecessor regarding disestablishment, religious liberty, and freedom of speech.²⁴² But other parts of the new constitution destroyed entirely the legal and institutional framework with which Radical Republicans had disfranchised and stigmatized, as moral reprobates, white southern evangelicals who had supported slavery, secession and the Confederacy. Excised entirely was the Test Oath, which had been ruled unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court in Cummings v. Missouri eight years earlier. Like the high court ruling itself, excision of the Test Oath ensured that no clergyman could be denied the right to preach or teach for having failed to swear, under oath, that he had always been loyal to the Union. Elimination of the oath also ensured that those unable to swear to it good conscience could not be disqualified from holding property in trust for a congregation or denomination.²⁴³ The new Constitution also omitted provisions of the 1865 Constitution that had placed a ban on the donation, sale, or devise, in trust, of any land or chattels to “any minister, public teacher, or preacher of the Gospel . . . or to any religious sect, order, or denomination” A donor could now give as much land and personal property to a church as she wanted. As well, land and personal property could now be deeded or devised to ministers, as well as lay persons, in trust for congregations or other religious organizations.²⁴⁴ The 1875 Constitution perpetuated the 1865 provision allowing the establishment of religious corporations for the purposes of holding limited amounts of real estate for church edifices, parsonages or cemeteries. But it reversed entirely that part of the previous constitution that had allowed taxation of church property.²⁴⁵ The 1875

Constitution also exempted church corporations from a new general requirement that corporations pay into the state treasury graduated amounts of money upon the issuance of capital stock and payment of additional fees upon the enlargement of such stock.²⁴⁶

Last, but not least, the 1875 Constitution provided something of a new dispensation for Roman Catholics, one that might well have pleased even castoff Radical leader Charles Daniel Drake. As the new frame of government declared in the case of a Protestant minister, the Redeemer Constitution permitted a Catholic priest or bishop to preach, teach, receive donations of property, and hold it in trust for congregations and dioceses regardless of whether he had supported the Confederacy. But, as in the case of the Protestant churches, the Catholic Church could claim a property tax exemption for only the limited amount of exempted land allowed for each individual congregation, that is, one acre in towns and cities and five acres outside of municipalities. Given the relatively large real estate holdings of the Roman Catholic Church in the state, the church would certainly pay taxes on a larger portion of its lands than would the Protestant churches taken as a whole.²⁴⁷ Equally problematic from the Roman Catholic perspective was a provision in the 1875 Constitution that strictly forbade the General Assembly or any county or municipal government to grant public funds to a parochial school. This new stricture applied to schools sponsored by Protestant denominations. But the convention delegates certainly aimed it at Roman Catholics. Through Reconstruction, Catholic schools had, like many Protestant schools, received public funds in support of them. As discussed, however, some Catholic parents and prelates had also demanded that the new public school system restrain its teachers from providing classroom instruction in the Protestant faith and reading from the King James Bible. The delegates, it seems, were willing to see Protestant educational institutions incur the loss of public funding to even things up.²⁴⁸

Conclusions

New civil and political liberties for Missouri African Americans during Reconstruction secured for them the right to worship independently and the means to protect their church property -- but black believers abandoned white-controlled churches in droves, created their own Baptist and Methodist organizations, and faced down the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan to nurture distinctive faiths that nurtured African American advancement. After political “Redemption” in 1875, white evangelicals remained ecclesiastically divided over the religious and political meanings of slavery, secession and disloyalty. New and delimited evangelical understandings of Divine Providence arose in step with decreasing confidence in the efficacy of state-generated social reform.

White evangelicals in Missouri recovered variously from the dislocations of the Civil War and increased their numbers substantially in the ensuing decade. New railroads and industrial development spurred massive immigration from further east and north. Because of these developments, well-to-do, town-dwelling Presbyterian societies recovered much more easily than did rural religious societies. Economic and demographic transformation especially fueled the growth of Baptist and northern Methodist congregations, who were able to far surpass their beleaguered southern Methodist competitors. It also generated a rapidly-growing rural-urban divide, especially among Baptists.

Through Reconstruction, the civil and political liberties granted to African Americans by the 1865 Radical Constitution secured for them the right to worship independently as they saw fit and the means to protect their church property. Black believers abandoned white-controlled churches and created their own Baptist and Methodist organizations, constituting, by far, the most dramatic schisms to occur in post-Civil War Missouri. African Americans relied on their

own churches, rather than the newly-established public schools, to provide education for their children, a consequence of the reluctance of most whites to pay taxes for new common schools. Distinctive African religious traditions fundamentally shaped the autonomous worship of African Americans. But the social, civil, religious, and political ideas that abolitionists, including African American freedom fighters, had articulated for decades also informed their decisions to secede from the white churches. While church-going freed people and their Radical allies faced the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan, the religious beliefs and sentiments of black congregants continued to spur their active pursuit of socioeconomic, civil, and political advancement for all African Americans.

By the end of Reconstruction, white Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in Missouri had learned to co-exist peacefully. But northern and southern evangelicals, in each case, did not reconcile ecclesiastically. They, essentially, agreed to a cease fire. Commemoration of white southerners who had faced the reprisals of Union partisans and Radicals and of Unionist wartime heroes powerfully reinforced divergent understandings of religion, politics, and the past. Reconstruction saw an upsurge in extended religious revivals, which southern and northern evangelicals perceived primarily in terms of sacrifice and spiritual rebirth. Reconstruction also saw a key modulation in white evangelical faith arising as a consequence of the schisms and the sectional struggle they engendered. New and delimited understandings of Divine Providence, which prompted evangelicals now to look only to the past for signs of God's intervention, could no longer provide rosy and confident predictions of social and political transformation. This was a view that coincided with a decreased willingness on the part of most evangelicals to support social reform and a common eagerness to disentangle religion from civil government.

The 1875 Redeemer Constitution registered a powerful reaction by southern Democrats and southern evangelicals to what they perceived to be Radical tyranny and an unjustifiable and unprecedented expansion of centralized and costly state government. The new Constitution undercut tax-based funding of the new public school system and of railroad building, while targeting Roman Catholics for having challenged the teaching of the Protestant faith in public schools. Equally important, the new constitution discarded entirely those provisions of the 1865 Radical Constitution that had made past loyalty to the Union a litmus test of viable citizenship and stripped white southern evangelicals of political power and important civil and religious liberties. Radicals and their northern evangelical allies failed in their effort to impose upon white southerners a new civil religion making condemnation of slaveholding and disloyalty prime articles of faith and political orthodoxy.

Notes

¹ Slicking became widespread initially during an extended feud between the clans of Hiram Turk and Andy Jones in Benton County in the period 1840-1841. Governor Thomas Reynolds sent in the state militia to deal with the violence. Clarke Thomas and Jack Glendenning, The Slicker War (Aldrich, Mo: Bona, 1984).

² Others included in the group of Klansmen who attacked Thomas Calahan were the son of Sheriff George, Napoleon George, county and circuit clerk A. J. Banks, his son A. M. Banks, Jesse Allison and William Banks, and one other by the name of Parks. Boonville Weekly Eagle, 23 August 1872, p. 1; "Kuklux," New York Times, 8 July 1872; "The Enforcement Act in Missouri. . .," *ibid.*, 9 July 1872. Copies of the Ironton Enterprise from 1872 are not available.

³ "Kuklux," New York Times, 8 July 1872.

⁴ Ironton County Register, 31 August 1872, p. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ "Anarchy in Missouri," Missouri Democrat, 3 August 1872.

⁷ "The Missouri Democrat as a Liar – What it Knows About Ku-Kluxing," Ironton County Register, 10 August 1872, p. 2.

⁸ Governor Brown's agent in the area, William S. Relfe, was unable to investigate the crime and relied on local officials. William S. Relfe to Benjamin Gratz Brown, 31 August 1872, RG3.20, Benjamin Gratz Brown, 1871-1873, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri.

⁹ "Masked Murder," Missouri Democrat, 21 August 1872, p.

¹⁰ Ironton County Register, 31 August 1872, p. 2.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Foner asserts that northern whites feared that class conflict, especially in the light of increasing overseas immigration, led them to sympathize with southern whites and abandon Reconstruction. Coupled with the waning influence of the free labor ideology that brought the Republican Party into being during the 1850s, many in the North could justify abandoning blacks to the Redeemers. Eric Foner, Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877 (New York: Harper & Row, 1988). Before the publication of Foner's influential work, revisionist historians had long since jettisoned the Dunning School argument that decent southern whites put aside their differences to unite and overthrow the corrupt Radical rule. They argue that competing business groups in the South entered politics and the Republican Party during the early years of Reconstruction to gain traction over their competitors. But lower-class whites ensured that anti-black racism would animate the competing Democrats, encourage white conservatives to rejoin the party, and isolate blacks and their remaining Radical allies. As a result, Republicans were doomed to defeat. Dunning, Reconstruction; Fleming, The Sequel of Appomattox; Bowers, The Tragic Era; Coulter, The South During Reconstruction. See W. E. B. Du Bois Black Reconstruction in America (New York: Russell and Russell, 1935); Francis B. Simkins, "New Viewpoints in Southern Reconstruction," Journal of Southern History 5, (February 1939): 49-61; Otto H. Olsen, "Reconsidering the Scalawags," Civil War History 12,

(December 1966): 304-20; Allen W. Trelease, "Who Were the Scalawags?," Journal of Southern History 29, No. 4 (November 1963): 445-68; Vernon L. Wharton, The Negro In Mississippi 1865-1890 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947); Willie Lee Rose, Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964); Joel Williamson, After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction, 1861-1877 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965). For a synthesis of the Revisionist arguments see J. G. Randall, David Donald, The Civil War and Reconstruction, Second Edition (Boston: Little Brown, 1969). See also Howard K. Beale, The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction (New York: F. Ungar Publishing Company, 1930); C. Vann Woodward, Reunion and Reaction: The Compromise of 1877 and the End of Reconstruction (Boston: Little, Brown, 1951); Robert Sharkey, Money, Class, and Party: An Economic Study of the Civil War and Reconstruction (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959).

Neo-revisionists argue that most whites, North and South, were unwilling to accept the Radical agenda that called for equality of African Americans with whites. White southern business men sought reunification and the advantages of increased economic ties with the North and thus were willing to end Reconstruction. See James H. McPherson, The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); Kenneth M. Stampp, The Era of Reconstruction (New York: Knopf, 1965); Robert Sharkey, Money, Class, and Party: An Economic Study of the Civil War and Reconstruction (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959); Irwin Ungar, The Greenback Era: A Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964). Allen Trelease emphasizes that the seeds of racial equality simply fell on unfertile soil, as evidenced by the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Trelease, White Terror. Historians writing on the Redeemers in Missouri, most notably William E. Parrish, conclude that Radical vindictiveness combined with the re-enfranchisement of former Confederates led to the end of Reconstruction in the state. Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule.

¹³ After raising all but \$551 of the \$3,350 they needed, four members agreed to pay the balance. Shortly thereafter two women, Virginia Holland and Sue Brock, were elected to purchase chandeliers for the new church. As a result, they favored public education to indoctrinate these newcomers and move them towards the evangelical faith many in the movement were sympathetic too. Ward M. McAfee, Religion, Race, and Reconstruction: The Public School in the Politics of the 1870s (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998).

¹⁴ Victor Howard, Religion and the Radical Republican Movement, 1860-1870 (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1990).

¹⁵ Many African Americans rejected these ideas and viewed the United States as a racist and sinful land as a result of their treatment under Jim Crow. Edward J. Blum, Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion and American Nationalism, 1865-1898 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005); Ibid., "O God of a Godless Land": Northern African American Challenges to White Christian Nationhood, 1865-1906," Vale of Tears, 93-111.

¹⁶ In this conception, southern evangelicals believed that defeat and Radical Reconstruction had been inflicted upon them for not having kept their Christian obligations to lead a pious life and to be good slave holders. Most southern evangelicals contemplating the Civil War during Reconstruction did not believe that they lost the war because southerners had been wrong to support slavery, secession, and the Confederacy. While some northern evangelicals believed that the bloodshed, death, and destruction of the war were God's punishment for having neglected their faith, others simply perceived Union victory and the prosperity that followed as a reward bestowed by him for fighting in a just cause. Eugene D. Genovese, A Consuming Fire: The Fall of the Confederacy in the Mind of the White Christian South (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1998). Blum, Reforging the White Republic.

¹⁷ Charles Reagan Wilson, Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920 (Athens: The University of Georgia, 1980), 1-2.

Paul Harvey argues that conservatives and Republicans in the post-war South, as well as African Americans, conceived of politics in religious terms. Redemption, therefore, in the minds of many white southerners, was the manifestation of God's favor while any Republican who switched sides was seen as undergoing a process of conversion. Paul Harvey, "'That Was about Equalization after Freedom': Southern Evangelicalism and the Politics of Reconstruction and Redemption, 1861-1900," Vale of Tears, 73-92; *Ibid.*, Redeeming the South: Religious Cultures and Racial Identities Among Southern Baptists, 1865-1925 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

Daniel W. Stowell, "Why 'Redemption'? Religion and the End of Reconstruction, 1869-1877," in Edward J. Blum, W. Scott Poole, eds., Vale of Tears: New Essays on Religion and Reconstruction (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2005), 133-46. At the same time, he argues that the South did not repent of its previous support for slavery and secession. Instead southerners continued to believe that the region was favored by God and their failures during the war were caused by an impure heart. African American evangelicals in the South, nonetheless, rejected these ideas as they built up their churches. Daniel W. Stowell, Rebuilding Zion: The Religious Reconstruction of the South, 1863-1877 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

¹⁸ Beth Barton Schweiger contends that the unwillingness or incapacity of American theologians to respond effectively to slavery without causing a bloody civil war was the catalyst for rejection of religion in American intellectual life after the Civil War. Beth Barton Schweiger, "Mark A Noll's 'The Civil War as a Theological Crisis'," Fides et Historia, 39.2 (Summer 2007): 29-34. Schweiger's work was based on a roundtable discussion of Mark Noll, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 159-62.

¹⁹ Several historians have examined the efforts by southerners to memorialize the Civil War with texts and by other means, practices that helped to generate the so-called "religion of the Lost Cause." This southern civil religion helped southerners to understand and cope with their defeat, avoid losing what they believed to be distinctive in their region, and instill southern moral, manners, and values among the generations to come. The discursive linkage of religion and

southern culture facilitating the lore of the Lost Cause was a result of the evangelical consensus achieved prior to the war. While some like Gaines M. Foster discount the idea that the Lost Cause amounted to a civil religion, others, such as Charles Reagan Wilson, characterize it this way. Gaines M. Foster, Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, The Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); Charles Reagan Wilson, Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920 (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1980); Lloyd A. Hunter, "The Immortal Confederacy: Another Look at the Lost Cause Religion," Gary W. Gallagher, Alan T. Nolan, eds., The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000). Most historians rate Robert E. Lee as the ultimate figure in the drama of the Lost Cause. But those who fashioned Lost Cause texts and memorials also perpetuated the memory of Jefferson Davis, along with the scores of rank and file veterans. Gary W. Gallagher, Lee and His Generals in War and Memory (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University press, 1998); Donald E. Collins, The Death and Resurrection of Jefferson Davis (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005). William White contends that Confederate veterans constructed their own identity around this model. William W. White, The Confederate Veteran (Tuscaloosa AL, Confederate Publishing Company, Inc., 1962). Karen L. Cox asserts that it was the New South's women who took the initiative in preserving Confederate culture. Karen L. Cox, Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of the Confederate Culture (Gainesville: The University of Florida Press, 2003). David W. Blight, Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory (Cambridge, Ma: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001). In his leading work on the Ku Klux Klan during Reconstruction, historian Allen Trelease explores the relationship of Lost Cause sentiment and belief to violent southern resistance to Radical Reconstruction. Allen W. Trelease, White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction (Westport, Ct: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1971). George C. Rable includes an extensive discussion of the Klan to make his larger argument that many white southerners employed counterrevolutionary guerilla warfare to bring about the end of Republican rule in the South. George C. Rable, But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984).

¹⁹ Many historians of Reconstruction, such as Eric Foner, devote a significant amount of attention to the organization, describing its rise and the efforts, both legally and militarily, to curb its influence. There are a plethora of local histories on the Klan. But these do not help to explain why local "klaverns" organized in some areas of the South and not in others. Steven Hahn and Michael Fitzgerald also examine the Klan in works of a larger scope. Foner, Reconstruction, 342-43, 425-44, 454-59, 504, 507, 509, 593-94; Hahn, A Nation Under our Feet, 265-88; Michael W. Fitzgerald, "The Ku Klux Klan: Property Crime and the Plantation System in Reconstruction Alabama," Agricultural History, 71 (Spring 1997): 186-206. But as Elaine Franz Parsons argues, many white Americans sought to deny the existence of the Klan. This denial played into the hands of Democrats, and sometimes Liberal Republicans, who often benefited from Klan terror. Elaine Franz Parsons, "Klan Skepticism and Denial in

Reconstruction-Era Public Discourse,” The Journal of Southern History, 77.1 (February 2011): 53-90.

²⁰ A good number of scholarly monographs dealing with Reconstruction Missouri, and those detailing the organization nationally, limit the discussion of the Klan in the state. But various articles in the Missouri Historical Review along with William Parrish’s A History of Missouri discuss the Klan to some extent. “Missouri History Not Found in Textbooks,” Missouri Historical Review, 36.2 (January 1942): 258-60; William Parrish, A History of Missouri, Volume 3, 1860-1875 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1997). In terms of religion, Orlando Patterson argues that southern white violence targeting African Americans during Reconstruction was a part of a ritual of sacrifice. W. Scott Poole, however, disagrees with some of Patterson’s argument. Poole maintains that Klan violence, and that of other whites, contributed to a religious atmosphere created by the language of the apocalypse. Orlando Patterson, Rituals of Blood: Consequences of Slavery in Two American Centuries (New York: Basic Civitas Books, 1988), 171-232; W. Scott Poole, “Confederate Apocalypse: Theology and Violence in the White Reconstruction South,” Vale of Tears, 36-52. Those who became members of the Klan swore that they “reverentially acknowledge the majesty and supremacy of the Divine Being and recognize the goodness and providence of the same.” Walter L. Fleming, ed., Documentary History of Reconstruction, Vols. 1-2, (Cleveland, 1907), 2:347.

²¹ Ralph E. Morrow, Northern Methodism and Reconstruction (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1956).

²² As Ellwood Smith explains neither side could begin to seriously consider overtures from the other after the war. Ellwood Smith, “Background and Consequences of Methodist Union,” Methodist History, 2.2 (April 1964): 1-30. But Burton Williams holds that others, such as the Reverend Cyrus Rice, who was a Missouri MECS minister that moved to Kansas and joined the MEC, also wanted a middle course toward the former rebels, religiously and politically. Burton Williams, “Religion and Reconstruction: A Cleric’s Conception,” *ibid.*, 9.3 (April 1973): 45-52. J. Treadwell Davis argues both the Old and New Schools in the North, united in their hatred for the South, quickly got over their theological differences after the war. Neither the northern or southern Presbyterian General Assemblies were able to put off their hatred of one another to reunify. J. Treadwell Davis, “The Presbyterians and the Sectional Conflict,” Southern Quarterly, 8.2 (Winter 1970): 117-33. Ernest Trice Thompson, in his Presbyterians in the South, agrees with those sentiments. Both churches by the end of the 1870s believed that fraternal relations were a good idea, however, throughout the Reconstruction period the leadership and the ordinary rank and file Presbyterians did not desire unity. Ernest Trice Thompson, Presbyterians in the South Vol. 2 (Richmond, Va., 1973). Thompson himself, it should be noted, was a southern Presbyterian minister who was influential in liberalizing his denomination and leading to the 1983 reunification of both general assemblies.

²³ R. S. Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists (Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1934); J. Gordon Kingsley, Frontiers: The Story of the Missouri Baptist Convention (Jefferson City: Missouri Baptist Historical Commission, 1983); Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist

Church in Missouri, 1798-1939, A Brief History (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966). Leslie Anders emphasizes how some MEC ministers, especially John Cox, supported Radical Reconstruction in Missouri. Leslie Anders, "His Radical Reverence, John H Cox," Missouri Historical Review, 65.2 (January 1971): 139-58. See also William E. Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 1865-1870 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1965), 319-20.

²⁴ W. E. B. DuBois extensively described the rise of independent black churches. In his estimation, these were institutions critical in the growth of the African American community. Mirroring his drift from active church membership into agnosticism, DuBois was also often critical of the various institutions associated with black churches for not doing more to aid in the plight of African Americans. He specially criticized the urban congregations whose members, in his view, often excluded lower class blacks. W. E. B. Du Bois Black Reconstruction in America (New York: Russell and Russell, 1935); *Ibid.*, ed., The Black Church (Walnut Creek, Ca: AltaMira Press, 2003); Phil Zuckerman, "Introduction," *Ibid.*, ed., DuBois on Religion (Walnut Creek, Ca: AltaMira Press, 2000), 1-18. Many Dunning school historians, nonetheless, along with others subsequently, focused on other issues and did make much effort to discuss African American religion. William A. Dunning, Reconstruction, Political and Economic 1865-1877 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1907); Claude G. Bowers, The Tragic Era (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929); E. Merton Coulter, The South During Reconstruction 1865-1877 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1947).

²⁵ Katherine Dvorak and Daniel Stowell conclude that the primary reason that blacks established independent churches during Reconstruction was, simply, to break away with former white co-congregants. Katherine Dvorak, An African-American Exodus: The Segregation of Southern Churches (Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing INC, 1991); Daniel Stowell, Rebuilding Zion: The Religious Reconstruction of the South, 1863-1877 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). William Montgomery agrees with some of these assertions but examines the racist attitudes of many whites that spurred them virtually to expel black members. Many white northern missionaries in the South during Reconstruction, however, wanted to "correct" what they saw as flaws in black religion. William E. Montgomery, Under Their Own Vine and Fig Tree: The African-American church in the South, 1865-1900 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993). Michael Williams Sr., Fred Arthur Bailey and Paul Harvey explain that whites, forced to deal with the fact that black co-congregants had abandoned them, eventually embraced a theology that encompassed racial segregation. Michael Williams Sr., Isaac Taylor Tichenor: The Creation of the Baptist New South (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2005); Fred Arthur Bailey, "That Which God Hath Put Asunder: White Baptists, Black Aliens, and the Southern Social Order, 1890-1920," Glenn Feldman ed., Politics and Religion in the White South (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2005); Paul Harvey, Freedom's Coming: Religious Culture and the Shaping of the South from the Civil War through the Civil Rights Era (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005). Storey argues that the main issue for southern Baptists in the post-bellum South was not racial segregation or integration but rather how to keep African Americans as docile as they had been when they were slaves. John W.

Storey contends that southern Baptists were more than willing to let relatively submissive African Americans comingle with whites in their churches and that they preferred to expel “uppity” blacks. For that reason, the Baptists were more than willing to remain in the SBC after the war, allow certain blacks leave their churches, and to keep others as co-congregants. John W. Storey, “Southern Baptists and the Racial Controversy in the Churches and Schools During Reconstruction,” Mississippi Quarterly, 31.2 (Spring 1978): 211-28. On the other hand, historian James Bennett explains that, in post-bellum New Orleans, churches were models of integration that only became segregated by whites during the Gilded Age. James B Bennett, Religion and the Rise of Jim Crow in New Orleans (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

John M. Giggie argues that historians have placed too much emphasis on the development of independent African American denominations after the war. He maintains that historians should explore more thoroughly how black church-goers dealt with segregation and made cultural improvements. John M. Giggie, After Redemption: Jim Crow and the Transformation of African American Religion in the Delta, 1875-1915 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Historians of Reconstruction who do not make religion their focus have helped to develop a number of key themes raised by historians of religion. Eric Foner discusses quite thoughtfully the migration of blacks into their own churches. In his view, this was a major achievement for African Americans, who viewed their churches only second to their families. Foner, Reconstruction, 88-102. Others, such as Steven Hahn, conclude similarly, while Paul Ortiz emphasizes how the black clergy were crucial in the civil and political organization of African Americans. Steven Hahn, A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration (Cambridge, Ma: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 230-37; Paul Ortiz, Emancipation Betrayed: The Hidden History of Black Organizing and White Violence in Florida from Reconstruction to the Bloody Election of 1920 (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 2005).

History scholarship on black churches in Missouri during Reconstruction reflects some of the foregoing frameworks of analysis. Gaston Hugh Wamble, for example, studies white congregations across the state that had to deal with African American members who withdrew to form their own societies. These whites often responded with disappointment or anger to such developments. Gaston Hugh Wamble, “Negroes and Missouri Protestant Churches Before and After the Civil War,” Missouri Historical Review 61.3 (April 1967): 321-347. Drawing on a host of denominational records, Alberta D. Shipley and David O. Shipley examine a number of black Baptist churches that originated and grew in postwar Missouri and that provided substantial civil, social, and political advancement for black communities. Alberta D. Shipley and David O. Shipley, The History of Black Baptists in Missouri (Kansas City: Missionary Baptist State Convention of Missouri, 1976). Henry T. Brownlee, Jr. in his discussion of the Pleasant Green Baptist Church in St. Louis, emphasizes the centrality of black theology. Most proponents of African American theology maintained that black religion was grounded in the basic social reality of experiencing life in America as a member of a racial minority. Central to this concept was the idea that white Protestant religion inherently sought to oppress blacks and that African

Americans had no choice but to overcome this racist effort. In this understanding of religion, God particularly despised oppression of any kind. Black theology, moreover, was evident in virtually all of the distinctive modes of black religious expression, such as forms of prayer, as well as shaping black history and art. Henry T. Brownless, Jr., “Keeping their Memory Green: The Pleasant Green Baptist Church in St. Louis, Missouri, 1866-1950,” PhD. Diss., St. Louis University, 2008. For a discussion see James Cone, A Black Theology of Liberation (New York: Orbis Books, 1996); James H. Evans, Jr., Black Theology: A Critical Assessment and Annotated Bibliography (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987). Historians William E. Parrish, Lorenzo J. Greene, Gary R. Kremer and Antonio F. Holland, whose work does not focus on religion, emphasizes that black churches played a crucial role in assisting and organizing recently-freed slaves in the state. Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 106-38; Greene, Missouri’s Black Heritage, 88-102.

²⁵ University of Virginia, “Historical Census Browser;” Baptist Home Missions, 555; Duncan History of Missouri Baptists, 930. Missouri’s population rose to 2,168,380 in 1880. Assuming even population expansion of 44,708.5 per year, Missouri’s population would have been roughly 1,989,546 in 1876. Baptists would have been about 3.6 percent of the population, a slight decrease from six years earlier.

²⁶ University of Virginia, “Historical Census Browser;” Baptist Home Missions, 555; Duncan History of Missouri Baptists, 930. Missouri’s population rose to 2,168,380 in 1880. Assuming even population expansion of 44,708.5 per year, Missouri’s population would have been roughly 1,989,546 in 1876. Baptists would have been about 3.6 percent of the population, a slight decrease from six years earlier.

²⁷ For an example of contemporary concern see “Leaving Missouri,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 22 March 1866, p. 4. University of Virginia, “Historical Census Browser;” Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 177-95; L. Steven Demaree, “Post-Civil War Immigration to Southwest Missouri 1865-1873,” Missouri Historical Review, 69, No. 2 (January 1975): 169-190.

²⁸ Minutes of the Baptist General Association, 1865, 9.

²⁹ Zoar Baptist Church Record Book, 1867-1886, State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, Collection 0900, p. 22.

³⁰ Minutes of the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the Baptist General Association of Missouri . . . 1866 (St. Louis, 1866), 10-12.

³¹ Hebron Baptist Church, Cape Girardeau County, Missouri, Minutes, 1829-1878, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1311.

³² T. L. Largen, History of the Shoal Creek Association With History of Her Churches and Biography of Ministers (Kansas City, Mo, 1908), 109.

³³ Missouri Patriot, 12 July 1866, p. 3; M. M. Richardson, A Brief History of The First Baptist Church of Springfield, Missouri, 1852-1927 . . . (Springfield, Mo, 1928), 11-12.

³⁴ Betty R. Murray, ed., Gone and Forgotten, Pleasant Grove Cemetery and Church, Camden Point, Missouri, Researched and compiled by Lu Durham and Irma Miller (Platte City, Mo: Platte County Historical Society, 1994), 6.

³⁵ Mrs. Farrie L. Cole Sr., Mrs. Alvin E. Phillips, Mrs. Royce Moser, Mrs. Clarence M. Brumback, Mrs. Virginia Bailey and Mrs. A. P. Reichel, A History of the Lamine Baptist Association of Missouri 1872-1971 (Stover, Mo, 1971), 88.

³⁶ Minutes of the Thirty-Second Annual Meeting of the Baptist General Association of Missouri . . . 1868 (St. Louis, 1868), 16.

³⁷ In southwestern Wayne County, the Big Lake Missionary Baptist Church was organized in 1868. Members met initially in a log cabin. Leota Meador, The Big Lake Missionary Baptist Church: The Past and Present (1971), 1. On the western border with Kansas, the Round Prairie Church was established in 1866 and acquired property in 1872. After joining the Tebo Association, its members sent funds to the Southern Baptist Convention. Round Prairie Baptist Church, Bates County, Missouri, Records, 1866-1937, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1320, pp. 1-4.

³⁸ Murray, Pleasant Grove Baptist Church Minutes, 6-7.

³⁹ According to church minutes, "Sister Nancy proposes to give to the church one acre or more of land . . . adjoining the Church lot for a grave yard." Grand Prairie United Baptist Church, Callaway County, Missouri, Minutes, 1843-1868, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1310, p. 155.

⁴⁰ Liberals and Democrats also hoped to attract African Americans, with the latter providing food and drink to sway votes. The black population in western Clay County appears to have succumbed to the bribery. Most voters in Missouri supported the Radical ticket. Opportunities for white Baptists improved in the Cape Girardeau Association after 1866. One of the disorganized congregations, the Hebron Baptist Church, was reconstituted in 1872. Hebron Baptist Church Minutes; J. C. Maple, History of the Cape Girardeau Baptist Association from 1824 to 1912 (Cape Girardeau, Mo., 1913), 19.

⁴¹ Cape Girardeau Argus, 27 February, 1868, p. 3; *Ibid.*, 11 November 1869, p. 3.

⁴² Beginning in 1867, the Zoar Baptist Church in Saline County saw an influx of arrivals who bolstered membership numbers to about what they had been before the war. Zoar Baptist Church Record Book. The southern Missouri community of Rolla witnessed a revival in November of 1873. "Religious Revival," The Rolla Express, 1 November 1873, p. 3.

⁴³ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 314.

⁴⁴ Baptist Development in St. Louis Association, 7, 31-33.

⁴⁵ "Missouri Baptist Convention, Loyal Pastors in Council," Missouri Democrat, 6 October 1865, p. 3.

⁴⁶ A Brief Chronicle of the Rise and Progress of Baptist Development in Saint Louis Association from 1800-1922 (St. Louis, 1922), 31.

⁴⁷ Fuller's new congregation was sometimes called the Grand Avenue Baptist Church. Jonathan B. Fuller Papers, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo, Collection KC0040, Folder 11.

⁴⁸ Baptist Home Missions in North America. . . 1832-1882 (New York, 1883), 553; Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 685.

⁴⁹ This remark came at a meeting of the consolidated Missouri General Association at in 1869. Minutes of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting of the Baptist General Association of Missouri . . . 1869 (St. Louis, 1869), 13-14; Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 685-87, 910-11; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 133-40; R. S. Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists (Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1934), 237-42.

⁵⁰ Frederick L. Anderson, Galusha Anderson: Preacher and Educator, 1832-1918 (1933), 13.

⁵¹ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 686.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 687.

⁵³ Minutes of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting of the Baptist General Association of Missouri . . . 1869 (St. Louis, 1869), 13-14; Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 685-87, 910-11; Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 133-40; R. S. Douglass, History of Missouri Baptists (Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1934), 237-42.

⁵⁴ Minutes of the Southwest Conference, 1880, 5; University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

⁵⁵ "The Murdered, and the Murderers Again," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 15 August 1866, p. 4; Lewis, Methodism in Missouri, 362, 383, 440; William L. Harris, editor, Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Held in Chicago, ILL., 1868 (New York, 1868), 313, 317; Minutes of the Southwest Conference, 1880, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, p. 5; University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

⁵⁶ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 1:248-49.

⁵⁷ Missouri East Conference, United Methodist Church, Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Folder 299, pp. 2-5.

⁵⁸ Charles N. Dochterman, ed., Records from the Wyaconda Methodist Circuit (Clark County, Missouri) including church membership rolls; births, marriages, deaths (Des Moines, Iowa, n.d.), 1.

⁵⁹ Minutes of the Southwest Conference, 1880, 5; University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

⁶⁰ "Pastoral Address of the St. Louis Annual Conference of the M E Church, South," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 September 1865, p. 3.

⁶¹ "Proceedings of the Missouri Annual Conference," *ibid.*, 31 October 1866, p. 2.

⁶² Minutes of the Southwest Conference, 1880, 5; University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

⁶³ "Religious Intelligence," *ibid.*, 16 November 1865, p. 5; "Religious Intelligence," *ibid.*, 15 March 1866, p. 5.

⁶⁴ "Dr. Newman Calculates . . .," *ibid.*, 11 January 1866, p. 2.

-
- ⁶⁵ St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church South, St. Louis, Missouri, Ivan Lee Holt, pastor (St. Louis, 1938), 3-5.
- ⁶⁶ Missouri East Conference, Folder 257, p. 19.
- ⁶⁷ St. Louis Christian Advocate, 15 May 1867, p. 5.
- ⁶⁸ Missouri East Conference, Folder 259.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., Folder 274.
- ⁷⁰ Minutes of the Southwest Conference, 1880, 5; University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."
- ⁷¹ "Missouri Annual Conference," ibid., 19 September 1866, p. 1.
- ⁷² "For the Advocate," ibid., 19 July 1866, p. 2; Lewis, Methodism in Missouri, 273.
- ⁷³ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:308-316; Liberty Tribune, 17 March 1865, p. 2.
- ⁷⁴ Anders, "His Radical Reverence," 139-58.
- ⁷⁵ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:312; "Report of the Missouri Conference on the State of the Church," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 September 1865, pp. 4-5.
- ⁷⁶ "The Perpetuity of the Church," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 20 June 1866, p. 2.
- ⁷⁷ "Re-Union," ibid., 5 September 1866, p. 4.
- ⁷⁸ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 140.
- ⁷⁹ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 140.
- ⁸⁰ "Western Correspondence," Missouri Presbyterian, 15 November 1867, p. 3; "The Prospects," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 5 October 1865, p. 4.
- ⁸¹ Callaway CO. Missouri, Augusta Presbyterian Church, Shamrock, Missouri, 1846-1953: Admissions, Dismissals, Baptisms, Burials in the Augusta Cemetery, 30-33.
- ⁸² Price's Branch Presbyterian Church, Price's Branch, Missouri, Records, 1867-1907, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1363, pp. 1, 20.
- ⁸³ History of Lewis, Clark, Knox and Scotland Counties, 551.
- ⁸⁴ Carrie Westlake Whitney, Kansas City Missouri its History and its People, 1808-1908 Vols. 1-3 (Chicago, 1908), 1:432.
- ⁸⁵ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 140.
- ⁸⁶ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser." The census combined all Presbyterians into one grouping, so exact numbers are almost impossible to determine. Subtracting the 131 congregations within the Cumberland Presbyterian Church which comprise 27.5 percent of the 476 recorded in the census, it can be assumed that 28,443 of the 103,305 sittings were in Cumberland Presbyterian congregations. Minutes of the Forty-Fourth General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, in the United States. Volume 12 (Nashville, 1874), 92-94.
- ⁸⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1870 (Philadelphia, 1870), 302-10.
- ⁸⁸ E. E. Stringfield, Presbyterianism in the Ozarks, A History of the Work of the Various Branches of the Presbyterian Church in Southwest Missouri, 1834-1907 (Springfield, Mo., 1909), 41-46.

⁸⁹ In 1870, the northern General Assembly divided its membership between those adhering to the Old School and New School. While available 1860s data for the Presbyterians is not complete, by 1870 accurate numbers were being reported. This was a fact that contemporary George Miller mentioned in his memoir. Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 139-40.

⁹⁰ Henry H. Sweets III, The Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church: A sesquicentennial History (Hannibal, Mo, 1984), 15-16.

⁹¹ First Presbyterian Church, Laclede, Missouri, Records, 1866-1888, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1350, pp. 2-3, 23.

⁹² History of Lewis, Clark, Knox and Scotland Counties, 600-1.

⁹³ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 140-41.

⁹⁴ The 1876 records show that there were 9,711 Presbyterians in the northern General Assembly situated within 207 congregations. If one takes into account also the group led by the Reverend James H. Brookes into a breakaway society in 1874, the totals come to 10,614 members and 208 congregations. Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America 1876, 354-63.

⁹⁵ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States . . . 1876 (Richmond, Va., 1876), 336-41.

⁹⁶ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 140.

⁹⁷ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 140.

⁹⁸ Alena Chance Jablonsky, ed., Vital Statistics of Rock Hill Presbyterian Church Rock Hill, St. Louis Co. MO, 1845-1956, 5.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 127-28, 132.

¹⁰⁰ "The Assembly in Lexington, MO," Missouri Presbyterian, 22 November 1867, p. 1.

¹⁰¹ "A Radical's View of Our Synod," ibid., 15 November 1867, p. 2.

¹⁰² "Synod of Missouri," Missouri Presbyterian, 18 October 1867, p. 2.

¹⁰³ S. S. Laws, A Letter By the Rev. S. S. Laws, LL. D., to the Synod of Missouri (O.S.) Which Met at Columbia, Missouri, October 8, 1872 (New York, 1873), 10-12.

¹⁰⁴ Williams, Brookes, 105.

¹⁰⁵ Drake, "Autobiography," 965.

¹⁰⁶ Williams, Brookes, 113-14.

¹⁰⁷ One Hundred Years Presbyterian Church in Missouri, 15.

¹⁰⁸ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1874 (Philadelphia, 1874), 28. John F. Philips and William Chrisman accompanied Brookes to present the request.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 26-30; Williams, Brookes, 109-10.

¹¹⁰ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1877 (New York, 1877), 872.

¹¹¹ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1877 (New York, 1877), 872.

¹¹² "Rev. Mr. Foreman's Report," Missouri Presbyterian, 20 December 1867, p. 2.

¹¹³ In 1874, a majority of the southern-oriented Independent Synod voted to send a delegation to the southern Presbyterian Church in the United States for the purpose of seeking admission into that body. One Hundred Years, 15; White, Southern Presbyterian Leaders, 357; Ernest Trice Thompson, Presbyterians in the South Vols. 1-3 (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1973), 2:192-94. Some northern-oriented Presbyterian congregations sent a delegation to the 1874 northern general assembly meeting in St. Louis. Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1874 (Philadelphia, 1874), 28.

¹¹⁴ One Hundred Years, 15; White, Southern Presbyterian Leaders, 357; Ernest Trice Thompson, Presbyterians in the South Vols. 1-3 (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1973), 2:192-94.

¹¹⁵ Mo. Const. of 1865, Art. I, §3.

¹¹⁶ Mo. Const. of 1865, Art. I, § 3; Missouri Constitutional Convention Journal, 25-26.

¹¹⁷ Mo. Const. of 1865, Art. IX, § 2; Missouri Constitutional Convention Journal, 196-99, 222.

¹¹⁸ Mo. Const. of 1865, Art. II, §18, Art IV, §§3,5, Art. V, §2; Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 14-35, 116-18.

¹¹⁹ Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 14-35, 116-18; Greene, Missouri's Black Heritage, 58, 93-98.

¹²⁰ Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 14-35, 116-18; Greene, Missouri's Black Heritage, 58, 93-98.

¹²¹ Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 108-38; Lorenzo J. Greene, Gary R. Kremer, Anthony F. Holland, Missouri's Black Heritage (St. Louis: Forum Press, 1980), 81-88; Lawrence O. Christensen, "Schools for Blacks: J. Milton Turner in Reconstruction Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 76 (January 1982): 121-135; Richard B. Foster, "Some Aspects of Black Education in Reconstruction Missouri: An Address by Richard B. Foster," edited by Antonio F. Holland and Gary R. Kremer, Missouri Historical Review 92.4 (July 1998): 407-420.

¹²² This policy differed from that the bureau adopted in most of the slaveholding states of the former Confederacy. Ira Berlin, Steven F. Miller, Joseph P. Reidy, Leslie S. Rowland, eds., The Wartime Genesis of Free Labor: The Upper South, Series 1, Volume 2 Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 551-64.

¹²³ University of Virginia, "Historical Census Browser."

¹²⁴ Baptist Home Missions, 402-3.

¹²⁵ "Local Pastors in Council," Missouri Democrat, 10 October 1865, p. 2.

¹²⁶ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 758.

¹²⁷ After the war, the ABHMS once again sent missionaries to the South to labor among the freedmen while establishing a number of educational institutions. Baptist Home Missions in North America. . . 1832-1882 (New York, 1883), 401-12.

Only in 1864 were the Western Missionary Baptist Convention and Southern Missionary Baptist Convention formed to work in the South and West. In 1866 the two conventions merged to form the Consolidated American Baptist Missionary Convention. The Consolidated Convention struggled because many black Baptists were unwilling to spend their resources outside of their

particular regions. Baptists in many western states, including Missouri, formed the Baptist General Association of the Western States and Territories in 1873. A New England Baptist Missionary Convention was formed the next year [1874]. Black Baptists were unwilling to contribute funds to the white-dominated Consolidated American Baptist Missionary Convention for evangelical work outside of Missouri. Alberta D. Shipley and David O. Shipley, A History of Black Baptists in Missouri : National Baptist Convention, USA, INC. (Kansas City, Mo: Missionary Baptist State Convention of Missouri, 1976), 30-34.

¹²⁸ Rev. William L. Harris, D. D., ed., Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Held in Chicago Ill., 1868 (New York, 1868), 571-73.

¹²⁹ Morrow, Northern Methodism and Reconstruction, 134-42.

¹³⁰ Missouri Statesman, 7 June 1867, p. 2. The accused were Benjamin F. DeWolf, Levi McCormack, Joseph McAdoo, William Blair, Julia Brewer, Elisha Brewer, S. P. Manbooker.

¹³¹ Presbyterian Church in the USA Presbytery of Ozark, Pamphlet 1890, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, Collection R1191.

¹³² This church received African Americans into the 1880s. Concord Presbyterian Church, Callaway County, Missouri, Records, 1833-1935, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1349, pp. 104, 112, 116, 141.

¹³³ Listed as a slave in 1859, Maria was disciplined in 1859 for an incident in which she assaulted her owner and ruling elder Jack Berry and lambasted the minister J. P. Findley. She was suspended and reentered the congregation in 1860. Maria appears to have remained a member in good standing after the Civil War. Mount Horeb Presbyterian Church, Monroe County, Missouri, Record Book, 1852-1875, Collection 1355, pp. 29-31, 34, 380-81; Andrew E. Murray, Presbyterians and the Negro- A History (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1966), 117-18, 150, 170, 177-81.

¹³⁴ Union Memorial United Methodist Church (1996).

¹³⁵ George E. Stevens, "History of the Central Baptist Church," 1846-1926," State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, Collection sl28, pp. 6-9, 12-14. Quote is from p. 14. S. P. Anderson, who was still living when the history was compiled, provided a large amount of information for it.

¹³⁶ Gaston H. Wamble, "Negroes and Missouri Protestant Churches Before and After the Civil War," Missouri Historical Review 61.3 (April 1967).

¹³⁷ Alberta D. Shipley and David O. Shipley, A History of Black Baptists in Missouri : National Baptist Convention, USA, INC. (Kansas City, Mo: Missionary Baptist State Convention of Missouri, 1976), 182.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 181-82.

¹³⁹ Grand Prairie Baptist Church, pp. 142-59.

¹⁴⁰ Cold Water Baptist Church, St. Louis County, Missouri, Record Book, 1809-1871, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1296, p. 15.

¹⁴¹ Log Providence Missionary Baptist Church (1990), 1.

¹⁴² "Our Church In Illinois," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 June 1870, p. 4.

-
- ¹⁴³ “Baptist Church – Colored,” Missouri Statesman, 23 September 1870, p. 3.
- ¹⁴⁴ Log Providence Church, 1-2.
- ¹⁴⁵ Second Baptist Church (Neosho, Mo.) Centennial Booklet, 1976, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, Collection R821, pp. 5, 10.
- ¹⁴⁶ William Black, Slave Narratives, George P. Rawick, Papers, University Archives, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Box 32, p. 2, at <http://www.umsl.edu/~munsr/focus/good/slaves/black.htm>, accessed 13 August 2011.
- ¹⁴⁷ Charles Spenser Smith, D. D., A History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church . . . (Philadelphia, 1922), 29, 37, 98, 108, 116.
- ¹⁴⁸ Shipley, Black Baptists in Missouri, 247.
- ¹⁴⁹ Missouri Statesman, 20 October 1871, p. 3.
- ¹⁵⁰ C. H. Phillips, The History of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America . . . (Jackson, Tn., 1898), 26.
- ¹⁵¹ In 1870, the efforts of white southern Methodists to retain some measure of influence over their recently freed black co-denominationalists prompted them to establish the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church. While this was an independent denomination located largely in the Deep South during the nineteenth century, the other Methodist churches condemned it as a continuation of the pre-war caste system that ensured the subservience of blacks within the church. This denomination is now known as the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church. C. W. Phillips, The History of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America: Comprising its Organization, Subsequent Development and Present Status (Jackson, Tenn.: 1898), 23-33; Raymond R. Sommerville, Jr., An Ex-Colored Church: Social Activism in the CME Church, 1870-1970 (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2004), 1-2, 16.
- ¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 27,71; Raymond R. Sommerville, Jr., An Ex-Colored Church: Social Activism in the CME Church, 1870-1970 (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2004), 37-44.
- ¹⁵³ Shipley, Black Baptists in Missouri, 175.
- ¹⁵⁴ Duncan, History of the Baptists in Missouri, 758.
- ¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 758-59; Shipley, Black Baptists in Missouri, 39-42.
- ¹⁵⁶ “From the St. Louis Republican: The Colored Baptists,” Missouri Statesman, 6 November 1874, p.1; Shipley, Black Baptists in Missouri, 31.
- ¹⁵⁷ Zoar Baptist Church, p. 8.
- ¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 19.
- ¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-21.
- ¹⁶⁰ Rufus Burrow, Jr., James H. Cone and Black Liberation Theology (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1994), 153-54; James H. Cone, Black Theology and Black Power (New York: Seabury Press, 1969); A Black Theology of Liberation (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1970).
- ¹⁶¹ According to Campbell, black ministers organized separate black church, black schools, black economic enterprises, benevolent societies, and fraternal orders. James T. Campbell, Songs of Zion: The African American Methodist Church in the United States and South Africa (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 54. Middle-class black women organized missionary

societies, which provided job training, literacy, education, improved living conditions, fundraising for African missions, wrote religious newspaper, and also promoted white Victorian ideals of true womanhood. Peter Kolchin, American Slavery, 1619-1877 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 222, et seq.

¹⁶² Central Baptist Church, 12.

¹⁶³ See Judges 4:6-15, Matthew 17: 1-9, Mark 9: 2-8, Luke 9:28-36.

¹⁶⁴ Moses Dickson, International 777 Order of Twelve 333 of Knights and Daughters of Tabor (St. Louis, 1894); *Ibid.*, Manual of the International Order of Twelve of Knights and Daughters of Tabor (St. Louis, 1891); Greene, Missouri's Black Heritage, 95-96; Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 320. For a discussion of black Masons in Missouri see Gary R. Kremer, "The World of Make-Believe: James Milton Turner and Black Masonry," Missouri Historical Review, 74.1 (October 1979): 50-71.

¹⁶⁵ William Monks, A History of Northern Arkansas and Southern Missouri . . . (West Plains, Mo, 1907), 207-29; Parrish, A History, 281.

¹⁶⁶ "Missouri History Not Found in Textbooks," 258-60. Some who were not obviously affiliated with the Ku Klux Klan harassed black churches and schools. In 1875, for example, Alexander Miller, a white man, was prosecuted in the circuit court for Dade County, situated in the southwest part of the state, for disturbing worship at a newly-established school for "colored children." State of Missouri v. Alexander Miller, Folder 022, Box 27, Case No. 285, Dade County Circuit Court Case Files, 1857-1899, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri. For case detail, see the Missouri Judicial Index Database at <http://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/judiciary/allcourts/detail.asp?rID=81949>.

¹⁶⁷ "Missouri Ku Klux Rampant," New York Times, 27 December 1871.

¹⁶⁸ "More Than Was Bargained For," Liberty Tribune, 24 November 1871, p. 2.

¹⁶⁹ "The Ku Klux Bill," Ironton County Register, 22 June 1872, p. 2.

¹⁷⁰ "The Ku-Klux Outrages," *ibid.*, 14 August 1872, p. 3.

¹⁷¹ "News of the Week," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 15 April 1868, p. 6.

¹⁷² "New England Methodists," Hannibal Clipper, 5 April, 1877, p. 1.

¹⁷³ "A Ku-Klux Sensation," Cape Girardeau Weekly Argus, 30 July 1868, p. 1.

¹⁷⁴ "The Negroes and the Ku-Klux," Liberty Tribune, 26 February, 1869, p. 1.

¹⁷⁵ Blum, Reforging the White Republic, 87-91.

¹⁷⁶ Morrow, Northern Methodism and Reconstruction, 242-43.

¹⁷⁷ Methodist historian W. H. Lewis specifically explained this occurrence in his history of the MECS during the 1860s. Lewis, Methodism in Missouri, 228. In 1874, the MEC and MECS reestablished "fraternal" relations, that is, they agree, at least, to communicate with one another. Ellwood K. Smith, "Background and Consequences of Methodist Union," Methodist History, 2, no. 2, (January, 1964): 7-9. Reunification occurred in 1939 as both branches merged, along with the Methodist Protestant Church, to form the Methodist Church (now the United Methodist Church).

¹⁷⁸ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 141.

-
- ¹⁷⁹ ‘Our Synod and the Southern Assembly,’ Old School Presbyterian, 6 March 1874, p. 2.
- ¹⁸⁰ ‘The Northern Assembly,’ *ibid.*, 5 June 1874, p. 2; ‘Not the Truth,’ *ibid.*, 19 June 1874, p. 2.
- ¹⁸¹ ‘The Bitter Spirit in the Northern Church,’ *ibid.*, 3 July 1874, p. 2. In 1875, the newly-established northern Presbyterian St. Louis Evangelist conveyed the view that southern Presbyterians were not averse to keeping lines of communication open with their northern brethren. And in Palmyra, church documents show that Duncan Brown served both northern and southern Presbyterians. ‘Religious News,’ St. Louis Evangelist, February 1875, p. 13.
- ¹⁸² ‘Our Church In Illinois,’ St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 June 1870, p. 4.
- ¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 25 September 1865, p. 5.
- ¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 6-7.
- ¹⁸⁵ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:27.
- ¹⁸⁶ ‘The Murder of Rev. Augustus H. F. Payne,’ Liberty Tribune, 1 July 1870, p. 1.
- ¹⁸⁷ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 2:9.
- ¹⁸⁸ ‘The Murder of Rev. Augustus H. F. Payne,’ Liberty Tribune, 1 July 1870, p. 1.
- ¹⁸⁹ There can be no doubt that the Klan conceived of itself, at least by 1868, as a secret vigilante group designed to restore white supremacy – and that bona fide evangelical articles of faith provided no justification whatsoever for the brutal tactics that Klansmen employed to achieve this goal. Even so, well-educated Klan founders, such as Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest, quite naturally drew on pro-slavery Protestantism and related understandings of social, economic, and political organization to place the founding of the organization in the best possible public light. In its 1868 founding document, in which Missouri was set out as one of fourteen ‘jurisdictions,’ introductory language declared that ‘We. . . reverentially acknowledge the majesty and supremacy of the Divine Being and recognize the goodness and providence of the same. And we recognize our relation to the United States government, the supremacy of the Constitution, the constitutional laws thereof, and the Union of states there under.’ Potential new members were to be asked whether they opposed ‘the principles and policy of the Radical Party, and. . . the Loyal League and the Grand Army of the Republic’ and whether they had fought against the South during the ‘late war.’ New recruits were also to be asked if they ‘opposed. . . Negro equality both social and political’ and whether they favored ‘white man’s government in this country. . . re-enfranchisement and emancipation of the white men of the South, and the restitution of the Southern people to all their rights, alike proprietary, civil, and political. . . .’ Historian Eric Foner argues that the Klan was, at least in the Deep South, a military force in the service of a planter-dominated Democrat Party. But he also maintains that, while its goal was primarily political in the traditional sense, it also sought to preserve, as much as possible, antebellum power relations in public and private life, including the subordination of African Americans. Organization and Principles of the Ku Klux Klan (1868), in Henry Steele Commager and Milton Cantor, eds., Documents of American History: To 1898 (Upper Saddle River: N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1988); Foner, Reconstruction, 425-26. See also Allen W. Trelease, White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 3-48, 55-56.

¹⁹⁰ Postwar northern modulations of orthodox northern Protestant moral philosophy, Presbyterian minister and president of Oberlin College James H. Fairchild such as that rendered by embraced abolitionist preachments that declared slaveholding to be sinful – and clarified that the traditional moral duties and rights specific to the relation of “master and servant” had never applied to the relation “master and slave.” Presbyterian minister and president of Oberlin College James H. Fairchild, in his post-bellum treatise, pointed to slavery as the prime example of an odious abridgment of liberty in utter contradiction to natural theology and divine law. In his estimation, furthermore, those who had too strenuously advocated slavery exemplified how deep-seated moral error led to unpatriotic sentiment and disloyalty. In Moral Philosophy, or, the Science of Obligation (1869), Fairchild wrote that “The earnest opponents of slavery have been, in past years, under great temptation. They were in danger of failing to appreciate the real value of the government, and of assailing slavery, by acts and measures, scarcely consistent with patriotism. It is the common danger of those who rise up against a wrong sustained by government.” James H. Fairchild, Moral Philosophy, or, the Science of Obligation (1869), 270. Northern moralists came under pressure to reconcile the free-market and pro-capitalistic principles undergirding the Republican party with the greed and corruption that appeared to have run rampant in the federal government during the administration of Ulysses S. Grant. Allen C. Guelzo, “‘The Science of Duty’: Moral Philosophy and the Epistemology of Science in Nineteenth-Century America,” David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, Mark A. Noll, eds., Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective (New York and Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1999), 282-86.

The antebellum moral philosophy of such theologians as Richard Henderson Rivers and James Henley Thornwell had included within the traditional organic understanding of society, and its network of relations, that of master and slave. Postwar orthodox moral philosophy in the former slave states continued to support this conceptual framework. According to Edward Blum, these writing allowed the educated elite in the South to continue to believe in the sanctity of its lost social order. Southern Presbyterian minister Robert Lewis Dabney was among those theologians who perpetuated this view. Blum, Reforging the White Republic. Dabney, in his 1869 Practical Philosophy, for instance, was unwilling to admit any sanctity in the abolitionist’s use of scripture to condemn slavery, mentioning among others, Francis Wayland for holding to this position. For Dabney, using scripture to condemn slavery would put a person on a path “leading directly to infidelity.” Robert Lewis Dabney, The Practical Philosophy. . . (Mexico, Mo: 1897), 415.

Baptist divine Richard Fuller, one of the founders of the Southern Baptist Convention, did not retract his antebellum actions in any of his postwar sermons. Richard Fuller (1804-1876), Sermons by Richard Fuller, preached during his ministry with the Seventh and Eutaw place Baptist churches, Baltimore, 1847-1876 (Baltimore: J. F. Weishampel, 1877).

James H. Cuthbert, who published a biography of Fuller in 1879 attempted to recap the widely-publicized debate over slavery that his subject had with Francis Wayland. Cuthbert prefaced his discussion with the notion that Fuller’s hard-fought arguments on the institution were in good faith even though the issue was settled with the war. James H. Cuthbert, Life of Richard Fuller (New York: Sheldon & Co., 1879), 152-59.

-
- ¹⁹¹ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 4-5.
- ¹⁹² St. Louis Christian Advocate, 13 January 1875, p. 1.
- ¹⁹³ Grace C. Avery and Floyd C. Shoemaker, comps. and eds., The Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of the State of Missouri, vol. 4, (Columbia: State Historical Society of Missouri, 1924), 53.
- ¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 64.
- ¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 256.
- ¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 80.
- ¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 283.
- ¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 407, 502, 515, 538, 548.
- ¹⁹⁹ Galusha Anderson, "The Test Oath of Missouri," The Baptist Quarterly, 1, (July, 1867): 297-98.
- ²⁰⁰ "Up North – No. 6," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 17 October 1866, p. 1.
- ²⁰¹ "Local News," Liberty Tribune, 10 August 1866, p. 2.
- ²⁰² "The Great Question," *ibid.*, 13 April 1866, p. 2.
- ²⁰³ Parrish, A History, 193-94; Tucker, Methodism in Missouri.
- ²⁰⁴ Lewis, Methodism in Missouri, 197-98.
- ²⁰⁵ Yeaman, History of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 159.
- ²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁰⁷ Duncan, History of Baptists in Missouri, 452.
- ²⁰⁸ William E. Parrish, A History of Missouri. Volume III. 1860 To 1875 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973) 194.
- ²⁰⁹ Miller, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 143-44.
- ²¹⁰ Leftwich, Martyrdom in Missouri, 4-5.
- ²¹¹ "[B]ut the All-wise Creator knows, independently, every thing [sic] great and small which is still in the future." "Sermon," *ibid.*, 15 March 1866, p. 1.
- ²¹² Grace C. Avery and Floyd C. Shoemaker, comps. and eds., The Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of the State of Missouri, vol. 5, (Columbia: State Historical Society of Missouri, 1924), 26, 70.
- ²¹³ Riddle, Memoir of Brookes, 148.
- ²¹⁴ The incipient challenges posed by positivism and science were also considerable. But evangelical religion appeared to have forfeited its traditional leading role because of what seemed to be permanent doctrinal confusion among evangelicals over the basic meanings of morality, good citizenship, and the public good. See Schweiger, "Mark A. Noll's 'The Civil War as a Theological Crisis,'" 29-34; Noll, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis, 159-62
- ²¹⁵ John Patrick Daly, When Slavery was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery and the Causes of the Civil War (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 154.
- ²¹⁶ William McKendree Prottzman, Sermons of the Late Rev. William McKendree Prottzman . . . (Fayette, Mo., 1903), 33. Text of Revelations 6: 9-11: And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony

which they held: And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled. The Holy Bible: King James Version.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 35.

²¹⁸ Bertram Wyatt-Brown, Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South, Oxford University Press, 1982), 25-26, 99-108.

²¹⁹ A radicalized set of evangelical articles of faith and related socio-political ideas had undergirded the agenda of abolitionists and Radical Republicans. This distinctive amalgam sought to reconcile natural theology, scripture, and traditional Protestant moral philosophy with a cluster of beliefs and goals grounded in natural law claims to universal social and political equality. Set up against this ideological juggernaut had been the militantly conservative natural theology, scriptural exegesis, and related moral philosophy of pro-slavery evangelicals in the South, a body of religious, social, and political thought they configured to justify and perpetuate a race-based hierarchical and organic social order. Notwithstanding Union victory, northern evangelical confidence in radicalized evangelical social and political reform collapsed after the war. National political leaders, secular thinkers, and ordinary citizens could perceive all too plainly that their implementation had played a major role in generating the deadly sectional conflict. The general public, including more than a few northern evangelicals, were both fatigued with reform and leery of its ominous capacity to destroy and disrupt. This was especially so as urban-based, mass circulation party newspapers advanced increasingly secular and “scientific” postulations of about social organization, human nature, and competitive free market capitalism. According to political historian Eric Sands, whose work focuses on Lincoln’s “public philosophy,” moderate and liberal Republicans responded by embracing what he calls “strategic interest politics.” This was an essentially pragmatic agenda that entailed substantial compromise of cardinal articles of faith and political principles advanced by former abolitionists and Radical Republicans. Eric C. Sands, American Public Philosophy and the Mystery of Lincolnism (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009), 158-204.

The concept of Divine Providence lost its capacity to inform northern understandings of social and political relations precisely in step with growing doubts about the social, civil, and political efficacy of the northern evangelical reform ideology of which the concept of divine intercession had always been an integral part. Sands reaches these conclusions with a systematic analysis of Abraham Lincoln’s “public philosophy.” In his view, this philosophy was grounded in natural rights, an augmentation of the principles of the founders, an egalitarian concept of universal brotherhood. Central to this philosophy was a narrative of Divine Providence. In his view, the notion of Providence was useful to Lincoln because he helped him to deal with the imperfections of humanity and fashion an understanding about the ultimate meaning and purposes of humankind in the world – a concept especially important during the carnage of the war. According to Sands, the philosophy of Lincoln failed as a consequence of his assassination,

Andrew Johnson's unsuccessful succession, and developments in philosophy and science that took place in the 1860s and 1870s. Ibid.

Joseph R. Fornieri argues that, in his speeches, Lincoln conveyed an understanding of statesmanship build on reflective patriotism enhanced by a republican love of liberty, all of which proceeded under God's providence. Joseph R. Fornieri, "Lincoln's Reflective Patriotism," Perspectives on Political Science, 39.2 (April-June 2010): 108-17.

In his study dealing with northern evangelicals during the Civil War, historian Sean A. Scott argues that Lincoln, perhaps even during the war, ultimately rejected the idea that he or anyone else could actually know that God was on the side of the Union. According to Scott, this understanding was significantly different from that to which many northern evangelicals subscribed during the war. Sean A. Scott, A Visitation of God: Northern Civilians Interpret the Civil War (Oxford University Press, 2011).

²²⁰ Ibid., 147-58; Carl E. Sanders, The Premillennial Faith of James Brookes: Reexamining the Roots of American Dispensationalism (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2001).

²²¹ Riddle, Memoir of Brookes, 148.

²²² Ibid., 147-58; Carl E. Sanders, The Premillennial Faith of James Brookes: Reexamining the Roots of American Dispensationalism (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2001).

²²³ Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 735.

²²⁴ "Northern and Southern Churches,"

²²⁵ "A Most Remarkable Letter," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 4 December 1867, p. 1.

²²⁶ "Sunday School Operations – No. 2," ibid., 27 November 1867, p. 1.

²²⁷ Columbia Statesman, 23 August 1867, p. 2.

²²⁸ The Democrats took control of the government of Missouri in early 1871. Radicals, former abolitionists, who had continued to press for suffrage for black men since the adoption of the 1865 Constitution, were heavily outnumbered at the polls. More than a few withdrew from the field of religious and political combat, some capitulated to the Democrats, and several simply left the state. A number of these reformers ultimately capitulated or left the state. Charles D. Drake took a position as Chief Justice of the United States Court of Claims in 1870. Knowing that his Radical movement was defeated, Drake resigned his senate seat early, but not before giving one last speech on the floor of the body defending his policies. The remnants of the Radicals soon merged with some Liberal Republicans. The Republican Party was able to hold onto power in a few scattered enclaves in St. Louis and in southwestern Missouri. Many Liberal Republicans began to cooperate with the Democrats. A few of their programs were adapted by the Democrats according to historian William Parrish. See Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 307-26. Democratic voting strength throughout central and southern Missouri was far superior to Republican strongholds in St. Louis and the western part of the state. Allying themselves with re-enfranchised ex-Confederates, Democrats regained virtually complete power over the government after 1874. Almost all of these men had been part of the pro-slavery anti-Benton wing of the Missouri Democratic Party before the Civil War, and their return to political

dominance was based on vehement public opposition to Radical economic policies and racist rhetoric that played on white fears of incipient African American social and economic equality. An election held in March 1874 authorized Missourians to select delegates for a constitutional convention. Shoemaker, Personal,” 64.

²²⁹ Shoemaker, Personal,” 64.

²³⁰ “No person shall be prosecuted in any civil action or criminal proceeding for or on account of any act by him done, performed or executed between the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and the twentieth day of August, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, by virtue of military authority vested in him, or in pursuance of orders from any person vested with such authority by the government of the United States, or of this State, or of the late Confederate States, or any of them to do such act. And if any action or proceeding shall have been, or shall hereafter be instituted against any person for the doing of any such act, the defendants may plead this section in bar thereof.” Sec. 2, Article XIV, Constitution of Missouri, 1875

The congressional Amnesty Act of May 22, 1872 removed office-holding disqualification against most of those who rebelled, except for some 500 military leaders of the Confederacy. The original restrictive act was passed by Congress in May 1866. The 1872 Act affected over 150,000 former Confederate troops. James A. Rawley, “The General Amnesty Act of 1872: A Note,” Mississippi Valley Historical Review 47.3 (1960): 480-84.

²³¹ The phrase “unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it” had appeared in the 1820 and 1865 constitutions. Christensen and Kremer, A History, 3.

²³² Lawrence O. Christensen and Gary R. Kremer, A History of Missouri. Volume IV 1875-1919 (Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press, 1977), 2.

²³³ Secs. 43-56, Article IV, Constitution of Missouri, 1875; Christensen & Kremer, A History, 3.

²³⁴ “That there cannot be in this State either slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.” Sec. 31, Bill of Rights, Constitution of Missouri, 1875.

²³⁵ Suffrage and Elections, Secs. 1-12, Article VIII, Constitution of Missouri, 1875.

²³⁶ “Separate free public schools shall be established for the education of children of African descent.” Sec. 3, Article XI, Constitution of Missouri, 1875.

²³⁷ Floyd C. Shoemaker, “Personal of the Convention,” Isidor Loeb, Floyd C. Shoemaker, eds., Journal Missouri Constitutional Convention 1875 (Columbia, Mo., 1920), 65-67; William E. Parrish, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 1865-1870 (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1965), 323-26.

²³⁸ Harvey, Equalization After Freedom, 75-76.

²³⁹ Daniel W. Stowell, “Why ‘Redemption’?: Religion and the End of Reconstruction, 1869-1877,” in Edward J. Blum, W. Scott Poole, eds., Vale of Tears: New Essays on Religion and Reconstruction (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2005), 133-46; Daniel W. Stowell, Rebuilding Zion: The Religious Reconstruction of the South, 1863-1877 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

²⁴⁰ Shoemaker, Personal,” 64.

²⁴¹ Preamble, Constitution of Missouri, 1875.

²⁴² “That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no person can, on account of his religious opinions, be rendered ineligible to any office of trust or profit under this State, nor be disqualified from testifying, or from serving as a juror; that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no person out, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate, on account of his religious persuasion or profession; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured, shall be not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, nor to justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of this State, or with the rights of others.” Sec. 5, Bill of Rights, Constitution of Missouri, 1875.

“That no person can be compelled to erect, support or attend any place or system of worship, or to maintain or support any priest, minister, preacher or teacher of any sect, church, creed or denomination of religion; but if any person shall voluntarily make a contract for such object, he shall be held to the performance of the same.” Sec. 6, Bill of Rights, Constitution of Missouri, 1875.

“That no law shall be passed impairing the freedom of speech; that every person shall be free to say, write or publish whatever he will on any subject, being responsible for all abuse of that liberty; and that in all suits and prosecutions for libel the truth thereof may be given in evidence, and the jury, under the direction of the court, shall determine the law and the fact.” Sec. 14, Bill of Rights, Constitution of Missouri 1875.

²⁴³ A provision of the 1865 Missouri Constitution had disqualified disloyal church property trustees, empowering Unionist evangelicals to consolidate and build on the gains they had made at the expense of their southern brethren during the war. Anyone who had supported the Confederacy was prohibited from “holding any real estate, or other property, in trust for the use of any church, religious society, or congregation.” Mo. Const. of 1865, art. II, § 3.

As a result, any trustee who had been disloyal could be ousted from his position within his congregation. This provision thus allowed Unionist elements to retain control of church property they had acquired during the war at the expense of their pro-Confederate counterparts. Equally important, it empowered Unionist factions take control of all remaining congregational property in the state at the expense of their now disqualified brethren. John W. Whitehead, “Tax Exemptions and Churches: A Historical and Constitutional Analysis,” Cumberland Law Review, 22, no. 3 (1991-92): 536-42.

Cumming v. Missouri, 71 U.S. 277 (1867).

The Test Oath had declared, in part, that no “person be competent as a bishop, priest, deacon, minister, elder, or other clergyman of any religious persuasion, sect or denomination, to teach, or preach, or solemnize marriages, unless such person shall have first taken, subscribed and filed said oath.” Mo. Const. of 1865, art. I, § 9.

The 1865 Constitution included the following provision: “At any election held by the people under this Constitution, or in pursuance of any law of this State, or under any ordinance or by-

law of any municipal corporation, no person shall be deemed a qualified voter, who has ever been in armed hostility to the United States, or to the lawful authorities thereof, . . . or been in the service, of the so-called “Confederate States of America” . . . nor shall any such person be capable of holding, in this State, any office of honor, trust, or profit, under its authority; or of being an officer, councilman, director, trustee, or other manager of any corporation, public or private, now existing or hereafter established by its authority; or of acting as a professor or teacher in any educational institution, or in any common or other school; or of holding any real estate, or other property, in trust for the use of any church, religious society, or congregation”. Mo. Const. of 1865, art. II, § 3.

²⁴⁴ “That every gift, sale, or devise of land to any minister, public teacher, or preacher of the Gospel, as such, or to any religious sect, order, or denomination; or to or for the support, use, or benefit of, or in trust for, any minister, public teacher, or preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any religious sect, order, or denomination; and every gift or sale of goods or chattels to go in succession, or to take place after the death of the seller or donor, to or for such support, use, or benefit; and also every devise of goods or chattels, to or for the support, use, or benefit of any minister, public teacher, or preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any religious sect, order, or denomination shall be void; except always any gift, sale, or devise of land to a church, religious society or congregation, or to any person or persons in trust for the use of a church, religious society or congregation, whether incorporated or note, for the uses and purposes, and within the limitations of the next preceding clause of this Article.” Sec. 18, Declaration of Rights, Constitution of Missouri, 1865.

According to the Address to the People explaining the key innovations in the Bill of Rights, “All the proscriptive features of the present Bill of Rights have been abolished, such forfeiture of estates for treason, and the provision which prevents gifts of any kind to religious denominations, or to trustees for their use. . . .” Address to the People of Missouri, New Constitution of the State of Missouri, Adopted in Convention August 2, 1875; and an Ordinance Prohibiting the Payment of Missing Railroad Bonds Also the Address of the Convention to the People of the State. Election: Saturday, October 30, 1875 (Jefferson City: Regan & Carter, State Printers and Binders, 1875), pp. 49, 49-55.

²⁴⁵ The 1875 Constitution held “That no religious corporation can be established in this State, except such as may be created under a general law for the purpose only of holding the title to such real estate as may be prescribed by law for church edifices, parsonages and cemeteries.” Sec. 8, Bill of Rights, Constitution of Missouri, 1875.

The 1865 Constitution of Missouri allowed the state the power to tax church property, provisions that Drake and others intended to use to damage the Catholic Church.

Article One, Section Twelve of the constitution limited church lands to five acres in the country and one acre in town. Section Thirteen limited gifts and sales of property to the regulations in the previous section. The controversial effort to authorize church taxation failed to pass the Missouri state legislature and was eventually abandoned.

Mo. Const. of 1865, art. 1, § 12-13. Radical officials could have used the new taxing power to punish disloyal evangelical congregations. States and the federal government, nonetheless, continued the tax exemptions for ecclesiastical properties in the postwar period in most places outside of Missouri. John W. Whitehead, "Tax Exemptions and Churches: A Historical and Constitutional Analysis," Cumberland Law Review, 22, no. 3 (1991-92): 536-42.

According to the 1875 Constitution, "The property, real and personal, of the State, counties and other municipal corporations, and cemeteries, shall be exempt from taxation. Lots in corporate cities or towns, or within one mile of the limits of any such city or town, to the extent of one acre, and lots one mile or more distant from such cities or towns, to the extent of five acres, with the buildings thereon, may be exempted from taxation when the same are used exclusively for religious worship, for schools, or for purposes purely charitable; also, such property, real or personal, as may be used exclusively for Agricultural or Horticultural Societies: Provided, That such exemptions shall be only by general law." Sec. 6, Article X, Constitution of Missouri, 1875; Shoemaker, Personal," 64.

²⁴⁶ The 1875 Constitution held that "No corporation, company or association, other than those formed for benevolent, religious, scientific or educational purposes, shall be created or organized under the laws of this State, unless the persons named as corporators shall, at or before the filing of the articles of association or incorporation, pay into the State treasury fifty dollars, for the first fifty thousand dollars or less of capital stock, and a first sum of five dollars for every additional ten thousand dollars of it capital stock. And no such corporation, company or association shall increase its capital stock without first paying into the treasury five dollars for every ten thousand dollars of increase: Provided, That nothing contained in this sectional shall be construed to prohibit the General Assembly from levying a further tax on the franchise of such corporation. Sec. 21, Article X, Constitution of Missouri, 1875

²⁴⁷ The 1865 constitution had placed intense pressures on the Catholic clergy to dispose of most of the church property in the state or convey it to lay Catholics deemed loyal by state officials. See discussion in Chapter Seven.

²⁴⁸ The 1875 Constitution provided as follows: "Neither the General Assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any religious creed, church or sectarian purpose; or to help to support or sustain any private or public school, academy, seminary, college, university or other institution of learning, controlled by any religious creed, church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of personal property or real estate ever be made by the State, or any county, city, town or other municipal corporation, for any religious creed, church or sectarian purposes whatever. Mo. Const. of 1875, art. II, § 11.

Chapter Nine

Faiths under Siege, Jim Crow, and the Making of a White Evangelical Midwest

In October 1884, Baptists from across Missouri met in the central Missouri town of Marshall for the annual meeting of the State Baptist General Association. Situated in the “Little Dixie” County of Saline, the gathering of Baptist congregational leaders in the state was no ordinary event, but rather the fiftieth anniversary of an organization that had, for almost two decades, included not only southern Baptist congregations but northern ones as well. Honored guests and white-headed ministers and laity took their turns at the podium, delivering sermons and addresses that highlighted the stunning successes of the consolidated General Association and the history of the denomination in Missouri going back to the late eighteenth century. The women and men who filled the opulent Marshall First Baptist Church heard how their denominational forbears had heroically braved the wilderness of the western frontier to spread the Gospel. The presentation of northern Baptist minister, former abolitionist, and editor of the Christian Repository Samuel Howard Ford astonished the youth in attendance with his discussion of the striking differences between contemporary Baptist preachers and their 1830s counterparts. According to Ford, “The man of scholarship and refined taste often preached with the man dressed in a hunting-shirt and scarcely able to read his text.”¹ Also set to speak was southern Baptist minister Benjamin George Tutt of Liberty, Clay County, situated on the western border with Kansas, where pro-slavery Missouri “Border Ruffians” and abolitionist Kansas Jayhawkers had, only twenty-five years earlier harped on one another with a zeal that had shocked the nation. All the older divines in attendance could easily recall that Tutt had famously preached in defiance of the Test Oath imposed by Radicals on suspect southern clerics during

Reconstruction. But, once at the lectern, the Reverend Tutt could only agree with Brother Ford. In his words, “Our religious growth has been as great as our material prosperity.”²

Those in attendance through the several days of the General Association meeting heard virtually nothing at all about the 1844 schism that had prompted most Baptist congregations in the state to abandon the Baptist Triennial Convention and the American Baptist Home Mission Society and to affiliate with the Southern Baptist Association. Much less did they hear about partisan vigilantes who harped on Baptist ministers in the late 1850s and 1860s. Avoided altogether were references to the defunct Unionist Baptist State Convention, which had, in the late 1860s, set up loyalty to the Union and conscientious objection to slavery, or sincere repentance for failing in this connection, as criteria for membership and eternal salvation. The sermons and addresses featured no reminiscences about pro-Radical ministers such as the State Convention’s first moderator, Galusha Anderson. Instead, southern Baptist minister Wiley J. Patrick recalled the Reverend Thomas Fristoe, whose courageous wife had raised a black flag at Union soldiers in the town of Columbia during the darkest days of the war. Standing before a statue dedicated to the Confederate dead, he also reminded the audience that the God-fearing southern Baptists who had supported the Confederacy had, like their northern counterparts, fought bravely from sincere religious convictions, albeit hopelessly outnumbered. Gazing at the marble representation of a Confederate sword and scroll, he closed with heartfelt words: “The sword was broken, but the scroll, the history, the honor was preserved.” Given that the overwhelming majority of Baptist ministers and laity in attendance were of the southern persuasion, the northern brothers and sisters, quite likely, had little choice but observe the solemnity of the moment. On the other hand, the Reverend Patrick praised, with equal sincerity and eloquence, as had all the other speakers, the great missionaries from further east and north

who had made equally monumental sacrifices and efforts to establish and build the Baptist faith in Missouri decades before the sectional conflict.³

Baptist leaders distributed reports of the General Association meeting across the state, to Baptists and non-Baptists alike. Regular newspapers, such as the Columbia Missouri Statesman and the Jefferson City Daily Tribune, gave full coverage to the reportage.⁴ The most impressive sermons given at the conference were compiled and printed in a volume to be sold across the state and further east. Notwithstanding the Confederate eulogy presented by the Reverend Patrick, most of the ministers hoped that, by providing these texts to the general public, every thoughtful man would appreciate and remember well the hallowed sacrifices made by the builders of the Baptist Church in Missouri “and thus acquaint himself with the philosophy of progress, and arm himself and his co-workers with mightier weapons of warfare against the powers of darkness. And through these instrumentalities our beloved cause will keep pace with the social and material progress of this great central state of a mighty republic.”⁵

That the consolidated General Association provided a once-a-year venue for both northern and southern Baptist congregations certainly distinguished the meeting from similar ones convened by Missouri Methodists and Presbyterians in the closing years of the nineteenth century. The MEC and the MECS on the one hand, and the southern Presbyterian Church and the northern Presbyterian Church on the other, remained totally separate ecclesiastical organizations in the state. But given the relatively small contingent of northern Baptists at the 1884 meeting of the General Association, its commemorative rites suggest rather well how the two Presbyterian and two Methodist denominations presented their histories to themselves, one another, and to the general public in the period.

At commemorative gatherings, but more often in printed publications, white evangelicals in Gilded Age Missouri lauded their religious forbears in ways that typically glossed over the schisms that had sundered each denomination and, in some cases, individual congregations. Amid destabilizing socioeconomic transformation, the darkening backdrop of secular ideas, such as Darwinism and biblical criticism, and amid explosive urban growth, waves of Roman Catholic immigration, and the scourge of rampant intemperance, white evangelical leaders saw little advantage in emphasizing their common grievances, or even their persistent ecclesiastical divisions. Commemorative writings and ritual occasions thus typically obscured the bloody strife and contention over correct theology and social order that had left churches in turmoil during the Civil War and Reconstruction. Honored speakers and chroniclers, instead, most often offered encomiums to the pioneer evangelists who had transformed the polity from a howling, God-forsaken trans-Mississippi wilderness into a stable, prosperous, and democratic Middle-Western polity, indeed, an All-American “center state” where evangelical Protestantism had, aside from some troublesome irregularities at mid-century, generally prevailed from the beginning of Anglo-Saxon settlement.

Thesis

Notwithstanding voluminous immigration from the Northeast and rapid urban growth after Reconstruction, there were three times as many southern evangelicals than northern ones in Missouri by 1900. Rural evangelical congregations, however, grew increasingly distant from more worldly and wealthy urban congregations. Black church leaders, along with their congregants, denounced and resisted the imposition of racial segregation after 1875. And African American men voted to the end of the nineteenth century, while black church-goers continued to

cultivate their independent Methodist and Baptist congregations and improve educational opportunities for their youth.

The socioeconomic revolution that Radical Republicans wrought from 1861 to 1900 engendered a siege mentality among white Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in the state. Northern and southern evangelicals perceived that massive immigration of Roman Catholic immigrants posed a dire threat to Protestantism. White evangelicals perceived socioeconomic changes attendant on rapid industrialization and urban explosive growth as a fundamental threat to the authority and cohesiveness of their families, churches, and communities. Most worrisome to them was the rapidly declining effects of religion in the lives of church members, which they attributed to growing worldliness and new secular ideas, such as Darwinism and the new biblical criticism emanating from the urban Northeast.

The lingering resentment of abolitionism among southern evangelicals redoubled their opposition to the use of government power to promote liberal evangelical social ideals, a position that a substantial number of northern evangelicals also adopted in the decades following Reconstruction. But evangelical opposition to state-imposed reform shaped the response of white church-goers and elected officials to radical and destabilizing socioeconomic transformation. A revitalized temperance crusade ultimately bound white northern and southern evangelicals together in spite of their longstanding ecclesiastical divisions, theological disputes, and political differences. White evangelical leaders concluded that the greatest single evil threatening society was hard liquor, especially in the hands of self-indulgent and irresponsible men. Middle-class evangelical women in St. Louis took up the cause of rectifying drunken husbands and fathers before the end of Reconstruction and, by the 1880s, had turned the WCTU into a juggernaut for women's rights and liberal Social Gospel reform. Black ministers and congregants in Missouri

readily embraced organized temperance activism. But evangelical leaders who began calling for prohibition after 1880, in the circumstances, ran up against stiff resistance from those who feared government intrusion into matters of personal morality. Missouri residents ultimately configured their landscape “wet” or “dry” along the lines of a growing urban-rural divide.

Post-Civil War commemoration did not always serve to perpetuate sectional antagonisms. In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, evangelical chroniclers, memoirists, and autobiographers crafted accounts of Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist church development in Missouri that obscured the unsavory impulses that drove all evangelicals to support strongly the temperance campaign. These commemorative accounts papered over the intertwined theological and political controversies that had divided the three churches since the late 1830s and the militant strife that pitted northern and southern evangelicals against one another during the Civil War and Reconstruction. Most of the white evangelical chronicles refrained from discussing the African Americans who had abandoned the white churches, while prominently featuring anti-Roman Catholic diatribes. By the turn of the twentieth century, the histories and commemorative writings of northern and southern evangelicals had contributed substantially to the rise of a popular perception of Missouri as an All-American Middle Western state.

Literature Review

Traditional history scholarship dealing with the last quarter of the nineteenth century emphasizes how evangelicals reacted rather ineffectually to the increasing influence of Darwinism, biblical criticism, explosive urban growth, and an increasingly secular culture.⁶ But a more recent generation of scholars stresses the active role that white evangelicals played in developing reforms in response to these changes, such as the Social Gospel.⁷ Ralph E. Luker

maintains that white racist goals shaped this effort, while Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford emphasize that church women were central to Social Gospel reforms.⁸ Historian Randall J. Stephen argues that the former slaveholding states constituted the cradle of the Holiness Movement, whose adherents rejected the growing clericalism, worldliness, and materialism of the urban evangelical elite.⁹ Richard P. Callahan reveals that eastern Kentucky coal miners in the late nineteenth century found in Holiness-Pentecostal faiths a means to resist economic exploitation and preserve features of rural worship that mainstream denominations no longer offered.¹⁰ Historians have generally cast the temperance movement in the Gilded Age as a northern-based, urban evangelical reform that often met with stiff resistance from Roman Catholics.¹¹ The work of historians Paula C. Baker and Meg Opdycke Lamme explore how the Women's Christian Temperance Union began as a traditional evangelical moral suasion campaign before becoming a contentious effort to have government ban entirely the manufacture and sale of alcohol.¹²

Scholarship focusing on African American religion in the Gilded Age emphasizes how its adherents continued to form independent religious societies to promote African American equality, liberty, and prosperity.¹³ Edward J. Blum and others show that white evangelicals closed ranks along the lines of racial segregation in the last third of the nineteenth century.¹⁴ But historian James Bennett reveals that, while churches in New Orleans eventually segregated along racial lines, some of them had served as models of integration after the Civil War. He also demonstrates that some recently-freed African Americans had hoped to maintain these biracial congregations.¹⁵ Historian Kenneth Christmon shows that African Americans joined the temperance crusade, in part, because its northern advocates had once opposed slavery.¹⁶

Historian Cornelius L. Bynum stresses that some African American leaders drew selectively on the tenets of the Social Gospel to achieve distinctive goals for black communities.¹⁷

An abundance of history scholarship has explored the discursive construction of regional identities in the Gilded Age. This work shows that those advancing understandings of the “religion of the Lost Cause” did so to help white southerners cope with defeat, retain their veneration of the Confederacy, and perpetuate southern religious beliefs and related conceptions of civil polity.¹⁸ In his study focusing on the Grand Army of the Republic, Stuart McConnell discloses how that organization of Union veterans sought to reconcile its fervent nationalism with efforts to craft a collective memory of the Civil War that remained somewhat divisive.¹⁹ John Teaforde reveals that late-nineteenth century accounts of the rise of St. Louis, alongside Chicago and Cleveland, figured critically in the discursive creation of an urban Midwest that had always been the heart of American society and at the center of industrial progress.²⁰ Andrew Cayton and Peter Onuf stress that, in an increasingly pluralistic Middle West, memorials and local histories increasingly emphasized Anglo-American pioneer forbears.²¹ Richard Jensen maintains that accounts of the newly-invented region that emphasized the importance of Protestant religion had special power to animate white voters at least to the turn of the twentieth century.²²

Boom Time

The population of Missouri grew rapidly in the last decades of the nineteenth century, especially in the major urban areas of St. Louis and Kansas City. This growth was fueled in part by immigration from both the eastern United States and Europe. The state, now largely settled after the efforts by the Radicals during Reconstruction, saw its overall population growth slow from the previous fifty years after 1880. Urban areas like St. Louis and Kansas City, nonetheless,

posted significant gains after the end of Reconstruction. Missouri grew by 447,085 people in the 1870s to 2,168,380 – an uptick of about twenty-six percent. A little less than ten percent of this number, or 211,578, were listed by the census-takers as being foreign-born. Almost half of these men and women lived within the city of St. Louis, which also burgeoned to 350,518. Kansas City had 55,785 residents within its city limits. There were another 145,350 African Americans in Missouri, whose numbers increased slightly under the state average at twenty-two percent. Many of the population trends of the previous decade continued in the 1880s, especially with the growth in urban areas like St. Louis and Kansas City. By 1890 the state population saw a half-million upswing to 2,679,184, a twenty-four percent increase. The non-American-born population grew to 234,869, a slight increase. A large percentage still lived within the city of St. Louis, which added about 100,000 people to 451,770. Kansas City expanded its numbers to 132,716 over the previous decade, a 138 percent increase. Immigrants composed 8.8 percent of the state or 234,869 women and men – a ten percent increase. The African American population, however, only went to 150,184 during the 1880s and to 161,234 by 1900 as blacks migrated from Missouri. Overall, African Americans continued to have their most significant numbers in the urban areas as they moved to the cities in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Often forced into crowded ghettos, forty-seven percent of blacks lived in Missouri's urban areas in 1890, a figure jumping to fifty-five percent at the end of the century. At the same time, former-slave regions of the state continued to have significant, but diminished, black populations.²³

By the turn of the century, Missouri was the fifth most populous state in the nation, far surpassing the populations of most other former slave states. Missouri only trailed New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio in its total population. While the black population stagnated, there were 3,106,665 men in women in the state, a modest fourteen percent increase from 1890.

The census takers found fewer foreign-born women and men in 1900 as only 216,379 were listed as having been born outside of the United States, a nine percent decrease from 1890. Again, a large-percentage lived within the city of St. Louis – 111,356 or a little more than fifty-one percent. Unlike many of the other former slave states that were just beginning to see the formation of significant urban areas, Missouri’s status as a populous state was significantly enhanced by St. Louis. In 1900 St. Louis was the fourth largest city in the nation with a population of 575,238, a twenty-seven percent upswing from the previous decade. It had been the eighth largest city in America prior to the onset of the Civil War. Kansas City, the other large urban area in Missouri, grew by twenty-three percent to 163,752.²⁴

The Believing Multitude and a Growing Rural-Urban Divide

Notwithstanding voluminous immigration from the Northeast and rapid urban growth, there were three times as many southern evangelicals than northern ones in Missouri by 1900. The Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches grew slightly faster than the general population of the state. But northern and southern Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians in Missouri remained ecclesiastically divided as they had been at the end of Reconstruction at least until the end of the nineteenth century.²⁵ From 1876 through 1900, the Methodist and Baptist churches remained the two largest Protestant denominations. But the Roman Catholic Church had, by 1900, numerically eclipsed the Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church, the Disciples of Christ, and the Episcopal Church.²⁶ And a number of congregations flourished that were affiliated with other denominations, including the Christian Union Church; Church of God; Church of Christ, Scientist; Congregational Church; German Baptist Brethren; German Evangelical Synod; Latter-day Saints; and Lutheran Church.²⁷

Missouri Baptists in the last third of the nineteenth century further augmented that segment of its membership affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention while increasing only slightly their overall percentage of the general population. There were approximately 90,542 adherents at the end of the 1870s, constituting an almost thirty percent increase from 1860. Similarly to 1870, Missouri Baptists in 1880 comprised about 4.1 percent of the state population.²⁸ Ten years later, they counted 112,296 men and women within their ranks, 4.2 percent of the total state population an increase of 22,000 from 1880.²⁹ By 1900 there were about 138,000 women and men within the Baptist pews, or about 4.4 percent of Missouri's population, another increase from 1890. Baptists resided in both urban areas and the countryside, but continued to be more numerous in rural areas than the Methodists or Presbyterians. The denomination saw especially rapid growth in the southern Missouri Ozarks, a region that saw extraordinarily rapid development as a consequence of railroad development.³⁰ By 1906, out of 204,129 Baptists in the state, 165,759 (81.12%) explicitly affiliated themselves with the Southern Baptist Convention, while only 115 (.0563%) women and men claimed allegiance to the Northern Baptist Convention. From the end of Reconstruction to the end of the century, white southern Baptists did little to increase their black membership.³¹

The MEC and MECS significantly increased their respective percentages of the general population but, by 1900, southern Methodists had a substantially larger membership than that of their northern counterparts. Both the MEC and MECS remained unsuccessful, if not increasingly unwilling, to bring African Americans into their ranks. The northern Methodists grew eighteen percent to 30,043 from 1870 to 1880. The MECS, moreover, saw 55,864 men and women in its pews, a thirty-two percent upswing during the last ten years. Overall, there were 85,907 Methodists in Missouri, or about four percent of the state's population – roughly the same

proportion as in 1870. While there were no significant decreases in the main Methodist regions of the state, they saw more than half of their growth in the southwestern and western parts of the states, including Kansas City. St. Louis saw some growth as well.³² By 1890, there were 151,063 Methodists in both branches of the denomination or 5.6 percent of all Missourians – 90,280 southern Methodists and 60,783 northern members. With the MECS witnessing a sixty-one percent upswing and the MEC growing by 102 percent, both segments of Missouri Methodism increased far quicker than the overall state population.³³ Northern Methodists, however, saw a slightly larger increase, with their congregations growing most rapidly in urban areas. By 1900 the southern Methodists had 105,922 members in their three annual conferences. Northern Methodists, on the other hand, counted 74,519 women and men in their pews. The combined 180,411 members comprised about 5.8 percent of the state's population, a significant increase from twenty years earlier.³⁴

The growth of Presbyterian congregations in the last third of the nineteenth century left northern Presbyterians in Missouri twice as numerous as southern ones, while expanding only slightly their combined percentage of the general population by 1900. Northern Presbyterians continued to bring middle-class whites into their ranks but had more limited success in drawing the allegiance of the small but growing black middle class.³⁵ Northern Presbyterians numbered 10,976 in 1880, a significant forty-two percent increase from ten years earlier. While they were present throughout the state, they were most numerous in and around St. Louis and in towns along the Mississippi River and those in western and southwestern Missouri.³⁶ As rapid urban growth and rail linkages radically augmented places such as St. Louis and Kansas City, northern Presbyterians in Missouri increased their numbers much more than did southern Presbyterians, who more often resided in smaller towns and cities. There were 7,376 southern Presbyterians in

Missouri. This was a loss of almost 900 members from the initial membership after the independent synod joined the southern General Assembly. Overall, both groups comprised about eight-tenths of a percent of the state population total. While they had followers throughout the state like their fellow northern Presbyterians throughout the last decades of the nineteenth century, the southern church was strongest in the Boone's Lick, dubbed "Little Dixie" after the Civil War, and in other parts of the state where slavery had been widespread prior to the war, such as the counties in the "Boot heel" of southeast Missouri. Unlike their northern counterparts, the southern Presbyterians only had a token presence in the larger urban areas of the state. This trend, among others, led to the dominance of the northern Presbyterian Church in Missouri after 1880.³⁷ In 1890 there were 9,761 southern Presbyterians in Missouri, a thirty-two percent increase over the preceding decade.³⁸ Adding fifty-four percent to its totals of the previous decade, in 1890 the northern Presbyterian Church had 16,892 members and had begun expansion into Arkansas. Both denominations were about one percent of the total state population in 1890.³⁹ While the Arkansas expansion had only doubled to roughly a little more than 400 men and women throughout the 1890s, the remainder of the Missouri Synod continued its rapid growth. There were 22,725 adherents, another thirty-four percent increase. The St. Louis area remained the biggest stronghold of Missouri's northern Presbyterians but Kansas City and much of the western part of the state saw rapid growth throughout the last years of the nineteenth century.⁴⁰ At the close of the century the southern Presbyterians had 12,442 women and men within their ranks, an increase of twenty-seven percent during the 1890s.⁴¹ As the new century dawned, 1.1 percent of people in Missouri were Presbyterians. The largest percentage in decades certainly reflected the increasing urbanization and cosmopolitan nature of the state.

Middle-class evangelicals in the larger urban areas of Missouri placed increasing importance on well-situated and posh edifices through the Gilded Age. While this trend had begun in the antebellum period, it became much more pronounced during and after Reconstruction. Upper and middle class white parishioners, a larger percentage of which nurtured northern affiliations than their rural counterparts, sought to cement their status and assert control over their congregations and denominations. In Kansas City, a hub of rapid urban growth, congregations added significantly to their holdings in the 1880s and 1890s. In the Kansas City District of the MECS, there were forty churches and twelve parsonages that totaled about \$250,000 in value by 1890. Two of the congregations, the Walnut Street and Southside, completed \$10,000 worth of renovations at about that time. In the antebellum era, such accumulations could only have been achieved in several subordinate districts, not one. By the end of the century, nine congregations in Kansas City were worth \$153,000, while the Walnut Street Church in St. Louis had holdings worth \$75,000.⁴² The MECS Fifth Street Methodist Church in Hannibal saw its Young Ladies Society raise \$1,100 for a new pipe organ. The edifice that this congregation constructed in 1856 cost \$1,500.⁴³ Baptist church property in St. Louis was valued at over \$308,000 at the turn of the century.⁴⁴ Advertisements in evangelical newspapers underscored the movement toward increased acquisition of congregational accoutrements and adornment and a growing market for such additions. For example, an advertisement run by J. B. Merwin in the northern Presbyterian St. Louis Evangelist in the late 1870s, featured “Pulpits and Church Seats of Various Styles and Prices.”⁴⁵

Some rural white Baptists certainly sought to emulate their urban brethren. But most rural congregations continued to make do with more meager resources. Many, if not most, of the local associations listed in the 1900 minutes of the Baptist General Association were composed of

rural or small town congregations.⁴⁶ The rural and small town orientation of Missouri Baptists, whose congregational affiliations with the Southern Baptist Convention increased steadily through the period, was evident in their choice of annual conference venues. The fiftieth anniversary meeting of the Missouri Baptist General Association held in the town of Marshall, Saline County, situated squarely in Little Dixie. Rural southern Baptist congregations generally remained well satisfied with ministers who had not received expensive seminary educations and operated with limited funds.⁴⁷ For example, a southern Baptist congregation in the town of Hornersville, Dunklin County, situated in the Ozarks of southeastern Missouri, convened for worship in a storage shed and then a schoolhouse for years until they were able to collect the cash to build their own house of worship in 1892.⁴⁸

Rural Baptists appear to have grown increasingly distant from the more urbane leadership of the consolidated Missouri General Association. Through the last three decades of the nineteenth century Baptist societies in rural villages and small towns responded less frequently to General Association requests for money.⁴⁹ Country congregations sent representatives to its annual meetings less frequently, notwithstanding improved communications and transportation. The meeting minutes of most rural Baptist societies did not include much commentary at all about their relationships with the state body. The Round Prairie Baptist Church, in Bates County, situated on the border of Kansas, indicated that it preferred to contribute money to the missionary efforts of the Southern Baptist Convention. But the local society rarely, if ever, made donations to Baptist organizations outside the Tebo Baptist Association of which it was a member.⁵⁰

Urbane southern Methodist leaders, it seems, took an increasingly patronizing tone toward their rural brothers and sisters. St. Louis MECS leaders, for example, publicly advised them to abandon the supposedly antiquated rural camp meeting. As during Reconstruction,

evangelicals in Missouri continued to organize and draw new members from extended revivals. But the more cosmopolitan MECS leadership in St. Louis expressed the view that the camp meeting was, somehow, no longer capable of attracting new converts, or at least desirable ones. One article in the St. Louis Christian Advocate chided village MECS members to adopt more refined town-based revival methods. In his words, “We must not set up the old time camp meetings as a model; if we do so, we will be assured of failure. . . .”⁵¹ Yet the contributor also warned the country Methodists not to allow extended revivals to become little more than extended social events, a prime criticism of urban revivals at the time.⁵²

African American believers in Missouri persisted in cultivating their independent Methodist and Baptist congregations after Reconstruction. But the rise of national-level African American Baptist associations in the last decades of the nineteenth century provided critical support for black Baptists in the state. The all-black Consolidated American Baptist Convention had combined the Baptist General Association of the Western States and Territories and the New England Baptist Missionary Convention in 1874. This organization failed in 1880. But the continuing need for national black missionary activity led to the establishment of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Convention for overseas missions in the same year. The American National Baptist Convention, furthermore, was formed in 1886 in St. Louis for domestic missions and the National Baptist Educational Convention in 1893 for education and printing. African American Baptists consolidated these organizations into the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A. in 1895.⁵³

Independent African American congregations in Missouri continued to nurture distinctive religious beliefs and modes of worship, while increasing their numbers and building new houses of worship. As during Reconstruction, black Missouri church-goers developed a brand of

Protestantism grounded in resistance to slavery and dedicated to emphasizing the dignity and equality of souls, redemption for individual suffering, hell fire for oppressors, and collective deliverance through faith. Amid a continuing migration from rural precincts to large towns and cities, African American Protestants ensured that their churches served as social centers, public signifiers of freedom, and societies that bolstered black community aspirations.⁵⁴ Black churches in Missouri expanded not only in numbers but in power and influence to the end of the nineteenth century. The substantial African American population growth in St. Louis led to a corresponding increase in the number of black churches in the city, especially those affiliated with the Baptist church. The Central Baptist Church, with a number of the preeminent African Americans as the core of its membership, was able to purchase a new edifice for \$22,000 in 1885.⁵⁵ Through the 1880s and 1890s, the Pleasant Green Baptist Church, also in St. Louis, established new auxiliaries, while women congregants steadily assumed increasingly active roles in church life.⁵⁶ In the Little Dixie area of central Missouri, where a relatively large African American population continued to reside notwithstanding black migration to the cities, a number of new African American churches coalesced after Reconstruction, especially in Boone County. The Mount Hope Baptist Church financed a new edifice and established the only black cemetery in that county. In 1884 the Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church in the town of Centralia, situated on the border of Boone and Audrain counties, also acquired land for a new house of worship.⁵⁷ By 1880, black Baptists in Missouri had established 150 churches with 10,000 members, a year in which white Baptists could claim 1,300 churches and about 80,000 members. By 1906, there were 655 African American congregations in Missouri, with a total of 600 houses of worship.⁵⁸

To the end of the nineteenth century, church-going blacks in Missouri remained dedicated to improving educational opportunities for their youth. While public schools remained racially segregated, African Americans benefitted substantially from a steady increase in the number of schools reserved for their children. All-black elementary schools named after abolitionist Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln cropped up across the state. As a consequence of the constant pressure that African Americans placed on legislators and school boards, the public schools of Missouri enrolled sixty-five percent of black children between ages six and twenty by 1901.⁵⁹ But black Methodist and Baptist churches also continued to provide Sunday schools and elementary schools for African American children. The Lincoln Institute in Jefferson City became a publicly-funded normal school for training black teachers in the 1870s. And black education made a considerable advance when, in 1894, George R. Smith College opened in the town of Sedalia, Pettis County, situated south of the Missouri River in Little Dixie. Founded by contributions from the Freedman's Aid and Southern Education Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, this institution offered elementary instruction, college preparatory classes, a four-year college program, and a one-year Bible study course.⁶⁰

The Changing Complexion of Intra-Congregational Strife

At least until 1900, MECS schools and southern Baptist congregations in Missouri filed claims in Congress to obtain compensation for property seized or damaged by Union forces during the Civil War. St. Charles College, the MECS institution that the Union army used during the fighting, sent a claim to Congress in 1890. The petition did not specify damages but requested the federal government to look into the matter and report what would be a fair amount of compensation. While the Senate reported favorably on the claim, the House refused to approve it in the face of considerable support at least until 1900.⁶¹ The First Baptist Church in

Springfield, which the Union Army had occupied and seized because of perceived disloyalty, sent its claim for \$3,000 to the House Committee on War Claims in 1910. The committee, after deciding that the only evidence supporting it was a collection of ex parte affidavits, referred the case to the United States Court of Claims, where it languished for decades.⁶²

Congregational conflict over church property grounded in divergent understandings of slavery and loyalty to the Union continued to spur litigation after the close of Reconstruction -- but in civil courts that increasingly sought to enforce legal rules rather than allow partisan pressures to shape outcomes. Take, for example, the Sixteenth Street Presbyterian Church in St. Louis. Formed in 1864 as a member of the St. Louis Presbytery, the majority of the congregation followed its pastor, James H. Brookes, out of the Old School General Assembly during the Declaration and Testimony controversy. Shortly after the war, however, this majority re-joined the northern church. The remaining minority faction of southern Presbyterians affiliated with the southern-oriented Independent Synod. Despite the claim of the southern faction to ownership of the Sixteenth Street property, the northern faction had retained possession and, by 1878, sought to sell it in order to raise funds for a new lot and edifice. On January 6, 1879, the northern majority, led now by trustee Edward Bredell, filed suit in the St. Louis Circuit Court to have the minority show cause why it should not be required to bring an action to quiet title. The court gave the southern minority faction, led by M. Alexander, until May 1, 1879, to make its case. Alexander filed an answer indicating that the trustees affiliated with the northern faction retained possession of the property “in violation of their trust,” holding it, in fact, for “certain seceding members.” But the answer did not set out any more specifically than this the basis of the minority claim. Optimally, it seems, Alexander should have pled that the trustees in the majority faction had no right to the property because the Missouri Supreme Court, in Watson v. Garvin

(1873), had recognized the legitimacy of the pro-southern St. Louis Presbytery, with which the Sixteenth Street Church had originally been affiliated. In any case, the St. Louis Circuit Court ruled in favor of Bredell and the northern Presbyterians. Alexander and the southern Presbyterians appealed the case to the St. Louis Court of Appeals the following December, arguing somewhat lamely that, because the Sixteenth Street property was now up for sale, there was nothing to which they could lay claim. The Court of Appeals was composed entirely of Democrats – Edward A. Lewis, Robert A. Bakewell and Charles S. Hayden. Writing for the Court in Bredell v. Alexander, Judge Hayden affirmed the judgment of the circuit court that had barred the southern minority claim. According to the Court, Alexander’s faction had failed to comply with the statute setting out the process for quieting title. In his words, “the defendants claim should be set forth as facts, not argumentatively; nor are they relieved from the obligation of conforming their answer to the rules of pleading.”⁶³ The Court of Appeals judges, quite likely, sympathized with the Alexander faction of southern Presbyterians. But, by 1879, the appellate courts of Missouri had returned to applying the letter of the law in ways much more dispassionate than ten years earlier.

Disputes over the ownership of church property remained at the center of congregational ruptures. But one of the most high profile Baptist conflicts of this kind arose from the effects of rapid railroad and town development rather than from differing views on the moral questions of slaveholding and disloyalty to the Union. In 1881, the First Baptist Church of Crescent Hill, a village situated in Bates County on the border with Kansas, voted to dissolve when most of the congregants agreed to relocate two and a half miles away to the neighboring village of Adrian and join its Baptist Church. A new railroad line had given birth to the town, the advantages of which had proved irresistible to the majority. A minority of the Crescent Hill membership, led by

S. E. McRoberts, denied the power of the majority to convey its property to the Adrian congregation and filed a bill in the Bates County Circuit Court. Future state Supreme Court Judge James B. Gantt, a devout Cumberland Presbyterian who had fought in the Confederate army under Stonewall Jackson, ruled that the departing majority had violated its deed of trust. That 1878 document had conveyed a lot upon which was to be built a house of worship for the Baptist denomination in Crescent Hill. Relying on the doctrine of implied trust, Judge Gantt concluded that the Crescent Hill majority had no right to convey its endowed property to a society outside the county. The Adrian faction, led by John Moudy, appealed the case to the Kansas City Court of Appeals in 1885. A three judge panel, consisting of future federal judge John F. Philips, James Ellison, and Willard P. Hall, sided with the Moudy faction. Philips, the presiding judge, wrote the opinion of the Court in McRoberts v. Moudy. He relied entirely on the increasingly influential deference rule to hold that, because Baptist societies were independent congregations, the vote of a majority was decisive under the ecclesiastical rules of the denomination.⁶⁴

Consider the dispute arising in the Pleasant Hill Baptist Church of Polk County, situated in the Ozarks Highlands of southwest Missouri. This conflict derived from the decision of a Pleasant Hill majority to expel two ministers, Gideon Higginbotham and G. M. Potts in August 1888. In its resolution to banish the two elders, the majority condemned them as heretics for teaching a concept of universal salvation. Universalism, a product of northeastern liberal theological ferment, contradicted entirely the longstanding Calvinist doctrine of the elect, to which rural southern Baptists in Missouri continued to adhere. According to the Pleasant Hill authorities, Higginbotham and Potts had “taught and are teaching doctrine that is contrary to the teaching of the word of God and the third article of the Baptist faith, relative to the fall of man, in

that they teach that the sin of Adam did not affect his posterity spiritually, and that the infantile world stands just where Adam stood before he sinned” But the two supposed heretics and their minority of supporters did not accept this ruling. The Reverend Higginbotham gained access to the house of worship by taking out the windows and then allowed his congregational supporters to enter. He claimed, furthermore, that one of the original 1884 incorporators had authorized him to do so – kinsman Thomas Higginbotham, who was also a deacon and trustee. Jason W. Fulbright and the majority faction subsequently sued in the Polk County Circuit Court to enjoin Gideon Higginbotham from entering or making use of the church building again. Active MEC congregant Judge Argus Cox, an Iowan by birth and an ardent Republican, issued a ruling in favor of Fulbright, declaring that he and his co-plaintiffs were the true deacons and trustees of Pleasant Hill.⁶⁵ Higginbotham appealed, but the Missouri Supreme Court declined to overturn the lower court decision, in deference to the majority of the Pleasant Hill society.⁶⁶ According to Democrat and Presbyterian Judge George B. MacFarlane, who wrote the opinion for the Court, “these officers have the power, while their authority continues, to determine by whom the property may be used, and have the power to exclude those members who refuse to recognize the authority of the regular organization.”⁶⁷

The outcome in Fulbright v. Higginbotham (1895) appears to have turned on a rather straightforward application of the deference rule. But the underlying conflict arose, nonetheless, from a basic ideological disagreement among evangelicals that had spawned ecclesiastical conflict for decades. Theological differences grounded in divergent understandings of human nature had undergirded the oppositional world views of pro-slavery evangelicals and abolitionists earlier in the century. Conservative and liberal evangelicals had disagreed about the inherent goodness or wickedness of human kind and whether individuals and societies could

improve or even achieve perfection. The conflict at Pleasant Hill between conservative Calvinists wedded to a belief in a chosen few and liberal Universals committed to a more democratic understanding of salvation demonstrates how these differences persisted in Missouri long after the demise of slavery.

Religious freedom, congregational autonomy, and civil rights for freed people in Missouri fully empowered black congregants to go to law, if necessary, to secure title to church property from factional rivals. By the early 1880s, the leaders of the St. Louis society of black Baptists established by the Reverend John Berry Meachum had become experienced members of the city's growing black middle class. After his death in 1854, the black congregants had continued to meet in the house of worship that the reverend had held in trust for them since 1829. Congregational relations appear to have been fairly harmonious until a dispute arose over the selection of a minister to replace black Elder Thomas Jefferson in 1882, at which time one faction moved quickly to establish itself legally as the bona fide trustees of the divided church. In 1883, leaders of the "First Colored Baptist Church," representing a majority of the society, succeeded in having the St. Louis Circuit Court appoint them trustees in the stead of the Reverend Meachum and to execute the trust set out in the original 1829 deed issued to him. This board of trustees soon sold the old church lot to the St. Louis Transfer Company in order to raise money for a new house of worship. In August 1884, its members incorporated the society under the same name. In November 1884, however, the rival minority faction of congregants obtained a charter of incorporation under the identical name of the beneficiary set out in the original trust deed, that is, the "African Baptist Church." Subsequently, they sued their factional rivals and the St. Louis Transfer Company in the St. Louis Circuit Court for equitable relief or compensation for the old church lot and edifice. Union veteran Judge Daniel Dillon recognized title in the

trustees of the First Colored Baptist Church, and the trustees of the African Baptist Church appealed. The Missouri Supreme Court that ruled in African Baptist Church v. St. Louis Transfer Company (1889) was composed mostly of southern Democrats, including Judge Theodore Brace, who had served as a Confederate colonel. The Court publicly acknowledged that it faced the difficulty of deciding which of the two factions was “the genuine original African Baptist Church” and that the original society had called itself by that very name. With Judge Shepard Barclay writing the opinion, however, the Court upheld Judge Dillon’s decision because it duly gave credence to the 1883 circuit court ruling that had appointed the leaders of the majority First Colored Baptist Church faction to be trustees in succession to Reverend Meachum. This group had also obtained articles of incorporation three months before the African Baptist Church faction did so in November 1884.⁶⁸

Radical Designs Gone Wrong and a New Evangelical Crisis

Rapid population growth and the attendant increase in evangelical numbers in Missouri hardly translated into peace, harmony, and prosperity for all. The commitment of the Radicals in Missouri to free labor, free soil, and free markets, as well as their religiously-infused devotion to racial equality certainly produced important benefits: African American liberation, new educational opportunities, booming industries, opulent cities, and increased prosperity for many. But the last third of the nineteenth century in the state featured a boiling pot of unprecedented demographic, cultural, socioeconomic and political transformation. These changes produced acute anxieties among all Missourians, northern and southern evangelicals included. Beginning in the 1870s, farmers registered growing dissatisfaction with runaway deflation, reduced crop prices, and increasing railroad freight rates. Such complaints typically included sharp critiques of railroad and corporate combinations; the credit of the state and high property taxes that had

subsidized the railroads; and self-serving and corrupt politicians.⁶⁹ The small minority of former abolitionists and Radicals who had remained in the state certainly continued to favor equal civil and political rights for African Americans. But ordinary white farmers and industrial laborers felt a growing unease over their worsening economic circumstances, and they grew particularly resentful of large landowners and industrialists who turned increasingly to inexpensive black labor.⁷⁰

Electoral politics in Missouri from 1876 through 1900 reflected the response of Missourians to the tumultuous socioeconomic changes wracking their state, but in a way that preserved the dominance of its Democrat Party. The national depressions that occurred in the periods 1873-79 and 1893-97 spurred much of the unrest and discontent of industrial laborers and farmers, while also punctuating a good bit of the public violence marking the 1880s. Distressed farmers in the state joined the National Grange of the Order of Patrons of Husbandry in droves, especially after the Panic of 1873.⁷¹ By the end of the 1880s, a new wave of agrarian unrest had helped to generate chapters of the Farmers' and Laborer's Union of America. Democrats continued to denounce high taxes and centralized state government but faced increasingly urgent calls to rein in the monopolistic practices and often corrupt influence of the railroads. In March 1892, the Missouri Farmers Alliance joined the People's Party. Central to the public rhetoric arising with the Populist challenge to the Democrats was the enthusiastic support by rural residents of federal policies intended to expand the supply of currency. The contrary efforts of President Grover Cleveland and the so-called "Gold Democrats" had infuriated many rural Democrats. Missouri Populists echoed demands for reform made by their counterparts across the country. In addition to supporting an inflationary monetary policy, they favored introduction of a federal income tax, government ownership of the railroads, and a reduction in

bank interest rates. But the Missouri Populists won no state elections in 1892. In the elections held the year after the Panic of 1893, they managed to elect all of two members to the state house of representatives. Missouri Democrats succeeded quite handily in blunting the insurgency, winning the 1896 gubernatorial election for Lawrence V. Stephens and retaining control of the state house. In doing so, they snuffed out the last gasp of well-organized agrarian and labor political action until the 1930s.⁷² Beginning with the election of Governor David Francis in 1889, Democrats in the General Assembly began passing laws to deter or at least regulate monopolies, such as the insurance companies. With the assistance of “muckraker” reportage by such newspapers as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, they took aim, in particular, at the so-called “urban trusts,” that is, privately-owned companies in places like St. Louis and Kansas City that had cornered the markets in the provisioning of water, electricity, and street cars. But attorneys general and county prosecutors rarely prosecuted offenders under laws that provided far too many loopholes for ingenious monopolies.⁷³

Ordinary white Missourians responded vigorously to socioeconomic dislocations in ways that skirted formal politics and the law. When wages for railroad operatives in St. Louis dropped precipitously in 1876 and 1877, and especially after owners began to lay off workers, they went out on strike. Laborers in other industries in the city soon began walking off the job, as did railway employees, miners, and agricultural laborers across the state, constituting one of the first general strikes of the era. The common complaints were that the new legion of industry owners had created dangerous and unhealthful working conditions; they no longer paid a “living wage”; and they replaced skilled white family men with machines operated by low-paid unskilled workers, including African Americans, women, and children.⁷⁴ Until 1881, Jesse and Frank James and the Younger brothers robbed banks and railroads, while receiving widespread support

from struggling farmers and industrial laborers, who cultivated the popular belief that these “bandits” distributed their largess to the poor.⁷⁵ Public violence in the southern Ozarks ratcheted up substantially in the 1880s. Angry and often intoxicated men, who resented the individual competitiveness and greed that developers brought to traditional rural communities, targeted these interlopers with vandalism, vigilantism, and sometimes deadly assaults. Newly-arrived business leaders and industrial kingpins responded in kind with night-riding terror tactics aimed at punishing and suppressing local rebels; the large-scale vigilante activities of the so-called “Bald Knobbers” in Taney and Christian counties drew national attention.⁷⁶

The Radical Republicans lost political control of Missouri in 1871. But the socioeconomic revolution their well-intended efforts wrought from 1861 to 1900 engendered a siege mentality among both northern and southern evangelicals in the state. Commercial agriculture, mechanized industry, and growing urban centers certainly produced the 1877 General Strike, the deadly vigilantism of the Bald Knobbers, and radical agrarian politics. But evangelicals increasingly came to believe that these same transformations were also undercutting the cohesiveness and authority of their congregations and the patriarchal families and clans that comprised them. Convinced that their local communities, churches, and households were under attack, rural and small town evangelicals identified the large cities, such as St. Louis and Kansas City, as the prime source of growing disorder, worldliness, and sin.⁷⁷

Most worrisome to sincere evangelicals was not the shrinkage of congregations but, rather, the rapidly declining effects of religion in the lives of increasingly numerous church members. The availability of new consumer goods and secular reading materials, the influence of advertising, and even new roads and railways that made trips to urban places easier and more frequent seemed to diminish the interest that adult congregants had in matters of the spirit, while

also rapidly displacing them as the prime influence on the character development of their children. According to one contributor to the St. Louis Christian Advocate, “The worldliness in the church is one of the alarming evils of our day. . . . [and] Worldly symptoms may be in the pulpit as well as the pew.”⁷⁸ Notwithstanding the understandable complaints of Roman Catholics in places like St. Louis, the new public schools in most counties, at least to the end of the century, provided Protestant “nonsectarian” Bible reading and discussion in classrooms. But teachers did this, as school boards directed, to inculcate respect for authority and habits of self-control suited for the workplace rather than from abiding concern about the eternal salvation of their charges.⁷⁹ At the same time, ministers decried a decline in “family religion,” that is, prayer and catechism in the home. They chided members for engaging in frivolous “amusements,” individual competitiveness, and preoccupations with acquiring comforts and wealth.⁸⁰ Exemplifying notoriously all of these discouraging trends, as indicated, was the large city. To make matters worse in this regard, urban developers encouraged a booming commerce in vice. Even the game of baseball was suspect. The Central Christian Advocate supported the sport as a wholesome mode of recreation. But contests featured as entertainment for the masses threatened to ruin it according to Advocate editor Benjamin St. James Fry. In his words, “Speculators, taking advantage of the craze over it, have laid out splendid grounds, employed professional players, and made base-ball odious by associating it with gambling, beer drinking and Sabbath desecration. This is too valuable a game to turn over to the devil.”⁸¹

White evangelical leaders in Gilded Age Missouri concluded that the greatest single evil threatening society was hard liquor, especially its sale to husbands and fathers. Certainly they frequently took the view that the business in spirituous liquors and saloons nefariously served the interests of the Roman Catholic immigrants and further empowered them to corrupt the political

system. But Protestant church-goers in Missouri more often complained that the liquor trade catered most to farmers, mechanics, and the growing class of industrial laborers who were attempting to deal with an overwhelming set of difficulties posed by a rapidly changing socioeconomic order. The new dispensation had produced a socially-destabilizing shift of authority from families and local communities to new government institutions and corporate powers. White evangelical leaders concluded that fathers and husbands, especially those who were distressed farmers and industrial workers, resorted to strong drink far too often to deal with the resulting stresses.⁸²

White evangelicals in Missouri certainly did not articulate their condemnation of the liquor trade as an unprecedented crisis in gender for white men. But its ill consequences, taken in context, fully support this characterization. Protestants had for centuries, of course, identified drunkenness as a serious sin because excessive consumption of alcohol spurred imbibers to lose control of base passions. But in Reconstruction-era Missouri drunkenness became, more than ever, a man problem. The toll it exacted on men caught in the vortex of fundamental socioeconomic and political transformations, especially when they failed to adapt to these changes, threatened families and communities on an unprecedented scale.⁸³ Such men routinely sought relief, or escape, in bars, saloons, and other “public houses.”⁸⁴ White evangelicals in the state may have experienced increased trepidation about traditionally masculine “frolics” because, as historian Ted Ownby indicates, such activities were now legally open also to all African American men.⁸⁵ But it seems fairly clear that white evangelicals in Missouri objected most to adult white male drunkenness and associated vices because such indulgences produced public and domestic violence, financial irresponsibility, and wretched homes. For men with wives and children, alcohol consumption and gambling excesses not infrequently produced broken

marriages and left destitute women and infants with only minimal means of support. Fractured extended family networks, increasingly common among transients in urban places, compounded these problems. Not surprisingly, evangelical women lodged complaints loudly and especially condemned the commerce in liquor and vice that thrived in saloons and gambling dens, which were often one and the same.⁸⁶

Probably the most threatening secular ideas perceived by conservative evangelical leaders in Gilded Age Missouri arrived with yet another wave of liberal theology emanating from cosmopolitan northeastern precincts. In 1874, Old School Presbyterian and Principal of Princeton Theological Seminary Charles Hodge famously published What is Darwinism?, in which he maintained that, because the new theory did not comport with Christian evidences of sacred design, it amounted to atheism.⁸⁷ But Darwinism had made its debut among northern Presbyterians in Missouri at least as early as this. Upstate New Yorker Oren Root Jr., brother of influential statesman and future Nobel Peace Prize recipient Elihu Root, came to teach at the University of Missouri in 1866 and obtained a license to preach from the Presbytery of Palmyra in 1874. In sermons he delivered before that presbytery and across central and northeastern Missouri – and well armed with higher education in mathematics, geology, and other science disciplines – the erudite Reverend Root routinely mixed Darwin’s theory of natural selection and Presbyterian articles of faith.⁸⁸ The editors of the St. Louis Evangelist also lent support to the controversial theory. According to one article it published in 1883, “Darwin was not registered as a Christian, but he had the greatest respect for all that was good in Christianity, and was great enough to acknowledge it.”⁸⁹ Liberal-minded Presbyterians in Missouri were certainly not taken by surprise when Church of Scotland minister, champion of Scottish Common Sense Philosophy, and President of the College of New Jersey James McCosh published his The Religious Aspects

of Evolution (1888), the most well known early effort in the United States to reconcile Presbyterian doctrine, rational moral philosophy, and evolution theory.⁹⁰

Evangelical Responses to the Crisis

As did their counterparts in other former slaveholding states, southern Presbyterian ministers in Missouri established themselves as a bulwark of undiluted traditional Calvinism against the encroachments of Darwinism and the new biblical criticism. Virginia-born Robert Lewis Dabney became the successor to leading southern Presbyterian minister, theologian, and moralist James Henley Thornwell of South Carolina, who died shortly after helping to found the Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States of America in 1861.⁹¹ As early as 1881, Dabney began preaching and publishing to warn southern Presbyterians against the teachings of Charles Darwin.⁹² And in January 1882, he published a treatise that took to task the Reverend W. Robertson Smith, a professor at the Free Church Theological College in Aberdeen, Scotland, who had questioned whether certain parts of the Bible were revealed truth with new modes of historical, literary, and comparative biblical criticism.⁹³ Helping most to sustain staunch opposition among southern Presbyterians in Missouri to all such liberal innovations, at least to 1900, was the Reverend Robert P. Farris of St. Charles. With an orthodoxy that had been super-hardened in the cauldron of civil war and by Unionist reprisals, Farris was elected moderator of the General Assembly of the southern Presbyterian Church in 1881.⁹⁴ He articulated staunchly conservative theological views in the St. Louis Presbyterian, which he continued to edit until 1895, and served as permanent clerk of the southern General Assembly from 1885 until he died on August 28, 1903.⁹⁵

Southern Baptists and southern Methodist in Missouri also expressed growing dismay with Darwinism and those features of the new criticism that drew into question the sanctity and

veracity of scripture. The sermons of leading Baptist minister William Pope Yeaman, for example, condemned the “the so-called ‘New Theology,’ the ‘Higher Criticism,’ . . . ‘Evolution,’ and other phases of current thought that insist upon distinctive recognition in this time of intellectual enterprise. . . .” Yeaman also took exception to critical studies of the Bible showing that characterizations of the Deity as “Father” were much less frequent in the Old Testament than references of this kind made by Jesus in the New Testament. In his view, all of these ideas needed “to be carefully and conscientiously scrutinized.”⁹⁶ An 1898 article published in The Central Baptist strenuously denied that the physical sciences had any authority to draw conclusions about revealed truth or to conclude that the human soul could be reduced to the mere electrochemical processes of the brain: “Unmodified evolution – and the scientist knows no other kind – insists that all powers and faculties are produced by a development from within.”⁹⁷ If evolution were to gain hold in America, this contributor averred, the consequences would be dire. The death of Jesus would lose “all of its vicarious character” and His blood would become “no longer a sacrifice for sin. The cross might be banished except that it becomes a sort of symbol of His devotion, an appeal to our best feelings.”⁹⁸ In July 1890, the editor of the St. Louis Christian Advocate expressed the anger and confusion of many MECS members when he pointed out the anti-religious tone of several articles of “doubtful propriety” featured in an edition of the Scientific Monthly.⁹⁹

While some evangelicals in Missouri reacted to the perceived decline in Godly behavior among congregants with customary church discipline, more than a few lamented the decreasing power of such proceedings to ensure sincere faith and pious comportment. Congregations continued the practice of formally disciplining members guilty of drunkenness, dancing, gambling, and a number of other transgressions that the sessions of local religious societies had

traditionally penalized. For instance, Rufus Alexander, a member of the Presbyterian Church of Farmington, St. Francois County, situated in the southeast part of the state, was held in contempt in the late 1870s for leading an un-Christian life and not attending church. According to the session minutes, he was guilty of “habitually and without good excuse neglecting attendance upon the services and ordinances of God’s House.”¹⁰⁰ Alexander, however, refused to respond to the letters notifying him of the pending disciplinary procedure and never returned to meetings.¹⁰¹ His abandonment of the Farmington church, however, indicates the decreasing effectiveness of church disciplinary proceedings to make an impact on congregants. According to a 1906 poll of fifty Missouri Baptist ministers regarding changes in the church over the preceding quarter century, the most common complaint was that pastors had become boosters and fundraisers and that church trials had lost their effectiveness. Discipline, they complained had become “a lost art.”¹⁰²

The determination of some northern and southern Methodists to counteract growing worldliness and vice included a not altogether successful campaign to proscribe tobacco use among Methodist ministers. Most antebellum northern Methodists in Missouri had taken the position that the smoking, sniffing, and chewing of tobacco were vile and ungodly habits. At its annual conference meetings in 1872 and 1880, the MEC returned to this issue but took more aggressive steps by adopting resolutions intended to encourage its ministers to abandon such vices.¹⁰³ In his 1896 autobiography, northern Methodist minister Lorenzo Waugh expressed hopes that his many grandchildren and great-grandchildren would emulate his decision to refrain from alcohol consumption and the smoking of tobacco, the latter of which was a practice, according to him, that had originated with superstitious and “savage” Native Americans.¹⁰⁴ Waugh also maintained that far too many whites who used tobacco and alcohol were poor and

that middle-class success could only be achieved by avoiding such dissipation. Well before 1890, some southern Methodist leaders in the St. Louis Conference, at least, advocated a total ban of tobacco within the ministerial ranks of the MECS statewide. The reverends debated the merits of this, but more than a few southern Methodist ministers in the state continued to smoke, sniff, and chew tobacco, and to fill spittoons, to the end of the century.¹⁰⁵

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, rural and small town church-goers in Missouri responded to the increasingly worldly orientation of urban congregants in the mainstream evangelical churches by establishing breakaway societies affiliated with the growing Holiness Movement. Beginning shortly after the Civil War, the movement sought to revitalize the late eighteenth-century focus of the Methodist Church on the equality of believers, revivalism, personal piety, and John Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection – especially the belief that such was possible through a second work of saving grace known as “sanctification.”¹⁰⁶ In 1883, a congregation of Independent Holiness People, later referred to as the Church of God, Holiness, was set out in the town of Centralia, Boone County, in central Missouri. In the next few years, several more societies of this kind arose in that area and further north, where farming immigrants from the northeast United States predominated, as well as in far western Missouri on the border with Kansas.¹⁰⁷ In 1885, MEC minister John P. Brooks of Illinois, editor of the Banner of Holiness since 1873, moved to College Mound, Macon County, situated in the north-central plains of the state – the same year he organized a National Holiness Assembly to meet in Chicago. In March 1887, Brooks began editing a new holiness periodical, The Good Way. After the Central Illinois Conference of the MEC brought Brooks to trial for some of his unorthodox publications in March 1889, he left the Methodist Church and became pastor of a society of Independent Holiness People at College Mound. The teachings of Brooks,

which culminated with the publication of his influential The Divine Church in 1891, make it rather clear that the Holiness People in Missouri had grown decidedly fatigued with the more cosmopolitan faith that had become common in the Methodist Church and other mainstream denominations. According to Brooks, the late-nineteenth-century declension of holiness was attributable to “a weakened and deteriorated Christianity,” clerics in numerous denominations who fashioned creeds producing apathy about or active opposition to the doctrine of sanctification, “mammonized” religious beliefs and practices that aided and abetted spiritually degrading forms of recreation, and a flagging piety associated with increasing carnality.¹⁰⁸

The theological innovations made by leaders of the Holiness Movement did not sit well with northern Methodists in the state. John P. Brooks certainly stressed the critical importance of the Methodist doctrine of sanctification. He and other Holiness leaders, however, blamed the growing multiplicity of denominational creeds for the flagging power of Protestantism to unify the faithful against the encroachments of secularism. This critique proved quite troublesome to mainstream Methodist leaders. In 1886, for example, the Central Christian Advocate republished an article in the Richmond Advocate that had denounced as error any theological innovations that deemphasized the importance of creeds: “[I]t is folly or madness to urge upon the Church to abandon all contemplation of what He said and did in order to embrace him personally. . . . The agitation going on for Christ without creeds is absurd and vain.”¹⁰⁹

Missouri evangelicals also responded to socioeconomic upheaval with a version of the Social Gospel that comported with the preference of southern church-goers in the state that civil authority not be used to advance religiously-grounded social ideals in ways that violated individual liberty. As had been the case with abolitionism, the Social Gospel movement drew on the reform idealism of liberal-minded evangelicals in the urban Northeast of the United States.

Most of those who hammered out new theological principles to justify the movement, such as Richard T. Ely, Washington Gladden, and Walter Rauschenbusch, were members of the Episcopal or Congregational churches. But northern Methodist and northern missionary Baptists readily adopted its goals, whether they subscribed to these theological modulations or not. Generally those who embraced the Social Gospel were dedicated to radically expanding the realm of divinely-ordained moral obligation from concerns about individual salvation to improving the socioeconomic circumstances of groups they deemed to be particularly harmed by industrial capitalism. The post-millennial theology to which these middle-class evangelicals generally adhered stood in marked contrast to the pre-millennial theology that predominated in virtually all the former slaveholding states.¹¹⁰ As had been the case during Reconstruction, most evangelicals in Gilded Age Missouri did not regain any confidence in their ability to know if or when Divine Providence might benefit any particular socioeconomic or political agenda.¹¹¹ And to the end of the nineteenth century, leading southern Presbyterian and MECS ministers in the state, such as Robert P. Farris and David Rice McAnally, similarly maintained strenuous opposition, on intertwined theological and constitutional grounds, to church intrusion into politics or vice versa. For men like this and their co-denominationalists, individual freedom, including liberty of conscience, was to be carefully guarded from government power.¹¹² In this context, Missouri evangelicals who embraced the Social Gospel became most active in large cities, where more liberal attitudes prevailed, and were careful not to appear to rely too heavily on legislation and the courts to achieve their goals.

Southern Methodists in Missouri did not share the zeal with which the MEC embraced Social Gospel reforms, a difference that turned on the question of whether state power should be enlisted to correct social ills, including the relations of workers and employers. In 1867, St.

Louis Christian Advocate editor David Rice McNally articulated the disdain that many of his brethren had for government interference in the socioeconomic relations of Missourians. In particular, he was troubled by Social Gospel initiatives that sought to intervene in the increasingly troubled relationship of industrial workers and the owners of capital. McNally took the position that each side had faults and valid criticisms of the other. But, in keeping with laissez faire economic principles that stressed a constitutional “liberty of contract” applicable to employment, McNally argued that the free market must be allowed to regulate itself: “As a matter of necessity these things will sooner or later regulate themselves. They must be governed between the ratio of supply and demand. . . . From this rule there seems to be no appeal.”¹¹³ At the 1891 Southwest Missouri Annual Conference, MECS leaders discussed the notable insufficiency of contributions to the American Bible Society, which the MECS had supported since its inception in 1845. But the ABS had, in recent years, increasingly supported Social Gospel reforms that drew on the power of the state to remedy social ills. The official minutes explained that “From the meager accounts contributed to the ‘American Bible Society’ throughout this Conference, we infer that there is a lack of interest in this line, and the work, which its increasing importance, is not fully appreciated by the dear people.”¹¹⁴ A year later, at the MECS Annual Conference, anti-smoking advocates proposed a resolution to the Missouri General Assembly asking the lawmakers to outlaw tobacco use among all residents in the state. But influential conservative ministers at the meeting, such as the Reverend Thomas H. Finney of St. Louis, an avid smoker, easily garnered the votes to defeat the resolution.¹¹⁵

Northern and southern Methodists in Missouri, however, agreed to support a voluntary youth league that might divert young members from worldly beliefs and practices they deemed inimical to faith and family well being. To achieve this purpose, both branches of Methodism in

the state threw their weight behind the formation of the Epworth League. Named after John Wesley's boyhood home, the Epworth League was organized in 1889 by MEC members in Cleveland, Ohio, thereby consolidating at least five separate Methodist youth organizations. Chapters were generally affiliated with a particular congregation and established as their goal the promotion of vital piety among young members of the church. The Missouri MEC formed its first chapters of the league in 1889, and the MECS in the state did the same two years later. In 1895 the southern Methodists counted 113 chapters with 5,050 members in Missouri.¹¹⁶ But in the southeastern area of the state, especially in and around the town of New Madrid, organizers had to deal with considerable opposition from the un-churched southerner whites.¹¹⁷ By the end of the century, the St. Louis Christian Advocate featured a large section in most of its editions dealing exclusively with the activities of the league. And both annual conferences generally received formal reports on their progress in this regard.¹¹⁸

At the end of Reconstruction, a surge of revival fervor in the St. Louis spurred the organization of its first Young Men's Christian Association, a signal institution of the Social Gospel. Founded in 1844 in London, the YMCA was committed to putting evangelical Christian principles into action. The organization embraced a social ministry that combined preaching in the streets, the distribution of evangelical religious tracts, and low-cost housing for young men migrating from rural areas to the cities. Intended to provide a "safe" Christian environment, early organizers emphasized its commitment to developing a "healthy spirit, mind, and body." What this meant, as a practical matter, was setting up boarding houses and gymnasiums that shield impressionable men from the countryside from the temptations of alcohol, gambling, and prostitution, while also promoting good citizenship. Most YMCA chapters, in these decades, at least, also encouraged evangelical prayer meetings during the week and Sunday services.¹¹⁹ After

several failed attempts shortly before and during the Civil War, twelve young men, who were members of the St. Louis Union Methodist Church, established the first YMCA in the city in 1875. Initially, the small group occupied a single rented room. But in 1879 popular Methodist evangelist Dwight Lyman Moody of Massachusetts led a revival in St. Louis and took the opportunity to persuade its leading businessmen to provide the city's fledgling YMCA with a building. By 1885, the St. Louis organization, which remained affiliated with the Union Methodist Church, constructed a gymnasium. According to historian Walter B. Stevens, the Christian influence of the organization was felt city-wide until at least 1900.¹²⁰

Demon Liquor, the Return of Benevolent Women, and the Limits of Evangelical Social Reform

In a postwar society fatigued with benevolent reform, a number of activists employed a secular facade to revitalize a moribund temperance movement that had been organized in the state five decades earlier by New England missionaries. Proponents of the Social Gospel undoubtedly made temperance activism vital to their agenda. But those who first revitalized the religiously-grounded antebellum temperance movement immediately after the Civil War avoided public associations with evangelicalism. White residents in at least four counties situated in the agricultural regions of the state, beginning in 1867, organized chapters of the Independent Order of Good Templars. While its members adhered strongly to evangelical beliefs making the consumption of alcohol sinful, leaders of the organization cast it as a "fraternal union" dedicated, however, to moral uplift and community tranquility.¹²¹ In a similar development beginning several decades later, small town opponents of strong drink established chapters of the Missouri Temperance Union. A chapter established in the town of Prathersville, Clay County, typically organized lectures and readings at lengthy bi-monthly convocations. By 1887, women presented

papers and joined with men in discussions, but only men enjoyed the privilege of giving lectures.¹²²

In the closing years of Reconstruction, northern evangelicals in St. Louis came out openly in behalf of temperance and other causes that targeted faltering and backslidden men. If the evangelist Edward Payson Hammond stuck to the themes for which he was famous in the sermons he gave at the early 1874 revival in St. Louis, attendees certainly received an earful of temperance preaching. The New School Presbyterian revivalist had graduated from Williams College in Massachusetts and studied at Union Theological Seminary in New York, both bastions of liberal Protestantism and social reform. At the revival Hammond had led in February and March 1872 in Lawrence, Kansas, his sermons had pounded hardest on the evils of alcohol, saloons, and gambling and included also special pleas for the children victimized by these adult male depredations against the family.¹²³

Northern Methodists in Missouri had always advocated abstention from alcohol. But temperance gained increasing traction. The St. Luke's M. E. Church in St. Louis, which grew rapidly in the late 1870s and early 1880s, made temperance an important part of its regular missionary work.¹²⁴ This effort drew praise from the editors of regular newspapers. For instance, an 1883 edition of the Liberty Tribune published an article entitled "An Irrepressible Conflict," which described the temperance efforts of the MEC and approved their biblical arguments in supporting them.¹²⁵ Through the 1880s, the northern Methodist Central Christian Advocate contained weekly sections focusing on the temperance issue. 1886 editions featured more than one temperance article.¹²⁶

Northern Presbyterians in Missouri were far more inclined than northern Methodists to embrace understandings of temperance that focused on the social damage caused by drunkenness

rather than its ill effects on individual salvation. In 1876, the northern General Assembly especially decried the vice of alcoholism, along with card-playing and dancing. The First Presbyterian Church in Rolla, located in southern Missouri, passed a resolution in 1876 to that effect: The session resolved “That we do heartily respond to the Assembly action thereover, and pledge ourselves to do all in our power officially and otherwise to prevent and correct this evil.”¹²⁷ Subordinate MEC organizations, such as the southern Missouri Presbytery of Ozark, maintained a committee on temperance that reported at their annual convocations.¹²⁸ By the late 1870s the St. Louis Evangelist contained a regular section entitled “Temperance” that included editorial pieces and articles that included a decidedly secular view of alcoholism. An 1883 edition, for example, featured an article entitled “Drunkenness is a Crime.” This piece belabored the point that alcoholism was not only a sin but produced criminality particularly devastating to society in general: “Let the sinfulness and criminality of drunkenness be made more heinous than the wrongs committed through its power, and there would be a restraining influence in public opinion to prevent and suppress the use of intoxicating drinks.”¹²⁹

Southern Baptists in Missouri were avid supporters of the temperance movement, but generally eschewed other Social Gospel reforms. Constituting the vast majority of Baptists in the state in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, southern Baptists tended to continue their traditional modes of combating drunkenness. At a December 1879 meeting of the Zoar Baptist Church in Saline County, a majority voted to allow a chapter of the Sons of Temperance, a voluntary society established in the state in the 1840s, to use their church building. At the same church session, William Britt was disciplined for drunkenness.¹³⁰ The “churching” of William Britt suggests that southern Baptists continued to view drunkenness as, primarily, a breach of the individual’s religious obligation to God, one’s self, and then others. By the last decade of the

century, Baptist periodicals contained temperance articles, although not to the extent as did the organs of northern Methodists and Presbyterians in the state. In 1893, the St. Louis American Baptist even published an article discussing the pros and cons of a proposed saloon law.¹³¹

Staunch southern Baptists who embraced temperance, such as the Reverend Robert S. Duncan, generally opposed legislation to limit the manufacture and sale of alcohol. Duncan was devoted to temperance through his adult life. To the end of the nineteenth century, he made active efforts as a member of such organizations as the Sons of Temperance and the short-lived temperance crusade launched by Irish-born Francis Murphy of Maine in 1877. Duncan had little patience with members who reneged on their pledges to abstain from alcohol, and he devoted an entire chapter of his 1910 memoir to the temperance movement.¹³² He supported a chapter of the IOGT whose membership spread to his charge in the Missouri River County of Montgomery near St. Louis. A report in the Hannibal Clipper described how one IOGT excursion on the Mississippi River in 1875 included close to 1,000 women and men.¹³³ But Duncan opposed Social Gospel temperance approaches that called for legislation against liquor. According to him, “the most calamitous of all events that happened to the Good Templars was their practical abandonment of the original plans and templates of temperance advocates, viz., moral suasion for the individual; and their going into politics.”¹³⁴

Middle-class evangelical women in St. Louis took up the cause of reining in drunken husbands and fathers in 1873. Two years later, they established the first chapter of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union in the State of Missouri.¹³⁵ The organization carefully steered clear of the woman suffrage movement that had gathered momentum in the city in 1867 as a consequence of the efforts of such feminists as Phoebe Cousins and Virginia Louisa Minor.¹³⁶ Under the leadership of northern Methodist Annie Turner Wittenmyer, who served as the first

national president of the WCTU until 1879, all local chapters focused their energies on the far less radical task of combating the destructive effects of adult male alcoholism on women, children, and the social order – albeit with particular enthusiasm for rectifying the supposed moral deficiencies of immigrant men with Irish and German ancestry. Relying exclusively on moral suasion to convert wayward men to the principles of temperance, similarly to the contemporaneous efforts of the IOGT, the WCTU hewed to the late antebellum framework of benevolent female activism.¹³⁷ But the organization was, even at this early juncture, much more of a feminist agency than it had been before the Civil War insofar as it sought to break women free from what they perceived to be radically increased abuses within persistently patriarchal domestic arrangements.¹³⁸

In the late 1870s, white evangelicals in rural and small town precincts established temperance societies that were decidedly less committed to advancing women’s rights than the St. Louis WCTU. The state-wide Christian Temperance Union, organized in 1878 in the town of Sedalia, Pettis County, in west-central Missouri, comprised adult white males and females. While women constituted a slight majority in most chapters, men assumed the leading roles in the new organization. But the CTU placed evangelical religion at the forefront of its first principles. The preamble of its constitution, for example, declared the organization’s “humble dependence upon Almighty God” and averred that its members were “fully persuaded that all men may be saved by the grace of God and the power of human sympathy. . . .”¹³⁹ The Sedalia CTU chapter of the new organization convened initially in the town’s MEC house of worship.¹⁴⁰ In July 1878, the Christian Temperance Union successfully thwarted the plan of R. N. Marrow to open a saloon in the town.¹⁴¹

After Francis Willard became president of the WCTU in 1879, the Women's Christian Temperance Union in Missouri became the prime engine for woman suffrage and advanced a brand of temperance activism comporting much more with the Social Gospel than before. Indicative of the WCTU goal to achieve greater political influence, it organized its higher jurisdictions by congressional district. At an 1887 meeting of the Sixth Congressional District in the town of Glasgow, Howard County, WCTU organizers energetically made their presence known. According to one spokeswoman, "To us this is an omen full of hope; and we thank God that He is opening the way for yet more and more, as year by year we press onward in the work to which we have consecrated our lives."¹⁴² The middle-class white women who led the WCTU in Missouri sought to familiarize residents with the campaign for "social purity" articulated by Francis Willard, whose woman suffrage initiative presupposed that white women, as the morally superior sex, should be empowered as "citizen-mothers" capable of protecting homes and curing the ills of society. Increasingly, the WCTU cast alcoholism as the consequence of larger socioeconomic and institutional derangements rather than as a failure of individuals to conform their conduct to Christian moral precepts. Under Willard's leadership, the WCTU began to call for legislation to keep Sunday as a Sabbath day of rest; punish the men who paid for prostitutes; require that employers pay a "living wage" and observe a maximum eight-hour work day; and improve factory working conditions, public health, and sanitation. Head of the Missouri WCTU Department of Social Purity was Catherine P. Wallace of Fayette, Howard County, who organized a series of lectures in 1885 to familiarize the general public with the expanding goals of the organization.¹⁴³ By the mid-1880s, at least, the WCTU had begun to call for a legal ban on the manufacture and sale of alcohol, that is, prohibition. The WCTU chapter in Columbia, Boone County, was especially active in distributing literature. Pamphlets and circulars reached the

elementary and secondary schools, the several colleges in the town, the courthouse, the post office, and African Americans as well.¹⁴⁴ One WCTU pamphlet, for example, warned that children could be corrupted by unscrupulous servants, in all likelihood, a reference to African American housekeepers and nannies: “Those who have servants to take care of their children would need to make piety a first qualification. Many a ruined life can trace its evil course to the poison imbibed from an impure-minded nurse-maid.”¹⁴⁵

Black ministers and congregants in Missouri readily embraced organized temperance activism in the last several decades of the nineteenth century. It seems quite likely that some African American church leaders took up the temperance cause strategically to deflect the harsh criticisms of an increasingly racist white society. Black temperance activism both garnered the approval of white leaders and arrested white fears of alcohol-induced African American licentiousness. But Baptist minister John Berry Meachum had worked strenuously before the Civil War in behalf of temperance as a matter of faith and out of concern for struggling African American families. The 1880 visit to St. Louis by former Maryland slave Francis Ellen Watkins Harper, a WCTU activist, spurred the black women of the Central Baptist Church in the city to establish a chapter of the organization. Albeit under an advisory board composed of leading black men, many of these same women formed the St. Louis Colored Orphans’ Home.¹⁴⁶ Former slave Phannie Corneal, a member of the AME Church in St. Louis, spent many years organizing for the WCTU.¹⁴⁷ In 1883, black congregants at the St. Paul AME Church in Columbia, Boone County, held a debate in an effort to properly gauge the extent to which drunkenness generated crime among blacks. The participants clearly focused on the social ill consequences of the vice rather than its impact on the eternal salvation of their black brothers and sisters.¹⁴⁸ In the 1890s,

the black Baptist State Convention maintained an active official committee on temperance that reported at their annual meetings.¹⁴⁹

By the 1890s, some southern Methodist leaders in Missouri were making public their support for prohibition. Editorials and articles included in the St. Louis Christian Advocate favored a legal ban on alcohol. One piece asked point blank how devout Methodists could “find that the strong language and stronger action in favor of the total removal of the great evil of intemperance from our land is not necessary?”¹⁵⁰ Newspaper editor and publisher E. Herbert Smith, a southern Methodist in southeastern Missouri, took the view that liquor manufacturers and dealers should have as few opportunities as possible to promote their wares. According to him, “I have never [sic] accepted liquor advertisements in any newspaper I have been connected with . . . The way I viewed it, if my paper helped the liquor traffic, I did not dare accept it. If it did not, I would be accepting money under false pretenses and I did not want it either way.”¹⁵¹

In 1889, newly-elected Democrat Governor David Francis publicly conveyed the difficulties that elected officials encountered when faced with the prospect of increasing government regulation of alcohol. Quite clearly, he was well aware of the dilemma this posed in a polity inhabited by energetic teetotalers, conservatives who resented state intrusion into the realm of personal morality, and European immigrants who were adamant about keeping their customary liberty to have a few cups with friends and family every day. Francis declared that he was deeply concerned about “the corrupting influence of the saloons on the morals of the community and the politics of the country.” He promised to crack down on these dens of inequity and confine the liquor business to “the narrowest possible limits.” But he also promised to adhere strictly to the first rule of republican government, which was not to do more than

“preserve the life, liberty, and property of the people.” However this was to be accomplished, the new governor assured the electorate that “the people,” not politicians would make the laws.¹⁵²

Temperance advocates who took up the call for prohibition ran up against stiff resistance. Editorials in the regular press featured a constant stream of commentary critical of temperance activists who boldly called for legislation banning alcohol. Conservative aversion to the prospect of the government legislating personal morality, reinforced by decades of evangelical strife over the moral and constitutional propriety of abolitionism, spiced these pieces. In June 1879, outspoken temperance advocate Joseph Walker devoted an entire article in the Phelps County New Era to deflecting trenchant conservative criticisms of the growing movement.¹⁵³ By the 1880s, St. Louis had become a major beer manufacturing hub with far-reaching political influence. German-born Adolphus Busch and his father-in-law Eberhard Anheuser, most notably, had established a powerful beer-brewing fiefdom in the city that consolidated company-licensed saloons in the city as bastions of “wet” Democrat Party power.¹⁵⁴ But a substantial segment of the evangelical leadership, as well as the CTU and the WCTU, worked systematically to generate anti-saloon legislation, especially after Kansas became the first state to adopt prohibition by constitutional amendment in 1880. The records of the Missouri General Assembly from this period are chock full of such efforts, most of which went down to defeat. But in a political culture where bribery involving elected officials and the trusts had become commonplace, and where conservative opposition to morals legislation remained strong, it is difficult to ascertain the actual voting power of prohibition forces. In any case, an 1897 resolution to ban the sale of intoxicating liquors passed by the house and brought to the floor of the Senate failed in that chamber twenty-four to five.¹⁵⁵

Through the instrumentality of local option laws, Missouri residents ultimately configured their landscape “wet” or “dry” along the lines of the demographic divide that separated rural and small town evangelicals from large urban places such as St. Louis, where Roman Catholics predominated. An 1875 Columbia ordinance prohibited the sale of liquor within three miles of the University of Missouri campus. The ordinance, however, came under fire in 1883-84 as citizens mobilized to repeal it.¹⁵⁶ Ladies in the local Women’s Christian Temperance Union, nevertheless, sought to use their influence to ensure that local justices of the peace and circuit court judges knew who to prosecute under the controversial law – even going into a secret session on one occasion to achieve those aims.¹⁵⁷ They appear to have met with limited success. An 1886 editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commented happily on the decline of prosecutions under the measure.¹⁵⁸ The Missouri General Assembly passed a new local option law in 1888. But sixty-seven of the 114 counties in Missouri were still wet at the turn of the twentieth century. Not surprisingly, the most homogenous block of wet counties included the County of St. Louis and others in the “Missouri Rhineland” west of the city along the Missouri River, where German farmers, who also made wine, resided in substantial numbers. Authorities, it seems, laxly enforced laws banning the sale of liquor on Sundays in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.¹⁵⁹ But as late as 1883, statewide leaders could still make political hay in so-called “outstate” areas, that is, largely rural regions, by threatening to crack down on Sunday tipplers in St. Louis. An 1883 article in the Columbia Missouri Statesman, for example, featured an interview with Governor Thomas Theodore Crittenden in which he promised to enforce the Sunday laws in that city.¹⁶⁰

Jim Crow and the Churches

The role that white evangelicals played in the consolidation of the Jim Crow system of racial segregation in Missouri had many facets, some of which appeared to comport with a substantial level of respect for their African American counterparts. White northern Baptists in Missouri continued to support their black counterparts to the end of the nineteenth century. Through the 1890s the American Home Missionary Baptist Association was still sending at least some assistance to African American congregations in Missouri. In 1896 the African Second Baptist Church in Neosho lost its building in a fire and the membership was able to gain a \$500 loan from white Baptist supporters to construct a new meeting place.¹⁶¹ The next year a delegate from the American Home Missionary Baptist Association spoke at the Missouri black Baptist convention.¹⁶²

White northern Methodists maintained some African Americans within their ranks, albeit in segregated circumstances. In 1884 the General Conference granted an enabling act to its Missouri subordinates to allow the formation of a segregated annual conference. The Central Missouri Annual Conference was formed as a result. White northern Methodists in the state had been advocating for this new annual conference since the 1870s.¹⁶³ During the 1880s and 1890s the MEC had at least two black congregations in St. Louis, Wesley Chapel and Elliott Ave. M. E. Church. But both churches hewed to the Jim Crow system that had been implemented in the state.¹⁶⁴

White northern Presbyterians in Missouri attempted to lend assistance to their black sisters and brothers. While northern Presbyterian congregations in St. Louis and other urban places typically had only had a few or no African American members, their congregations were not racially segregated. Edward Cooper, the editor of the northern Presbyterian St. Louis

Evangelist, was not a strict segregationist and decidedly hostile toward the southern Presbyterians. Cooper was born in New York and came to St. Louis from Ohio in the 1880s.¹⁶⁵ Writing in 1887 during one of the proposed reunification efforts of both branches of the Presbyterian Church, he claimed it would fail because the rights that African American members possessed in the northern church would be abrogated. He explained that “We have no doubt that the appeal and argument presented by the colored Presbyterians in connection with the Northern Church, against union with the Southern Church will prevail.”¹⁶⁶ Cooper asserted in an issue a few weeks later that a proposal to turn the missionary efforts among blacks in the South over to the southern General Assembly portended disaster: “Take control of this vast work, and of its funds out of the hands of our Assembly, and turn it over to the “squatter sovereigns” of South Carolina!”¹⁶⁷ Northern Presbyterian Missouri Presbytery of the Ozark in the southern part of the state appear to have agreed. That body maintained a committee on the freedmen into the 1890s.¹⁶⁸

On the other hand, the relationship of white evangelicals to African American churchgoers developed amid the growing repression of African Americans by white Missourians. The state board of education continued to maintain separate schools for black children and white children. An 1879 statute banned the intermarriage of blacks and whites. Towns and counties passed ordinances that required separate accommodations for whites and blacks. African Americans in Missouri suffered stricter punishments for liquor violations and were less likely to see judges mitigate their sentences than in the case of white defendants. An anonymous 1884 letter to the Columbia Missouri Statesman asked that simple fact after a white man had his fine waived unlike an African American man who committed the same offense.¹⁶⁹

White evangelicals in Missouri increasingly shaped their relations with black churchgoers in keeping with the full-blown emergence of racial segregation. The reunified Democratic Party exploited themes of racial prejudice and a narrative of the “Lost Cause,” which cast white Missourians as victims of Federal tyranny and outrages. In this version of the past, Missouri Unionists and Republicans were cast as traitors and criminals. This surge of racist sentiment ushered in Missouri’s version of Jim Crow, which drew on longstanding white racial prejudice, fears of African America licentiousness, and concerns that the freed people were likely to be reliable Republican voters.

Missouri Methodists, in particular, articulated reactionary views that bolstered the emerging system of thoroughgoing racial segregation. For instance, in January of 1890 the St. Louis Christian Advocate published an article entitled “Slavery and Intemperance.” Demonstrating how many southerners were unrepentant over slavery, it began “Slavery for a time was a blessing to the enslaved.”¹⁷⁰ The article only put some limits on its praise of slavery as it theorized “Perhaps the time came when the elevation of the negro, in a state of slavery, could proceed no further, and the continuance of his enslavement would have resulted in the degradation of both master and slave.”¹⁷¹ Throughout the 1880s the Columbia Missouri Statesman took a tone in its discussions of African Americans that largely focused on scandals at black churches. It gave only brief coverage of other African American church activities. For instance, the paper reported in March 1880 a central Missouri Methodist preacher, James Hogan was arrested after he stole thirty-five dollars from the church collection.¹⁷² Three years later in Mexico, northeast of Columbia, three women and the pastor of the black Baptist church, Silas Smith, were arrested for burning down the structure. Smith’s story was that his alleged mistress, Ann Crockett, started the fire. She in turn defended herself from the accusation saying “that

Smith is a conjurer, and that he vodoodooed her, and while under his influence she fired the building.”¹⁷³ While Smith was eventually acquitted, he was cut off from his fellow black churchgoers. In 1884 he tried to become a member of the Chambers Street Baptist Church in St. Louis but was unanimously rejected.¹⁷⁴

African American Resistance to Jim Crow

African Americans in Missouri saw the white-dominated Republican Party abandon them completely in the 1890s. A substantial minority of the national Republican Party, the so-called “Mugwumps,” persisted in advancing liberal reforms and Protestant government in the 1880s. But, not surprisingly, this group of public moralists obtained little traction in Gilded Age Missouri.¹⁷⁵ Out of power after 1870, Missouri Republicans retained the support of the German-American population, white northern immigrants, and some upcountry residents in the Ozark highlands of southwest Missouri. But by the late 1890s, African Americans had become decidedly discontented with the GOP. Through that decade, the white Republican leadership in the state became steadily more conservative, business-oriented, and much less concerned with advancing black equality. This tendency was especially pronounced in the villages and towns of Little Dixie and the southeastern Boot heel. White Republicans, essentially, adopted the Democrat Party tactic of playing on racial fears to draw the votes of poor whites. By the mid-1890s, Missouri Republicans no longer even bothered to field African American candidates or support civil rights reform. Given that the Republicans did not hold any statewide offices, they had nothing to offer African Americans in the way of state and country patronage appointments. By 1900, black Missourians correctly perceived that the Republican Party had, basically, abandoned and betrayed them.¹⁷⁶

Notwithstanding the growing sense among blacks that the Republican Party had abandoned them, African American men continued to vote to the end of the nineteenth century. While there were flirtations with the Democrats, most African Americans in the state continued to be Republicans.¹⁷⁷ An article from the African American St. Louis Palladium shortly after the turn of the century indicates this fact. The paper said that in preparation for the 1904 election that the city and state needed to be organized for a GOP victory since “until the party is recognized in the state and city, there can be no victory in Missouri.”¹⁷⁸ Such mobilization was, moreover, not always in vain. Black resistance ensured that 1903 requiring separate seating for blacks and whites on passenger trains.¹⁷⁹

Black church leaders in Missouri denounced the imposition of racial segregation and other forms of persecution targeting African Americans. AME Bishop Henry McNeal Turner, for example, vehemently condemned the racist efforts of whites. His denunciations, in many ways foreshadowed the Black Nationalist movement of the twentieth century.¹⁸⁰ At the 1897 meeting of the Missouri Colored Baptist Convention, black ministers vehemently spoke out against segregation by condemning the separate coach law. With lynching on the rise throughout the United States, the convocation also denounced racist mob actions. It resolved to attack “lynching in strong language, as well as lawlessness. It said that the negro should obey the law and if he violated, he should be punished, but that punishment should be by the law and not by mobs.”¹⁸¹

Black ministers continued to advance the socioeconomic, civil, and political rights of their people. African American ministers situated in the more liberal precincts of large towns and cities pressured their counterparts who remained publicly silent about racial prejudice and injustice to speak out. Pastor of the First Baptist Church in St. Louis E. C. Cole, Meachum’s successor at the Baptist Church in St. Louis boldly called for an end to accommodation to white

racial prejudice while also arguing that “there ought to be peace and harmony in the church.”¹⁸² As in Reconstruction, black evangelicalism did not make distinctions between spiritual, religious, socioeconomic, and political relations. The preaching and public commentary of the Reverend Henry Brownlee, pastor of the Pleasant Green Baptist Church in St. Louis commonly reflected such commitments. African Americans continued to draw on their historical experiences with slavery and, since the Civil War, racial prejudice and segregation to shape their understandings of faith and the relationship of religion to secular matters. Memorial volumes of this congregation and others in state commonly featured such condemnations.¹⁸³

Protestant Supremacy

Beginning during Reconstruction, northern and southern evangelicals in Missouri appear to have agreed that Roman Catholic immigration posed an increasing threat to Protestantism. Native-born Missourians became alarmed at the large number of foreign arrivals, especially those of the Roman Catholic faith who hailed from the Northeast and Germany. Radicals had promoted northeastern immigration in order to boost their numbers in the state. But many Protestant leaders agreed with Radical leader Charles D. Drake that the steadily enlarging number of foreign-born Roman Catholics, much more than before the war, posed a very real threat to white Protestant supremacy. In 1869, a two-part series appearing in the St. Louis Christian Advocate called to arms its rank and file southern Methodist membership. The Reverend G. W. Horn of Jefferson City, author of the editorial pieces, declared that the alarming increase in the Catholic population was a phenomenon unfolding singularly in the United States and a threatening development about which all Protestants should be deeply concerned. Horn warned of a dark conspiracy of international proportions: “The foreign influx [of Catholics] is more than the native increase. European States are being depleted to fill America.”¹⁸⁴ Centuries-

old sectarian diatribes abounded. In an 1869 letter, for example, MECS Bishop Enoch Mather Marvin of Missouri compared the heightened veneration given by Roman Catholics to the Virgin Mary with idolatry.¹⁸⁵

Evangelical denunciations of Roman Catholic immigrants in Missouri arose powerfully in response to Radical Republican policies that proscribed traditional Protestant education in public school classrooms. Implementing this change was Connecticut-born William Torrey Harris, whom Radicals appointed superintendent of the new St. Louis public school system in 1867. Harris's tendency to impose industrial discipline on children raised the hackles of parents wedded to the traditional idea that the family, rather than the state, was to teach children basic morals and manners.¹⁸⁶ But he angered white evangelicals much more with his influential solution to the so-called "School Question" then facing the state and the nation. By the late 1860s, Roman Catholic immigrants across the United States, including those in St. Louis, had begun to oppose strenuously daily prayer and the reading of the King James Bible in public common schools. Equally problematic in the view of evangelicals was that Catholics also received public funds for their parochial schools. Notwithstanding their success in the latter regard, Catholic objections to Protestant instruction in the public schools drew considerable strength from evolving liberal understandings of the constitutional separation of church and state.

During his tenure as superintendent of the St. Louis schools, William Torrey Harris banned daily Bible reading in recognition of the preferences expressed by the parents of the large number of German Catholic students enrolled. By the end of Reconstruction, he declared widely that the public common school must be a "purely secular institution, without any religious instruction in it whatever."¹⁸⁷ Harris's policies prompted contributors to the northern Presbyterian St. Louis Evangelist to lament the increasing power that Catholics exercised in

Missouri and the United States. Consider an 1876 letter that appeared in that newspaper penned by retired Presbyterian minister William Breckinridge, who was then residing on his farm in Cass County, situated in the western part of the state. According to Breckinridge, the Roman Catholic Church remained engaged in “movements against the liberties of this country. . . fierce assaults upon the public schools, to destroy them in the end – meanwhile to seize as much as possible of their funds, and its plain purpose [is] to control elections to the utmost of its power, as a political party. . . .”¹⁸⁸

Missouri evangelicals became increasingly troubled in the 1870s and 1880s by the continuing voluminous immigration of Roman Catholic from southern and eastern Europe. Bolstering traditional Protestant resentments was the growing influence of German Catholics in the state’s Democratic Party, believed to be linked fundamentally to corrupt machine politics controlled by the brewing trusts. Notices in newspapers like the Liberty Tribune disparaged new Catholic arrivals.¹⁸⁹ The The Rolla New Era featured an editorial bemoaning the decision of Democratic Congressman Richard P. Bland to convert to Catholicism during a trip he took to Washington, D.C. The Republicans would certainly smear Bland with the decision.¹⁹⁰ St. Louis, newspapers such as The Central Baptist and The American Baptist ran numerous articles that featured denunciations of the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church. In 1898, The Central Baptist printed a piece entitled “Romanism in America” in which it detailed Catholicism’s nefarious growth as a result of immigration.¹⁹¹ The American Baptist produced far more incendiary articles detailing, among other things, how a woman was kidnapped by several priests and nuns.¹⁹² A few weeks after that publication, the story of a former priest, Joseph Slattery, who had given an anti-Catholic talk in St. Louis, appeared in The American Baptist. After speaking at the Central Turner Hall in November of 1893, a mob chased him back to the Laclede Hotel.¹⁹³

White Evangelical Commemoration and the Invention of the Ideal Middle Westerner

Former Confederates in Missouri generally cast their fallen comrades as heroes in an intersectional struggle infused with sacred meanings. In Missouri, as in the other former slaveholding states, veterans of the Civil War formed their own organizations. In 1881, the Ex-Confederate Veteran Association of Missouri was established at a meeting in the Randolph County town of Moberly, situated in Little Dixie. Speakers at association events frequently invoked the Lost Cause, while reminding listeners that the South had been outnumbered during the War Between the States. For reasons known only to God, in his infinite wisdom, the valiant efforts of her soldiers and her people could not stave off defeat under the circumstances. While a chaplain was generally present at meetings, attendees were rarely treated to sermons or extended addresses stressing the religious foundations of the great conflict.¹⁹⁴ They avoided making public any continuing belief in the intertwined constitutional and religious ideas that had, from their perspective, once justified slavery. But the Confederate veterans certainly continued to perceive their understandings of the war in religious terms. At an 1883 meeting of the association in St. Louis, for example, members solemnly resolved that “we have accepted the results of the issues of the late war in good faith, and from the arbitration of arms, sealed with the blood of a million martyrs, there is no appeal.”¹⁹⁵

White women with southern bearings in Missouri formed a state-wide United Daughters of the Confederacy in 1898 to perpetuate, in palpable religious terms, the memory of fallen Confederate soldiers. The initial meeting was held in the Little Dixie venue of Fayette, Howard County. While the organization began with four “circles,” it soon expanded across the rural and

small town regions of state.¹⁹⁶ At their 1899 meeting, Mrs. Hyde proposed a resolution saying that

the organization of the United Daughters of the Confederacy was founded in a desire to perpetuate and promote the high principle of loyalty and truth; and, believing that the heroic courage, endurance and fidelity of the representative Confederate soldier should be held as a sacred heritage; and, seeing the wide-spread misunderstandings of facts relating to the causes, motive and aspirations of our Southern people in the great struggle known as the civil war [sic].¹⁹⁷

Hyde and the other delegates also resolved at the meeting to organize in behalf of inculcating among the students in Missouri elementary and secondary schools a proper appreciation of the war and its true causes. This version of the past included due veneration of the sacred sacrifices made by Confederate soldiers, as well as the irregular pro-Confederate partisans in the state. At a 1900 gathering, members began soliciting nominations for an organizational motto. The Kansas City chapter submission, later adopted by the organization, commemorated the fallen Confederate dead and also emphasized the role of the Almighty in allowing Godly civilizations to flourish. The chosen motto derived from a section of Rudyard Kipling's imperialist poem Recessional, composed in honor of Queen Victoria's diamond jubilee: "Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet, Lest we forget, Lest we forget."¹⁹⁸

Union veterans of the Civil War did not shy away from articulating the religious sentiments and political arguments that they had relied upon to justify the Civil War – as well as a continuing sacrosanct veneration of loyalty to the Union. The Union Veteran organization, the Grand Army of the Republic, was on the vanguard in promoting these views in the state. The GAR was originally established in Missouri immediately after the war.¹⁹⁹ After 1882, its membership grew rapidly, reaching 20,353 members in 1892. While former combatants began to pass away at about this time, thinning the roles of the organization, there were over 500 posts

erected in Missouri. Of course, more were set up in the regions that had seen strong Union support, such as the St. Louis area.²⁰⁰ In addition to providing fraternity and mutual assistance for former Union Army soldiers, the GAR promoted one key feature of the distinctive brand of patriotism that Radical Republicans and northern evangelical churches had sought to impose on recalcitrant southern partisans during Reconstruction -- loyalty to the Union. Consider, for example, the words of Senior Vice Commander in Chief A. G. Weissert at the 1890 GAR "encampment": "But the duties of the Grand Army have not ceased . . . the great object of the Grand Army of the Republic is in teaching, in perpetuating loyalty (applause); and there are no departments in which that can be done so well as in these Departments of the so-called border States." Weissert also stressed to the audience that the GAR would continue to advance this prime tenet of northern civil religion with presentations and publications among students in the new public school system of Missouri.²⁰¹ As with the UDC, the challenge was to win the hearts and minds of the children.

Northern evangelical sentiments, including invocations of Divine Providence, figured significantly in the commemorative understandings of the Civil War advanced by the GAR. The organization certainly appears to have claimed strict adherence to first principles of religious liberty. Addressing a procession in Jefferson City after the annual state encampment in 1890, the head of the local post, John T. Clarke, extolled the religious tolerance that marked the society. But he concluded this section of his remarks by saying that "among us we have devout Christians and as pious ministers as ever sang an anthem or ever lisped a prayer to the living God."²⁰² By the early 1880s, GAR members sometimes invoked the millennial promise of the Civil War. Some continued to believe that the war was an apocalyptic event that had preserved the Union.²⁰³ GAR chaplains generally supported this view. Consider the utterances of northern Methodist

chaplain Thomas Johnson Ferril, who led prayer at the 1890 encampment: “We glorify Thee, our Heavenly Father, for the blessings which Thou hast providentially bestowed upon us in the years which have past and gone. Thou hast cared for our lives when we could not care for ourselves. Thy protecting power has been over us, and we are brought to see this beautiful morning with a halo of spring loveliness spread before us²⁰⁴ This appreciation of a generous Divine Providence was also evident in the benediction given by another northern Methodist minister Thomas H. Hagerty, at the 1892 encampment. He opened the meeting by thanking God for

when our Nation’s life was assailed Thou didst inspire the loyal sons of America to go into the field of strife, and when upon the battlefield Thou didst nerve their arms, and Thou didst give success to the right. We thank Thee that when our National emblem was torn down at Ft. Sumpter, that Thou didst take it in Thine own hand and carry it through the smoke of battle . . . and Thou didst take it and keep it safely; and at Appomattox Thou didst unfurl it forever in the breeze.²⁰⁵

Ministers who chronicled the development of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Missouri, not surprisingly, were rather consistently the least predisposed to abandon old grievances against their northern denominational counterparts and the Unionists and Radicals who had supported them. MECS writers often placed the blame for the continuing division of Methodism on the MEC, while discounting the role that contention over the morality of slavery had played in the 1845 denominational split, secession, or Civil War. David R. McAnally published History of Methodism in Missouri in 1881. His story followed the course taken by other chroniclers, even barrowing information from a manuscript written by Robert S. Duncan about the Baptists. McAnally maintained that the state, at this point, was mostly filled with Methodist ministers with southern heritage, an assertion which flatly contradicted some MEC accounts.²⁰⁶

All three MECS annual conferences officially recognized W. S. Woodard's 1893 Annals of Methodism in Missouri as the bona fide account of southern Methodism in the state. Woodard largely traced out the careers of influential ministers, but emphasized most the frontier origins of the church. He mentioned briefly the various points of conflict between the MEC and MECS in the state, often placing blame entirely on the northern Methodists. In his discussion of the 1845 national Methodist schism, he stressed that the MEC had extra-judicially deposed Bishop Andrew, the critical catalyst spurring the MECS to break from the MEC in 1845. According to Woodward, the moral issue of slavery was not the cause of the split, nor did contention over its morality or abolitionism hasten secession or the Civil War. On the whole, Woodard praised the fateful denominational division: "The Methodist church has accomplished more good under the jurisdiction of the two general Conferences than it could have under one."²⁰⁷

Southern Methodist chronicler William Lewis similarly blamed the MEC for the division of Methodism, exculpated the Missouri MECS of any wrongdoing, and held up its faithful as martyrs. The Reverend Lewis, writing at the behest of his friend David R. McAnally, chronicled the experiences of the MECS during the 1860s, picking up where McAnally had left off in the construction of a usable history of southern Methodism in the state. Certainly Lewis's The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870 (1890) described far more instances of intra-denominational strife than did other evangelical chronicles of the period. At the outset of the book, Lewis denied MEC arguments that the MECS had caused of the Civil War and that its ministers had been treasonous political agitators. He also lamented "the cruel persecution of the M. E. Church, South, which, as a Church, was unsectional, unpolitical, and loyal to the Constitution and government of our country."²⁰⁸ He retold the stories of numerous Methodist ministers persecuted by Unionist partisans; some of these accounts he derived from

William Leftwich's Martyrdom in Missouri. Included was a description of how McAnally had been unjustly arrested by the provost marshal as a consequence of his MECS newspaper publications. In the estimation of Lewis, those who suffered Unionist reprisals "deserve to have an imperishable monument as high as heaven in honor of their Christian heroism. Their names should live in the Church of Christ until time shall be no more."²⁰⁹

The Methodist Episcopal Church in Missouri produced no grand history in the late nineteenth century, but works produced by individual ministers generated a rather positive public image of the denomination. Consider an account written by MEC minister Lorenzo Waugh. While Waugh relocated to California after the Civil War, he felt it necessary to write a memoir of his ministerial life. The memoir was republished in several editions beginning in 1883 and circulated in Missouri. In looking back on his experiences in the state, Waugh averred that he certainly did not wish to live that part of his life over. But he also conveyed that he was generally happy with what he had done, which he believed had made the country a better place. While far less presupposing than Galusha Anderson, Waugh explained, toward the end of his book, that "I have fought a good fight, and in the main have conquered. I can say with a clear conscience, I have battled for the right, and sometimes for the time being, in doing this, I have lost friends and favorable reputation. But inward joy and happiness in every instance have come on surely as they final result."²¹⁰

Southern Baptist leader William Pope Yeaman publicly expressed the view that Baptist division dating back decades was a regrettable development that left few Baptists, northern or southern, guilty of any serious transgressions. In his 1899 History of Missouri Baptist General Association, Yeaman discussed briefly the way that intra-denominational strife over slavery had undercut the unity of the Baptists. In his words, "It is not to be accounted a strange thing that at

such a time and under the baleful and blighting influences of such social conditions christianity [sic] was hindered.”²¹¹ While Yeaman alluded to numerical tabulations to demonstrate the deleterious impact of the Border War with Kansas, he did not blame any of his fellow Baptists for any of the troubles that the denomination had suffered. Once again, outside forces were to blame. The Central Baptist, published in St. Louis, lauded Yeaman’s: “It was written with an impartial hand – a brief comprehensive generalization such as one would expect from the gifted writer.”²¹² Similarly to MECS chronicler William Lewis, Yeaman emphasized most that southern Baptists ministers in the state had been, during the antebellum period and through the Civil War and Reconstruction, distinctively uninvolved in politics.²¹³

In his discussion of the Radical-leaning Missouri Baptist Convention, northern Baptist Robert S. Duncan found ways to gloss over its rather strenuous efforts to make slaveholding and disloyalty articles of faith and political orthodoxy. Duncan explained that the members of the Convention had simply been ignorant of the fact that the then-southern-oriented General Association deeply resented the new Unionist ecclesiastical body. According to Duncan, “This fact being discovered by influential members of the convention, good counsel prevailed, this young state organization disbanded, peace was restored, and the members returned to their former seats in the General Association.”²¹⁴ Duncan’s work was praised in advance at the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the General Association.²¹⁵

Northern Baptist leaders in Missouri, it seems, sometimes sought to obscure the militant Unionism that marked that denomination during and after the war. For example, moderator of the first State Convention, northern Baptist minister Galusha Anderson, produced a 1908 history of St. Louis that completely erased his opposition to the Radical 1865 Constitution. His The Story of a Border City During the Civil War arrogantly portrayed himself as one of the few shining

lights for Unionism in the early days of the war in St. Louis. He provided numerous examples of how his work in St. Louis had furthered the federal cause in the city, especially in 1861.

Nowhere did he discuss the formation of the Missouri Baptist State Convention. At the same time, he distanced himself from the suppression of religious liberty attendant on the imposition of the Test Oath. In contradiction to a 1860s piece he published in the Baptist Quarterly, Anderson praised those in the 1865 constitutional convention who had voted against the oath. In his words, they “could not stem the tide of radicalism in the Convention and this notorious oath became a part of the new Constitution of Missouri.”²¹⁶

Chronicles authored by southern Baptists generally concentrated on praising the pioneering missionaries and fledgling congregations who had helped build up Missouri, while discounting the denominational strife resulting from the 1844 schism. Baptist historian Robert S. Duncan’s 1888 History of the Baptists in Missouri, certainly condemned the abuses of the Test Oath, spending twelve pages to name the southern Baptist ministers who had fallen prey to its enforcement. But Duncan focused otherwise entirely on the rise and development of various local associations. In doing so, he bypassed any discussion of the antebellum denominational rupture in the state and strife of the Civil War itself. The basic storyline was much more wholesome. Rural white Baptists pioneered the trans-Mississippi West. Their religious societies rose from humble frontier beginnings, ultimately, to claim their place in Gilded Age Missouri as the largest Christian denomination in the state.²¹⁷

A series of articles published in the northern Presbyterian St. Louis Evangelist, beginning in 1876, similarly focused on the heroic frontier development of the church. The author, writing under the pseudonym of “Senex,” that is, “wise old man,” praised the bold evangelism of the Reverend David Nelson in newly-settled Palmyra. But he omitted altogether to explain the intra-

denominational strife over the moral issue of slavery that violently drove Nelson from the state. Nor did the pseudonymous author mention the abolitionist Presbyterian minister Elijah Lovejoy, his personal trials, or murder at the hands of pro-slavery partisans.²¹⁸

At the 1882 convention of the northern Synod of Missouri, delegates generally emphasized that intra-denominational division over the morality of slavery had not really been the fault of Missouri Presbyterians and, in any case, was a thing of the past. In his “Historical Sketch of the Synod of Missouri,” William Cochran blamed the late 1841 Presbyterian schism in the state on outside forces. He briefly addressed the Declaration and Testimony controversy – but condemned both its signers and the northern General Assembly that excluded them. In his view, it was “was uncalled for and unchristian; it deserved to be reprovved by the judiciaries, but was not met by the spirit that overcomes evil.”²¹⁹ In the estimation of Cochran, the controversy needlessly continued the division of Presbyterianism in Missouri and in the other former slaveholding states. Two ministers, John Leighton and J. J. Marks, duly eulogized early missionaries who had paid a high price for advancing the denomination in frontier Missouri, such as David Nelson and Elijah Lovejoy. But the overriding spirit of all the addresses was that these trials were long past. Leighton summed up this point when he said that “but beginning just about 50 years ago, our laborious brethren divided on questions very minor”²²⁰

One northern Presbyterian chronicler described the establishment of the Presbyterian Church in southern Missouri in terms that virtually excluded all reference to the deep divisions over slavery that had sundered the denomination. E. E. Stringfield, in his 1909 Presbyterianism in the Ozarks, conceded that the church had not developed in that part of the state prior to the Civil War as it had elsewhere. And there were certainly “disagreements.” But, Stringfield basically blamed such discord on “outside forces.” “None of the controversies that have affected

Presbyterianism so disastrously in this State have originated in her borders.”²²¹ Stringfield, moreover, played down the virulent conflict between northern and southern Presbyterians during the Civil War and omitted altogether to discuss the Unionist and Republican efforts to muzzle southern Presbyterian ministers such as Robert P. Farris. By the same token, he omitted even to mention the moral issue of slavery, secession, or disloyalty, the fundamental bases of southern and northern Presbyterianism division dating back decades.²²²

In the final analysis, the revitalized temperance movement in Missouri after about 1880 proved much more capable of binding white northern and southern evangelicals together than continuing ecclesiastical divisions and longstanding theological and political differences had to deter their joint prosecution of the campaign against alcohol. To the end of the nineteenth century, there was no ecclesiastical re-unification among northern and southern Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. But in the view of most evangelicals, northern and southern, rural and urban, excessive alcohol consumption was at the bottom of all the major social ills confronting them. The marital and family transgressions of white husbands and fathers seemed to result directly from the rapidly growing number of saloons established in crossroad villages, towns, and large cities. As did whites generally, white evangelicals perceived a dire threat from politically empowered African American men, whom they believed to be especially disorderly and beastly when intoxicated. White Protestants grew especially resentful of the Sunday tipping and related ceremonial drinking culture of Roman Catholics, whose numbers continued to rise rapidly in the City of St. Louis and surrounding counties to the end of the century.

Evangelical chroniclers, memoirists, and autobiographers crafted accounts of Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist church development served several discursive purposes. First, they usefully obscured the unsavory impulses that drove all evangelicals to support strongly the

temperance campaign. Equally important, these accounts papered over the intertwined theological and political controversies that had divided the three churches since the late 1830s and the militant strife that pitted northern and southern evangelicals against one another during the Civil War and Reconstruction.

Divided northern and southern evangelicals in Missouri undoubtedly continued to articulate among themselves, even if in somewhat hushed tones, the basic differences concerning religion and the organization of society and government that had divided them since the late antebellum period. But by the early twentieth century, their chronicles, autobiographies and other historical accounts generally emphasized the distinctive pioneer heritage of each denomination and the remarkable growth and prosperity each had enjoyed. Looking at such good fortune in retrospect, it was easy for such men to credit Divine Providence for further advancing the sacred mission of the nation. Even if only grudging, such accounts conveyed a sense that old antagonisms were long past and that some measure of mutual accommodation was in order. Northern evangelicals politely acquiesced to southern evangelical claims to have taken principled objections against Union military aggression. In turn, southern evangelicals, even recalcitrant southern Methodists, publicly dropped the claim that they had been correct on the moral question of African American bondage – and even pledged future loyalty to the Union.

Northern and southern evangelical writers and spokesmen eagerly embraced the trope that ministers on both sides of the divide had, before, during, and after the Civil War, remained notably uninvolved in politics, just as the 1820, 1865, and 1875 constitutions had required. Revisionist chronicles and memorials eliminated most of the vituperative debates over the morality of slavery and the propriety of church involvement in the efforts of political leaders and civil authorities to resolve the problem. Much less did they acknowledge that, prior to the Civil

War, the vast majority of southern and northern Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians in the state supported the peculiar institution. Standard accounts generally maintained that boundaries between church and state had never been endangered in the least. Minor disagreements remained, but northern and southern evangelicals agreed that they shared a common purpose – the salvation of souls.

Whether an intentionally collaborative effort or not, the eradication of the darkest nineteenth-century exploits of evangelicals from their collective memory definitely tended to sanitize the public image of both liberal and conservative church-goers. Each side had skeletons it preferred to leave in the closet. Northern and southern evangelicals preferred not to dwell much on the zeal with which New England missionary societies had, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, organized to save a depraved and Godless trans-Mississippi Southwest from infidelity, barbarism, and the bane of Roman Catholicism. Nor did they prefer to comment much on the wholesale displacement of French Creole Catholics by Protestant Americans or the evangelical diatribes that had spurred mob actions against German Catholic immigrants in the 1840s and 1850s.

Denominational leaders pushed into the background of their various narratives and commemorative publications the congregational and denomination schisms that had fractured Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian societies from 1837 through about 1870. Both northern and southern evangelical leaders cloaked the way that evangelical division had generated the bloody sectarian strife and violence that had marked the conflict on the border of Missouri and Kansas from 1854 to the end of the Civil War. Certainly much more than their northern counterparts, Southern evangelicals preferred to omit altogether the mob actions that had resulted in the death of abolitionist editor Elijah Lovejoy. Northern evangelicals, in particular, sought to bury deeply

the encroachments that abolitionists, Unionist partisans, and Radical Republicans had made against the religious liberties of southern evangelical clergy and congregations during the Civil War and Reconstruction. By 1900, evangelical chronicles and commemorative writings generally relegated abolitionists and Radical Republicans to the status of “outside agitators.”

Most of the white evangelical chronicles rendered at the end of the nineteenth century refrained from discussing much their black sisters and brothers in Missouri or, for that matter, African Americans in general. This was so notwithstanding that the post-Civil War withdrawal by African Americans from the white-dominated bi-racial churches and the formation of truly independent black churches marked, perhaps, the most radical re-arrangement of Protestantism in the history of the state. Southern Methodist histories were particularly prone to make this omission. Others discussed black Protestantism only in passing. Duncan’s History of the Baptists in Missouri, for instance, devoted only five pages to African American Baptists in the state. Taking into account Duncan’s Autobiography, it is clear that he and his fellow southern Baptists, who now thoroughly dominated that denomination in the state, wholly supported racial segregation.²²³ In this connection, Stringfield’s history of Presbyterianism in the Missouri Ozarks was, in many ways, quite similar to Duncan’s work. He devoted two pages to African Americans affiliated with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and all of two lines to a discussion of regular black Presbyterian minister George M. Bonner, who had become most active only toward the turn of the century.²²⁴ By 1900, the vast majority of evangelicals in Missouri accepted racial segregation of African Americans. Those who thought otherwise were generally excised from denominational chronicles.

On the other hand, commemorative evangelical writings at the end of the nineteenth century prominently featured anti-Catholic diatribes. These accounts noted the great progress

that evangelicals had made in redeeming the state from the clutches of Roman Catholicism. Centuries-old Protestant objections to the older Church remained potent. William Pope Yeaman's introduction in Duncan's History of Missouri Baptists, for instance, boasted that the work was "A history well worth writing, for one fact if for no other, that the Baptists were the first anti-Roman Catholics who planted the standard of an unpriestridden Christianity west of the Mississippi River."²²⁵

By the turn of the twentieth century, the histories and commemorative writings of northern and southern evangelicals had contributed substantially to the rise of a popular perception of Missouri as an All-American Middle Western state. Their joint efforts in this regard unfolded in step with the popular reception nationwide of novels that Mark Twain, Edward W. Howe, Harold Bell Wright, and Winston Churchill began publishing in 1876. As historian Paul Nagel points out, these fictional works presented Missouri nostalgically as "a cherished world which Americans were forgetting in their rush toward progress." In such renderings, embattled and bloody Missouri was magically recast as the "Show Me" state – a charming place of unspoiled rural and village beauty inhabited by Tom Sawyers and Huckleberry Finns, a timeless realm that was home to God-fearing people who lovingly farmed the land and who still knew right from wrong, notwithstanding the rise of gigantic cities, Biblical criticism, Godless social theories, and the reign of money mongers, con men, and corrupt politicians.²²⁶ With deft nuance and detail, historian Walter Barlow Stevens articulated masterfully this popular revision of the state in his multi-volume Centennial History of Missouri (The Center State): One Hundred Years in the Union, 1820-1921 (1921). By the end of the nineteenth century, white ministers and lay leaders in Missouri, like Stevens, essentially produced texts that emphasized how their pioneering evangelical forebears had established and

cultivated denominations that had brought Protestant Christian civilization and democracy to the trans-Mississippi Southwest. Such stalwarts had given rise to agriculture, industry, commerce, and prosperity. And, in doing so, they had played a central role in creating an Edenic world where Godly Anglo-Saxon agricultural communities flourished. Missouri was, in this account, a place where a basically unified evangelicalism dedicated primarily to spreading the Gospel had, aside from some unfortunate irregularities, always predominated. In this rendering, the ideal Midwesterner was a hardworking white farmer, a devoted family man, community oriented, a regular churchgoer, and generally averse to hard liquor. By no coincidence, these signal attributes of Midwestern-ness constituted the exact antithetical personification of the direst threats that rapid socioeconomic and cultural transformation posed to devout white evangelicals in Missouri at the time.²²⁷

Conclusions

Notwithstanding voluminous immigration from the Northeast and rapid urban growth after Reconstruction, there were three times as many southern evangelicals than northern ones in Missouri by 1900. Middle-class evangelicals in the larger urban areas of the state placed increasing importance on well-situated and imposing edifices and other middle-class accoutrements of wealth and status. Most rural evangelical congregations continued to make do with more meager resources but grew increasingly distant from the more urbane leadership of the churches. Congregational conflict over church property grounded in divergent understandings of slavery and loyalty to the Union continued to spur litigation after the close of Reconstruction. But civil courts increasingly sought to enforce legal rules rather than allow partisan pressures to shape outcomes.

Black church leaders, along with their congregants, denounced and resisted the imposition of racial segregation after 1875 and combined to advance the socioeconomic, civil, and political rights of African Americans in the face of rising Jim Crow. The Republican Party abandoned African Americans in the 1890s. But religious freedom, congregational autonomy, and basic civil rights for freed people fully empowered black congregants to go to law, if necessary, to secure title to church property. African American men voted to the end of the nineteenth century, while black church-goers continued to cultivate their independent Methodist and Baptist congregations and improve educational opportunities for their youth.

The socioeconomic revolution that Radical Republicans wrought from 1861 to 1900 engendered a siege mentality among white Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in the state. Northern and southern evangelicals perceived that massive immigration of Roman Catholic immigration posed an increasing threat to Protestantism. Electoral politics, firmly under the control of the Democrat Party, responded only feebly to the tumultuous socioeconomic changes attendant on rapid industrialization and urban explosive growth, all of which white evangelicals perceived to threaten the authority and cohesiveness of their families, churches, and communities. Most worrisome to them was the rapidly declining effects of religion in the lives of church members. Southern white evangelicals expressed growing dismay with Darwinism and those features of the new biblical criticism that emanated from the urban Northeast, which seemed to question the sanctity and veracity of scripture. Rural and small town church-goers responded to the increasingly worldly orientation of the mainstream evangelical churches by establishing breakaway societies affiliated with the growing Holiness Movement.

The lingering resentment of abolitionism among southern evangelicals redoubled their opposition to the use of government power to promote liberal evangelical social ideals, a position

that a substantial number of northern evangelicals also adopted in the decades following Reconstruction. But evangelical opposition to state-imposed reform shaped the response of white Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterians and those of elected officials to large-scale socioeconomic change. A revitalized temperance crusade ultimately bound white northern and southern evangelicals together notwithstanding their longstanding ecclesiastical divisions, theological disputes, and political differences. White evangelical leaders concluded that the greatest single evil threatening society was hard liquor, especially in the hands of self-indulgent and irresponsible men. Middle-class evangelical women in St. Louis took up the cause of reining in drunken husbands and fathers in 1873 and, by the 1880s, had turned the WCTU into an engine for women's rights and Social Gospel reform. Black ministers and congregants in Missouri readily embraced organized temperance activism. White evangelicals responded initially to the perceived threat of masculine drunkenness with a distinctly local version of the Social Gospel – one that comported with the demands made by southern church-goers that civil authority not employ its power to advance religiously-grounded social ideals in violation of individual liberty. Evangelical leaders who began calling for prohibition after 1880, in the circumstances, ran up against stiff resistance. Missouri residents ultimately configured their landscape “wet” or “dry” along the lines of the demographic divide that separated rural and small town evangelicals from large urban places.

Post-Civil War commemoration did not always serve to perpetuate sectional antagonisms. By the late nineteenth century, evangelical chroniclers, memoirists, and autobiographers crafted accounts of Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist church development that obscured the unsavory impulses that drove all evangelicals to support strongly the temperance campaign. These commemorative accounts papered over the intertwined theological

and political controversies that had divided the three churches since the late 1830s and the militant strife that pitted northern and southern evangelicals against one another during the Civil War and Reconstruction. Commemoration of former Confederates and Union soldiers cast their fallen comrades as heroes in an intersectional struggle infused with sacred meanings. But denominational leaders pushed into the background of their commemorative publications the schisms that had fractured Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian societies from 1837 through about 1870. Most of the white evangelical chronicles refrained from discussing the African Americans who had abandoned the white churches, while prominently featuring anti-Roman Catholic diatribes. By the turn of the twentieth century, the histories and commemorative writings of northern and southern evangelicals had contributed substantially to the rise of a popular perception of Missouri as an All-American Middle Western state.

Notes

¹ Semi-Centennial Memorial, 1834-1884, Missouri Baptist General Association . . . (Columbia, Mo., 1885), 103.

² Ibid., 16; J. C. Maple and R. P. Rider, Missouri Baptist Biography: A Series of Life Sketches Indicating the Growth and Prosperity of the Baptist Churches as Represented in the Lives and Labors of Eminent Men and Women in Missouri, 6 vols. (Kansas City, 1914), 1:319-20, 314-323.

³ Ibid., 52.

⁴ Columbia Statesman, 24 October 1884, p. 3; “General Association Held at Marshall,” Jefferson City Daily Tribune, 21 October 1884, p. 4.

⁵ Semi-Centennial Memorial, 7. Baptist leaders similarly viewed Robert Samuel Duncan’s History of the Baptists in Missouri as an invaluable aid for appreciating the true development of the denomination in the state. Ibid., 8.

⁶ Some historians have followed the lead of Arthur Schlesinger Sr.’s A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900 in describing the post-bellum era in which evangelical churches were faced with the onslaught of Darwinism, biblical historicism, the transformation of America through the growth of cities, immigration. In this view, most evangelicals merely reacted to Darwinism and secularism and a host of other issues. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900 (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1967).

⁷ Those making this case include Paul Carter, D. H. Meyer and James H. Moorhead. Paul A. Carter, The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971); D. H. Meyer, “American intellectuals and the Crisis of Faith,” American Quarterly 27 (December, 1975); James H. Moorhead, American Apocalypse: Yankee Protestants and the Civil War, 1860-1869 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978), 236-44.

Others, such as Sidney Ahlstrom, Henry May, Martin Marty and Sidney Mead argue how many evangelicals embraced the Social Gospel movement to combat the problem of growing secularism. Sidney Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972); Martin Marty, Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America (New York: Dial Press, 1970); Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949); Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 134-89.

Christopher McKnight Nichols shows that, during the era of progressive reform, a rift often developed between religious and secularly-oriented reformers. Christopher McKnight Nichols, “The Gilded Age and Progressive Era: Mastery, Modern Doubt, and the Costs of Progress,” Charles Mathewes, Christopher McKnight Nichols, eds., Prophesies of Godlessness: Predictions of America’s Imminent Secularization, from the Puritans to the Present Day (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 113-36.

Charles Howard Hopkins was one of the first to study closely the rise of the Social Gospel Movement. Charles Howard Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 1967).

C. Howard Hopkins and Ronald C. White, Jr. expanded upon these ideas in their 1976 work. Ronald C. White, Jr., C. Howard Hopkins, The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976).

Gaines Foster's Moral Reconstruction argues that Protestants sought to lobby the federal government to enact a number of moral reforms, including temperance. These efforts advanced a white racist agenda, especially in the South. Initiatives sought to curb what white reformers perceived to be the invidious appetites of African Americans. Foster argues that, while some reforms were aimed at the poor or new arrivals from abroad, some within the movement sought to reform middle and upper class individuals. Gaines M. Foster, Moral Reconstruction: Christian Lobbyists and the Federal Legislation of Morality, 1865-1920 (The University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

⁸ Ralph E. Luker argues that white reformers often maintained widely divergent views on the question of racial segregations. In Luker's estimation, Schlesinger and omitted to consider racism. Ralph E. Luker, The Social Gospel in Black and White: American Racial Reform, 1885-1912 (Chapel Hill and London: North Carolina Press, 1991).

Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards, Carolyn De Swarte Gifford, ed., Gender and the Social Gospel (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003).

⁹ Randall J. Stephens, The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South (Harvard University Press, 2008).

Holiness adherents sprang from a split between two groups of evangelicals: those who accepted biblical historicism and sought to modify articles of faith accordingly – and those who wanted to maintain a scripturally-oriented, traditional evangelical faith. George Marsden connects Holiness congregations with fundamentalism, a movement that did not emerge full blown until the 1920s, they began to develop in the late 1800s. George M. Marsden, Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids, Mi: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991), 1-4; Ibid., Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980); Mark A. Noll, The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind (Grand Rapids, Mi: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994).

¹⁰ Richard P. Callahan explores the coal miners in eastern Kentucky who had taken up such labor amid the demise of subsistence farming in the late nineteenth century. While companies supported churches representing mainline denominations, such as independent Baptists and Old Regular Baptists, white miners preferred newer Holiness-Pentecostal societies. These groups offered struggling mining families ways to resist oppression and infuse their life and labor with positive meanings. Unions became, effectively, extensions of Holiness-Pentecostal churches. The work and challenges of white miners informed their religious ideas, which, in turn, shaped their labor and decisions in their struggles with mine owners. In the Holiness movement, miners

found the means to preserve older features of rural faith and worship that denominations sponsored by the owners undercut. Richard P. Callahan, Work and Faith in the Kentucky Coal Fields: Subject to Dust (Indiana University Press, 2008). Callahan's work comports rather well with that of William R. Sutton, who maintains that artisans in early nineteenth-century Baltimore joined the city's numerous Methodist churches as part of their fight against exploitation amid emerging industrial capitalism. Sutton explores how workers confronted the negative effects of industrialism in Baltimore in the 1820s and 1830s. Many of these workers found, in Methodism, an empowering force that underwrote their refusal to accept dependency and second-class citizenship. This populist form of evangelicalism drew on a producer tradition that prevailed among those who supported trade union goals. Methodism provided these workers with a language and ethic to express their discontent. William R. Sutton, Journeyman for Jesus: Evangelical Artisans Confront Capitalism in Jacksonian Baltimore (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998). The work of both Callahan and Sutton challenges the thesis of Paul E. Johnson, who maintains that, in Rochester, New York, during the 1830s, upwardly mobile artisans embraced evangelicalism only for the same reasons as did members of the new middle-class. Evangelical moral values and habits of industry ensured entry into that class and success as one of its members. Paul E. Johnson, A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978), 6-8.

¹¹ Joe L. Coker argues that, while the temperance movement originated in the North, and as such was initially condemned by many southerners, many southerners embraced it as it slowly became a moral imperative. Joe L. Coker, Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007). Dale Baum explains that, in the state of Massachusetts, most temperance advocates worked in urban areas to attack saloons. Margaret Bendroth holds that, in Boston, evangelical teetotalers had to contend with an increasing backlash as Roman Catholics grew in the city. Dale Baum, "Teetotalers Enter Politics: The Massachusetts Prohibitionist Party in the Early 1870s," Mid America 65.3 (1983): 137-54; Margaret Bendroth, "Rum, Romanism, and Evangelism: Protestants and Catholics in Late-Nineteenth-Century," Church History 68.3 (September 1999): 627-48.

¹² Paula C. Baker in fact has argued that women's subordinate status made them more than willing to enlist the government to protect them. Paula C. Baker, The Moral Frameworks of Public Life: Gender, Politics, and the State in Rural New York, 1870-1930 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Meg Opdycke Lamme asserts, moreover, that the evangelical faith of the national founders Francis Willard and Annie Wittenmyer influenced their communication campaign. Meg Opdycke Lamme, "Shining a Calcium Light: The WCTU and Public Relations History," Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly 88.2 (Summer 2011): 245-66.

¹³ Literature on African American religion during the Gilded Age is heavily focused on the segregation and denominational organization that took place within the black churches. Though, in terms of scholarly focus, slave religion and twentieth century faith receive a bit more emphasis

from historians. These congregations, though, were important in the self-help that the black community sought to undertake. Works by authors such as William Montgomery, Fred Author Baily, Michael Williams, Sr. and Paul Harvey assert that the black churches remained segregated from their white counterparts throughout the last decades of the nineteenth century and they were forced to struggle against this segregation. William E. Montgomery, Under Their Own Vine and Fig Tree: The African-American church in the South, 1865-1900 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993); Fred Arthur Bailey, "That Which God Hath Put Asunder: White Baptists, Black Aliens, and the Southern Social Order, 1890-1920," in Glenn Feldman ed., Politics and Religion in the White South (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2005), 11; Michael Williams Sr., Isaac Taylor Tichenor: The Creation of the Baptist New South (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2005); Paul Harvey, Freedom's Coming: Religious Culture and the Shaping of the South from the Civil War through the Civil Rights Era (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005). Historian John M. Giggie maintains that a traditional focus on black denominational development overlooks the ways that African Americans coped with racial segregation and growing consumerism. John M. Giggie, After Redemption: Jim Crow and the Transformation of African American Religion in the Delta, 1875-1915 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

¹⁴ Edward J. Blum, Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion and American Nationalism, 1865-1898 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005). A similar argument can be found in Bruce Kuklick Churchmen and Philosophers: From Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985), 216-62.

Numerous historians have demonstrated that, at the national level, Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians adopted racial segregation through the last three decades of the nineteenth century and made this official policy shortly after 1900. While segregation hardened in the late nineteenth century, especially with fears of northern cultural dominance, the Southern Baptist Convention itself condemned lynching in 1906. Natalie N. Ogle, "Brother Against Brother: Baptists and Race in the Aftermath of the Civil War," American Baptist Quarterly, Vol. 23, 2 (June 2004): 137-54; Casey Cater, "To Pick Up Again the Cross of Missionary Work: W. J. Northen's Politics of Race, Religion, and Reform, 1890-1911," Georgia Baptist History, Vol. 21 (2008): 23-41.

While they numbered only a handful of black congregants within their ranks, southern Presbyterians embraced racial segregation no less than did the majority of Baptists and Methodists through the Gilded Age. This was evident in the thinking of noted divines like Robert Lewis Dabney and Benjamin M. Palmer. Palmer, a New Orleans minister, was one of the fiercest evangelical supporters of the Confederacy during the war. The northern branch of Presbyterianism officially adopted racial segregation in 1904 in order to facilitate its missionary work in the South and complete its merger with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church two years later. David M. Reimers, "The Race Problem and the Presbyterian Union," Church History, Vol. 31, 2 (June 1962): 203-15; William D. Carrigan, "In Defense of the Social Order: Racial Thought among Southern White Presbyterians in the Nineteenth Century," American Nineteenth

Century History, Vol. 1, 2 (Summer 2008): 31; Sean Michael Lucas, “‘Old Times There are not Forgotten’: Robert Lewis Dabney’s Public Theology for a Reconstructed South,” Journal of Presbyterian History, Vol. 81, 3 (August 2003): 163-177; Stephen R. Haynes, “Race, National Destiny, and the Sons of Noah in the Thought of Benjamin M. Palmer,” Journal of Presbyterian History, Vol. 78, 2 (May 2000): 125-143.

Morris Davis argues that Methodism was constructed in the late 1800s and early 1900s under a racial lens. Morris L. Davis, The Methodist Unification: Christianity and the Politics of Race in the Jim Crow Era, New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Paul Harvey, examining white and black Baptists throughout the South, concludes that most whites sought to maintain their notions of racial supremacy even after Reconstruction. Paul Harvey, Redeeming the South: Religious Cultures and Racial Identities among Southern Baptists, 1865-1925 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

¹⁵ James B Bennett, Religion and the Rise of Jim Crow in New Orleans (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 71-100.

¹⁶ Kenneth Christmon explains that slaveholders had used alcohol carefully to control the behavior of slaves. Even so, freed people were often sympathetic to temperance organizations because they were northern organizations that had once opposed slavery. Kenneth Cristmon, “Historical Overview of Alcohol in the African American Community,” Journal of Black Studies 25.3 (January 1995): 318-31.

¹⁷ Bynum shows that blacks viewed the movement differently from whites, especially regarding the issue of racial segregation. But important leaders, such as Chicago A. M. E. minister Reverdy C. Ransom drew from the Social Gospel ideals. Cornelius L. Bynum, “An Equal Chance in the Race for Life”: Reverdy C. Ransom, Socialism, and the Social Gospel Movement, 1890-1920,” Journal of African American History, Vol. 93, 1, (Winter 2008): 1-20.

¹⁸ Historian Edward Baptist argues that planters in middle Florida began revamping their embattled and less than honorable history even before the Civil War. Edward Baptist, Creating an Old South: Middle Florida’s Plantation Culture before the Civil War (University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 247-276.

Gaines M. Foster deemphasizes the interrelation of religion and understandings of civil obligation and loyalty, while Charles Reagan Wilson emphasizes these linkages. Gaines M. Foster, Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, The Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); Charles Reagan Wilson, Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920 (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1980); Lloyd A. Hunter, “The Immortal Confederacy: Another Look at the Lost Cause Religion,” Gary W. Gallagher, Alan T. Nolan, eds., The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000).

Most historians rate Robert E. Lee as the ultimate figure in the Lost Cause but many others, including Jefferson Davis, were resurrected as well, along with the scores of rank and file veterans. Gary W. Gallagher, Lee and His Generals in War and Memory (Baton Rouge:

Louisiana State University press, 1998); Donald E. Collins, The Death and Resurrection of Jefferson Davis (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005).

William White contends that Confederate veterans constructed their own identity around this model. William W. White, The Confederate Veteran (Tuscaloosa AL, Confederate Publishing Company, Inc., 1962).

While Karen L. Cox maintains that New South women who took the initiative in preserving veneration of the Confederacy, while Caroline E. Janney argues that white southern women played a major role in forestalling efforts in the 1890s to reconcile with the North. Karen L. Cox, Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of the Confederate Culture (Gainesville: The University of Florida Press, 2003). Caroline E. Janney, "War Over a Shrine of Peace: The Appomattox Peace Movement and Retreat from Reconciliation," The Journal of Southern History 77.1 (February 2011): 90-120.

¹⁹ Stuart McConnell, Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900 (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

David Blight, in his Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory, argues that some northerners were willing to accept southern versions of the war in order to re-forge economic ties. David W. Blight, Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory (Cambridge, Ma: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001).

According to Patrick J. Kelly, Gilded Age Republicans in the North were notorious for blaming their Democratic opponents for the upheaval, that is, for waving the bloody shirt, to garner votes.

Kelly explains that during the presidential election of 1896 William McKinley and his supporters jettisoned what remained of their traditional role of the party in improving race relations to claim that the possible election of his Democratic opponent William Jennings Bryan represented the greatest threat to America since the rebellion. Patrick J. Kelly, "The Election of 1896 and the restructuring of Civil War Memory," Alice Fahs, Joan Waugh, eds., The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 181-212.

Joan Waugh examines efforts to memorialize Robert E. Lee's Union counterpart Ulysses S. Grant in her U. S. Grant: American Hero, American Myth. Joan Waugh, U. S. Grant: American Hero, American Myth (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

²⁰ Jon C. Teaford, Cities of the Heartland: The Rise and Fall of the Industrial Midwest (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993).

²¹ Andrew R. L. Cayton, Peter S. Onuf, The Midwest and the Nation: Rethinking the History of an American Region (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990).

²² Richard Jensen, The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888-1896 (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1971).

²³ University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Center, "Historical Census Browser," (2004, accessed 10 October, 2010).

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ellwood K. Smith, "Background and Consequences of Methodist Union," Methodist History, 2, no. 2, (January, 1964): 7-9. Reunification occurred in 1939 as both branches merged, along with the Methodist Protestant Church, to form the Methodist Church (now the United Methodist Church).

²⁶ In 1870, with a general population of 1,721, 295, the seating accommodations and numbers of individual congregations were as follows: 1) Methodist, 185,420/1,066; 2) Baptist, 145,360/805; Presbyterian, 103,350/262; 4) Roman Catholic, 97,550 /184; 5) Christian (Disciples of Christ), 68,545 /394; 6) Lutheran, 39,550/94; 6) Episcopal, 20,950/83; 7) United Brethren in Christ, 5,800/38. Total church sittings in 1870 came to 691,520, which constituted 40.17% of the general population. Total church sittings in 1890 were 735,839 or 27% of total population. From: Statistics of Churches, 1890 Census, vol. 9, 163-64, 174-75, 182, 186, 195, 197, 198, 203, 349-50, 513, 547-48, 561, 569, 578, 586-87, 601, 606, 615, 639, 661-62, 674, 678, 686, 700 Available data suggests extraordinary church membership increases in the last decade of the nineteenth century, especially among the Baptists and Methodists. From 1890 to 1916, the population of the state grew 25%. But the number of native-born, English-speakers grew in each of the following denominations as indicated: Baptists, 69%; Methodists, 57%; Disciples of Christ, 49%; Presbyterians, 45%. From: U.S. Census, Religious Bodies: 1916, vol. 1, 280-83.

²⁷ The total membership, in each case, was as follows: Christian Union (2,296); Church of God in North America (1,023); Church of Christ, Scientist ((2,484); Congregational Church (11,046); German Baptist Brethren (1,894); German Evangelical Synod of North America (30,730); Latter-day Saints (7,879); and Lutheran Church (38,042). E. Dana Durand, comp., Special Reports, Religious Bodies: 1906, Part I, Summary and General Tables (Washington: Government Printing Office, Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, 1910), p. 222.

²⁸ Baptist Home Missions in North America . . . (New York, 1883), 505.

²⁹ Minutes of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Session of the Missouri Baptist General Association . . . (Columbia, Mo, 1890), 72-73.

³⁰ William Pope Yeaman, A History of the Missouri Baptist General Association (Columbia, Mo, 1899), 386.

³¹ Durand, Religious Bodies: 1906, p. 222.

³² Minutes of the Tenth Session of the Southwest Missouri Conference of the M. E. Church South . . . 1880, Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Southwest Missouri Conference Minutes of annual sessions, 1880-1925, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Missouri Institute of Science and Technology, Rolla, Collection R552, p. 5.

³³ W. S. Woodard, Annals of Methodism in Missouri: Containing an Outline of the Ministerial Life of More Than One Thousand Preachers, and Sketches of More Than Three Hundred (Columbia, Mo, 1893), xlv.

³⁴ Frank C. Tucker, The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939, A Brief History (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966), 205.

³⁵ Through the 1890s, white Presbyterians in Missouri consistently counted far fewer African Americans among their numbers than did the Methodists and Baptists. The work of recruiting new African American members in the southern Presbyterian Church was far less successful, with only 700 new members enlisted in the 1890s. The northern Presbyterian Church did a great deal to evangelize among the black community in the South and made especially concerted efforts to provide African Americans with educational opportunities, including Sunday schools. Murray, Presbyterians and the Negro, 150, 170, 177-81.

³⁶ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix (New York, 1880), 358-67.

³⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States . . . 1880 (Wilmington, N.C., 1880), 322.

³⁸ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States . . . 1890 (Richmond, 1890), 180.

³⁹ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix (Philadelphia, 1891), 415-25.

⁴⁰ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1902 (Philadelphia, 1902), 499-509.

⁴¹ Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States: With an Appendix . . . 1901 (Richmond, 1901), 163-67.

⁴² Minutes of the Southwest Missouri Conference, 1891, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, p. 40; Howard L. Conrad, editor, Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference 4 vols. (New York, 1901), 4:364.

⁴³ Missouri East Conference Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Folder 268.

⁴⁴ Minutes of the Sixty-Sixth Meeting of the Missouri Baptist General Association . . . 1900 (St. Louis, 1900), 155-56.

⁴⁵ St. Louis Evangelist, October 1876, p. 8.

⁴⁶ Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1900, 155-56.

⁴⁷ Missouri East Conference Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Folder 273.

⁴⁸ Twelve years later, however, they were able to raise the funds for an even larger house of worship. Missouri East Conference Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Folder 273. The 1900 minutes of the Baptist General Association listed \$2,118,762 in property-holdings. Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1900, 155-56.

⁴⁹ The General Association took in \$9,882.44 in contributions for the state missions in 1900 – local district missions, however, netted \$16,108.80. Minutes Missouri Baptist General Association, 1900, 155.

⁵⁰ Round Prairie Baptist Church, Bates County, Missouri, Records, 1866-1937, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 1320, pp. 1-4.

⁵¹ “Camp-Meetings,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 9 July 1890, p. 3; Ted Ownby, Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 144-64.

⁵² “Camp-Meetings,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 9 July 1890, p. 3; Ted Ownby, Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 144-64.

⁵³ Alberta D. Shipley and David O. Shipley, A History of Black Baptists in Missouri : National Baptist Convention, USA, INC. (Kansas City, Mo: Missionary Baptist State Convention of Missouri, 1976), 30-34.

⁵⁴ David Thelan, Paths of Resistance: Tradition and Dignity in Industrializing Missouri (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 143-44.

⁵⁵ George E. Stevens, “History of the Central Baptist Church, 1846-1926,” State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, Collection sl28, p. 14.

⁵⁶ Brownlee, “Keeping Their Memory Green,” 65.

⁵⁷ Becky L. Snider, A Survey of the Rural African American Churches of Northern Boone County (St. Louis: University Bindery, INC, 1997), 14, 17.

⁵⁸ Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 144.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 140.

⁶⁰ Christensen and Kramer, A History of Missouri. 59-60.

⁶¹ Nothing more was written within the Congressional record on these efforts. St. Charles College, St. Charles, Mo., Fifty-First Congress, First Session, Miscellaneous Document No. 220, 23 June 1890; St. Charles College, Fifty-Sixth Congress, First Session, Report No. 42, 9 January 1900.

⁶² First Baptist Church, Springfield, Mo., Sixty-First Congress, Second Session, Report No. 164, 17 January 1910.

The congregation’s 1928 history made no mention of the attempt to get reparations. M. M. Richardson, A Brief History of The First Baptist Church of Springfield, Missouri, 1852-1927 (Springfield, 1928).

⁶³ Bredell v. Alexander, 8 Mo. App. 110 (1879), *ibid.*, 112-113; Horace W. Fuller, ed., The Green Bag: A Useless but Entertaining Magazine for Lawyers, Volume Three for the year 1891 (Boston, Ma, 1891), 160-61; David Riddle Williams, James H. Brookes: A Memoir, Published for Dr. Brookes' family (St. Louis, 1897), 111-132.

⁶⁴ 19 MA 26 Criticized 332 Mo. 68; Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual Meeting of the Missouri Bar Association . . . 1913 (Springfield, Mo, 1913), 287-89. No information has been found about the other judges on the appellate court.

⁶⁵ Fulbright v. Higginbotham, 133 Mo. 668 (October Term, 1895), *ibid.* 673.

⁶⁶ By 1895, the Court had been enlarged to seven judges and split into two divisions to deal more effectively with the ever-growing case load. While Chief Justice Theodore Brace and Shephard Barclay remained on the Court, joining them were Waltour M. Robinson, a Baptist and a

Republican, and George B. MacFarlane, a Presbyterian and a Democrat. MacFarlane authored the opinion of the Court in Fulbright v. Higginbotham, which upheld the decision of Judge Cox. *Ibid.*, 678.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 678. As in McRoberts v. Moudy, since Baptist ecclesiastical rules allowed congregations to govern themselves, the civil courts were not to interfere with either their religious practice or the determinations of a congregational majority regarding its endowed property. The original expulsion of Higginbotham was absolute. *Ibid.*; Walter B. Stevens, Missouri The Center State, 1821-1915 Vol. 1-4 (Chicago and St. Louis, 1915), Conard, Encyclopedia of Missouri, 3:664-67; 4: 5:384-85.

⁶⁸ Of the judges on the high court, Theodore Brace served as a Confederate colonel while Francis M. Black was one of the leaders at the 1875 constitutional convention. Thomas A. Sherwood, moreover, was an ardent Democrat and devout Baptist. St. Louisan Shepard Barclay wrote the decision, arguing that there was little need to adjudicate the original decision any further. He held that “it is unnecessary to elaborate an extended review of the testimony. It furnishes abundant support of the conclusion reached by Judge Dillon in favor of the defendant church.” African Baptist Church v. St. Louis Transfer Co., 98 Mo. 412 (1889); “The Missouri Democrats . . .,” New York Times, 18 August 1886; Walter B. Stevens, St. Louis: The Fourth City 1764-1911 Vols. 1-2 (St. Louis, 1911), 1:375;

The National Cyclopedia of American Biography . . . Volume VII (New York, 1897), 53. Howard L. Conrad, editor, Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference, 5 vols. (New York, 1901), 1:281-83, 355. No information could be found on the other judge, Robert D. Ray.

⁶⁹ During the 1870s a growing number of Missouri farmers, along with their Democratic allies, became increasingly discontented. With the beginnings of economic deflation that occurred throughout the nineteenth century, farmers saw increasing debt as their prices fell as their railroad freight rates. Parrish, A History of Missouri, 223, 231, 284, et seq.; Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), 4-5, 8-9.

⁷⁰ Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 25-100.

⁷¹ Native Bostonian Oliver Hudson Kelly and others had established the organization along the lines of Freemasonry, and with no church associations, to ensure bi-sectional support. In Missouri, Grange leaders effectively articulated the discontent of farming men and women with their common economic plight, unmanageable property tax burdens, and the seeming assault by big business on rural families, communities, and traditions. On the heels of the Panic of 1873 Missouri witnessed the formation of the National Grange of the Order of Patrons of Husbandry, commonly known as the Grange. The state Grange formed in May of 1873 was comprised of 365 groups which had gradually grown since 1868. By February of 1874 there were 1,732 branches in the state. An organization modeled on Freemasonry, it advocated the regulation of railroads, cooperative stores, grain elevators and warehouses along with temperance and women’s suffrage. As Robert H. Wiebe asserts, many Grangers longed for the continuation of local rural

ways. Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), 4-5, 8-9.

While men formed the core of the leadership of most local granges, there were lower offices that were reserved for women, as a notice for the election of the northeastern Lewis County Grange indicated. "Exchange Notes," Hannibal Clipper, 11 February 1877, p. 4; Parrish, History of Missouri. Fed up with dishonest and corrupt politicians, the Grangers began to move into politics. For instance, an 1875 meeting of the Grange in southern Phelps County but forth a series of resolutions that asserted their county was assessed more in taxes than others within the state. Phelps County New Era, 15 May 1875, p. 2. The large number of Grange chapters established in the state prompted one southern Methodist writing the St. Louis Christian Advocate to conclude that the era was quickly become "times of Grange excitement, when every farmer was going to do his own thinking and writing. "Local News," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 10 February 1875, p. 6.

⁷² Lawrence O. Christensen and Gary R. Kremer, A History of Missouri. Volume IV. 1875-1919 (Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press, 1997), 136-49.

⁷³ Christensen and Kramer, A History of Missouri, 136-59.

⁷⁴ Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 77-78.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 70-69.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 86-99. In addition to the Ku Klux Klan, night-riding vigilantes increased their operations in the southern Ozarks through Reconstruction, especially in the counties of Taney, Christian, Stone, Douglas, and Greene. Similarly to the Klan, members of these gangs wore hoods and perpetuated the bushwhacker tactics employed during the war by Unionist and pro-Confederate neighbors. Officials had difficulties distinguishing this kind of strife from conflicts that amounted to little more than feuds between competing clans and tit-for-tat vigilantism pitting supposed outlaw gangs against posses raised by local communities. From 1865 to 1885, Taney County officials reported forty murders associated with this kind of violence, all of which were left unsolved. Church goers and town-dwelling members of the middle class combined with calls to the governors and state legislature to re-establish law and order. Elmo Ingenthron and Mary Hartman, Bald Knobbers: Vigilantes on the Ozarks Frontier (Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing, 1988), 30. Reconstruction-era nightriders built on long-established customs of vigilante justice in Missouri. In the 1830s and 1840s, outlaws and vigilante groups spread across the Missouri Ozarks. The outbreak of violence was dubbed "The Slicker Wars." The Missouri Ozarks provided refuge for counterfeiters, thieves, rustlers, and other outlaws. The Ozark Plateau gave rise to numerous vigilance committees determined to "regulate" these individuals. The vigilantes were referred to as "slickers." Originally, their purpose was to punish and expel outlaws. They were called slickers because, once the members of a committee determined that a man was guilty, they usually tied him to a tree and whipped him with a hickory withe. Local residents called this a "slicking." Anti-slicker groups arose in response to the practice by outlaws of becoming themselves members of slicker groups. Richard Maxwell Brown, Strain of

Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 97-102, 313, 354-55.

⁷⁷ Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 146-55.

⁷⁸ "Some Symptoms," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 January 1890, p. 4.

⁷⁹ William Torrey Harris of St. Louis School Board fame served as superintendent of schools for the whole state of Missouri in the period 1868-1880. He deferred to the preferences of most of the county school boards across the state to include Protestant instruction in the classroom. But, as in St. Louis, he persisted in having teachers inculcate in students habits of punctuality and self-control precisely to transform them into industrious and productive workers and citizens. Steven K. Green, The Second Disestablishment: Church and State in Nineteenth Century America (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 289, 297, 305-306, 311, 324, 363, 389; Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 109-10. Protestant Bible study in the classroom was common place and even prescribed by the Missouri Teachers Association at the end of the century. Missouri School Journal, Vol. XII, Nos. 1-12 (Jefferson City, 1896), 25, 49-50, 110, 177, 183, 186, 194, 210, 253, 285, 415, 421, 482, 501, 507, 626, 645-46, 712-13, 716, 720, 748.

⁸⁰ See "Narrative of the State of Religion," in n. a., Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Vol. V (Wilmington, N.C., 1882), 402-403; Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 146-50.

⁸¹ Central Christian Advocate, 19 July 1886, p. 1.

⁸² Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 151-52.

⁸³ Historian LeeAnn Whites shows that, in industrializing Augusta, Georgia, during Reconstruction, white men who could no longer serve effectively as family breadwinners commonly experienced a serious upheaval in gender identity. Whites argues that the post-Civil War employment of white women and children in the manufacturing firms of August, Georgia, perpetuated a crisis in gender for white men brought on initially by the demise of slavery. Well-paying jobs for white women and children often provided family incomes to which displaced husbands and fathers could contribute little. Whites also maintains that elite whites in Augusta "reconstructed" themselves by commemorating the Confederate dead in ways that cast the "Lost Cause" as a defense of antebellum slaveholder patriarchy, a discursive tactic intended to obscure the gender threats posed by post-war industrial development. LeeAnn Whites, The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta, Georgia, 1860-1890 (Athens : University of Georgia Press, 1995).

⁸⁴ Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 151-53.

The effective legalization of prostitution in St. Louis by virtue of its notorious July 1870 "Social Evil Ordinance" certainly didn't improve the situation in a metropolis numbering then at least 230,000 residents and with 5,000 female sex workers. The ordinance authorized city officials to register public houses, madams and prostitutes. Although prostitution was still prohibited on the streets, the new law effectively legalized harlotry so long as sex transactions occurred in a brothel. Duane R. Sneddeker, "Regulating Vice -- Prostitution and the St. Louis Social Evil Ordinance, 1870-1874," The Magazine of the Missouri Historical Society 11.2 (Fall 1990): 20-47; James Wunsch, "The Social Evil Ordinance," American Heritage 33.2 (Feb/Mar 1982): 50-

55; John C. Burnham, "The Social Evil Ordinance: A Social Experiment in Nineteenth Century St. Louis," Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 27.3 (1971): 203-217.

⁸⁵ Historian Ted Ownby stresses that evangelical town leaders in the post-war South ramped up traditional objections to masculine vice, including drunkenness, because of the enhanced dangers such activities posed when also available to freedmen. Ownby, Subduing Satan, 169.

⁸⁶ According to Thelan, "The struggle over liquor was a struggle to reconvert Protestants to older obligations." Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 152.

⁸⁷ George M. Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980; reprint, 2006), 19-20, 111-113; Joseph E. Illick, "The Reception of Darwinism at the Theological Seminary and the College at Princeton, New Jersey. Part I: The Theological Seminary," Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society 38.3 (1960): 152-165.

⁸⁸ Oren Root, Jr., was something of a professional and academic jack of all trades. Born in 1803, he graduated from Hamilton College and practiced law in the late 1850s. He also worked as a professor of mathematics, astronomy, mineralogy and geology at various institutions from 1840 to 1881. Root was a professor of English at the University of Missouri in the period 1866-67 and taught at Pritchett College in Glasgow, Missouri, a non-denominational Christian institution from 1873 to about 1876. He returned to New York to teach at Hamilton College in 1880, joined the Dutch Reformed Church in 1890, served as a pastor in Utica, New York, from 1890 to 1894, and earned a D.D. in 1891 and, at the age of ninety-two, an LL.D. in 1895. Oren Root Papers, 1858-1930, C3311, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Columbia, folders 1-6. For a detailed biography on Root see Win Winship, "Oren Root, Darwinism and Biblical Criticism," Journal of Presbyterian History 62.2 (Summer 1984): 111-23.

⁸⁹ "Darwin on Missions," St. Louis Evangelist, 26 April 1883, p. 1.

⁹⁰ McCosh authored his first edition of The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral in 1850. See James McCosh, The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral, 4th ed. (Edinburgh, 1855); *Ibid.*, The Religious Aspects of Evolution (New York, 1888).

⁹¹ Wallace Hettle, "The Minister, the Martyr, and the Maxim: Robert Lewis Dabney and Stonewall Jackson Biography," Civil War History 49.4 (December 2003): 353-369; Sean Michael Lucas, Robert Lewis Dabney: A Southern Presbyterian Life (P & R Publishing, 2005); Thomas Cary Johnson, The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney (Richmond, Va., 1903); White, Southern Presbyterians, 382-293. Other eminent southern Presbyterian divines through the last third of the nineteenth century include the following: Benjamin Morgan Palmer, *ibid.*, 359-381; John Leighton Wilson, *ibid.*, 394-408; Jacob Henry Smith, *ibid.*, 409-413; Stuart Robinson, *ibid.*, 414-420; John Newton Waddel, *ibid.*, 421-425; and Moses Drury Hoge, *ibid.*, 426-45. An equally ardent disciple of Thornwell was John L. Girardeau, a professor at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. Ernest Trice Thompson, Presbyterians in the South Vols. 1-3 (Richmond, Va., 1973), 2:442-46.

⁹² Dabney also targeted physicist John Tyndall and biologist Thomas Henry Huxley, well-known Englishmen who adamantly defended Darwin's theory of evolution against religious critics.

Johnson, Life and Letters of Dabney, 343-4.

⁹³ "Refutation of Professor W. Robertson Smith," in C. R. Vaughan, ed. Discussions by Robert L. Dabney, D.D., LL.D., 3 vols. (Richmond, Va., 1890), 1:399-439.

⁹⁴ n. a., Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Vol. V (Wilmington, N.C.), 406-407.

⁹⁵ In addition to articles set out in the regular issues of the St. Louis Presbyterian until 1895, Farris's views on the southern Presbyterian doctrine of jure divino and the Bible as unquestionably revealed truth are also evident in his sermons. See, for example, "Age of Progress," Series I (1850-1881), Folder 4, Robert P. Farris Papers, RG 445, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; "The Family Relation," *ibid.*, Folder 11; and "Unbelief," *ibid.*, Folder 26.

⁹⁶ J. C. Maple, Life and Writings of Rev. William Pope Yeaman, S. T. D. (Columbia, Mo, 1906), 171.

⁹⁷ "Evolution and Theology," The Central Baptist, 14 April 1898, p. 2.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ "Periodicals and Pamphlets," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 9 July 1890, p. 6.

¹⁰⁰ Presbyterian Church in Farmington Missouri, Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, Collection R114, Folder 2.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² Missouri Baptist General Association, Missouri Baptist Centennial, 1906 (Columbia: E. W. Stephens, 1907), 88, 194.

¹⁰³ Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 245.

¹⁰⁴ Waugh blamed the encounters Europeans had with Native American, to whom he referred to as "savages," for the introduction of tobacco use among whites. In his view, superstitious Indians smoked it to ward off evil spirits. In his words, "these savages believe that the best way to get along with the big devil and all the little devils, or bad spirits, is to try to please them, to pet them, and to keep them in good humor as much as possible. And so, thus believing that these devils love to float along in the tobacco smoke . . . these savages smoke with a wonderful zest."

Waugh, Autobiography, 270-71.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, v, 271-84.

¹⁰⁶ Vinson Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1997 2nd ed.), 8, 17-18; Melvin E. Dieter, The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century (Rowman & Littlefield, 1996).

¹⁰⁷ William Kastlevy and Gari-Anne Patswald, eds., Historical Dictionary of the Holiness Movement (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2001), 59.

¹⁰⁸ John Petit Brooks was born July 24, 1826, in Cincinnati, Ohio. In about 1848, while residing in Canton, Illinois, he was baptized in the MEC and given a license to preach in 1849.

Thereafter, he was pastor of a number of MEC congregations in Illinois. He resided from 1872 to

about 1884, in Bloomington, Illinois, and began editing the Banner of Holiness in 1873. On November 26, 1877, Brooks delivered an important address at a Holiness conference held at Cincinnati, Ohio, organized under the auspices of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness. It was entitled “What are the Chief Hindrances to the Progress of the Work of Sanctification Among Believers?” According to Brook, holiness, or the Methodist belief in and experience of sanctification, was held in disfavor by other Christian denominations. This attitude he, concluded, was “symptomatic of a weakened and deteriorated Christianity.” Long-standing denominational creeds had produced apathy or active opposition to belief in sanctification. Methodist ministers were also guilty of having discounted this prime article of Methodist Church faith. Also undercutting the belief in and efficacy of sanctification was a worldly view of holiness. According to Brookes, “It is an easy, indulgent, accommodating, mammonized kind of religion, whose followers are given license, even though sanctified with the sanctification which such pulpits enjoin, to become the abettors of and partakers in a certain class of recreative and dissipative practices that are so much in vogue in popular and carnal Churches.” Declining piety was, he emphasized, also a consequence of a growing “carnal spirit.” The only remedy to the “spirit of sectarianism” was a spiritual one -- the experience of unity to be brought about by sanctification. Brooks’s Banner of Holiness ultimately became the authorized voice of the Western Holiness Association, which met in convention December 15-19, 1880, in Jacksonville, Illinois. In 1885 Brookes moved to College Mound, Macon County, situated in north central Missouri. That year he was the chairman of the committee that called the National (General) Holiness Assembly to meet in Chicago, May 20-26. In March 1887, Brooks became the first editor of a periodical committed to the teaching of the One New Testament Church – The Good Way. Brooks was, however, brought to trial on thirteen charges related to his publications by the Central Illinois Conference of the MEC on March 29, 1889. He formally left the Methodist Church and shortly thereafter became a member of the society known as Independent Holiness People.” In May of 1889, while editor of The Good Way, he stated his intention to write his highly influential The Divine Church, which was published in 1891 by Herald Publishing House, Printers and Binders, Columbia, Missouri. Brooks died on June 10, 1915 and was buried at College Mound, Missouri. Proceedings of the Holiness Conference at Cincinnati, Ohio, November 26, 1877, and at New York, December 26, 1877 (Philadelphia, 1878); Kenneth J. Archer, The Gospel Revisited: Toward a Pentecostal Theology and Witness (Pickwick Publications, 2001), 32, et seq.; Stanley M. Burgess and Edward M. van der Maas, eds., New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements (Zondervan Press, 2002), 421, et seq. In the late 1890s, Holiness and Pentecostal societies arose in Kansas City, including the Church of the Nazarene, whose membership mostly comprise rural migrants to the city. All of the foregoing developments set the stage for a powerful surge of interest in Pentecostalism that would, in the first two decades of the twentieth century, transform the southwest plains and Ozarks of Missouri, including especially the City of Springfield, into one of its major strongholds in the United States. Alan F. Bearman and Jennifer L. Mills, “Charles M. Sheldon

and Charles F. Parham: Adapting Christianity to the Challenges of the American West,” Kansas History 32.2 (Summer 2009): 106-23.

¹⁰⁹ “A Personal Savior,” Central Christian Advocate, 19 July 1886, p.3.

¹¹⁰ The Social Gospel movement was a Protestant Christian intellectual movement that took a decidedly negative view of classical economic principles undergirding free market capitalism. Its leaders presupposed that the new industrial order had produced myriad forms of economic inequality and social injustice. These liberal-minded Protestants sought to apply Christian ethics to myriad social ills. They relied upon voluntary organizations but also sought to use the power of the state to achieve “social justice.” Thus they supported churches, labor unions, and other civic organizations, as well as legislation to regulate child labor and factory working conditions and hours. They also supported laws that might quell the ill effects of alcohol abuse, urban crime, racial tensions, and poor hygiene among the working poor. Benjamin L. Hartley, Evangelicals at a Crossroads: Revivalism and Social Reform in Boston, 1860-1910 (University of New Hampshire Press, 2011), 304; Susan Curtis, A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991).

Social Gospel approaches commonly emphasized the importance of lay leadership.¹¹⁰ But Episcopal political economist Richard T. Ely, Congregational Church minister Washington Gladden, and Baptist minister Walter Rauschenbusch articulated the intertwined religious and secular ideas that undergirded the movement.

Richard T. Ely (1854-1943) was raised a Presbyterian but became an Episcopal in college. Born in Ripley, New York, in 1854, Ely became a professor of and head of the Department of political economy at Johns Hopkins. In 1885, Ely was a founder of the American Economic Association. He served as president of the organization from 1899 to 1901. In April 1891, Ely was a founder and the first Secretary of the Christian Social Union. This organization advocated the application of Christian principles to the solving of social problems. Benjamin G. Rader, “Richard T. Ely: Lay Spokesman for the Social Gospel,” Journal of American History, vol. 53, no. 1 (June 1966): 61-74.

Washington Gladden (1836 - 1918) was born in Pennsylvania to devout parents. He studied at Williams College, a bastion of liberal evangelicalism and became a leading Congregational Church minister and early leader of the Social Gospel movement. Gladden was a leading member of the Progressive movement and, probably, the first eminent religious figure in the United States to support unionization of the work force. Among other causes, he strenuously opposed racial segregation. He was Vice President of the American Missionary Association between 1894 and 1901 and served as the President of the organization between 1901 and 1904. Jacob Dorn, Washington Gladden: Prophet of the Social Gospel (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968).

Rauschenbusch set about bringing the theological house of the Social Gospel movement in order with his influential Christianity and the Social Crisis (1907). According to him, “Whoever uncouples the religious and the social life has not understood Jesus. Whoever sets any bounds for the reconstructive power of the religious life over the social relations and institutions of men, to

that extent denies the faith of the Master.” Quite obviously, the theology developed by Rauschenbusch shifted substantially the emphasis from the traditional focus on individual salvation toward her or his moral responsibility toward other members of society.

Walter Rauschenbusch (1861- 1918) was a Christian theologian and Baptist minister. He was a key figure in the Social Gospel movement. The social gospel movement was not unified or well-focused. Rauschenbusch declared that the movement needed “a theology to make it effective” and likewise, “theology needs the social gospel to vitalize it.” In A Theology for the Social Gospel (1917), Rauschenbusch took up the task of articulating “a systematic theology large enough to match [our social gospel] and vital enough to back it.” He believed that the Social Gospel would be “a permanent addition to our spiritual outlook and that its arrival constitutes a state in the development of the Christian religion.” In his Theology for the Social Gospel (1917), he wrote that, in the case of John the Baptist, baptism was “not a ritual act of individual salvation but an act of dedication to a religious and social movement.” In A Theology for the Social Gospel, Rauschenbusch said that the “individualistic gospel” had made sinfulness of the individual clear, but it had not illuminated “institutionalized sinfulness”: “It has not evoked faith in the will and power of God to redeem the permanent institutions of human society from their inherited guilt of oppression and extortion.” This set of theological beliefs would influence liberation theologians and civil rights such as such as Martin Luther King, Jr.

The idea of the Kingdom of God was vital to Rauschenbusch’s theology. He declared that “doctrine of the Kingdom of God,” of which Jesus Christ “always spoke” had been replaced by that of the traditional Church. Rauschenbusch called Christians to return to the doctrine of the Kingdom of God. According to Rauschenbusch the Kingdom of God was not subject to the pitfalls of the Church. In his view the doctrine could test and correct the Church. It was thus prophetic, forward-looking, and revolutionary. It was to be a social and political force that contemplates all creation as sacred and could help save a sinful social order.

William M. Ramsay, Four modern prophets: Walter Rauschenbusch, Martin Luther King, Jr., Gustavo Gutiérrez, Rosemary Radford Ruether (Westminster John Knox Press, 1986).

Walter Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel (New York: Abingdon Press, 1917), 1-2, 5, 131-37. See also Curtis, A Consuming Faith.

¹¹¹ As during Reconstruction, the traumatic impact of bloody civil war continued to substantially undercut such beliefs and practices. Baptist minister William Pope Yeaman, writing in 1899, maintained that providence simply required believers to pay heed to the signs of the time at hand. In his words, “in all efforts for the evangelization of an enlightened and progressive people the current avenues to thought and feeling must be hunted out and followed. To do otherwise would be to ignore the laws of thought and to defy the indications of providence.” *Ibid.*, 294.

By and large, evangelicals invoked Providence to deal with unfortunate events, such as to the death of a loved one. For example, in 1878, when David Rice McAnally eulogized his recently deceased wife Julia in the St. Louis Christian Advocate, he observed that, during her final illness “she exhibited profound peace and trust in the providence, goodness and mercy of God.” “Mrs. Julia R. McAnally,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 4 September 1878, p. 3.

¹¹² James Henley Thornwell had made the jure divino doctrine of strictly separate civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions central to southern Presbyterianism. James Henley Thornwell, “The Principles of Southern Presbyterians,” in Henry Alexander White, Southern Presbyterians (New York, 1911), 322-330. In tandem with the Westminster Confession, the church catechism, and Form of Government, this understanding undergirded the closely related position that articles of faith and church authority did not extend to politics, civil law, or the social relations, such as slavery, that secular government maintained. To the end of the nineteenth century southern Presbyterians insisted that the northern church had lapsed into infidelity by requiring that its members be loyal to the United States government and refrain from slaveholding. White, Southern Presbyterians, 351-60. Robert Lewis Dabney perpetuated these positions to the end of the nineteenth century. Dabney authored a piece in 1867 attempting to defend slavery and his home-state of Virginia’s role in secession, arguments he maintained until the end of his life. Prof. Robert L. Dabney, D. D. A Defence of Virginia, [And Through Her of the South] . . . (New York, 1867). See also Wallace Hettle, “The Minister, the Martyr, and the Maxim: Robert Lewis Dabney and Stonewall Jackson Biography,” Civil War History 49.4 (December 2003): 353–369; Lucas, Robert Lewis Dabney; Johnson, Life and Letters of Dabney.

In October 1886, the northern Presbyterian Synod of Missouri sent a letter to the southern Presbyterian Synod of Missouri that included a detailed offer to abide strictly by the jure divino understanding of spiritual jurisdiction, civil polity, and freedom of conscience articulated by Thornwell and championed by Dabney and others. The reply of the southern synod, to which Farris’s name was appended first, thanked the northern ministers for their belated offer and agreed to the proposed reconciliation -- but only after the General Assembly of the northern Presbyterian Church had also approved the new understanding. This did not happen in Farris’s lifetime. The full text of both letters is included in M. M. Fisher and John L. Rice, History of Westminster College, 1851-1903 (Columbia: E. W. Stephens, 1908), 262-65. In addition to articles set out in the regular issues of the St. Louis Presbyterian until 1895, Farris’s views on the southern Presbyterian doctrine of jure divino and the Bible as unquestionably revealed truth are also evident in his sermons. See, for example, “Age of Progress,” Series I (1850-1881), Folder 4, Robert P. Farris Papers, RG 445, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; “The Family Relation,” *ibid.*, Folder 11; and “Unbelief,” *ibid.*, Folder 26.

In 1890, a contributor to McAnally’s St. Louis Christian Advocate opined reflectively on the proper relationship between religion and patriotism. Using the devout Jefferson Davis and the less religious Abraham Lincoln, a non-church member, as his examples, he concluded that in the “politico-religious estimate, Mr. Lincoln’s patriotism answered for his lack of faith. Mr. Davis’ lack of patriotism, as they termed patriotism, neutralized his personal faith in Christ. Nothing can be more damaging to the true interests of piety than this confusion, the degradation of religion.” “Patriotism vs. Religion,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 5 February 1890, p. 4.

While the love of one’s country is generally a good thing in this estimate, it was not a Christian virtue as “Patriotism and religion are neither synonymous or co-existent; they do not mean the same thing, do not always meet in the same person.” *Ibid.*

¹¹³ “News of the Week,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 8 May 1867, p. 5. One of the earliest Gilded Age articulations of the “liberty of contract” came in an 1892 decision of the Missouri Supreme Court. In State v. Loomis, the Court dealt with sections 7058 and 7060 of the 1889 Revised Statutes. These sections made it a misdemeanor for any corporation, person or firm engaged “in manufacturing or mining” to issue in payment of the wages of its laborers any order, check, memorandum, token or evidence of indebtedness, payable otherwise than in lawful money of the United States, unless the same is negotiable and redeemable at its face value in cash or other goods or supplies, at the option of the holder, at the store or other place of business of the corporation, person or firm. According to the Court, these sections constituted “class legislation” and, as such, violated the constitutional guaranty of “due process of law” set out in the Missouri Constitution. The State v. Loomis, et al., 115 Mo. 307 (1892). The Missouri Supreme Court also declared unconstitutional an 1889 anti-monopoly law with similar logic in State ex rel. Attorney General v. Simmons Hardware Co., 18 S.W. 1125 (Mo. Div. 1 1892). For discussion of this case, see Gerald T. Dunne, The Missouri Supreme Court: From Dred Scott to Nancy Cruzan (Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 96-104.

¹¹⁴ Minutes of the Twenty-First Annual Session of the Southwest Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held at Sedalia, MO., September 16-21, 1891 (Sedalia, Mo, 1891), State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Southwest Missouri Conference Minutes of annual sessions, 1880-1925, Collection R552, p. 33.

¹¹⁵ St. Louis Christian Advocate, 5 October 1892, p. 5.

¹¹⁶ The Epworth League, in the coming years, offered day camps for city children, literary events, lectures, and fellowship meetings. Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 227-28.

¹¹⁷ Talmage Clark, One hundred years of New Madrid Methodism: a history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in New Madrid, Missouri (1912), 41-46, 59.

¹¹⁸ For example see “Epworth League,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 3 January 1900, p. 10; Minutes of the Thirty-First Annual Session of the Southwest Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, . . . 1901 (Sedalia, 1901), Southwest Annual Conference, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, Collection R552.

¹¹⁹ J. William Frost, “Part V: Christianity and Culture in America,” Christianity: A Social and Cultural History, 2nd ed. (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1998), 476.

¹²⁰ The first YMCA officers were H. C. Wright, Frank L. Johnson, Dr. L. H. Laidley, Charles C. Nichols, and E. Anson More. Walter B. Stevens, Centennial History, 103.

¹²¹ As in the early nineteenth century temperance movement during Reconstruction temperance advocates targeted the individual, seeking his conversion to the cause of temperance much like evangelical revivalists had sought new converts in the state for decades. To avoid the association with radical evangelical reform, however, temperance advocates initially grafted their cause onto new and seemingly secular fraternal orders. The Independent Order of Good Templars was organized in the United States before the Civil War. As a “Fraternal Union,” its charter declared the society to be a “friend of moral reform, to establish order in more perfect tranquility.” The

organization saw its most dramatic growth in Missouri in the period 1867-1875. David M. Fahey, "How the Good Templars Began: Fraternal Temperance in New York State," Social History of Alcohol Review Nos. 38-39 (1999); *Ibid.*, Temperance & Racism: John Bull, Johnny Reb, and the Good Templars (University Press of Kentucky, 1996). In 1867, Olive Leaf Lodge Number 91 was established in the town of Sedalia, Pettis County, situated south of the Boone's Lick in the western part of the state. New members took a solemn vow neither to drink nor sell alcohol, "the source of so much crime, poverty, and sorrow in our community." By 1874, the I.O.G.T. had established chapters in Boone's Lick County of Saline; rural Adair County, situated in the north-central plains; and McDonald County, in the far southwest Ozarks region of the state. Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 152.

¹²² At the 17 September 1887 meeting, for example, Curtis Robinson gave speech while Julia McKee read a paper. Missouri Temperance Union, Prathersville, Missouri, Records, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Kansas City, University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, Collection KC0109, p. 16.

¹²³ A Brief Account of the Great Revival in Lawrence, Kansas February and March 1872 In Connection with the Evangelistic Labors of Rev. E. Payson Hammond Assisted by All the Evangelical Clergy of the City (Lawrence, Ks, 1872); Parrish, A History of Missouri, 194.

¹²⁴ Missouri East Conference United Methodist Church, Records, 1836-1984, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 3727, Folder 299, p. 18.

¹²⁵ "An Irrepressible Conflict," Liberty Tribune, 4 May 1883, p. 1.

¹²⁶ Central Christian Advocate, 19 July 1886, pp. 8-9.

¹²⁷ First Presbyterian Church of Rolla (Mo.), Records 1864-1997, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, R668, p. 79.

¹²⁸ Presbytery of Ozark, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla.

¹²⁹ "Drunkenness is a Crime," St. Louis Evangelist, 26 April 1883, p. 4.

¹³⁰ Zoar Baptist Church Record Book, 1867-1886, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Collection 0900, pp. 87-88.

¹³¹ "Question Box," American Baptist, 31 August 1893, p. 4.

¹³² R. S. Duncan, The Life Story of R. S. Duncan (Kansas City, 1910), 187-92.

¹³³ "Good Templars' Excursion," Hannibal Clipper, 26 August 1875, p. 1.

¹³⁴ R. S. Duncan, The Life Story of R. S. Duncan (Kansas City, 1910), 187-92.

¹³⁵ Shapiro, A French Community, 196; Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 152.

¹³⁶ Among the leadership of the women's movement in Reconstruction-era Missouri was Phoebe Couzins, had worked with the Western Sanitary Commission in St. Louis and graduated from Washington University in 1871, as well as Mary Whitney Phelps, wife of Unionist congressman from Missouri and Civil War hero John S. Phelps, elected governor of the state in 1876.

In 1867, Virginia Louisa Minor co-founded and became the first president of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Missouri. At an 1869 convention held in St. Louis, she maintained that "the Constitution of the United States gives me every right and privilege to which every other citizen is entitled." Later that year, she and her husband Francis drafted and circulated pamphlets

arguing for women's suffrage based on the newly-passed Fourteenth Amendment. In October 1872, Virginia attempted to register to vote in St. Louis. When turned down, she brought a law suit based on her Fourteenth Amendment argument, which she appealed, albeit unsuccessfully, all the way to the United State Supreme Court. The trial court, the Supreme Court of Missouri, and the United States Supreme Court all ruled against her. Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. 162 (1875).

The Civil War amendments prompted numerous test cases in which white middle class women challenged their civil and political disabilities. Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. (1874); LeeAnn Whites, "The Tale of Two Minors: Women's Rights on the Border," 101-118; Rebekah Weber Bowen, "The Changing Role of Protection on the Border: Gender and the Civil War in Saline County," 120-134, in Whites, et al., Women in Missouri History: In Search of Power and Influence (2004).

Most southern evangelicals in Missouri probably did not contemplate the expanding public demands made by middle-class white women in places such as St. Louis in terms of scripture, Protestant moral philosophy, and the traditional organic social relations it articulated. But one can reasonably surmise that they looked on such changes a bit more negatively than did their liberal northern counterparts. From the perspective of conservative southern evangelicals, however, such demands portended the collapse of traditional domestic arrangements. Historian Stephanie McCurry demonstrates quite well that leading southern evangelicals, such as South Carolina Presbyterian minister, theologian, and moral philosopher James Henley Thornwell, feared that social and political equality for African Americans would open the door to similar advances for white women, changes that would threaten the divinely-ordained hierarchical relations of husbands, wives, and children within southern households. According to McCurry, South Carolina Presbyterian minister, theologian, and moral philosopher James Henley Thornwell articulated most forcefully the view that emancipation portended an equalization of rights and obligations would, ultimately, destroy the institution of marriage, the vital domestic relations dependent upon it, and thus the very foundation of southern society. McCurry, Masters of Small Worlds, 208-76.

¹³⁷ The WCTU was founded in 1874 at a national convention in Cleveland, Ohio. Its sole purpose, initially, was to combat the influence of alcohol on families and society. The first president was Annie Wittenmyer, a northern Methodist. She served as president until about 1879. Wittenmyer energetically espoused the single of purpose of the organization. She opposed efforts to turn the WCTI toward woman's suffrage and other reforms, including legal prohibition. In the 1870s, most Americans, including church women, viewed suffragists as far too radical. During Wittenmyer's tenure as first president of the WCTU, the group expanded to over 1,000 local chapters. Wittenmyer edited the WCTU periodical Our Union and published two books other books: History of the Women's Temperance Crusade (1878), and Women of the Reformation (1884). Jack S. Blocker, Jr., "Annie Wittenmyer and the Women's Crusade," Ohio History 88.4 (Dec 1979): 419-422. Frances Willard, the second president of the organization (c. 1879-1898) was an avowed feminist and suffragist. Willard pushed for the "Home Protection"

ballot, arguing that women were the superior sex morally. As such, they could employ the vote to act as “citizen-mothers” and, thereby, protect their homes and rectify social ills. The WCTU became involved in number of social reforms, including organized labor, anti-prostitution, public health, sanitation, and international peace. In the 1880s the WCTU began working to secure legislation against prostitution, which purported to protect sex workers from the exploitation of men. The organization also petitioned legislatures to pass laws that would enforce Sunday as a Sabbath day and restrain un-Godly amusements. Frances Elizabeth Willard, Home Protection Manual (New York: Published at the Independent Office, 1879). See Ruth R. B. Anderson Bordin, Frances Willard: A Biography (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press (1986).

¹³⁸ Historian Ted Ownby makes the point that post-Civil War temperance reform in the former slaveholding states constituted primarily an effort to “abolish an important male recreation.” Ownby, Subduing Satan, 171. See also Anne Firor Scott, Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-930 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 145-50; Carol Mattingly, Well-Tempered Women: Nineteenth-Century Temperance Rhetoric (Southern Illinois University Press, 2000); Jean E. Friedman, The Enclosed Garden: Women and Community in the Evangelical South, 1830-1900 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), chap. 6; Ruth B. A. Bordin, Women and Temperance: The Quest for Power and Liberty, 1873-1900 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981); Barbara Leslie Epstein, The Politics of Domesticity: Women, Evangelism, and Temperance in Nineteenth-Century America (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1981); Anastasia Sims, “‘The Sword of the Spirit’: The WCTU and Moral Reform in North Carolina, 1883-1933,” North Carolina Historical Review 64.4 (October 1987): 395-415. See also Norman H. Clark, Deliver Us from Evil: An Interpretation of American Prohibition (New York: Norton, 1976).

¹³⁹ The instant passage was set out as follows: “Being fully persuaded that all men may be saved by the grace of God and the power of human sympathy, we, Delegates of the several Local Temperance Unions of the State of Missouri, in Convention assembled, with humble dependence upon Almighty God” Constitution Revised and Adapted by the Second Annual Convention of the Missouri C. T. U., Held in Sedalia, June 13, 1878, Christian Temperance Union, Sedalia, Missouri, Record Books, 1878-1879, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, C1073, Volume one.

¹⁴⁰ Christian Temperance Union, Sedalia, Missouri, Record Books, 1878-1879, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, C1073, Volume two, p. 33.

¹⁴¹ Christian Temperance Union, Sedalia, Volume two, p. 33.

¹⁴² Summary of the Second Annual Report of the Convention of the W. C. T. U. Sixth Congressional District of MO, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Columbia, Missouri, Minute Book, 1884-1888, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Columbia, Collection, C0262, p. 1.

¹⁴³ The lectures were to be given by “Mrs. Duncan.” Mrs. Catherine P. Wallace to Mrs. S. S. Laws, 4 April 1885, Women’s Christian Temperance Union, Columbia, Papers.

-
- ¹⁴⁴ Women's Christian Temperance Union, Columbia, Papers, pp. 26-27.
- ¹⁴⁵ Mrs. McCarthy, A Loving Word to Mothers, Women's Christian Temperance Union, Columbia, Papers.
- ¹⁴⁶ Stevens, History of Central Baptist Church, 14. For an overview of black women and the W.C.T.U. see Thomas Dublin and Angela Scheuerer, "Why Did African-American Women Join the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1880-1900?," Women & Social Movements in the United States, 1600-2000 4.0, 1.
- ¹⁴⁷ Phannie Corneal, Slave Narratives, George P. Rawick, Papers, University Archives, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Box 32, p. 2, at <http://www.umsl.edu/~munsr/focus/good/slaves/black.htm>, accessed 13 August 2011.
- ¹⁴⁸ Missouri Statesman, 23 November 1883, p. 3.
- ¹⁴⁹ "Colored Baptists Delegates Visit the Lincoln Institute . . .," Jefferson City Tribune, 16 October 1897, p. 4.
- ¹⁵⁰ "Slavery and Intemperance," St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 January 1890, p. 2.
- ¹⁵¹ E. Herbert Smith, Autobiography, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, Collection R184, p. 13.
- ¹⁵² Christensen and Kramer, A History of Missouri, 136.
- ¹⁵³ "Explanation," New Era, 28 June 1878, p. 3.
- ¹⁵⁴ Ira M. Wasserman, "Prohibition and Ethno-Cultural Conflict: the Missouri Prohibition Referendum of 1918," Social Science Quarterly, 80, No. 4 (December 1989): 886-901.
- ¹⁵⁵ Journal of the General Assembly of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Missouri 1897 (Jefferson City, 1897), 534.
- ¹⁵⁶ Missouri Statesman, 9 March 1883, p. 3; *Ibid.*, 23 March 1883, p. 3; *Ibid.*, 11 July 1884, p. 2.
- ¹⁵⁷ Women's Christian Temperance Union, Columbia, Papers, p. 49.
- ¹⁵⁸ Missouri Statesman, 14 July 1886, p. 3.
- ¹⁵⁹ Only through the election of a Progressive reform-minded Democrat to the governorship in 1904, Joseph W. Folk, did enforcement of the laws significantly change. Folk, an urban Baptist from St. Louis, was a vigorous prosecutor who closed at least 700 saloons while governor. Carroll D. Wright, The New Century of Facts . . . (Springfield, Ma, 1909), 1052; "Note and Comment," The National Magazine, 22, No. 2 (November, 1904): 223.
- ¹⁶⁰ Missouri Statesman, 31 August 1883, p. 2.
- ¹⁶¹ Second Baptist Church (Neosho, Mo.) Centennial Booklet, 1976, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Rolla, Collection R821, p. 10.
- ¹⁶² "Colored Baptist Convention . . .," Jefferson City Tribune, 17 October 1897, p. 4.
- ¹⁶³ Rev. David S. Monroe, D. D., ed., Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church . . . 1884 (New York and Cincinnati, 1884), 415; Tucker, Methodist Church in Missouri, 247.
- ¹⁶⁴ Union Memorial United Methodist Church (1996).
- ¹⁶⁵ Rev. R. C. Galbraith, Jr., The History of the Chillicothe Presbytery, From its Organization in 1799 to 1889 . . . (Chillicothe, Oh., 1889), 255.

-
- ¹⁶⁶ “Organic Union,” St. Louis Evangelist, 21 April 1887, p. 3.
- ¹⁶⁷ “Home Missions and the Colored People,” *ibid.*, 5 May 1887, p. 3.
- ¹⁶⁸ Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Presbytery of Ozark, State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscripts, Missouri Institute of Science and Technology, Rolla, Missouri, Collection R1191.
- ¹⁶⁹ Missouri Statesman, 5 September 1884, p. 3.
- ¹⁷⁰ “Slavery and Intemperance,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 29 January 1890, p. 2.
- ¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁷² “A Colored Preacher in Jail – STL Times,” Columbia Statesman, 5 March 1880, p. 4.
- ¹⁷³ “Sedalia Democrat – Colored church troubles in Mexico,” *ibid.*, 27 April 1883, p. 2.
- ¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 26 September 1884, p. 2.
- ¹⁷⁵ The Mugwumps were Republicans who supported a Democrat candidate in the presidential election of 1884. They rejected the financial corruption endemic in their own party. According to historian David M. Tucker, the Mugwumps were well-educated men who adhered to traditional Protestant moral philosophy, which placed a premium on Christian values, republican virtue, and classical liberalism. They were devoted to benevolent activism and campaigned against United States imperialism. They favored sound money policies, lower tariffs, and civil service reform. The Mugwumps advocated in behalf of public principles over private interests. David M. Tucker, Mugwumps: Public Moralists of the Gilded Age (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1998).
- ¹⁷⁶ Christensen and Kremer, A History of Missouri, 150.
- ¹⁷⁷ Lorenzo J. Greene, Gary R. Kremer, Anthony F. Holland, Missouri’s Black Heritage (St. Louis: Forum Press, 1980), 91-100s.
- ¹⁷⁸ “The Political Battle is On,” St. Louis Palladium, 16 January 1904, p. 4.
- ¹⁷⁹ Christensen and Kremer, A History of Missouri, 55-64, 179.
- ¹⁸⁰ Melbourne S. Cummings, “The Rhetoric of Bishop Henry McNeal Turner,” *The Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 12, 4, (June 1982), 457-470.
- ¹⁸¹ “Colored Baptist Convention . . .,” Jefferson City Tribune, 17 October 1897, p. 4.
- ¹⁸² “First Baptist Church Notes,” St. Louis Palladium, 16 January 1904, p. 1.
- ¹⁸³ Henry T. Brownlee, “Keeping Their Memory Green: The Pleasant Green Baptist Church in St. Louis, Missouri, 1866-1950,” (Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, 2008), 35-38. For a description of Black Theology see James Cone, A Black Theology of Liberation (New York: Orbis Books, 1996).
- ¹⁸⁴ “Protestantism,” St. Louis Christian Advocate, 24 March 1869, p. 2.
- ¹⁸⁵ “Letter From Bishop Marvin,” *ibid.*, 17 February 1869, p. 4.
- ¹⁸⁶ The reports that Harris produced from 1868-1880 established his reputation as the top schoolman in the United States, and he became United States commissioner of education from 1889 to 1997. With the policies Harris established in St. Louis, he created a model soon adopted in at least the public schools systems in most of the large towns and cities of the state. Thelan, Paths of Resistance, 109.
- ¹⁸⁷ Green, The Second Disestablishment, 305; William Torey Harris, “Division of School Funds for Religious Purposes (1876), 173, 177.

-
- ¹⁸⁸ “Of What Religion Are We?,” St. Louis Evangelist, January 1876, p. 1.
- ¹⁸⁹ Liberty Tribune, 26 March 1880, p. 3.
- ¹⁹⁰ The Rolla New Era, 4 September 1880, p. 2.
- ¹⁹¹ “Romanism in America,” The Central Baptist, 19 May 1898, p. 6.
- ¹⁹² “A Woman Kidnapped by Nuns and Priests,” The American Baptist, 28 September 1898, p. 1.
- ¹⁹³ “Let’s Hang Him,” *ibid.*, 2 November 1893, p. 4.
- ¹⁹⁴ One resolution, passed in 1883, affirmed that the members agreed that the great fight was over. Reports of the Proceedings of the Ex-Confederate Association of Missouri, in its Second Annual Meeting . . . (St. Louis, 1883), 5-13.
- ¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.
- ¹⁹⁶ History of the Missouri Division: United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1898-1966, 5-6.
- ¹⁹⁷ Minutes of the Second Annual Meeting of the Missouri Division United Daughters of the Confederacy . . . 1899 (Fayette, Mo, 1899), 11.
- ¹⁹⁸ History of the Missouri Division, 7.
- ¹⁹⁹ The group almost folded in the 1870s, as it did in many places outside of the northeast. McConnell, Glorious Contentment, 32-33.
- ²⁰⁰ Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Encampment of the Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic . . . 1901 (St. Louis, 1901), 24-25.
- ²⁰¹ Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic: Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Encampment . . . 1890 (St. Louis, 1890), 127.
- ²⁰² *Ibid.*, 149.
- ²⁰³ McConnell, Glorious Contentment, 186-88. Northern Methodist minister S. G. Bundy, who was one of many in his denomination that wanted to remove MECS influences from the state, was one of the first chaplains in 1883. Proceedings of the Second Annual Encampment of the Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic . . . 1883 (St. Louis, 1883).
- ²⁰⁴ Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Encampment . . . 1890, 3.
- ²⁰⁵ Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Encampment . . . 1892 (St. Louis, 1892), 3.
- ²⁰⁶ D. R. McAnally, History of Methodism in Missouri: from the date of its introduction, in 1806, down to the present day. . . (St. Louis, 1881), 211, 372-73.
- ²⁰⁷ Woodard, Annals of Methodism, 231.
- ²⁰⁸ W. H. Lewis, The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870 (Nashville, 1890), 22.
- ²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 21.
- ²¹⁰ Lorenzo Waugh, Autobiography of Lorenzo Waugh, (San Francisco, 1896), 285.
- ²¹¹ Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 119.
- ²¹² “Baptist Journalism in Missouri,” The Central Baptist, 7 April 1898, p. 4.
- ²¹³ Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 116-20.
- ²¹⁴ R. S. Duncan, A History of the Baptists in Missouri . . . (St. Louis, 1888), 687.
- ²¹⁵ “Baptist Journalism in Missouri,” The Central Baptist, 7 April 1898, p. 4.

-
- ²¹⁶ Galusha Anderson, The Story of a Border City During the Civil War (Boston, 1908), 355.
- ²¹⁷ Yeaman, Missouri Baptist General Association, 119.
- ²¹⁸ “Reminiscences of Presbyterianism in Missouri,” St. Louis Evangelist, March 1877, p. 2.
- ²¹⁹ Rev. Dr. Cochran, “Historical Sketch of the Synod of Missouri,” Minutes of the Semi-Centennial Session of the Session of the Synod of Missouri (St. Louis, 1882), 40.
- ²²⁰ Rev. John Leighton, “Primitive Presbyterianism in Missouri,” *ibid.*, 70; J. J. Marks, “Some Personal Remembrances of Rev. David Nelson,” *ibid.*
- ²²¹ E. E. Stringfield, Presbyterianism in the Ozarks: A History of the Work of the Various Branches of the Presbyterian Church in Southwest Missouri, 1837-1907 (1909), 21. The work covers both the northern and Cumberland Presbyterian development as both branches reunified in 1906.
- ²²² *ibid.*, 35. By the turn of the century, however, a movement towards erecting a monument in honor of Elijah Lovejoy had resulted in a memorial to his martyrdom in Alton, Illinois. That year Melvin Jameson authored a 1910 work entitled Elijah Parish Lovejoy as a Christian which was both a biography of the man and a testimony to the Presbyterian faith that drove him to his death. Melvin Jameson, Elijah Parish Lovejoy as a Christian (Rochester, N.Y., 1910).
- ²²³ Duncan, History of Missouri Baptists, 755-59.
- ²²⁴ Stringfield, Presbyterianism in the Ozarks, 245, 383-84.
- ²²⁵ Duncan, History of Missouri Baptists, ix.
- ²²⁶ Paul C. Nagle, Missouri: A History (1977; reprint, Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988), 15, 16-24. See Samuel Clemens, Tom Sawyer (1876); Huckleberry Finn (1876); Edward W. Howe, The Story of a Country Town (1883); Howard Bell Wright, The Shepherd of the Hills (1907); The Calling of Dan Matthews (1909). New York-born, Wright was a Disciple of Christ minister in Lebanon, Missouri, at the time he wrote these two books. Winston Churchill, The Crisis (1901); Winston Church, The Crossing (1904).
- ²²⁷ Other late nineteenth and early twentieth century histories of Missouri that contributed, in varying degrees, to the development of its “Middle West” identity include Louis Houck, A History of Missouri from the Earliest Explorations and Settlements until the Admission of the State into the Union, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1908); Chauncey Filley, Some Republican History of Missouri (St. Louis, 1898); Chauncey Filley, Some More Republican History of Missouri (St. Louis: Christmann Printing Co., 1902); Howard L. Conard, ed., Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri: A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference, 6 vols. (New York; Louisville; St. Louis, 1901); Perry Scott Rader, The Civil Government of the United States and the State of Missouri; and the History of Missouri from the Earliest Times to the Present (Columbia, 1898); Isidor Loeb, Civil Government: Local, State and National. The History of Missouri (Carrollton, Mo., 1907); Christian Ludwig Rutt, The Daily News’ History of Buchanan County and St. Joseph, Mo. from the Time of the Platte Purchase to the End of the Year 1898, Preceded by a Short History of Missouri, Supplemented by Biographical Sketches of Noted Citizens, Living and Dead. (St. Joseph, Mo, 1898); Marshall Solomon Snow, ed., History of the Development of

Missouri: and Particularly of St. Louis, 2 vols. (Saint Louis, Mo, 1908); Jere Taylor Muir, History and Government of Missouri (Boston, 1908); A.J.D. Stewart, ed., The History of the Bench and Bar of Missouri: With Reminiscences of the Prominent Lawyers of the Past, and a Record of the Law's Leaders of the Present (St. Louis, 1898); James Underwood Barnard, History and Civil Government of Missouri, to Which is Appended the Constitution of the United States (Chicago, New York, 1895).

Conclusions

Congregational and local denominational schisms among Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterians in the Border State of Missouri before, during, and after the Civil War were central to the crisis of the Union in that state from 1837 to 1876. Employing an array of approaches that examine these ecclesiastical fractures beyond the customary antebellum temporal scope of analysis, and as local phenomenon, this study maintains that the sectional schisms were interlinked religious, socio-cultural, legal, and political developments rife with implications for the transformation of evangelicalism and the United States in that period and to the end of the nineteenth century. Such fractures were grounded in divergent moral and political understandings of slavery, abolitionism, secession, and disloyalty. Publicly articulated by factional litigation over church property and a combative evangelical print culture, the schisms were complicated by race, class, and gender dynamics that arrayed the contending interests of white middle class women and men, rural church-goers, and African American congregants. These ecclesiastical ruptures forged antagonistic and uncompromising northern and southern evangelical worldviews that increased antebellum sectarian strife and violence, energized the notorious guerilla conflict that gripped Missouri through the Civil War, and fueled post-war vigilantism between opponents and proponents of emancipation. As such, the schisms produced the intertwined religious, legal and constitutional controversies that shaped pro- and anti-slavery evangelical contention before 1861, wartime Radical rule, the rise and fall of Reconstruction and social reform to the end of the nineteenth century.

Evangelical contention over slavery in Missouri from 1837 through 1860 resulted, most obviously, from the expansion of the “Benevolent Empire” into a slaveholding polity situated in the frontier trans-Mississippi Southwest. Beginning shortly before the American takeover of

Louisiana in 1804, evangelical missionaries dispatched from the Northeast established congregations in Missouri to redeem the West from what denominational leaders perceived to be a degree of Godlessness prevailing in the region that posed a threat to the well being of the young United States. In doing so, well-intended Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian missionaries met the needs of isolated white Anglophone settlers and a smaller number of African Americans extraordinarily hungry for religion. These energetic operatives established congregations that grew steadily to the end of the antebellum period. But they did so in a slaveholding Border State that distinctively combined agriculture, slavery, and urban-based free market capitalism. Town-dwellers involved in commerce, moreover, hailed variously from the Upper South, the urban Northeast, and Europe and, thus, held widely divergent views about the morality of African American bondage. Baptist and Methodist congregations rose quickly in the rural precincts of the state, which were largely inhabited by white southerners who mostly supported slavery. But Presbyterians, as well as Methodists, had much more success than Baptists at increasing their numbers among members of the white middle class situated in growing towns, including St. Louis before and after it became a large city.

Beginning in the late 1830s, Northeast-based benevolent activism against slavery in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches produced fractures in all three national denominations. But these schisms produced divergent forms of ecclesiastical rupture among evangelicals in Missouri. Its distinctive situation as a frontier Border State inhabited by a largely southern-oriented white population committed to slavery and to the expansion of commerce in culturally-diverse urban venues ultimately shaped the contours of these schisms. Two-party politics increasingly focused on the volatile issue of slavery further fueled this essentially moral conflict. The resulting discord ultimately severed Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian

organizations in Missouri from pre-existing national affiliations. The relatively homogenous opposition of white rural Baptists to abolitionism left their local societies intact and free to align with a new southern-based regional association. But the trans-regional dynamic of conflict completely fractured a number of town-based Methodist and Presbyterian congregations and channeled the remnants, as reorganized societies, into newly formed, but antagonistic, regional and national ecclesiastical organizations. These often tumultuous ruptures and re-alignments resulted, in part, from the traditional organic connection of Methodist and Presbyterian societies to hierarchically-organized national ecclesiastical bodies. Equally important, they stemmed from the fact that anti-slavery religious beliefs advanced within town-based Methodist and Presbyterian congregations, and within those that flourished the City of St. Louis, appealed strongly to a substantial number of their liberal-minded middle-class members. This advocacy, however, utterly alienated co-congregants of the same class who continued to adhere to older denominational beliefs that hewed to a neutral position on slavery or supported the practice.

Intra- denominational and intra-congregational strife over African American bondage became most intense when it implicated the conflicting claims of urban middle-class congregants over church-owned property. While divergent views on the morality of slavery underlay evangelical contention, the determination of mutually antagonistic middle-class congregational factions to retain ownership of disputed church lands and buildings made congregational and denominational splits extraordinarily contentious public altercations. Equally important, benevolent women in town-dwelling congregations had vital stakes in disputed church lands, buildings, and schools, and that these women sometimes played key roles in such contests.

After the War of 1812, the gentry who led evangelical societies in the hinterlands and growing towns of Missouri set about acquiring real estate and buildings for their religious

societies and denominational schools with notable zeal. In this way, a growing urban middle class registered its growing status and collective pride in developing religious institutions. To achieve their intertwined material and spiritual goals, middle-class evangelicals necessarily relied on denominational books of discipline and governance that distinguished spiritual matters from “temporalities” and that prescribed the rules by which church trustees, who legally owned church property, were to manage it for the benefit of society members. Such books, however, relied upon a mix of Anglo-American common law rules and chancery rules of equity defining rights to ecclesiastical property.

Middle-class women played a primary role in the development of evangelicalism in the state. They did so by advancing benevolent enterprises and donating property to religious societies and institutions as both single women and as spouses. Similarly to the secular law, church rules subordinated women to men in religious societies and denominational educational enterprises. Missouri civil law tended to render legally invisible the substantial labor and property that evangelical women willingly contributed as wives and mothers to local religious societies and other evangelical institutions. But ecclesiastical authorities relied heavily upon its marital property rules to secure such donations.

Even in the absence of actual litigation, civil and ecclesiastical law fundamentally shaped the parameters of conflict among congregational and denominational factions divided over the morality of slavery. Middle-class evangelicals embraced a worldview that encouraged them to view the property they acquired for themselves and their religious societies as, primarily, a dispensation of Divine Providence. Congregations whose members reached unanimity in support of slavery after the national schisms, in both town and country, rarely split into factions contending for control and ownership of congregational property. Among middle-class

Methodists and Presbyterians in the more cosmopolitan Mississippi River towns, such as Hannibal, St. Charles, and St. Louis, such strife deeply implicated the fate of congregationally-owned property. Property claims shaped these conflicts as much as religious ones. Middle-class women, as much as their adult male counterparts, had strong religious and material stakes in the outcomes of congregational and denominational strife. Middle-class women were commonly at the center of the action. A religiously-grounded predisposition on the part of divided co-congregants to avoid litigation over church property often permitted assertive majorities to appropriate ownership of disputed congregational property in its entirety to the detriment of vanquished minorities. By the same token, conflict over the disposition of property used by churches and evangelical schools commonly divided houses of worship and also those of spouses, families, and larger religious communities.

The St. Louis Circuit Court case Farrar v. Finney (1855), which culminated in the Missouri Supreme Court, reveals that intra-congregational conflicts over church property among Methodists became especially heated when they pitted independently-minded urban slave and free black congregants against all-white pro-slavery congregational factions. As did civilly and ecclesiastically disempowered white women, African American congregants, both men and women, had substantial spiritual and material stakes in the bi-racial churches they helped to build. The high court of Missouri, however, discounted informal bi-racial church customs for handling the affairs of virtually-independent black congregations and ignore rules of law and equity to safeguard the material interests of pro-slavery church-goers. Equally important, highly-publicized litigation battles over church property ratcheted up tensions between contending pro- and anti-slavery congregants and ordinary residents in the state.

Farrar v. Finney reveals, first, the plight of ordinary African Methodist congregants caught between white anti-slavery Methodist ministers who, in 1848, repudiated the 1844 Methodist Episcopal Church Plan of Separation and white pro-slavery MECS clerics determined to have the civil courts validate it. The protracted struggle of the St. Louis black Methodists to obtain legal title to their Green Street house of worship shows the extent to which intra-congregational strife over the morality of slavery became most intense when it implicated conflicting factional claims to church property. It also highlights how such conflict was especially heated when litigation pitted all-white and all-black congregational factions against one another in a slaveholding metropolis inhabited by substantial numbers of European immigrants and northerners who strenuously opposed African American bondage.

Bold legal arguments made by the African Methodists Church in St. Louis combined with the political pressures of pro- and anti-slavery partisanship to pose a fundamental dilemma to the courts called upon to adjudicate the African Methodist claims to their Green Street church building. Relying on equitable principles relevant to trusts, the African Methodist Church claimed title to its lot and meeting house by arguing a history of de facto ecclesiastical independence that directly challenged longstanding Methodist Episcopal Church authority over its black congregations in the slave states. The St. Louis African Methodist Church also advanced its claim to ownership by arguing alternatively that the withdrawal of the southern Methodists and the Fourth Street Church from the MEC constituted an unauthorized secession that forfeited to the African Methodist Church all title and interest in the Green Street property. In doing so, the African Methodists courageously called upon the courts to adjudicate the legality of the secession of southern Methodists from the national Methodist church.

The struggle of the St. Louis African Methodists reveals that highly-publicized litigation battles over church property, such as Farrar v. Finney, occurred almost exclusively in the slaveholding Border States of Missouri, Kentucky, and Virginia. This contention in Missouri ratcheted up tensions between contending pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals and between non-church-goers divided on the moral question of slavery. Evangelical strife and litigation in the Border States spurred high-profile judicial pronouncements, print commentary, and other public disputation that shaped the parameters of national debate and radically increased sectional tensions.

After a protracted multi-year ordeal, a pro-slavery Missouri Supreme Court rejected the appeal of the black congregants in Farrar v. Finney on warrantless technical grounds. The outcome revealed a basic flaw in the equitable trust under the terms of which African American congregations depended upon the benevolence of white trustees to protect their property. It also demonstrated the limits of a related informal practice, or “legality,” by which African American congregants and all-white superintending Methodist churches ordered their temporal and spiritual relationships. As well, Farrar v. Finney demonstrates that the struggle over slavery spurred egregious violations of religious liberty heretofore unexamined by historians focusing on church-state relations in the antebellum period.

The evangelical schisms in Missouri spurred a radical escalation of theological and political disputation between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in religious newspapers and other printed publications. This verbal sparring played a heretofore unexamined central role in spawning a vicious guerilla conflict between northern and southern evangelicals and partisans on the border with Kansas after 1854. To the extent that sectarian strife over the morality of African

American bondage spurred armed strife in Missouri from spring 1854 through 1860, it helped to generate the larger sectional tensions that led to secession and the Civil War.

Evangelical missionaries in the first several decades of American settlement in Missouri invasion relied almost exclusively on the spoken Word to spread the Gospel. More effective than the publicly-funded elementary schools in improving literacy were the Sunday schools set up by Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches, whose teachers relied heavily on multi-denominational societies for texts. Divided by contention over slavery almost from the beginning, northern and southern evangelical newspapers in antebellum Missouri produced imagined communities of like-minded readers. The rise of a thriving evangelical print culture did not, however, displace preaching as a vital mode of religious communication. Household reading of evangelical publications constituted an index of both increasing literacy and the continuing development of mutually re-enforcing oral and print evangelical cultures.

A rapidly developing body of intertwined theological, social, and political thought regarding African American bondage informed the sectarian print wars that arose over the morality of slavery among evangelicals in Missouri. The Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian schisms in the state virtually ensured that the tracts, treatises, and newspaper produced by the respective publishing industries of northern and southern evangelicals would feature a rapid bilateral escalation of religious and political disputation over the question. Abolitionist publications spawned growing fears among most white Missouri residents that anti-slavery presses emboldened bonded African Americans to challenge it.

Heightening evangelical newspaper, tract, and book warfare over slavery after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 substantially increased the viciousness of the Border War that broke out between abolitionist settlers in Kansas and pro-slavery Missourians. But pro-slavery

leaders in Missouri focused first on the threat that abolitionist literature posed to the security of slaveholders in the state. The dangers that pro-slavery leaders perceived in anti-slavery newspapers and tracts powerfully spurred their virulent suppression of such publications. Pro-slavery partisans waged a ruthless campaign against abolitionist presses in Kansas in an effort to shape local and national perceptions of the brewing Border War. High-profile religious and political pronouncements divided congregations. Pro-slavery zealots harassed, assaulted, and occasionally murdered leading northern Methodist ministers.

Pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in Missouri aggressively exploited the emerging public sphere of print communications to achieve their respective goals. And they did so in ways that contributed substantially to the mob violence over slavery that plagued the state after about 1835. Evangelical print culture did not promote rational deliberation of pressing political problems in an orderly public sphere as libertarian proponents of a free market place of ideas professed.

An unfettered war of words among white evangelicals over the morality of slavery in Missouri had fanned the flames of intolerance and produced mob violence against abolitionists for at least a decade and a half before secession. The evangelical schisms that occurred in Missouri from 1837 through 1845 provided the critical socio-cultural and institutional pre-conditions necessary for the formation of irreconcilable views on the morality of slavery. In that context, institutionally-unconstrained evangelical ministers, often doubling as newspaper editors, purified and consolidated their opposing doctrines. In doing so, they developed two mutually antagonistic worldviews in which Protestant articles of faith defined righteousness and sinfulness, grounded individual and sectional identities, and inextricably implicated understandings of cardinal social, economic, and political relations. Pro-slavery evangelicals embraced religious beliefs and related ideas about government, civil society, and politics that

situated master and slave within an organic and hierarchical social order, one they insisted should be beyond the reach of civil authorities or secular government. Abolitionists developed a new and unorthodox theology that incorporated egalitarian commitments to civil and political equality for African Americans grounded in seminal natural law understandings of American polity. Amid increasingly virulent sectional rancor, the growing felt need among ordinary and leading evangelicals to know which one of these contending sectional credos was true took on an unprecedented sense of epistemological urgency.

The election of Abraham Lincoln pitted the consolidated systems of belief and sentiment that had set pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals against one another for at least a decade and a half. Brought with increasing energy into the public sphere by clerics, politicians, and newspaper editors and contributors, the antithetical world views of pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals provided the critical moral and intellectual energy for the armed resistance of rural Missourians to Union occupation. These divergent understandings also sustained the determination of United States Army troops and Unionist partisans to quell this rebellion. In the first years of the Civil War, white evangelical leaders locked horns over the issue of whether the moral question of slavery, secession, and loyalty to the Union were within the scope of religion. They also engaged in volatile disputation that focused on the question of whether secession amounted to defensible rebellion under God-given natural law principles or abandonment of Christian obligations to support civil government. Equally important was the question of whether Union military force was constitutional and consistent with Christian doctrine and duties.

The escalation of theological and political disputation between pro- and anti-slavery evangelicals in religious newspapers and other printed publications, which ensued after the evangelical schisms, played a prime role in fueling the vicious guerilla conflict that engulfed

Missouri during the Civil War. Through the war, committed white evangelicals struggled with the ponderous questions that had divided them for almost two decades but remained determined to continue their devotional activities. Northern and southern evangelicals invoked Divine Providence variously to justify their respective causes and to settle the question of which of the two sets of understandings of theology, social order, government, and politics would prevail. Pro-Union evangelicals, however, increasingly committed themselves to the view that support of slavery and secession and disloyalty to the United States constituted sin. These were positions that Union military victories seemed to confirm.

Conflict between northern and southern evangelicals over the question of slavery, nonetheless, contributed substantially to the pro- and anti-slavery guerilla depredations that disrupted congregations and church activities through the bloody conflict. The persistent fervor of white evangelicals during the Civil War translated into a heretofore unexamined dimension of the infamous guerilla conflict in Missouri that erupted after Union forces had established their dominance. Militant evangelicalism spurred denominational and congregational disruptions for both pro-Union and pro-Confederate church-goers. Believers in both camps suffered depredations that further fragmented church organizations. But, given Union control of Missouri after 1862, this kind of vigilantism more often resulted in harassment of congregations who Unionists believed to be in sympathy with the Confederate cause. Burning sectional loyalties amid irregular armed contention increased the number of congregational schisms. Such ruptures spurred legal battles over the meeting houses and lands that pro-Union evangelicals attempted to misappropriate from their increasingly powerless pro-Confederate counterparts. Challenged in the courts by dispossessed southern evangelicals, these were seizures that local tribunals under Radical control generally ratified in the name of well-established rules of ecclesiastical law,

constitutional doctrine, and equity jurisprudence. This variegated body of law, however, did not determine such outcomes as much as did the religious, social, and political preferences of partisan judges. Their rulings, moreover, obscured the boundaries of church and state, while powerfully shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and the armed struggle.

The heightened ideological conflict generated by the evangelical schisms that occurred in the period 1837-1845 fundamentally shaped the northern war effort in Missouri and the social, political, and ideological revolution that Unionist leaders sought to promote at the expense of defeated pro-Confederate partisans. African Americans certainly experienced the Civil War through the prisms of their own historical experiences with slavery and distinctive religious beliefs and sentiments. But they also took the most decisive initial steps toward establishing as civil and political fact abolitionist religious views that incorporated equality for African Americans. By the same token, anti-slavery evangelicals and their Radical allies extinguished property in human beings. More than any other wartime development, this redefinition of fundamental liberties gave effect to the radical vision advanced by abolitionists in the state.

Anti-slavery Unionists during the Civil War embraced the view that disloyalty to the United States and support of slavery were tantamount to sin, a position that northern evangelicals, Union troops, and Radical Republicans sought to impose, as a new civil religion, on southern evangelicals via wartime ecclesiastical sanctions and loyalty oaths. Such sentiments prompted Union authorities to muzzle the pro-slavery evangelical press, while spurring Unionist evangelicals to appropriate the church lands and buildings of their pro-slavery counterparts -- seizures that local courts under Radical control generally ratified in the name of well-established rules of law and equity.

Continuing strife within evangelical congregations and denominations in wartime Missouri took on harsh new features that included Union efforts to curtail the accustomed religious liberty of most residents. United States and Missouri officials combined with Radicals and abolitionists to seize the lands and meeting houses of evangelicals suspected of Confederate sympathies. Strife between church-goers divided over slavery and by civil war disorganized denominational associations and sometimes obliterated entire congregations. United States military forces sided with northern evangelicals to eradicate religious beliefs and praxis they deemed inimical to the Union war effort. United States army officers took possession of the meeting houses and other property of southern-leaning churches to promote the Unionist cause. Northern Methodists enlisted federal power to seize southern Methodist property and appoint ministers for suspect congregations. Their efforts to acquire title to congregational property previously held by pro-Confederate trustees ushered in years of litigation. In the name of wartime necessity, Union authorities discounted entirely religious views that had generated secessionist sympathies. Pro-slavery evangelicalism and related views of social, civil, and political order constituted treason in the view of most Union officials. Anti-slavery evangelicals were, consequently, often at the complete mercy of Union officials, federal troops, and pro-Union Missouri militia units convinced that they were solidly on the side of true religion and patriotism.

The commitment of Union authorities to the institutionalization of abolitionist understandings of civil and political equality generated vigorous suppression of southern evangelical religious beliefs, sentiments, and expression. Printed publication of pro-slavery views no longer merited any consideration or constitutional protection. United States troops and irregular pro-Union partisans quelled the publication of pro-Confederate evangelical newspapers.

Lincoln justified these encroachments by invoking military necessity and his war powers as commander in chief. Union officials and Radical leaders in Missouri, furthermore, imposed a number of loyalty oaths on suspected southern sympathizers, including both ministers and influential evangelical laity. This was a practice that created distinctive dilemmas of conscience for them. Some Radical leaders, as well as President Lincoln, had sought to mediate the claims of those who clung to slaveholder property rights and those determined to establish a new order erected on radical abolitionist theology. By the end of the war, the worldview to which pro-slavery evangelicals had adhered for decades had become theological and political anathema. Unionists and Missouri Radicals had successfully enlisted military force and the power of the federal and state governments in their efforts to impose a new civil religion. This intertwined set of beliefs, sentiments, and ideals set out as unshakeable first principles of government abolitionist religious commitments to civil and political equality for African Americans and loyalty to a perpetual Union.

Radical Republicans during Reconstruction, with a new state constitution, disqualified ministers of the gospel from preaching for failure to take a Test Oath professing present and past loyalty to the Union -- while northern evangelical church leaders made a declaration of loyalty and a profession that slavery and slaveholding amounted to sin a litmus test for church membership. It also shows how opposition to the Test Oath, on the ground that it infringed upon the liberties of conscience and free speech, produced the 1867 ruling of the United States Supreme Court in Cummings v. State of Missouri. This decision overturned the Test Oath, undercut the Radical redefinition of Protestant faith and citizenship, and provided the legal grist with which southern evangelicals, aided by state courts once again sympathetic to this white majority, reclaimed the church lands and buildings that Union soldiers, Radicals, and their

northern evangelical allies had seized during the war. As before and during the Civil War, high-profile litigation over church property reflected less the imperatives of church, civil, and constitutional law than the social, religious, and political preferences of judges. These disputes further clouded the boundaries of church and state, while further shaping popular understandings of evangelical faith and emerging civil religions among both former Confederate and Union supporters.

Continuing ecclesiastical ruptures in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches during Reconstruction in Missouri both reflected and reinforced the basic differences in theological and political understanding of northern and southern evangelicals. Such differences drove the process of Radical Reconstruction and hastened its demise. The years immediately following the Civil War saw continuing strife among former supporters of the Confederacy and victorious Radical Republican rulers and their supporters. With the Test Oath, Radicals sought to impose on a largely southern-oriented population a retrospective, solemn vow of allegiance that could not be conscientiously made by those who believed that slavery and slaveholding had been consistent with Protestant faith and that natural law, Scripture, and the Constitution had justified secession. By the same token, the Test Oath required of southern evangelicals a sworn declaration of adherence to novel articles of faith and good citizenship constituting the prime features of the new civil religion initially advanced by Union authorities during the war, that is, the conviction that African Americans deserved and should have equal civil and political rights and that support of slavery and disloyalty to the Union amounted to both sin and treason. Church property provisions included in the new state constitution placed particularly onerous burdens on Roman Catholics, who joined with southern evangelicals in denouncing the Radicals. But the effort of Republicans to impose their intertwined political and religious views on the southern-

affiliated residents of the state served most powerfully to exacerbate the conflict among evangelical Protestants that had begun over the moral question of slavery decades earlier.

Equally divisive during Reconstruction were the efforts of leaders in the northern-affiliated Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches to set up, as a litmus test for church membership, a declaration that disloyalty, slavery, and slave-owning amounted to egregious sin. This effort further alienated their southern brethren in each case and generated more ecclesiastical ruptures. Successful challenges to the Test Oath in the courts, based on the claim that the oath encroached on civil and religious liberties, culminated in the 1867 decision of the United States Supreme Court in Cummings v. State of Missouri. The case dealt with the refusal of Roman Catholic priest Father John A. Cummings to submit to the Test Oath. But the ruling of the Court that the oath breached the United States Constitution worked to strip the Radical redefinition of Protestant faith and citizenship of its legal and constitutional foundations.

As Liberal Republicans and southern-oriented Democrats in Missouri seized political power from the overreaching Radicals, the ruling in Cummings spurred renewed litigation between southern and northern Presbyterians and Methodists over the ownership and control of disputed church property. This litigation constituted a new phase in the intra-denominational and intra-congregational strife that had divided evangelicals in the state since the initial national schisms. The resurgence of southern Democratic power and a return to peacetime standards of jurisprudence, by 1873, produced judicial outcomes that placed in the hands of southern evangelicals the church-owned buildings and lands that Radical Republicans, Union military forces, and their northern evangelical allies had seized during the Civil War. Congress, President Ulysses S. Grant, and the Republicans had formally re-established the Union. But evangelicals in

Missouri continued to be divided. And these divisions entailed an increasingly complex set of religious, institutional, and political differences.

New civil and political liberties for African Americans during Reconstruction secured for them the right to worship independently and the means to protect their church property -- but black believers abandoned white-controlled churches in droves, created their own Baptist and Methodist organizations, and faced down the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan to nurture distinctive faiths that nurtured African American advancement. After political "Redemption" in 1875, white evangelicals remained ecclesiastically divided over the religious and political meanings of slavery, secession and disloyalty.

During Reconstruction, northern and southern evangelicals in Missouri recovered from the ravages of war and increased their memberships in ways that more than kept pace with the rapidly-growing population of the state. This growth was, to a large degree, a consequence of new railroads and industrial development that generated large-scale immigration from further east and north. In this context, relatively well-to-do middle-class Presbyterian societies recovered much more quickly than did rural evangelical congregations. These same transformations generated a relative decline in southern Methodist numbers. But these sweeping changes increased most the size of northern Methodist and Baptist churches, while producing a notable rural-urban divide among the latter.

Through Reconstruction, white evangelicals remained divided over the intertwined moral and political questions of slavery, secession and disloyalty. Northern and southern Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians agreed to co-exist peacefully. But no ecclesiastical reconciliations occurred among them. Commemoration of wartime heroes and victims powerfully reinforced antagonistic understandings of religion, politics, and the past. Southern and northern evangelicals

perceived the extended revivals that took place during Reconstruction primarily in terms of sacrifice and spiritual rebirth. But they embraced a delimited, backward-looking understanding of Divine Providence, which left them with scant means to make optimistic predictions of future social and political transformation. This key modulation in evangelical faith, a prime consequence of the schisms and sectional conflict, coincided with a decreased willingness on the part of evangelicals to support social reform and a rapidly growing commitment to separate religion from civil government.

By virtue of the 1865 Radical Constitution and the Civil War Amendments, African Americans in Missouri secured not only emancipation but the right to worship independently and the civil and legal rights to protect their church property. Black Missourians walked away from white dominated religious societies and formed their own Methodist and Baptist organizations. This was a process that constituted, by far, the most dramatic schisms to occur in post-Civil War Missouri. Black believers relied on their new churches to provide education for their children, rather than send them to the poorly-funded public schools. African American congregants and their religiously-affiliated Radical allies also faced the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan. Notwithstanding these depredations, the distinctive and powerful religious commitments of black believers undergirded their continuing efforts in behalf of African American socioeconomic, civil, and political advancement.

“Redemption” in Missouri re-established Democrat Party rule as early as 1871. The conservative 1875 Redeemer Constitution consummated it, undercutting the power of the state to tax and to incur indebtedness for the support of the new common school system and railroad expansion. The new Constitution also banned the use of tax dollars to fund parochial schools, an initiative aimed at the Roman Catholics who had challenged the teaching of the Protestant faith

in public school classrooms. Equally important, the new charter jettisoned entirely features of the 1865 “Drake Constitution” that had made past loyalty to the Union a litmus test of citizenship and had stripped white southern evangelicals of political power and important civil and religious liberties. Unionist partisans, Radical Republicans, and abolitionists ultimately failed in their campaign to impose upon white southerners a new civil religion making repentance for slaveholding and loyalty to the Union fundamental articles of faith and political orthodoxy.

Notwithstanding voluminous immigration from the Northeast and rapid urban growth after Reconstruction, there were three times as many southern evangelicals than northern ones in Missouri by 1900. Rural evangelical congregations, however, grew increasingly distant from more worldly and wealthy urban congregations. Black church leaders, along with their congregants, denounced and resisted the imposition of racial segregation after 1875. African American men voted in substantial numbers to the end of the nineteenth century. But black church-goers continued to cultivate independent Methodist and Baptist congregations and improve educational opportunities for their youth.

The socioeconomic revolution that Radical Republicans wrought from 1861 to 1900 engendered a siege mentality among white Missouri Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. Northern and southern evangelicals believed that massive immigration of Roman Catholic immigration posed a dire threat to Protestantism. White evangelicals perceived socioeconomic changes attendant on rapid industrialization and explosive urban growth as a fundamental threat to the authority and cohesiveness of their families, churches, and communities. Most worrisome to them was the rapidly declining effects of religion in the lives of church members. They attributed this declension to growing worldliness, centered in the rapidly-growing cities of the

state, and to novel secular ideas, such as Darwinism, and the new biblical criticism emanating from the urban Northeast.

The lingering resentment of abolitionism among southern evangelicals redoubled their opposition to the use of government power to promote liberal evangelical social ideals, a position that a substantial number of northern evangelicals also adopted in the decades following Reconstruction. Evangelical opposition to state-imposed reform shaped the responses of white church-goers and elected officials to radical and destabilizing socioeconomic transformation. White evangelical leaders concluded that the greatest single evil threatening society was hard liquor, especially in the hands of self-indulgent and irresponsible men. Middle-class evangelical women in St. Louis took up the cause of rectifying drunken husbands and fathers before the end of Reconstruction. By the 1880s, such women had turned the Woman's Christian Temperance Union into a powerful agency for women's rights and Social Gospel reforms. Black ministers and congregants in Missouri readily embraced organized temperance activism.

A revitalized temperance crusade bound white northern and southern evangelicals together in spite of their longstanding ecclesiastical divisions, theological disputes, and differences over the proper role for government. But evangelical leaders who had embraced the Social Gospel and began calling for prohibition after 1880 ran up against stiff resistance. Opposition to government intrusion into matters of personal morality was, to a substantial degree, grounded in the resentment of southern evangelicals to state interference in social relations, an attitude reinforced by bitter opposition to abolitionism and then Radical Rule. Missouri residents ultimately configured their landscape "wet" or "dry" along the lines of a growing urban-rural divide.

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, evangelical chroniclers, memoirists, and autobiographers crafted accounts of Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist church development in Missouri that obscured the unsavory impulses that drove most evangelicals to support strongly the temperance campaign. These commemorative accounts papered over the intertwined theological and political controversies that had divided the three churches since the late 1830s and the militant contention that pitted northern and southern evangelicals against one another during the Civil War and Reconstruction. Most of the white evangelical chronicles refrained from discussing the African Americans who had abandoned the white churches, while prominently featuring anti-Roman Catholic diatribes.

Post-Civil War commemoration did not always serve to perpetuate sectional antagonisms. By the turn of the twentieth century, the histories and commemorative writings of northern and southern evangelicals had contributed substantially to the rise of a popular perception of Missouri as an Edenic, agriculturally and industrially prosperous, All-American Middle Western state. By 1900, Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in Missouri did not share a common house, as a whole or even as individual denominations. Ecclesiastically, they remained divided by schisms over a half-century old that were central to painfully deep sectional memories and divergent theological and political views, which, to a large extent, persisted. But against the threatening storm of twentieth-century modernity, they could, at least, shelter beneath the roof and behind the façade of a commonly-constructed ideal of white Midwestern evangelicalism.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Greene County Archives and Records Center,
Office of the County Clerk, Springfield, Missouri

Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church Minutes, 1838-1870, Greene County, Missouri

Prospect Baptist Church Minutes, 1858-1910, Webster County, Missouri

Library of Congress

Abraham Lincoln Papers

First Baptist Church, Springfield, Mo., Sixty-First Congress, Second Session, Report No. 164, 17 January 1910.

St. Charles College, St. Charles, Mo., Fifty-First Congress, First Session, Miscellaneous Document No. 220, 23 June 1890; St. Charles College, Fifty-Sixth Congress, First Session, Report No. 42, 9 January 1900.

Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis

Lindenwood Collection

“An Act to Incorporate Lindenwood Female College.”

Sibley Journal

Sibley, George C., letters

Sibley, George C., “The Presbyterian Church of St. Charles, MO, Its Recent History and Disturbance.”

Missouri Valley Special Collections,
Kansas City Public Library, Kansas City, Missouri

Kauscher, William, Oregon, Missouri, Fourth of July Speech, 1876, "Holt County During the War," William Hyde Scrapbook, volume on "Early St. Louis and Missouri."

Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Missouri

Attorneys General, 1820-200.

Benjamin Gratz Brown, 1871-1873, Papers.

Missouri Judicial Records Database.

Missouri State Legislators, 1820-2000.

Union Provost Marshals' File of Papers Relating to Individual Citizens.

Cape Girardeau Circuit Court, 1865, Cape Girardeau County Circuit Court, 1799-1869

State of Missouri v. Asheal Munson

State of Missouri v. David Murphy

State of Missouri v. James Proctor

State of Missouri v. Patrick O'Regan

State of Missouri v. Sister Aidian

State of Missouri v. Sister Augusta

State of Missouri v. Sister Louisa

State of Missouri v. Sister Lucy

State of Missouri v. Sister Magdelan

State of Missouri v. Sister Molina

State of Missouri v. Sister O'Bene

State of Missouri v. Sister Margaret

State of Missouri v. Sister Olympia

State of Missouri v. William Woodward

Dade County Circuit Court, 1857-1899.

State of Missouri v. Samuel Mitchell

Madison County Circuit Court, 1810-1918.

State of Missouri v. Rev. Tucker Lewis

Missouri Supreme Court Case Files

Charles W. Emory, et al. v. Richard Phillips, et al.

Draper v. Minor

Farrar, et al. v Finney, et al.

Pierce v. Howard and Edwards

State rex el. Pittman v. Adams

William Finney v. The St. Charles College

Van Eman v. Walker

Webster County Circuit Court Records.

Cowan, et al., v. McNabb, et al.

State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscript Collection,
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

“A Diary of the Civil War on the Missouri Border,” ed., Donald W. Riddle.

Austin, R. A., Papers, Collection 2118.

Christian Temperance Union, Sedalia, Missouri, Record Books, 1878-1879, Collection 1073.

Cold Water Baptist Church, St. Louis County, Missouri, Record Book, 1809-1871, Collection 1296.

Concord Presbyterian Church, Callaway County, Missouri, Records, 1833-1935, Collection 1349.

Drake, Charles D., “Autobiography,” Collection 1003.

First Presbyterian Church, Laclede, Missouri, Records, 1866-1888, Collection 1350.

First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, Missouri, Records, 1833-1935, Collection 2308.

First Presbyterian Church, St. Charles, Missouri, Membership List, 1818-1849, Collection 1364.

First Presbyterian Church, St. Charles, Missouri, Session Minutes, 1840-1864, Collection 1365.

Grand Prairie United Baptist Church, Callaway County, Missouri, Minutes, 1843-1868, Collection 1310.

Guitar, Oden, Papers, 1832-1865, Collection 0882.

Hebron Baptist Church, Cape Girardeau County, Missouri, Minutes, 1829-1878, Collection 1311.

Missouri East Conference, United Methodist Church, Papers, 1850-1977, Collection 3595.

“A History of Kahoka Methodist Church.”

Autobiography of S. G. Bundy

“History of the Arley United Methodist Church, 1845-1974: The First Hundred Years An Historical Sketch The Church Since 1946.”

Methodism in Southwestern Montgomery County

New Madrid Quarterly Conference Minutes

The Old Grey Book

Young, Jerry D., The Hornersville United Methodist Church: A History 1860-1984. Hornersville, Mo., 1984.

Mount Horeb Presbyterian Church, Monroe County, Missouri, Record Book, 1852-1875, Collection 1355.

Mount Pleasant United Baptist Church, Hartsburg, Missouri, Records, 1858-1950, Collection 2990.

Price's Branch Presbyterian Church, Price's Branch, Missouri, Records, 1867-1907, Collection 1363.

Root, Oren, Papers, 1858-1930, Collection 3311.

Round Prairie Baptist Church, Bates County, Missouri, Records, 1866-1937, Collection 1320.

Smith-Cotton Family, Papers, 1834-1929, Collection 0399.

Starr, Jr., Frederick, Papers, Collection 2073.

Vanarsdale, Susan D., Diary, 1847-1855, Collection 1283.

Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Columbia, Missouri, Minute Book, 1884-1888, Collection, C0262.

Wood-Smith Family, Papers, 1864-1987, Collection 3857.

Zoar Baptist Church Record Book, 1867-1886, Collection 0900.

State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscript Collection,
University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri

Fuller, Jonathan B., Papers, Collection KC0040.

Missouri Temperance Union, Prathersville, Missouri, Records, Collection KC0109.

Nathan Scarritt Family Papers, Collection KC0248.

State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscript Collection,
Missouri Institute of Science and Technology, Rolla, Missouri

Minutes of the Southwest Missouri Conference, Collection R552.

Presbyterian Church in Farmington Missouri, Records, Collection R114.

Presbyterian Church in the USA Presbytery of Ozark, Pamphlet 1890, Collection R1191.

Second Baptist Church (Neosho, Mo.) Centennial Booklet, 1976, Collection R821.

Smith, E. Herbert, Autobiography, Collection R184.

State Historical Society of Missouri, Manuscript Collection,
University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri

Slave Narratives, George P. Rawick, Papers, University Archives, University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Stevens, George E., "History of the Central Baptist Church," 1846-1926," Collection sl28.

St. Louis Mercantile Library,
University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri

James S. Thomas Scrapbook, vol. 1, Collection M-92

Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee

Letter May 2, 1840, Marion College, MO to Mr. Woods

Denominational Newspapers

The American Baptist

The Central Baptist

The Home Missionary (American Home Missionary Society)

Missouri Presbyterian

Old School Presbyterian

St. Louis Christian Advocate (Methodist)

St. Louis Evangelist (Presbyterian)

St. Louis Observer (Presbyterian)

Western Watchman (Baptist)

Newspapers (Non-denominational)

Boonville Weekly Eagle

Booneville Weekly Observer

Cape Girardeau Weekly Argus

The Child's Paper

Columbia Missouri Intelligencer and Boon's Lick Advertiser

Commercial Cycle (St. Joseph)

Congressional Globe (Washington, DC)

Daily Evening Herald (St. Louis)

Daily Union (St. Louis)

Dollar Missouri Journal (Booneville)

Enquirer (St. Louis)

Hannibal Clipper

Hannibal Messenger

Ironton County Register

Jefferson City Daily Tribune

Jefferson City State Times

Jefferson Inquirer (Jefferson City)

Kansas City Star

Kansas Herald of Freedom (Lawrence, KS)

The Liberator (Boston, MA)

Liberty Tribune

Louisiana Journal

Missouri Democrat (St. Louis)

Missouri Intelligencer (Franklin)

Missouri Republican (St. Louis)

Missouri Statesman (Columbia)

Missouri Weekly Patriot (Springfield)

Missouri Whig and General Advertiser (Palmyra)

The National Magazine (New York City)

New York Times

Parkville Democrat

Platte Argus (Weston)

Phelps County New Era (Rolla)

Republican (Cassville)

The Rolla Express

Squatter Sovereign (Aitcheson, KS)

Southwest Union Press (Springfield)

St. Charles Cosmos-Monitor

St. Louis Palladium

Weekly Mirror (Richmond)

Weekly Missouri Sentinel (Columbia)

Weekly Pilot (St. Louis)

Published Baptist Records

Annual Report of the American Baptist Publication Society, Presented in Cleveland, Ohio. 1863. Philadelphia, 1863.

Minutes of the Missouri Baptist General Association, 1844-1866. St. Louis.

Minutes of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the General Association of United Baptists of Missouri, 1854. St. Louis, 1854.

Minutes of the Thirty-Second Annual Meeting of the Baptist General Association of Missouri . . . 1868. St. Louis, 1868.

Minutes of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting of the Baptist General Association of Missouri . . . 1869. St. Louis, 1869.

Minutes of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Session of the Missouri Baptist General Association Columbia, Mo, 1890.

Minutes of the Sixty-Sixth Meeting of the Missouri Baptist General Association . . . 1900. St. Louis, 1900.

Missouri Historical Records Survey, Bethel Church Book: Minutes of the Proceedings of the Bethel Church, 1806-1867. St. Louis, 1940.

Semi-Centennial Memorial Missouri Baptist General Association. . . . Columbia, Mo., 1885.

Published Methodist Records

Harris, William, ed., Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Held in Chicago, Ill., 1868. New York, 1868.

Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1836. Cincinnati, 1855.

Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1840. Cincinnati, 1855.

Journal of the General Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848. New York, 1848.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church For the Years 1773-1828. New York, 1840.

Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1846, 1850. Nashville, 1850.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the years 1829-1839. New York, 1840.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the years 1839-1845. New York, 1845.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1849. New York, 1849.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1850. New York, 1850.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Year 1857. New York, 1858.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the Years 1858-1865. Nashville, 1866.

Monroe, D. D., David S., ed., Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church . . . 1884. New York and Cincinnati, 1884.

Published Presbyterian Records

Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church to the General Assembly. Philadelphia: Published by the Board, 1855.

Extracts from the Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, AD 1818. Philadelphia, 1818.

Minutes of the Forty-Fourth General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, in the United States. Volume 12. Nashville, 1874.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States . . . 1880. Wilmington, N.C., 1880.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Vol. V. Wilmington, N.C, 1881.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Vol. V. Wilmington, N.C., 1882.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States . . . 1890. Richmond, 1890.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States: With an Appendix . . . 1901.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, From its Organization A. D. 1789 to A. D. 1820 Inclusive. Philadelphia, 1820.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix. A. D. 1830. Philadelphia, 1830.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with an Appendix, AD 1836. Philadelphia, 1836.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the USA, 1829-1837. Philadelphia, 1837.

Minutes of the General Assembly Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with an Appendix, AD 1837. Philadelphia, 1837.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with an Appendix, AD 1838 (Old School). Philadelphia, 1838.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School), 1838-50. Philadelphia, 1850.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1838-40 (New School). New York, 1840.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix. A. D. 1842 (Old School). Philadelphia, 1842.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, with an Appendix, 1843 (New School). New York, 1843.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, with an Appendix, 1846 (New School). New York, 1846.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: with an Appendix, A. D. 1850 (New School). New York, 1850.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with an appendix. A. D. 1851 (Old School). Philadelphia, 1851.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School), 1854. Philadelphia, 1854.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with An Appendix A. D. 1859 (Old School). Philadelphia, 1859.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with An Appendix A. D. 1861 (New School). New York, 1861.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XII A. D. 1861 (Old School). New York, 1861.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XIII A. D. 1862 (Old School). New York, 1862.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XVII A. D. 1863 (Old School). Philadelphia, 1863.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix, Vol. XXIV A. D. 1865. Philadelphia, 1865.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School) . . . 1866. Philadelphia, 1866.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1867 (Old School). Philadelphia, 1867.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1870 (Philadelphia, 1870).

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1874. Philadelphia, 1874.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America 1876. New York, 1876.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1877. New York, 1877.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix. New York, 1880.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: With an Appendix. Philadelphia, 1891.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America . . . 1902. Philadelphia, 1902.

Minutes of the Philadelphia Convention of Ministers and Ruling Elders in the Presbyterian Church in the United States Called by the Minority of the General Assembly of 1836. Philadelphia, 1837.

Minutes of the Semi-Centennial Session of the Session of the Synod of Missouri. St Louis, 1882.

Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church to the General Assembly (Philadelphia: Published by the Board, 1854).

Published Benevolent Society Records

Eleventh Annual Report of the American Tract Society New York, 1836.

First Report of the American Sunday-School Union: Read at their Annual Meeting, Held in the City of Philadelphia, On Tuesday Evening, May 24, 1825. Philadelphia, 1825.

Fortieth Annual Report of the American Colonization Society . . . 1857. Washington, 1857.

Forty-Third Annual Report of the American Colonization Society . . . 1860. Washington, 1860.

Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the American Bible Society. New York, 1862.

Forty-Seventh Annual Report of the American Bible Society. New York, 1863.

Fourth Report of the American Sunday-School Union: Read at their Annual Meeting. Philadelphia, 1828.

Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union Philadelphia, 1838.

Proceedings of the Bible Convention . . . of the American and Foreign Bible Society, Embracing the Period of its Provisional Organization. New York, 1837.

Ninth Annual Report of the American Tract Society, MDCCC,XXIII, with List of Depositories, Life Members and Benefactors, Extracts of Correspondence. Andover, 1823.

The Sixth Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union Philadelphia, 1830.

Twentieth Annual Report of the American Tract Society; Presented at New York, May 7, 1845 New York, 1845.

The Twenty-Third Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union, May 17, 1847. Philadelphia, 1847.

Twenty-Fifth Annual Report of the American Bible Society New York, 1841.

Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the American Bible Society, Presented May 9, 1844. New York, 1844.

Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the American Tract Society; Presented at New York, May 10, 1854. New York, 1854.

Thirty-First Annual Report of the American Tract Society New York, 1856.

Thirty-second Annual Report of the American Tract Society; Presented at New York, May 13, 1857. New York, 1857.

The Thirty-Third Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union; Presented at the Annual Meeting, May 12, 1857. Philadelphia, 1857.

Thirty-Fifth Annual Report of the American Bible Society, Presented May 9, 1850. New York, 1850.

Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the American Tract Society, Presented at Boston, May 30, 1860. Boston, 1860.

Congregational Histories

A Brief Chronicle of the Rise and Progress of Baptist Development in Saint Louis Association from 1800-1922. St. Louis, 1922.

Baker, Mary B., ed., Historical Sketch and Records of Parkville Presbyterian Church, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Barrett, T. C., History of Bellevue Presbyterian Church. A Sermon Preached by Rev. T.C. Barrett in the Presbyterian Church in Caledonia, Mo., August 5th, 1877. From Psalm XLVIII: 12, 13. Potosi, Mo, 1877.

Bartee, Wayne C., A History of the First Baptist Church, Springfield, Missouri, 1852-1977. Springfield, 1977.

Bolton, D. C., History of the Baptists of Saline County Missouri. 1911.

Callaway CO. Missouri, Augusta Presbyterian Church, Shamrock, Missouri, 1846-1953: Admissions, Dismissals, Baptisms, Burials in the Augusta Cemetery.

Clark, Elmer Talmage, One hundred years of New Madrid Methodism: a history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in New Madrid, Missouri. 1912.

Cole Sr., Mrs. Farrie L., Mrs. Alvin E. Phillips, Mrs. Royce Moser, Mrs. Clarence M. Brumback, Mrs. Virginia Bailey and Mrs. A. P. Reichel, A History of the Lamine Baptist Association of Missouri 1872-1971. Stover, Mo., 1971.

Dochterman, Charles N., ed., Records from the Wyaconda Methodist Circuit. Des Moines, Ia., n.d.

Galbraith, Jr., Rev. R. C., The History of the Chillicothe Presbytery, From its Organization in 1799 to 1889 . . . Chillicothe, Oh., 1889.

Haines, J. W., The History of the Polk County Baptist Association. Bolivar, Mo., 1897.

Hill, John B., The Presbytery of Kansas City and its Predecessors, 1821-1901, Historical Sketches and Statistical Matter. Kansas City, 1901.

Historical Sketch of the Bethel Presbyterian Church, Lowndes County, Miss., Prepared for the Semi-Centennial Celebration, June 21, 1884. Columbus, Ms., 1885.

History of Providence Baptist Church and Germania Cemetery . Bonne Terre, Mo., 1976).

Jablonsky, Alena Chance, ed., Vital Statistics of Rock Hill Presbyterian Church Rock Hill, St. Louis Co. MO, 1845-1956.

Largen, T. L., History of the Shoal Creek Association With History of Her Churches and Biography of Ministers. Kansas City, Mo., 1908.

Log Providence Missionary Baptist Church. 1990.

Meador, Leota, The Big Lake Missionary Baptist Church: The Past and Present. 1971.

Mertens, Marshall Lewis, Blue River Baptist Association, Missouri. Kansas City, Mo., 1947.

Murray, Betty R., editor, Gone and Forgotten, Pleasant Grove Cemetery and Church, Camden Point, Missouri, Researched and compiled by Lu Durham and Irma Miller. Platte City, Mo.: Platte County Historical Society, 1994.

One Hundred Years Presbyterian Church of U. S. in Missouri. n.p., n.d.

Patrick, Wiley Jones, The History of the Salt River Association, Missouri. Columbia, 1909.

Pitts, S. Y., The Mt Pleasant Association Historic-Biographic. Salisbury, Mo., 1895.

Prince, D.D., Rev. A. E., History of Fifth Street Baptist Church. Kansas City, Mo.: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1944.

Reichel, A. P., A History of the Lamine Baptist Association of Missouri 1872-1971. Stover, Mo., 1971.

Rice, Martin, History of the Blue River Baptist Association of Missouri. Kansas City, Mo., 1890.

Richardson, M. M., A Brief History of The First Baptist Church of Springfield, Missouri, 1852-1927. Springfield, 1928.

Sharp, W. A. Stewart, History of Kansas Baptists. Kansas City, 1940.

Siloam Church Record Book One, 1832-1857.

St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church South, St. Louis, Missouri, Ivan Lee Holt, pastor. St. Louis, 1938.

Sweets III, Henry H., The Hannibal, Missouri Presbyterian Church: A sesquicentennial History. Hannibal, Mo, 1984.

Watson, Elizabeth Audrain, Heritage and Promise: A Story of The Dardenne Presbyterian Church and Its Community. Chicago: Adams Press, 1977.

Williams, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Emmett, Centenary Methodist Church of St. Louis: The First Hundred Years, 1839-1939. St Louis, 1939.

English and Scottish Appellate Decisions

Attorney-General v. Pearson, 36 English Reports 135 (Chancery, 1817).

Attorney-General v. Pearson II, 58 English Reports 848 (Vice-Chancellor's Court, 1835).

Bevant v. Pope, 2 Freem. 71 (1681) (Freeman's Chancery Reports, England and Wales, 1660-1706).

Casborn v. English, 2 Eq. Cas. Abr. 728 (Equity Cases Abridged, England and Wales, 1667-1744).

Craigdallie, et al. v. Aikman, et al., 3 English Reports 601 (House of Lords, 1813).

Craigdallie II, 4 English Reports 435 (House of Lords, 1820).

Foley v. Wontner, 37 English Reports 621 (Chancery 1820).

Galbraith v. Smith, 15 Shaw 808 (Scottish Court of Sessions, 1837).

Gilbert's Chancery Reports, "Uses," 11, 172 (England and Wales, 1705-1727).

Hinton v. Hinton, 2 Ves. Sr. 634 (Vesey Senior's Chancery Reports, England and Wales, 1741-1756).

Noel v. Jevon, 2 Freem. 43 (1678) (Freeman's Chancery Reports, England and Wales, 1660-1706).

State Appellate Decisions

Alexander v. Slavens, 46 Ky. 351 (1853).

Antones v. Eslava's Heirs, 9 Port. 527 (Ala. 1839).

Atty. Gen. ex rel. Abbot v. Dublin, 38 N.H. 459 (1859).

Attorney General v. Federal St. Meeting House, 69 Mass. 1 (1854).

Attorney General v. Town of Dublin, 38 N. H. 459 (1859).

Baker v. Fales, 16 Mass. 487 (1820).

Bartlett v Gouge, 5 B. Mon. 152 (Ky. 1844).

Bascom, et al. v. Lane, et al., Case No. 1,089.

Beaver v. Filson, 8 Pa. 327 (1848).

Blair v. Ridgley, 41 Mo. 63 (March, 1867).

Beeler v. Cardwell, 33 Mo. 84 (1863).

Boyce v. Christian, 69 Mo. 492 (1879).

Brooke v. Shacklett, Carter v. Wolfe, 13 Va. 301 (Va. 1856).

Brown v. Landon, Smith, 178 (N.H. 1807).

Burrows v. Holt, 20 Conn. 459 (1850).

Burris v. Page, 12 Mo. 358 (1849).

Bushong v. Taylor, 82 Mo. 660 (1884).

Caldwell v. Bower, 17 Mo. 564 (1853).

Camp v. Camp, 5 Conn. 291 (1824); Curd v. Wallace, 37 Ky. 190 (1838).

The City of Hannibal v. Draper, 15 Mo. 639.

Collier v. Wheldon, 1 Mo. 1 (1821).

Commonwealth v. Green, et al., 4 Wharton 531 (Pa., 1839).

Consaul & Barber v. Lidell, 7 Mo. 250 (1841).

Cooper v. Whitney, 3 Hill 101 (N.Y. 1842).

Coster v. Clarke, 3 Edw. Ch. 428 (N.Y. 1840).

Cowman v. Hall 3 Gill & John. 398 (Md. 1831).

Crittenden v. Johnson, 6 Eng. R. 94 (Ark. 1850).

Dean v. Mitchell, 4 J. J. Marsh. 451 (Ky. 1830).

Derush v. Brown 8 Ohio 412 (1838).

Den & Day, et al. v. Bolton, et al., 7 Halstead 206 (N. Jersey, 1831).

Digges v. Trustees, Circuit Court of Fauquier County, October 8, 1850, Fauquier County Circuit Court Chancery Order Book, No. 3, 1850-56, p. 346; Law Order Book E, 1848-54, p. 459, Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia.

Draper v. Minor, 26 Mo. 290 (1865).

Duhring v. Duhring, 20 Mo. 174 (1854).

Edmondson v. Welsh, 27 Ala. 578 (1855).

Emory v. Phillips, 22 Mo. 499 (1856).

Ferraria v. Vasconcelles, 23 Illinois 456 (1860).

Finney v. St. Charles College 13 Mo. 266 (1850).

Firestone v. Firestone, 2 Ohio State R. 415 (1853).

First Baptist Church v. Robberson, 71 Mo. 326 (1879).

Fish v. Fish, 1 Conn. 559 (1816).

Fourth Parish in West Springfield v. Root, 35 Mass. 318 (1836).

Fulbright v. Higginbotham, 133 Mo. 668 (1896).

Gable v. Miller, 10 Paige Ch. 627 (N.Y., 1844), reversed Miller v. Gable, 2 Denio 492 (1845).

Gentry v. Woodson, 10 Mo. 224 (1846).

German Reformed Church v. The Commonwealth Ex rel. Seibert, 3 Barr 291 (Penn., 1846).

Germond v. Jones 2 Hill 569 (N.Y. 1842).

Gibson v. Armstrong, et al., 7 B. Monroe 481 (Ky., 1847).

Goddard v. Prentice, 17 Conn. 546, 555 (1846).

Greene v. Dennis, 6 Conn. 293 (1826).

Griffith v. Walker, 3 Mo. 191 (1833).

Hamilton v. O'Neil, 9 Mo. 11 (1845).

Harlow v. Humiston, 6 Cow. 189 (N. Y., 1826).

Harmon v. Dreher, 2 Speer's Equity 87 (S.C., 1843).

Harper v. Straws, 53 Ky. 48 (1853).

Hassinger v. Pye, 10 Mo. 156 (1846).

Herron v. Williamson, 6 Litt. 250 (Ky. 1821).

Hornsey v. Casey, 21 Mo. 255 (1846).

Humbert v. Trinity Church, 2 Wend. 587 (N.Y. 1840).

Inhabitants of Second Precinct in Rehoboth v. Carpenter, 40 Mass. 131 (1839).

Jackson v. Hammond, 2 Caines Cas. 337 (N.Y. 1805).

Keith & Perry Coal Co. v. Bingham, 97 Mo. 196 (1888).

Kemp v. Holland, 10 Mo. 255 (1846).

Kennerly v. Missouri Ins. Co., 11 Mo. 204 (1847).

Keyser v. Stansifer, 6 Ohio 364 (1834).

King's Chapel v. Pelham, 9 Mass. 501 (1813).

King v. Rundle, 15 Barb. 139 (N.Y. 1852).

Kniskern v. St. Johns and St. Peters Lutheran Churches, 1 Sandford's Chancery (1844).

Krevet v. Meyer, 24 Mo. 107.

Langdon v. Plymouth Congregational Society, 12 Conn. 113 (1837).

Lawson v. Morton, 6 Dana 471 (Ky. 1838).

Lecompte v. Wash, 9 Mo. 551 (1846).

Lee v. Lindell, 22 Mo. 202 (1855).

Lewis v. Lewis, 5 Mo. 278 (1838).

Link v. Edmondson, 19 Mo. 487 (1854).

Logan v. Phillipps, 18 Mo. 22 (1853).

Macon v. Sheppard, 21 Tenn. 335 (1841).

McClanahan v. Porter, 10 Mo. 746 (1847).

McFarland v. Blaize's Adm'r, 24 Mo. 156 (1857).

McNish v. Pope, 8 Rich. Eq. 112 (S. C. 1856).

Methodist Church v. Wood, 5 Ohio 283 (1831).

Miller v. Chittenden, 2 Iowa 315 (1856).

Miller v. Gable, 2 Denio. 492 (N.Y. 1845).

Milton (of color) v. McKarney, 31 Mo. 175 (1860).

Missouri v. Alexander J. P. Garesché, 36 Mo. 256 (1865).

Morgan v. Leslie, Wright, 144 (Ohio 1832).

Murphy v. Dallam, 1 Bland, 529 (Md. 1829).

Pemberton v. Pemberton, 29 Mo. 498 (1860).

People v. Trinity Church, 22 N.Y. 44 (1860).

Pomeroy v. Selmes, 8 Mo. 727 (1844).

Rankin v. Oliphant, 9 Mo. 289 (1845).

Reaume v. Chambers, 22 Mo. 86 (1855).

Riddick v. Walsh, 15 Mo. 519 (1852).

Riley v. Clamorgan, 15 Mo. 331 (1851).

Roberts v. Stoner, 18 Mo. 481 (1853).

Robison v. Codman, 1 Sumner 121, 129 (Fed. Cir. Ct. 1831).

Robertson, et al. v. Bullions, et al., 9 Barbour 64 (N.Y., 1850).

Rogers v. Woody, 23 Mo. 548 (1856).

Scott v. Bird, 9 Mo. 148 (1843).

Scott v. Emerson, 15 Mo. 586 (1852).

Shannon, et al. v. Frost, et al., 3 Monroe 253 (Ky., 1842).

Shermer v. Rusling, 12 Haz. Reg. 1 (Pa., 1833).

Skilton v. Webster, Brightly, N. P. 203 (Pa., 1851).

Stanwood v. Dunning, 2 Shep. 290 (Maine 1837).

The State v. Ambs, 20 Mo. 216 (1854).

State ex rel. Pittman v. Adams, 44 Mo. 570 (1869).

State of Missouri ex rel. Watson v. Farris, et al., 45 Mo. 183 (1869).

State v. Bates, 2 Har. 18 (Del. 1835).

Stevens v. Smith, 4 J. J. Marsh. 64 (Ky. 1830).

Stokes v. O'Fallon, 2 Mo. 82 (1828).

Tilden v. Metcalf, 2 Day. 259 (Conn. 1806).

Trustees of Associate Reformed Church v. Trustees of Theological Seminary at Princeton, 4 N. J. Equity 77 (1837).

Trustees of Quaker Soc. v. Dickenson, 12 N. C. 189 (1827).

Tucker v. St. Clement's Church, 5 N.Y. Super. Ct. 241 (1849).

Van Eman v. Walker, 47 Mo. 69 (1870).

Voorhees v. Presbyterian Church of Village of Amsterdam, 8 Barb. 135 (N. Y. 1849).

Wagner v. Episcopal Church, 9 Rich. Eq. 155 (S. C. 1857).

Watson, et al. v. Garvin, et al., 54 Mo. 353 (1873).

Welch v. Anderson, 28 Mo. 293 (1859).

Wells' Guardian v. Moore, 16 Mo. 478 (1852).

White v. Drew, 42 Mo. 561 (1868).

Whitney v. First Ecclesiastical Society in Brooklyn, 5 Conn. 405 (1825).

Wilson v. Presbyterian Church of John's Island, 2 Richardson's Equity 215 (S. Car., 1846).

White v. South Parish in Braintree, 54 Mass. 506 (Mass. 1847).

Federal Appellate Decisions

Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296 (1940).

Civil Rights Cases, 109 U. S. 3 (1883).

Cummings v. State of Missouri, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277 (1867).

Ex parte Garland, 71 U.S. 333, 398 (1867).

Ex parte Milligan, 71 U. S. 2 (1866).

Gitlow v. New York, 268 U.S. 652 (1925).

Goesele v. Bimeler, Fed. Cas. No. 5,503 [5 McClean, 223] (1851), judgment affirmed, 55 U.S. (14 How.) 589 (1852).

Harpending v. Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, 41 U.S. (16 Pet.) 455 (U.S. 1841).

Miller v. Lerch, Fed. Cas. No. 9,579 [1 Wall. Jr. 210] (U.S. 1848).

Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. 162 (1875).

Pawlet v. Clark, 13 U.S. (9 Cranch) 292 (1815).

Smith v. Swormstedt, 16 U. S. 288 (1853).

Terrett v. Taylor, 13 U.S. 43 (1815).

State Constitutions and Codes

Laws of A Public and General Nature, of the Territory of Louisiana, the Territory of Missouri, up to the Year 1824, 2 vols. 1842.

Laws of the State of Missouri, 2 vols. St. Louis: E. Charless, 1825.

Laws of the State of Missouri, Fourteenth General Assembly, 1846–1847.

Laws of the State of Missouri Regulating Pleadings and Practice in Courts of Justice. St. Louis, 1849.

Maryland Constitution of 1864.

Missouri Constitution of 1820.

Missouri Constitution of 1865.

Missouri Constitution of 1875.

Revised Ordinances of the City of St. Louis . . . 1836. St. Louis, 1836.

Revised Ordinances of the City of St. Louis . . . 1843. St. Louis, 1843.

The Federal Cases Comprising Cases Argued and Determined in the Circuit and District Courts of the United States. St. Paul, 1894.

The Revised Statutes of Missouri, 2 vols. St. Louis, 1835.

The Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri. St. Louis, 1845.

The Revised Statutes of Missouri, 2 vols. City of Jefferson: James Lusk, 1856.

Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri, 1889, 2 vols. Jefferson City, 1889.

Sullivan, M. J., comp., The Revised Ordinance of the City of St Louis. St. Louis, 1881.

State Constitutional Convention Records

Journal and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City and St. Louis February 28 to March 22, 1861.

Journal of the General Assembly of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Missouri 1897. Jefferson City, 1897.

Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri at the Adjourned Session of the Twenty-Third General Assembly Jefferson City, 1866.

Journal of the Senate of the State of Missouri, at the First Session of the Fourteenth General Assembly . . . 1846. Jefferson City, 1847.

Journal of the Senate of the State of Missouri at the First Session of the Sixteenth General Assembly. Jefferson City, 1849.

Journal of the Senate of the State of Missouri of the Extra Session of the Seventeenth General Assembly. Jefferson City, 1852.

Journal of the Missouri State Convention, Held at Jefferson City, July, 1861. St. Louis, 1861.

Journal, Appendix, and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City, June 2 to 14, 1862. St. Louis, 1862.

Journal, Appendix, and Proceedings of the Missouri State Convention, held at Jefferson City, June 15 to July 1, 1863. St. Louis, 1863.

Journal of the Missouri State Convention, Held at The City of St. Louis, January 6 – April 10, 1865. St. Louis, 1865.

Loeb, Isidor and Floyd C. Shoemaker, eds., Journal Missouri Constitutional Convention 1875. Columbia, Mo., 1920.

Legal Commentaries and Treatises

Blackstone, William, Commentaries on the Laws of England 4 vols. (1765-1769).

Halleck, Henry W., Elements of International Law and Laws of War. Philadelphia, 1866.

_____, International Law; or, Rules Regulating the Intercourse of States in Peace and War. New York, 1861.

Laurentius, Instit. juris eccl. Freiburg, 1908.

Lieber, Francis, On Civil Liberty and Self-Government. Philadelphia, 1853.

Parmelee, G. H., "Determination by the civil courts of property rights between contending factions of an independent congregational church," American Law Review, 1st series. 1920.

Sägmüller, Kirchenrecht. Freiburg, 1909.

Scribner, A Treatise on the Law of Dower, 2 vols. Philadelphia: T. & J. W. Johnson & Co., 1867.

Story, Joseph, Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence, 2nd ed., 2 vols. Boston: Charles C. Little & James Brown, 1839.

Thomassin, Louis, Vetus et nova ecclesia disciplina circa beneficia et beneficiaries. Paris, 1678-79.

Washburn, Emory, A Treatise on the American Law of Real Property, 3 vols. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1864.

Wells, Robert W., Observations on the pleadings and practice of the courts of justice in Missouri: and, a radical change therein recommended, in a letter addressed to the "Metropolitan." Jefferson City, 1847.

Wernz, Jus Decretalium, III. Rome, 1908.

Published Records, Documents, and Works (Miscellaneous)

A Brief Account of the Great Revival in Lawrence, Kansas February and March 1872 In Connection with the Evangelistic Labors of Rev. E. Payson Hammond Assisted by All the Evangelical Clergy of the City. Lawrence, Ks., 1872.

A Brief Answer to an Official Reply to the Board of Missions of the General Assembly. . . . New York, 1831.

Adams, George Crawford, A Christian Lawyer: A Sketch of the Life and Work of Hon. Warren Currier. St. Louis, 1893.

Adams, Jasper, Elements of Moral Philosophy. Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, & Thurston, 1837.

_____, The Relation of Christianity to Civil Government in the United States: Sermon preached in St. Michael's Church, Charleston, February 13th, 1833 by Rev. J. Adams. Charleston: A. E. Miller, 1833.

A Debate on Slavery: Held in the City of Cincinnati, On the First, Second, Third, and Sixth Days of October 1845 Cincinnati, 1846.

Addresses Delivered at the Centennial Celebration of the Founding of the First Presbyterian Church. Columbia, 1908.

“Art. VI- The Martyrdom of Bewley,” Methodist Quarterly Review 45 (1863).

A Visit to the Isle of Wight. Philadelphia, 1828.

Adger, John B., D.D. and John L. Girardeau D.D., eds., The Collected Writings of John Henley Thornwell, D.D., L.L.D. Late Professor of Theology at the Theological Seminary at Columbia, South Carolina, 4 vols. Richmond, 1873.

Allen, I. M., The Triennial Baptist Register. No. 2- 1836. Philadelphia, 1836.

_____, The United States Baptist Annual Register, For 1832. Philadelphia, 1833.

Anderson, Frederick, Galusha Anderson: Preacher and Educator, 1832-1918. 1933.

Anderson, Galusha, The Story of a Border City During the Civil War. Boston, 1908.

_____, “The Test Oath of Missouri,” The Baptist Quarterly 1 (July, 1867).

Armitage, Thomas, A History of the Baptists. New York: Bryan, Taylor and Co., 1890; reprint ed., Watertown, Wisconsin: Baptist Heritage Press, 1988.

Avery, Grace C., and Floyd C. Shoemaker, comps. and eds., The Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of the State of Missouri, 5 vols. Columbia: State Historical Society of Missouri, 1924.

Babock, Luther, ed., Forty Years of Pioneer Life, Memoir of John Mason Peck D. D. Edited from His Journals and Correspondence by Rufus Babcock. Philadelphia, 1864; reprint, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.

Baptist Home Missions in North America. . . 1832-1882. New York, 1883.

Barnard, James Underwood, History and Civil Government of Missouri, to Which is Appended the Constitution of the United States. Chicago, New York, 1895.

Barnes, Albert, The Missionary Enterprise dependent on the Religion of Principle for Success: A Sermon. . . Before the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at their Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting. Boston, 1844.

Barnes, Lemuel Call, et al, Pioneers of Light: The First Century of the American Baptist Publication Society, 1824-1924. Philadelphia, 1924.

Bascom, D. D., H. B., Methodism and Slavery: with other matters in Controversy Between the North and the South; Being a Review of the Manifesto of the Majority Frankfort, Ky., 1845.

Bay, W. V. N., Reminiscences of the Bench and Bar of Missouri. . . . St. Louis, 1878.

Beale, Howard K, ed., The Diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866. Washington, 1933.

Beecher, Lyman, A Plea for the West. Cincinnati, 1835.

Beggs, Rev. S. R., Pages from the Early History of the West and North-West. . . with Special Reference to the History of Methodism. Cincinnati, 1868.

Bryan William S., and Robert Rose, A History of the Pioneer Families of Missouri, with numerous sketches, anecdotes, adventures, etc., relating to Early Days in Missouri. St. Louis: Bryan, Brand & Co., 1876.

Butler, Joseph, Religion, Natural and Revealed to the Constitution and Course of Nature to which are Added Two Brief Dissertations. London: Knapton, 1736.

Burder, George, Village Sermons; or, Fifty-Two Plain and Short Discourses on the Principal Doctrines of the Gospel New York: American Tract Society, 1800.

Burder, Henry Forster, Memoir of the Rev. George Burder, Author of the "Village Sermons," and Secretary to the London Missionary Society. New York and Boston, 1833.

Butler, Joseph, Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel – to which are added Six Sermons Preached on Publick Occasions, 4th ed. London, 1749.

Chipman, Nathaniel, Book 4, "Of Rights and Liberty," in Sketches of the Principles of Government. Rutland, Vt., 1793.

Clark, Elmer T., One Hundred Years of New Madrid Methodism: A History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in New Madrid, Missouri. 1912.

Clarke, Samuel, A Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God, the Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation. . . . 1823.

Centennial Addresses: Synod of Missouri, United States Central Church, Kansas City, October 12, 1932: 1832-1932. Kansas City, 1932.

Cockrell, Ewing, History of Johnson County, Missouri. Topeka, Ks., 1918.

The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Containing the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Directory for the Worship of God, Together with the Plan of Government and Discipline, as Amended and Ratified by the General Assembly at their Session in May, 1821. Elizabethtown, New Jersey: Marvin Hale, Abraham Paul Printer, 1822.

The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: Containing the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Directory for the Worship of God. . . . Newark, 1829.

Comment, "Judge William Daniel, Jr.," Virginia Law Register 7.1 (May 1901).

Constitution and By Laws of the General Emancipation Society of Missouri. St. Louis, 1862.

Crowell, William, The Church Member's Hand-book: A Guide to the Doctrines and Practice of Baptist Churches. Boston, 1850)

Cuthbert, J. H., Life of Richard Fuller. New York: Sheldon and Company, 1879.

Dabney, D. D., Rev. Robert, A Defence [sic] of Virginia, [And Through Her of the South] New York, 1867.

Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic: Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Encampment 1890. St. Louis, 1890.

Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Encampment 1892. St. Louis, 1892.

Descartes, Rene, Meditations on First Philosophy In Which The Existence of God And the Distinction of the Soul from the Body are Demonstrated. Indianapolis and London: Hackett Publishing Company, 1993.

de Vattel, Emmerich, The Law of Nations, ed. Edward D. Ingraham. Philadelphia, 1852.

The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York, 1844.

The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York, 1852.

The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York, 1854.

The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Nashville, 1856.

Dickson, A. F., Plantation Sermons, or Plain and Familiar Discourses for the Instruction of the Unlearned. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1856.

Dickson, Moses, International 777 Order of Twelve 333 of Knights and Daughters of Tabor. St. Louis, 1894.

_____, Manual of the International Order of Twelve of Knights and Daughters of Tabor. St. Louis, 1891.

Drake, Charles D., Union and Anti-Slavery Speeches, Delivered During the Rebellion. Cincinnati, 1864.

Du Bose, Horace Mellard, Life of Joshua Soule. Nashville, 1911.

Duncan, R. S., A History of the Baptists in Missouri St. Louis, 1888.

_____, The Life Story of R. S. Duncan. Kansas City, 1910.

Dymond, Jonathan, Essays on the Principles of Morality and on the Private and Political Rights and Obligations of Mankind. Philadelphia, 1896.

Education, Temperance, Freedom Religion in Kansas. Boston, 1855.

Edwards, Richard, et al, Edwards's Great West and Her Commercial Metropolis, Embracing a General View of the West, and a Complete History of St. Louis. St. Louis, 1860.

Elliott, Charles, South-western Methodism. A History of the M. E. Church in the South-West, From 1844 to 1864 Cincinnati, 1868.

Ellis, Franklin, ed., History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania; with Biographical Sketches of Many of its Pioneers and Prominent Men. Philadelphia, 1882.

The Evidences of Christian Religion, 2 vols. Philadelphia: Kay, Jun. & Co., 1831.

Ferris, Isaac, Jubilee Memorial of the American Bible Society: Being a Review of its First Fifty Years' Work New York, 1867.

Filley, Chauncey, Some Republican History of Missouri. St. Louis, 1898.

_____, Some More Republican History of Missouri. St. Louis: Christmann Printing Co., 1902.

Finney, Charles G., Systematic Theology: Lectures on Classes of Truths, Moral Government. London, 1847.

Finney, Thomas M., The Life and Labors of Enoch Mather Marvin, Late Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. St. Louis, 1880.

First Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Marion College, Missouri 1835-36. St. Louis, 1836).

Fisher M. M. and John L. Rice, eds. History of Westminster College, 1851-1903. Columbia: E. W. Stephens, 1908.

Foreman, Rev. J. G., The Western Sanitary Commission: A sketch of its origin, history, labors for the sick and wounded of the Western armies, and aid given to the freedmen and Union refugees, with incidents of hospital life. St. Louis, 1864.

Fourth Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Marion College, MO 1838-9. St. Louis, 1838.

Furman, Richard, Exposition of the Views of the Baptists, Relative to the Coloured Population of the United States. 1823.

Fuller, Horace W., ed., The Green Bag: A Useless but Entertaining Magazine for Lawyers, Volume Three for the year 1891. Boston, Mass., 1891.

Fuller Richard, and Francis Wayland, Domestic Slavery Considered As a Scriptural Institution: In a Correspondence Between The Rev. Richard Fuller And Rev. Francis Wayland. New York, 1860.

Gillett, Ezra H., History of the Presbyterian Church 2 vols., rev. ed. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1864.

Grasty, John S., Memoir of Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D.D. St. Louis, 1871.

Greenwood, Grace, Queen Victoria: Her Girlhood and Womanhood. 1883; reprint, Middlesex: The Echo Library, 2008.

Hadden, James, History of Uniontown, Pennsylvania. 1913; reprint, Mt. Vernon, Indiana: Wiedrich Publishing – Unigraphic, 1978.

Harrison, W. P., Gospel Among the Slaves: A Short Account of Missionary Operations among the African Slaves of the Southern States. Nashville, 1893.

Hendel, Charles W., ed., David Hume: An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding. Upper Saddle River, N. J.: The Library of Liberal Arts Published by Prentice Hall, 1995.

Henkle, D. D., Rev. Moses M., Primary Platform of Methodism; or, Exposition of the General Rules. Louisville, Ky., 1853.

Henry D. D., Rev. Charlton, Letters to an Anxious Inquirer, Letters to Relieve the Difficulties of a Friend Under Religious Impressions. Philadelphia, 1840.

Hervey, George Winfred, The Story of Baptist Missions in Foreign Lands: From the Time of Carey to the Present Date. New York, 1884.

Hill, Rev. Timothy, Historical Outlines of the Presbyterian Church in Missouri. Kansas City, 1871.

Hillyer, S. G., Reminiscences of Georgia Baptists. Atlanta, 1902.

Hiscox, Edward T., DD, The Baptist Church Directory. A Guide to the Doctrines and Discipline, Officers and Ordinances, Principles and Practices, of Baptist Churches. . . . New York, 1864.

History of Clay and Platte Counties, Missouri, Written and Compiled From the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources. . . . St. Louis, 1885.

The History of Daviess County Missouri Kansas City, 1882.

History of the Missouri Division: United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1898-1966. Missouri Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1966.

History of Missouri: The General History. Chicago, 1888.

Holcombe, R. I., ed., History of Greene County Missouri. St. Louis, 1883.

_____, History of Marion County, Missouri, Written and Compiled from the Most Authentic Official and Private Sources. . . . St. Louis, 1884.

Holloway, J. N., History of Kansas from the First Exploration of the Mississippi Valley to its Admission into the Union. Lafayette, Ind., 1868.

The Holy Bible: King James Version.

Hopkins, John, A Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the Africans, showing it to be the Duty and Interest of the American States to emancipate all their African Slaves. 1776.

_____, A Discourse upon the Slave Trade and the History of the Africans. 1793.

Houck, Louis, A History of Missouri: From the Earliest Explorations and Settlements until the Admission of the State into the Union, 3 vols. Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company, 1908.

Howell George R., and Jonathan Tenney, eds., Bi-Centennial History of Albany: History of the County of Albany, N.Y., From 1609 to 1886. New York, 1886.

Hutcheson, Frances, A System of Moral Philosophy, 2 vols. Glasgow: Foulis Brothers, 1755.

Hyde, William, and Howard L. Conard, editors, Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis, A Compendium of History and Biography for Ready Reference, 4 vols. New York, 1899.

The Indiana Series. The Second Reader: Progressive Lessons for the Young Reader. Cincinnati.

Jeter, Jeremiah Bell, Recollections of a Long Life. Richmond, 1891.

Johnson, Thomas Cary, The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney. Richmond, Va., 1903.

Johnson, William, The Catholic Encyclopedia. New York, 1912.

Jones, E. D., Sunday School Work in the Benton Street Mission, St. Louis. St. Louis, 1868.

Jones, Isaac, et al, Review of "A Declaration of Sentiments made by the Synod of Missouri." St. Louis, 1842.

Jones, Charles C., The Religious Instruction of Negroes. In the United States. Savannah, 1842.

Jones, Samuel, A Treatise of Church Discipline and a Directory. Done by Appointment of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. Philadelphia, 1798.

Ker, Leander, Slavery Consistent with Christianity: With an Introduction, Embracing a Notice of the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" Movement in England. Weston, Mo, 1853; reprint, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Library.

Kirkpatrick, John Erwin, Timothy Flint, Pioneer, Missionary, Author, Editor, 1780-1840: The Story of His Life Among the Pioneers and Frontiersmen in the Ohio and Mississippi Valley and in New England and the South. Cleveland, 1911.

Knight, Mrs. Helen C., Lady Huntington and Her Friends; or, The Revival of the Work of God in The Days of Wesley, Whitefield, Romaine, Venn and Others in the Last Century. New York, 1842.

Lanius, Jacob, The Journal of the Reverend Jacob Lanius: An Itinerant Preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church from 1831 A.D. to 1851 A.D. Waynesville, Mo., 1963.

Laws, S. S., A Letter By the Rev. S. S. Laws, LL. D., to the Synod of Missouri (O.S.) Which Met at Columbia, Missouri, October 8, 1872. New York, 1873.

Lee, Luther, The Debates of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, May 1844: To Which is Added a Review of the Proceedings of Said Conference. New York, 1845.

Leftwich, Rev. W. M., D. D., Martyrdom in Missouri: A History of Religious Persecution, the Seizure of Churches, and the Persecution of Ministers of the Gospel, in the State of Missouri. . ., 2 vols. St. Louis, 1870.

Lewis, William H., The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870. Nashville, 1890.

Loeb, Isidor, Civil Government: Local, State and National. The History of Missouri. Carrollton, Mo., 1907.

Lovejoy, Joseph C. and Owen Lovejoy, Memoir of the Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy; Who was Murdered in Defense of the Liberty of the Press, at Alton, Illinois, Nov. 7, 1837. Freeport, N.Y., 1838; reprint, Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1970.

Lundy, Benjamin, and Julius Rubens Ames, The Anti-Texas Legion. Protest of Some Free Men, States and Presses Against the Texas Rebellion, Against the Laws of Nature and of Nations. New York, 1845.

Lyon, Rev. James A., An Address on the Missionary Aspect of African Colonization. St. Louis, 1850.

MacPherson, C. B., ed., Thomas Hobbes: Leviathan. London: Penguin Books, 1968.

Magie, Rev. David, Memorial Sermon of the Late Rev. Frederick Starr, Jr. . . . Rochester, N.Y., 1867.

Mahan, Asa, Science of Moral Philosophy. Oberlin, Oh., 1848.

Maple, J. C., Life and Writings of William Pope Yeaman, S. T. D. Columbia, Mo., 1906.

_____, History of the Cape Girardeau Baptist Association from 1824 to 1912. Cape Girardeau, Mo., 1913.

_____, and R. P. Rider, Missouri Baptist Biography: A Series of Life Sketches Indicating the Growth and Prosperity of the Baptist Churches as Represented in the Lives and Labors of Eminent Men and Women in Missouri, 6 vols. Kansas City, 1914.

Marlay, John F., The Life of Bishop Thomas A. Morris. Cincinnati, 1874.

Marquette, David, A History of Nebraska Methodism: First Half-Century, 1854-1904. Cincinnati, 1904.

Marshall, John A., American Bastille: A History of the Illegal Arrests and Imprisonment of American Citizens in the Northern and Border States on Account of Their Political Opinions during the Late Civil War. Philadelphia, 1881.

Marvin, Enoch M., The Life of William Goff Caples of the Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. St. Louis, 1870.

McAnally, D. R., History of Methodism in Missouri: from the date of its introduction, in 1806, down to the present day. . . . St. Louis, 1881.

_____, Life and Times of Rev. William Patton and Annals of the Missouri Conference. St. Louis, 1858.

McClintock, John, and James Strong, eds., Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. New York, 1880.

McCosh, James, The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral, 4th ed. Edinburgh, 1855.

McGrade, Arthur Stephen, ed., Hooker: Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

McGlothlin, W. J., Baptist Confessions of Faith. Philadelphia, 1911.

McGuffey, William H., McGuffey's New Fifth Eclectic Reader: Selected and Original Exercises for Schools. Cincinnati and New York, 1866.

McNamara, John, In Perils by My Own Countrymen: Three Years on the Kansas Border. By a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church. New York, 1856.

McTyeire, Holland Nimmons, A History of Methodism: Comprising a View of the Rise of this Revival of Spiritual Religion in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century, and of the Principal Agents by Whom it was Promoted in Europe and America. . . . London, 1885.

Meachum, John B., An Address to All the Colored Citizens of the United States. Philadelphia, 1846.

Miller, Rev. George, Missouri's Memorable Decade, 1860-1870. Columbia, Mo., 1898.

Minutes of the Second Annual Meeting of the Missouri Division United Daughters of the Confederacy . . . 1899. Fayette, Mo., 1899.

Missouri School Journal, Vol. XII, Nos. 1-12. Jefferson City, 1896.

Monks, William, A History of Northern Arkansas and Southern Missouri West Plains, Mo., 1907.

Muir, Jesse Taylor, History and Government of Missouri Boston, 1908.

Nicolay J. G., and John Hay, "Abraham Lincoln: A History. The Hampton Roads Conference," The Century. October 1889.

Nidditch, Peter H., ed., John Locke: An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Nelson, Rev. Henry A., "A Shining Light." A Discourse Commemorative of Rev. Frederick Starr, Jr. . . . St. Louis, 1867.

Note, "Hon. Thomas A. Marshall," United States Monthly Law Magazine, 5.5 (1852).

Orten, Martha Raines, History of Lewis, Clark, Knox and Scotland Counties, Missouri St. Louis and Chicago, 1887.

O'Shea, John J., The Two Kenricks Philadelphia, 1904).

Paley, William, Natural Theology: or, Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity. London: Printed for J. Faulder, 1809.

Palmer, B. M., ed., The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell, 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1875; Oxford: University Printing House, Oxford, 1986.

_____, The Oath of Allegiance to the United States, Discussed in its Moral and Political Bearings. Richmond, 1863.

Paxton, W. M., Annals of Platte County, Missouri, From its Exploration Down to June 1, 1897
... . Kansas City, Mo., 1897.

Peabody, Rev. Charles, Twenty Years Among the Colporteurs. New York, 1865.

Peck, D. D., Rev. George, Slavery and the Episcopacy: Being an Examination of Dr. Bascom's
Review of the Reply of the Majority New York, 1845.

Personal Reminiscences and Fragments of the Early History of Springfield and Greene County,
Missouri Springfield, Mo., 1914).

Phillips, C. H., The History of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America
Jackson, Tn., 1898.

Platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society and its Auxiliaries. New York, 1855.

Proceedings of the Second Annual Encampment of the Department of Missouri, Grand Army of
the Republic . . . 1883. St. Louis, 1883.

Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Encampment of the Department of Missouri, Grand Army
of the Republic . . . 1901. St. Louis, 1901.

Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual Meeting of the Missouri Bar Association . . . 1913.
Springfield, Mo., 1913.

Potts, William S., Dangers of Jesuit Instruction. St. Louis, 1846.

_____, The Inaugural Address of Rev. William S. Potts, President of Marion College. St.
Louis, 1835.

_____, Ministers Should Live of the Gospel: A Sermon on the Duty of the Presbyterian
Church in Missouri in Regard to Domestic Missions: Preached by Appointment Before the
Synod of Missouri, in Columbia, October 16, 1846 by William S. Potts. St. Louis, 1846.

_____, and William Porter Cochran, Review of "A Declaration of Sentiments Made by
the Synod of Missouri, Formed by a Convention of Presbyterian Ministers and Elders, Held at
Hannibal, Oct. 7, 1841. St. Louis, 1842.

_____, Presbyterian Church Government Scriptural: A Sermon, Delivered by Appointment
before the Presbytery of St. Louis, September 30, 1842. St. Louis, 1843.

Proceedings of the Holiness Conference at Cincinnati, Ohio, November 26, 1877, and at New
York, December 26, 1877. Philadelphia, 1878.

Prottsman, William McKendree, Sermons of the Late Rev. William McKendree Prottsman
Fayette, Mo., 1903.

The Publications of the American Tract Society, vol. 1. Printed for the Society by Flagg &
Gould, 1824.

Rader, Perry Scott, The Civil Government of the United States and the State of Missouri; and the
History of Missouri from the Earliest Times to the Present. Columbia, 1898.

Rauschenbusch, Walter, A Theology for the Social Gospel. New York: Abingdon Press, 1917.

Redpath, James, Public Life of Captain John Brown. Boston, 1860.

Reid, Thomas, An Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Sense.
Edinburgh, 1764.

Reports of the Proceedings of the Ex-Confederate Association of Missouri, in its Second Annual
Meeting St. Louis, 1883.

Rice, Edwin Wilbur, The Sunday-School Movement, 1780-1917 and the American Sunday-
School Union, 1817-1917. Philadelphia, 1917.

Rice, Col. James M., Peoria City and County Illinois, 2 vols. Chicago, 1912.

Rice, Nathan L., A Discourse on Dancing, Delivered in the Central Presbyterian Church,
Cincinnati. Cincinnati, 1847.

_____, God Sovereign and Man Free, or, the Doctrine of Divine Foreordination and Man's
Free Agency Stated, Illustrated, and Proved from the Scriptures. Philadelphia, 1850.

_____, The Immortality and the Soul and Destiny of the Wicked. Philadelphia: Westcott
and Thomson, 1871.

_____, Increase of Crime: An Address Delivered before the Society of Moral and Religious
Inquiry, of Shurtleff College, June 16, 1855. St. Louis, 1855.

_____, Lectures of Slavery, Delivered in the North Presbyterian Church. Chicago, 1860.

_____, Phrenology Examined, and Shown to be Inconsistent with the Principles of
Physiology, Mental and Moral Science, and the Doctrines of Christianity, also an examination of
the Claims of Mesmerism. New York, 1848.

_____, The Pulpit: Its Relation to the National Crisis. A Sermon, Preached in the Fifth
Avenue and Nineteenth Street Presbyterian Church. New York, 1862.

_____, Romanism, The Enemy of Education, of Free Institutions, and of Christianity. Cincinnati, 1853.

_____, The Signs of the Times in a Series of Eight Lectures. St. Louis: Keith & Woods, 1855.

_____, Ten Letters on the Subject of Slavery: Addressed to the Delegates from the Congregational Associations to the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. St. Louis, 1856.

Riley, B. F., A History of the Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi. Philadelphia, 1898.

Rivers, Richard Henderson, Elements of Moral Philosophy. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1859.

Roberts, Thomas P., Memoirs of John Bannister Gibson, Late Chief Justice of Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh, 1890.

Rutt, Christian Ludwig, The Daily News' History of Buchanan County and St. Joseph, Mo. from the Time of the Platte Purchase to the End of the Year 1898, Preceded by a Short History of Missouri, Supplemented by Biographical Sketches of Noted Citizens, Living and Dead. St. Joseph, Mo., 1898.

Scharf, J. Thomas, History of Saint Louis City and County, 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1883.

Schuckers, J. W., The Life and Public Services of Salmon Portland Chase. New York, 1874.

The Second Book of 100 Pictures. Philadelphia, 1862.

Scott, Jack, ed., An Annotated Edition of Lectures on Moral Philosophy by John Witherspoon. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1982.

Shannon, James, An Address Delivered Before the Pro-Slavery Convention on the State of Missouri, Held in Lexington, July 1855. St. Louis, 1855.

_____, The Philosophy of Slavery, as Identified with the Philosophy of Human Happiness. Frankfort, Ky., 1849.

Shaw, James, Early Reminiscences of Pioneer Life in Kansas. Atchison, 1886.

Simpson Matthew, ed., Cyclopedia of Methodism. Embracing Sketches of its Rise, Progress and Present Condition Philadelphia, 1878.

Smith, D. D., Charles Spenser, A History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church Philadelphia, 1922.

Smith, George Gillman, The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew: Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. With Glances at His Contemporaries and at Events in Church History. Nashville, 1883.

Snow, Marshall Solomon, ed., History of the Development of Missouri: and Particularly of St. Louis, 2 vols. Saint Louis, Mo., 1908.

Sprague, A. P., ed., Speeches, Arguments, and Miscellaneous Papers of David Dudley Field, 2 vols. New York, 1884.

Stansbury, Arthur, Trial of the Rev. Albert Barnes, Before the Synod of Philadelphia, In Session at York, October 1835, on a Charge of Heresy. . . . New York, 1836.

Starr, N. D., T. W. Holman, The 21st Missouri Regiment, Infantry Veteran Volunteers. Historical Memoranda. Fort Madison, Ia., 1899).

Stevens, Abel, The History of the Eighteenth-century Religious Movement Called Methodism, Vol. 2. New York: Carlton & Porter, 1859.

Stevens, John, A Brief Historical Sketch of the Western Baptist Theological Institute: Exhibiting Its Establishment, Location, and Endowment. . . . Cincinnati, 1850.

Stewart, A. J. D., ed., The History of the Bench and Bar of Missouri: with Reminiscences of the Prominent Lawyers of the Past, and a Record of the Law's Leaders of the Present. St Louis: The Legal Publishing Co., 1898.

Stott, E. C., Ministerial Directory of the Presbyterian Church, U. S., 1861-1941. Austin, Tx.: Von Boeckmann-Jones, 1942.

Stringfellow, B. F., Negro-Slavery, No Evil; or The North and the South. . . . St. Louis, 1854.

Stringfellow, Thornton, Brief Examination of Scripture Testimony on the Institution of Slavery. 1841.

_____, Scriptural and Statistical Views in Favor of Slavery. 1856.

_____, Slavery: Its Origin, Nature, and History. 1861.

Stringfield, E. E., Presbyterianism in the Ozarks, A History of the Work of the Various Branches of the Presbyterian Church in Southwest Missouri, 1834-1907. Springfield, Mo., 1909.

Sweet, William Henry, A History of Methodism in Northwest Kansas. Kansas Wesleyan University, 1920.

Tanner, Henry, The Martyrdom of Lovejoy: An Account of the Life, Trials and Perils of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy. . . . Chicago, 1881; reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1971.

True Loyalty and Independence of the Church. St. Louis, 1865.

The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies 70 vols. Washington, D.C.: 1880-1901.

Thomas, Alfred A., ed., Correspondence of Thomas Ebenezer Thomas, Mainly Relating to the Anti-slavery Conflict in Ohio, Especially in the Presbyterian Church. Published by Alfred A. Thomas, 1909.

Templin, Lucinda de Leftwich, Reminiscences of Linden Wood College. St. Charles, 1920.

Valpy, A. J. ed., Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy . . . Carefully Adapted to Schools of Both Sexes. Philadelphia: Uriah Hunt, 1835.

Vaughan, C. R., ed. Discussions by Robert L. Dabney, D.D., LL.D., 3 vols. Richmond, Va., 1890.

Waugh, Lorenzo, Autobiography of Lorenzo Waugh. San Francisco, 1896.

_____, A Candid Statement of the Course Pursued by the Preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, in Trying to Establish Their New Organization in Missouri. Cincinnati, 1848.

Wayland, Francis, The Elements of Moral Science. 1835; Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1856.

_____, The Elements of Moral Science. Boston, 1843.

_____, and Heman Lincoln, The Life and Labors of Francis Wayland, 2 vols. New York, 1867.

Webb, Thomas H., Information for Kansas Immigrants: Prepared by Thomas H. Webb, Secretary of the New England Immigrant Aid Co. Boston, 1855.

Weld, Theodore Dwight, American Slavery as it is: Testimony of A Thousand Witnesses. New York, 1839.

Whately, Richard, Introductory Lessons on Morals and Christian Evidences. Cambridge, Eng.: John Bartlett, 1857.

White, Alexander Henry, Southern Presbyterians. New York, 1911.

Whitney, Carrie Westlake, Kansas City Missouri its History and its People, 1808-1908, 3 vols. Chicago, 1908.

Wiggington, W. R., Life and Labors of Elder W. R. Wiggington: An Autobiography. State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia.

Wigham, Eliza, The Anti-Slavery Cause in America and its Martyrs. London, 1863.

Williams, David Riddle, James H. Brookes: A Memoir, Published for Dr. Brookes' Family. St. Louis, 1897.

Williams, Walter, ed., A History of Northwest Missouri, 3 vols. Chicago, 1915.

Woodard, W. S., Annals of Methodism in Missouri: Containing an Outline of the Ministerial Life of More Than One Thousand Preachers, and Sketches of More Than Three Hundred. Columbia, Mo., 1893.

Yeaman, William Pope, A History of the Missouri Baptist General Association. Columbia, Mo., 1899.

Secondary Sources

Books

Aaron, Daniel, The Unwritten War: American Writers and the Civil War. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973.

Adler, Jeffrey S., Yankee Merchants and the Making of the Urban West: The Rise and Fall of Antebellum St. Louis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Abrose, Stephen E., Halleck: Lincoln's Chief of Staff. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962.

Ahlstrom, Sidney, A Religious History of the American People. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Aiken, George L., Uncle Tom's Cabin. New York: Garland, 1993.

Anderson, Benedict, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso, 1983.

Archer, Kenneth J., The Gospel Revisited: Toward a Pentecostal Theology and Witness. Pickwick Publications, 2001.

Armstrong, Warren B., For Courageous Fighting and Confident Dying: Union Chaplains in the Civil War. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998.

Ash, Stephen V., The Black Experience in the Civil War South. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2010.

Ayers, Edward L., What Caused the Civil War: Reflections on the South and Southern History. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005.

Bailey, David T., Shadow on the Church: Southwestern Evangelical Religion and the Issue of Slavery, 1783-1860. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Baker, Paula C., The Moral Frameworks of Public Life: Gender, Politics, and the State in Rural New York, 1870-1930. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Baptist, Edward, Creating an Old South: Middle Florida's Plantation Culture before the Civil War. University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Barnes, William Wright, The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1953. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954.

Basler, Roy P., ed., Marion D. Pratt and Lloyd A. Dunlap, asst. eds., The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln, 9 vols. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953-55.

Beale, Howard K., The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction. New York: F. Ungar Publishing Company, 1930.

Bellows, Barbara L., Benevolence among Slaveholders Assisting the Poor in Charleston, 1670-1860. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.

Bennett, James B., Religion and the Rise of Jim Crow in New Orleans. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Berlin, Ira, Steven F. Miller, Joseph P. Reidy, Leslie S. Rowland, eds., The Wartime Genesis of Free Labor: The Upper South, Series 1, Volume 2 Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, 1861-1867. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Blied, Rev. B. J., Catholics and the Civil War. Milwaukee: Private edition, 1945.

Blight, David W., Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

Blum, Edward J., Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion and American Nationalism, 1865-1898. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005.

_____, and W. Scott Poole, eds., Vale of Tears: New Essays on Religion and Reconstruction. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2005.

Blumin, Stuart Mack, The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900. Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Boles, John, The Great Revival: Beginnings of the Bible Belt. University Press of Kentucky, 1996.

_____, The Great Revival, 1787-1805: The Origins of the Southern Evangelical Mind. University Press of Kentucky, 1982.

_____, ed., Masters and Slaves in the House of the Lord: Religion and Race in the American South, 1740 to 1870. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988.

Boman, Dennis K., Abiel Leonard, Yankee Slaveholder, Eminent Jurist, and Passionate Unionist. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002.

_____, Lincoln's Resolute Unionist Hamilton Gamble, Dred Scott Dissenter and Missouri's Civil War Governor. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.

Bond, Edward L., Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony: Religion in Seventeenth-Century Virginia. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2000.

Bonner, Richard E., Mastering America: Southern Slaveholders and the Crisis of American Nationhood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Bordin, Ruth R. B. Anderson, Frances Willard: A Biography. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Bowers, Claude G., The Tragic Era. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.

- Boylan, Anne, Sunday School: The Formation of an American Institution, 1790-1880. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Brown, Richard Maxwell, Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Brownlee, Richard E., Gray Ghosts of the Confederacy: Guerilla Warfare in the West, 1861-1865. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1958.
- Bruce, Jr., Dickenson D., And They all Sang Hallelujah: Plain-Folk Camp-Meeting Religion, 1800-1845. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1974.
- Bryan, William S., Robert Rose, A History of the Pioneer Families of Missouri. St. Louis, 1876.
- Buckley, Thomas E., Church and State in Revolutionary Virginia, 1776-1787. University of Virginia Press, 1977.
- Burgess, Stanley M., and Edward M. van der Maas, eds., New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements. Zondervan Press, 2002.
- Bynum, Victoria, Unruly Women: The Politics of Social and Sexual Control in the Old South. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Byrne, Frank J., Becoming Bourgeois: Merchant Culture in the South, 1820-1865. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2006.
- Callahan, Richard J., ed., New Territories, New Perspectives: The Religious Impact of the Louisiana Purchase. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008.
- _____, Work and Faith in the Kentucky Coal Fields: Subject to Dust. Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Carroll, Mark M., Homesteads Ungovernable: Families, Sex, Race, and the Law in Frontier Texas, 1823-1860. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001.
- Carter, Gerri, Troubled State: Civil War Journals of Franklin Archibald Dick. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2008.
- Carter, Paul A., The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971.
- Carwardine, Richard, Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1993.

Casper, Scott E., et al. A History of the Book in America. Vol. 3. The Industrial Book, 1840-1880. Chapel Hill: Published in Association with the American Antiquarian Society by the University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Castel, Albert, Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind. Lawrence, Ks.: University Press of Kansas, 1997.

Cayton, Andrew R. L., Peter S. Onuf, The Midwest and the Nation: Rethinking the History of an American Region. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Coker, Joe L., Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007.

Cole, Arthur C., The Irrepressible Conflict: 1850-1865. New York: MacMillan, 1934.

Collins, Donald E., The Death and Resurrection of Jefferson Davis. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Collins, Robert M., Transforming America: Politics and Culture During the Reagan Years. Columbia University Press, 2006.

Cone, James, A Black Theology of Liberation. New York: Orbis Books, 1996.

Connelley, William E., A Standard History of Kansas and Kansans, 5 vols. Chicago: Lewis, 1918.

Cornelius, Janet Duitsman, “When I Can Read My Title Clear”: Literacy, Slavery and Religion in the Antebellum South. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.

_____, Slave Missions and the Black Church in the Antebellum South. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1999.

Coulter, E. Milton, The South During Reconstruction 1865-1877. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1947.

Cox, Karen L., Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of the Confederate Culture. Gainesville: The University of Florida Press, 2003.

Christensen, Lawrence O., William E. Foley, Gary R. Kremer and Kenneth H. Winn, eds., Dictionary of Missouri Biography. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999.

Cooper, Jr., William J., and John M. McCardell, Jr., eds., In the Cause of Liberty: How the Civil War Redefined American Ideals. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009.

Curtis, Michael Kent, Free Speech, "The People's Darling Privilege," Struggles for Freedom of Expression in American History. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000.

Curtis, Susan, A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Cutler, William G., History of the State of Kansas: With Biographical Sketches and Portraits. Chicago: A. T. Andreas, 1883.

Daly, John Patrick, When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002.

Davenport, Steven, Friends of the Unrighteous Mammon: Northern Christians and Market Capitalism, 1815-1860. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Davis, Morris L., The Methodist Unification: Christianity and the Politics of Race in the Jim Crow Era. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Dempsey, Terrell, Searching for Jim: Slavery in Sam Clemens's World. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2003.

de Rosa, Deborah, Domestic Abolitionism and Juvenile Literature, 1830-1865. State University of New York Press, 2003.

Dieter, Melvin E., The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century. Rowman & Littlefield, 1996.

Dillon, Merton L., Elijah P. Lovejoy, Abolitionist Editor. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

Dorn, Jacob, Washington Gladden: Prophet of the Social Gospel. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968.

Donald, David H., Jean Harvey Baker, and Michael F. Holt, The Civil War and Reconstruction. 2001.

Donald, David Herbert, Lincoln. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.

Douglass, R. S., History of Missouri Baptists. Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1934.

Dreisbach, Daniel L., Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation between Church and State. New York: New York University Press, 2002.

Du Bois, W. E. B., The Black Church. Walnut Creek, Ca.: Altamira Press, 2003.

- _____, Black Reconstruction in America. New York: Russell and Russell, 1935.
- Dunaway, Maxine, Civil War period data from Thomas A. Peters ledger, 1861/62-1864, Polk County, Missouri: Including some Polk County loyalty oaths, 1862-64. M. Dunaway, 1984.
- Dunne, Gerald T., The Missouri Supreme Court: From Dred Scott to Nancy Cruzan. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993.
- Dunning, William E., Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction and Related Topics. London: McMillan & Co., 1904.
- _____, Reconstruction, Political and Economic 1865-1877. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1907.
- Dvorak, Katherine, An African-American Exodus: The Segregation of Southern Churches. Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing, 1991.
- Dyer, Robert L., Jesse James and the Civil War in Missouri. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1996.
- Edwards, Laura F., Gendered Strife and Confusion: The Political Culture of Reconstruction. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- _____, The People and Their Peace: Legal Culture and the Transformation of Inequality in the Post-Revolutionary South. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Edwards, Rem B., A Return to Moral and Religious Philosophy in Early America. Washington, D.C. : University Press of America, 1982.
- Edwards, Wendy J. Deichmann, and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford, ed., Gender and the Social Gospel. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003.
- Eisgruber Christopher L., and Lawrence G. Sager, Religious Freedom and the Constitution. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- English, William Francis, The Pioneer Lawyer and Jurist of Missouri. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1947.
- Etcheson, Nicole, Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004.
- Evans, Jr., James H., Black Theology: A Critical Assessment and Annotated Bibliography. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Faherty, William Barnaby, American Catholic Heritage: Stories of Growth. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1991.

_____, Exile in Erin: A Confederate Chaplain's Story: The Life of Father John B. Bannon. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 2002.

_____, and Kevin Laheen, The Fourth Career of John B. Bannon: St. Louis Pastor, Southern Chaplain, Confederate Agent, Irish Jesuit Orator. Portland, Or.: C&D Publishing, 1994.

Fahley, David M., Temperance & Racism: John Bull, Johnny Reb, and the Good Templars. University Press of Kentucky, 1996.

Fahs, Alice and Joan Waugh, eds., The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Farber, Daniel, Lincoln's Constitution. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Farmer, Jr., James Oscar, The Metaphysical Confederacy: James Henley Thornwell and the Synthesis of Southern Values. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986.

Farnham, Christie Anne, The Education of a Southern Belle: Higher Education and Student Socialization in the Antebellum South. New York and London: New York University Press, 1994.

Faust, Drew Gilpin, Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Fehrenbacher, Don E, Slavery, Law, and Politics: The Dred Scott Case in Historical Perspective. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Feldman, Glenn, ed., Politics and Religion in the White South. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2005.

Fellman, Michael, Inside War: The Guerrilla Conflict in Missouri During the American Civil War. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Fiering, Norman, Moral Philosophy at Seventeenth Century Harvard: A Discipline in Transition. Chapel Hill : Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1981.

Fleming, Walter L., ed., Documentary History of Reconstruction, 2 vols., Cleveland, 1907.

_____, The Sequel of Appomattox. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919.

Fogel, Robert William and Stanley L. Engerman, Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery. Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1974.

Foley, William E., The Genesis of Missouri: From Wilderness Outpost to Statehood. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1989.

Foner, Eric, The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010.

_____, Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution. New York: Harper and Row, 1988.

Forbes, Robert Pierce, The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Foster, Charles I., An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

Foster, Gaines, Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

_____, Moral Reconstruction: Christian Lobbyists and the Federal Legislation of Morality, 1865-1920. The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Fox, Adam, Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth, Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

_____, and Eugene D. Genovese, The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' World View. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Freehling, William W., The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Friedman, Jean E., The Enclosed Garden: Women and Community in the Evangelical South, 1830-1900. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.

Frost, J. William, "Part V: Christianity and Culture in America," Christianity: A Social and Cultural History, 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Gill, John, Tide Without Turning: Elijah P. Lovejoy and the Freedom of the Press. Boston: Starr King Press, Beacon Hill, 1958.

Gilmore, Donald, Civil War on the Missouri-Kansas Border. Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing, 2006.

Ginzberg, Lori D., Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-century United States. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Goen, C. C., Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the Civil War. Macon Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1985.

Goodrich, Thomas, Black Flag: Guerrilla Warfare on the Western Border, 1861-1865. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Green, Steven K., The Second Disestablishment: Church and State in Nineteenth-Century America. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Greene, Lorenzo J., Gary R. Kremer, Anthony F. Holland, Missouri's Black Heritage. St. Louis: Forum Press, 1980.

Greer, ed., Jane, Girls and Literacy in America: Historical Perspectives to the Present. Santa Barbara, Ca: ABC-CLIO, 2003.

Gutjahr, Paul, An American Bible: A History of the Good Book in the United States, 1777-1880. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Habermas, Jürgen, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.

Hagood J. Hurley, and Roberta (Roland) Hagood, The Story of Hannibal. Hannibal, Mo.: Standard Printing Company, 1976.

Hahn, Steven, A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration. Cambridge: Belknap Harvard University Press, 2003.

Hall Kermit L., and Peter Karsten, The Magic Mirror: Law in American History, 2d ed. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Hall, Joseph H., Presbyterian Conflict and Resolution on the Missouri Frontier. Lewiston/Queenston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1987.

Hamilton, Marci A., God vs. the Gavel: Religion and the Rule of Law. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Harris, William C., With Charity For All: Lincoln and the Restoration of the Union. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1997.

Hartley, Benjamin L., Evangelicals at a Crossroads: Revivalism and Social Reform in Boston, 1860-1910. University of New Hampshire Press, 2011.

Harvey, Paul, Freedom's Coming: Religious Culture and the Shaping of the South from the Civil War through the Civil Rights Era. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

_____, Redeeming the South: Religious Cultures and Racial Identities Among Southern Baptists, 1865-1925. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Hatch, The Democratization of American Christianity. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hatch, Nathan O. and John H. Wigger, eds. Methodism and the Shaping of American Culture. Nashville: Kingswood Books, 2001.

Hilliard, Frances McAnally Blackburn, Stepping Stones to Glory: From Circuit Rider to Editor in the Years in Between, Life of David Rice McAnally D. D. 1810-1895. Baltimore: Gateway Press, Inc., 1975.

Hobbs, Catherine, ed., Nineteenth-Century Women Learn to Write. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1995.

Hoeveler, J. David, James McCosh and the Scottish Intellectual Tradition: From Glasgow to Princeton. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1981.

Holifield, E. Brooks, The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860. Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1978.

Holter, Don W., Fire on the Prairie: Methodism in the History of Kansas. Methodist Publishing House, 1969.

Horwitz, Morton, The Transformation of American Law, 1780-1860. Cambridge and London, Harvard University Press, 1977.

Howe, Daniel Walker, What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hurst, J. Willard, Law and the Conditions of Freedom in the Nineteenth century United States. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956.

Hurt, R. Douglas, Agriculture and Slavery in Missouri's Little Dixie. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992.

Hyman, Harold Melvin, A More Perfect Union: The Impact of the Civil War and Reconstruction on the Constitution. 1973.

_____, Era of the Oath: Northern Loyalty Tests During the Civil War and Reconstruction. New York: Octagon Books, 1978.

_____, To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1959.

Isenberg, Nancy, Sex and Citizenship in Antebellum America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Gallagher, Gary W., The Confederate War: How Popular Will, Nationalism, and Military Strategy Could Not Starve Off Defeat. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1997.

_____, Lee and His Generals in War and Memory. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University press, 1998.

_____, Alan T. Nolan, eds., The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Gardner, Robert G., A Decade of Debate and Division: Georgia Baptists and the Formation of the Southern Baptist Convention. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995.

Genovese, Eugene, A Consuming Fire: The Fall of the Confederacy. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

_____, Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made. New York: Random House, 1974.

George, Floy Waters, History of Webster County, 1855 to 1955. Springfield, Mo.: Roberts and Sutter, printers, 1955.

Gerteis, Louis S., Civil War St. Louis. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001.

Gienapp, William E., Abraham Lincoln and the Civil War: A Biography. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Giggie, John M., After Redemption: Jim Crow and the Transformation of African American Religion in the Delta, 1875-1915. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Gillette, William, The Retreat from Reconstruction, 1869-1879. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.
- Glatthaar, Joseph T., Forged in Battle: The Civil War Alliance of Black Soldiers and White Officers. New York : Free Press; London : Collier Macmillan, 1990.
- Goodwin, Dorris Kearns, Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005.
- Graber, Mark A., Dred Scott and the Problem of Constitutional Evil. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Grimsted, David, American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Gross, Robert A., and Mary Kelley, eds. A History of the Book in America, Volume 2, An Extensive Republic, Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation, 1790-1840. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Grossberg, Michael, Governing the Hearth: Law and Family in Nineteenth-Century America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Guelzo, Allen C., Abraham Lincoln: Redeemer President. Grand Rapids: W.E. Eerdmans, 1999.
- _____, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004.
- Hamburger, Philip, Separation of Church and State. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Heidler, David S., and Jeanne T. Heidler, eds., Encyclopedia of the American Civil War: A Political, Social, and Military History. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000.
- Heyrman, Christine, Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Holt, Michael F., The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Hood, Fred J., Reformed America: The Middle and Southern States, 1783-1837. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1980.
- Hopkins, Charles Howard, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915. New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 1967.

Howard, Victor, Religion and the Radical Republican Movement, 1860-1870: Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1990.

Huston, James, Calculating the Value of the Union: Slavery, Property Rights, and the Economic Origins of the Civil War. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Huyler, Jerome, Locke in America: The Moral Philosophy of the Founding Era. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.

Jabour, Anya, Scarlett's Sisters: Young Women in the Old South. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Jeffrey, Julie Roy, The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Jensen, Richard, The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888-1896. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Johnson, Paul E., A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.

Johnson, Yvonne, ed., Feminist Frontiers: Women Who Shaped the Midwest. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2010.

Jones, Charles T., George Champlin Sibley: The Prairie Puritan. Jackson County Historical Society, 1970.

Kammen, Michael, The Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.

Kastlevy William, and Gari-Anne Patswald, eds., Historical Dictionary of the Holiness Movement. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2001.

Kaufman, Kenneth C., Dred Scott's Advocate: A Biography of Roswell M. Field. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1996.

Kaye, Anthony E., Joining Places: Slave Neighborhoods of the Old South. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Kingsley, J. Gordon, Frontiers: The Story of the Missouri Baptist Convention. Jefferson City: Missouri Baptist Historical Commission, 1983.

Klein, Rachel N., Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760-1808. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Kuklick, Bruce, Churchmen and Philosophers: From Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Kuykendall, John W., Southern Enterprize: The Work of Evangelical Societies in the Antebellum South. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Lambert, Frank, The Founding Fathers and the Place of Religion in America. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Larkin, Lew, Vanguard of Empire: Missouri's Century of Expansion. St. Louis: State Publishing Company, 1961.

Leslie, Edward E., The Devil Knows How to Ride: The True Story of William Clarke Quantrill and His Confederate Raiders. New York: De Capo Press, 1996.

Leonard, Bill J., Baptists in America. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Lebsock, Suzanne, The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860. New York: W. W. Norton, 1984.

Levy, Leonard W., The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment. New York: Macmillan, 1986.

Linfield, Michael, Freedom Under Fire: US Civil Liberties in Time of War. Boston: South End Press, 1999.

Litwack, Leon F., Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery. New York: Knopf, 1979.

Loughran, Trish, The Republic of Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. National Building, 1770-1870. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Loveland, Anne C., Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800-1860. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980.

Luker, Ralph E., The Social Gospel in Black and White: American Racial Reform, 1885-1912. Chapel Hill and London: North Carolina Press, 1991.

March, David D., Charles Daniel Drake of St Louis. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society, 1953.

Marsden, George M., The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth Century America. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970.

_____, Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

_____, Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991.

Marty, Martin, Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America. New York: Dial Press, 1970.

May, Henry F., Protestant Churches and Industrial America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Morrow, Ralph, Northern Methodism and Reconstruction. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1956.

Mathews, Donald, Religion in the Old South. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

_____, Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Mathewes, Charles, and Christopher McKnight Nichols, eds., Prophesies of Godlessness: Predictions of America's Imminent Secularization, from the Puritans to the Present Day. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

McAfee, Ward M., Religion, Race, and Reconstruction: The Public School in the Politics of the 1870s. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

McCandless, Perry, A History of Missouri. Volume II 1820 To 1860. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1971; rpt. 2000.

McConnell, Stuart, Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

McCurdy, Francis Lea, Stump, Bar, and Pulpit: Speechmaking on the Missouri Frontier. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1969.

McCurry, Stephanie, Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

McGarvie, Mark D., One Nation under Law: America's Early National Struggles to Separate Church and States. DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004.

McGinty, Brian, Lincoln and the Court. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

- McKanan, Dan, Identifying the Image of God: Radical Christians and Nonviolent Power in the Antebellum United States. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- McKivigan, John R. and Mitchell Snay, eds., Religion and the Antebellum Debate over Slavery. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1998.
- McKivigan, John, The War Against Pro-Slavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Churches, 1830-1865. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.
- McMillen, Sally G., Motherhood in the Old South: Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Infant Rearing. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990.
- McPherson, James M., Abraham Lincoln. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- _____, Abraham Lincoln and the Second American Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- _____, Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- _____, Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction. New York: Knopf, 1982.
- _____, The Negro's Civil War: How American Blacks Felt and Acted During the War for the Union. New York : Pantheon Books, 1965.
- _____, The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- _____, Tried by War: Lincoln as Commander in Chief. New York: Penguin Group, 2008.
- Mead, Sidney E., The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Mintz, Steven, Moralists & Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Melton, J. Gordon, A Will to Choose: The Origins of African American Methodism. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.
- Miller, Randall M., et al., eds., Religion and the Civil War. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Miller, William Lee, President Lincoln: The Duty of a Statesman. New York: Random House, 2008.

Montgomery, William E., Under Their Own Vine and Fig Tree: The African-American church in the South, 1865-1900. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.

Morrison, Jeffrey R., John Witherspoon and the Founding of the American Republic. University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.

Moore William F., and Jane Ann Moore, eds., His Brother's Blood: Speeches and Writings, 1838-64, Owen Lovejoy. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Moorhead, James, American Apocalypse: Yankee Protestants and the Civil War, 1860-1869. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.

Murray, Andrew E., Presbyterians and the Negro – A History. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1966.

Neely, Jeremy, The Border Between Them: Violence and Reconciliation on the Kansas-Missouri Line. Columbia and London: The University of Missouri Press, 2007.

Neely, Jr., Mark, The Fate of Liberty: Abraham Lincoln and Civil Liberties. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

_____, The Last Best Hope on Earth: Abraham Lincoln and the Promise of America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Nelson William E., and Robert C. Palmer, Constitution and Rights in the American Republic. Williamsburg: Institute of Bill of Rights Law, Marshall-Wythe School of Law, The College of William and Mary, 1987.

Nerone, John, Violence Against the Press: Policing the Public Sphere in U. S. History. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Nevins, Allan, The War for the Union: The Improvised War, 1861-62. New York: Scribner, 1959-1971.

Newman, Richard S., Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Niven, John, Salmon P. Chase: A Biography. Oxford University Press, 1995.

Noll, Mark, America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

_____, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

_____, God and Mammon: Protestants, Money and the Market, 1790-1860. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

_____, Princeton and the Republic: 1768-1822: The Search for a Christian Enlightenment in the Era of Samuel Stanhope Smith. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1989.

_____, ed., The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.

_____, The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

Nord, David Paul, Faith in Reading: Religious Publishing and the Birth of Mass Media in America. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Norton, Wesley, Religious Newspapers in the Old Northwest to 1861: A History, Bibliography, and Record of Opinion. Athens, Ohio University Press, 1977.

Novak, William J., The People's Welfare: Law and Regulation in Nineteenth-Century America. Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Oates, Stephen B., With Malice Toward None: The Life of Abraham Lincoln. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Ortiz, Paul, Emancipation Betrayed: The Hidden History of Black Organizing and White Violence in Florida from Reconstruction to the Bloody Election of 1920. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 2005.

Ownby, Ted, Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920. Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Paludan, William Shaw, The Presidency of Abraham Lincoln. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1994.

Parrish, William E., Frank Blair: Lincoln's Conservative. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1998.

_____, A History of Missouri. Volume III. 1860-1875. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973.

_____, Missouri Under Radical Rule, 1865-1870. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1965.

Parker Jr., Harold M., The United Synod of the South: The Southern New School Presbyterian Church. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Pasley, Jeffrey L., "The Tyranny of Printers," Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2001.

Patterson, Orlando, Rituals of Blood: Consequences of Slavery in Two American Centuries. New York: Basic Civitas Books, 1988.

Phillips, Christopher, Damned Yankee: The Life of General Nathaniel Lyon. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996.

_____, The Making of a Southerner: William Barclay Napton's Private Civil War. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008.

_____, Missouri's Confederate: Claiborne Fox Jackson and the Creation of Southern Identity in the Border West. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000.

Pennewell, Almer, A Voice in the Wilderness, Jesse Walker, "The Daniel Boone of Methodism." Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1958.

Pearson, Edward A., Designs against Charleston: The Trial Record of the Denmark Vesey Slavery Conspiracy of 1822. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Perman, Michael, Reunion Without Compromise, The South and Reconstruction, 1865-1868. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Pilkington, James Penn, The Methodist Publishing House: A History, 2 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Piston, William G., Wilson's Creek: The Second Battle of the Civil War and the Men Who Fought It. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Pitcock, Cynthia DeHaven, Bill J. Gurley eds., I Acted from Principle: The Civil War Diary of Dr. William M. McPheeters, Confederate Surgeon in the Trans-Mississippi. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2002.

Primm, James Neal, Lion of the Valley: St. Louis, Missouri, 1764-1980. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1998.

Quist, John W., Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998.

Rable, George C., But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984.

Ramsay, William M., Four modern prophets: Walter Rauschenbusch, Martin Luther King, Jr., Gustavo Gutiérrez, Rosemary Radford Ruether. Westminster John Knox Press, 1986.

Randall James G., Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1926.

_____, and David Donald, 2d ed. The Civil War and Reconstruction. Boston: Little, Brown, 1969.

_____, Lincoln the President, 4 vols. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1945-53.

Ravensway, Charles Van, St. Louis, An Informal History of the city and Its People. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1991.

Ray, Perley Ormond, The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Its Origin and Authorship. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark, 1909.

Read, James H., Majority Rule versus Consensus: The Political Thought of John C. Calhoun. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2009.

Reagan, Charles Wilson, Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.

Richards, Leonard L., "Gentlemen of Property and Standing," Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Robertson, David, Denmark Vesey: The Buried History of America's Largest Slave Rebellion and the Man Who Led It. New York: Knopf, 1999.

Rose, Willie E., Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Rosenberg, Norman L., Protecting the Best Men: An Interpretive History of the Law of Libel. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Rothman, David J., The Discovery of the Asylum : Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971; Aldine Transaction; Revised edition, August 2002.

Ryan, Mary, Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Ryan, Susan, The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Sanders, Carl E., The Premillennial Faith of James Brookes: Reexamining the Roots of American Dispensationalism. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2001.

Sands, Eric C., American Public Philosophy and the Mystery of Lincolnism. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009.

Saville, Julia, The Work of Reconstruction, from Slave to Wage Laborer in South Carolina, 1860-1870. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Schlesinger, Sr., Arthur M., A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1967.

Schultz, Duane, Quantrill's War: The Life and Time of William Clarke Quantrill. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Scott, Anne Firor, Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Scott, Sean A., A Visitation of God: Northern Civilians Interpret the Civil War. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Seaton, Richard A., History of the United Methodist Churches of Missouri. St. Louis: Missouri Methodist Historical Society, 1984.

Segrest, Scott Philip, America and the Political Philosophy of Common Sense. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2010.

Sellers, Charles, The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Sewell, Richard H., A House Divided: Sectionalism and the Civil War, 1848-1865. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Sharkey, Robert, Money, Class, and Party: An Economic Study of the Civil War and Reconstruction. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.

Shea, William, Fields of Blood: The Prairie Grove Campaign. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Shipley Alberta D., and David O. Shipley, A History of Black Baptists in Missouri : National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc. Kansas City, Mo.: Missionary Baptist State Convention of Missouri, 1976.

Siebert, Wilbur H., The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom. New York: Macmillan Co., 1898.

Silber, Nina, The Romance of Reunion, Northerners and the South, 1865-1900. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Simon, James F., Lincoln and Chief Justice Taney: Slavery, Secession, and the President's War Powers. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006.

Simon, Paul, Freedom's Champion: Elijah Lovejoy. Carbondale and Edwardsville, Il.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994.

Smith, Elbert B., Magnificent Missourian: The Life of Thomas Hart Benton. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1973.

Smith, Ronald D., Thomas Ewing Jr.: Frontier Lawyer and Civil War General. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008.

Smith, Wilson, Professors and Public Ethics: Studies of Northern Moral Philosophers before the Civil War. Ithaca: Published for the American Historical Association by Cornell University Press, 1956.

Snay, Mitchell, Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Snider, Becky L., A Survey of the Rural African American Churches of Northern Boone County. St. Louis: University Bindery, 1997.

Stampp, Kenneth M., The Era of Reconstruction. New York: Knopf, 1965.

Starr, Emmett, History of the Cherokee Indians and Their Legends and Folk Lore. Oklahoma City, 1921.

Startup, Kenneth Moore, The Root of All Evil: The Protestant Clergy and the Economic Mind of the South. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1997.

Staudenraus, P. J., The African Colonization Movement. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

- Stephens, Randall J., The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South. Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Stevens, Walter B., Centennial History of Missouri (The Center State): One Hundred Years in the Union, 1820-1921. St. Louis and Chicago; The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1921.
- Steward, David, Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000.
- Stone, Geoffrey R., Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime: From the Sedition Act of 1798 to the War on Terrorism. New York & London: W. W. Norton & Co., 2004.
- Stout, Harry S., Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the Civil War. New York: Viking Press, 2006.
- Stowell, Daniel W., Rebuilding Zion: The Religious Reconstruction of the South, 1863-1877. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Striner, Richard, Father Abraham: Lincoln's Relentless Struggle to End Slavery. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Strong, Douglas M., Perfectionist Politics: Abolitionism and the Religious Tensions of American Democracy. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999.
- Sullivan, Dolores, William Holmes McGuffey: Schoolmaster to the Nation. Rutherford, Madison and Teaneck, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994.
- Summerville, Jr., Raymond R., An Ex-Colored Church: Social Activism in the CME Church, 1870-1970. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2004.
- Synan, Vinson, The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1997.
- Teaford, Jon, Cities of the Heartland: The Rise and Fall of the Industrial Midwest. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Thelan, David, Paths of Resistance: Tradition and Dignity in Industrializing Missouri. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Thuesen, Peter J., Predestination: The American Career of a Contentions Doctrine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Thompson, Ernest Trice, Presbyterians in the South, 3 vols. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963.

- Tomlins, Christopher and Bruce H. Mann, eds., The Many Legalities of Early America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Tompkins, Jane, In Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790–1860. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Torbet, Robert G., A History of the Baptists. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1950.
- Trelease, Allen, White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction. New York: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Trexler, Anthony Harrison, Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1914.
- Tucker, David M., Mugwumps: Public Moralists of the Gilded Age. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1998.
- Tucker, Frank C., The Methodist Church in Missouri, 1798-1939. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1966.
- Ungar, Irwin, The Greenback Era: A Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Varon, Elizabeth R., We Mean To Be Counted: White Women and Politics in Antebellum Virginia. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Vile, John R., ed., Great American Judges: An Encyclopedia, 2 vols. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003.
- Wall Carla, and Barbara Oliver Korner, eds., Hardship and Hope: Missouri Women Writing About Their Lives, 1820-1920. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1997.
- Waldrep, Christopher, Roots of Disorder: Race and Criminal Justice in the American South, 1817-80. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998.
- Walters, Ronald G., American Reformers, 1815-1860. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978; revised edition, 1997.
- Warner, Ezra J., Generals in Blue: Lives of the Union Commanders. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.
- Watson, Harry L., Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America. New York: Hill and Wang, 1990; reprint, New York Hill and Wang, 2006.

Waugh, Joan, U. S. Grant: American Hero, American Myth. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Weaver, C. Douglas, In Search of the New Testament Church. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2008.

Weigle, Luther A., The Pageant of America: American Idealism, 10 vols. New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1928.

Wells, Jonathan Daniel, The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800-1860. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Wharton, Vernon L., The Negro In Mississippi 1865-1890. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.

White Jr., Ronald C., Lincoln's Greatest Speech: The Second Inaugural. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002.

_____, and Howard Hopkins, The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.

White, William W., The Confederate Veteran. Tuscaloosa, Al: Confederate Publication Company, 1962.

Whites, LeAnn, The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender: Augusta Georgia, 1860-1890. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.

_____, Alecia P. Long, eds., Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War. Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 2009.

Wigger, John H., Taking Heaven by Storm: Methodism and the Rise of Popular Christianity in America. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001.

Williams Sr., Michael, Isaac Taylor Tichenor: The Creation of the Baptist New South. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2005.

Williamson, Joel, After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction, 1861-1877. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Wilson, Douglas L., Honor's Voice: The Transformation of Abraham Lincoln. New York: Random House, 1998.

Winch, Julie, introduction to Colored Aristocracy of St. Louis by Cyprian Clamorgan. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1999.

Wright, Carroll D., The New Century of Facts Springfield, Mass., 1909.

Wolferman, Kristie C., The Indomitable Mary Easton Sibley: Pioneer of Women's Education in Missouri. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008.

Woodward, C. Vann, Reunion and Reaction: The Compromise of 1877 and the End of Reconstruction. Boston: Little, Brown, 1951.

Woodworth, Steven E., While God is Marching on: The Religious World of Civil War Soldiers. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram, Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South. Oxford University Press, 1982.

Yellin Jean Fagin, and John C. Van Horne, eds., The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Zuckerman, Phil, ed., DuBois on Religion. Walnut Creek, Ca.: AltaMira Press, 2000.

Articles

Adams Arlin M., and William R. Hanlon, "Jones v. Wolf: Church Autonomy and the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment," Pa. L. Rev. 128.6 (June 1980).

Alderman, Ashley, "Where's the Wall?: Church Property Disputes within the Civil Courts and the Need for Consistent Application of the Law," Ga. L. Rev. 39 (2005).

Anders, Leslie, "His Radical Reverence, John H Cox," Missouri Historical Review 65.2 (January 1971).

Apperson, George M., "Presbyterians and Radical Republicans: President Lincoln, Dr. McPheeters, and Civil War in Missouri," Journal of Presbyterian History 73.4 (Winter 1995).

Atkinson, James H., "The Arkansas Campaign and Election of 1872," Arkansas Historical Quarterly 1 (December 1942).

Avillo Jr., Phillip J., "Ballots for the Faithful. The Oath and the Emergence of Slave State Republican Congressmen, 1861-1867," Civil War History 22.2 (June 1976).

Asper, Lewis D., "The Long and Unhappy History of Loyalty Testing in Maryland," American Journal of Legal History 13.2 (April 1969).

_____, "Property and Race: The Dilemma of Slave-State Republican Congressmen and the Origins of Reconstruction, 1863-1867," Southern Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the South 23.2 (1984).

Balik, Shelby M., "Equal Rights and Equal Privileges: Separating Church and State in Vermont," Journal of Church and State 50.1 (2008).

Baltimore, Lester B., "Benjamin F. Stringfellow: The Fight for Slavery on the Missouri Border," Missouri Historical Review 62.2 (1967).

Banner, Stuart, "When Christianity was Part of the Common Law," Law and History Review 16.1 (1998).

Barclay, Thomas S., "The Test Oath for Clergy in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 18.3 (April 1924).

Baum, Dale, "Teetotalers Enter Politics: The Massachusetts Prohibitionist Party in the Early 1870s," Mid America 65.3 (1983).

Bearman Alan F., and Jennifer L. Mills, "Charles M. Sheldon and Charles F. Parham: Adapting Christianity to the Challenges of the American West," Kansas History 32.2 (Summer 2009).

Becker, Dorothy G., "Isabella Graham and Joanna Bethune: Trailblazers of Organized Women's Benevolence" Social Service Review 61.2 (June 1987).

Bellamy, Donnie B., "The Education of Blacks in Missouri Prior to 1861," The Journal of Negro History, 59.2, (April, 1974).

_____, "The Persistency of Colonization in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 72.1 (Oct 1977).

Bendroth, Margaret, "Rum, Romanism, and Evangelism: Protestants and Catholics in Late-Nineteenth-Century," Church History 68.3 (September 1999).

Berwanger, Eugene H., "Lincoln's Constitutional Dilemma: Emancipation and Black Suffrage," Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association 5 (1983).

Bierbaum, Milton E., "Frederick Starr, A Missouri Border Abolitionist: The Making of a Martyr," Missouri Historical Review 58.3 (April 1964).

- Blassingame, John W., "The Recruitment of Colored Troops in Kentucky, Maryland, and Missouri 1863-1865," Historian 29.4 (Fall 1967).
- Blocker, Jr., Jack, "Annie Wittenmyer and the Women's Crusade," Ohio History 88.4 (Dec 1979).
- Blume, William Wirt, "Chancery Practice on the American Frontier: A Study of the Records of the Supreme Court of Michigan Territory, 1805-1836," Michigan L Rev. 59.1 (November 1960).
- Blumenthal, Susanna L., "The Mind of a Moral Agent: Scottish Common Sense and the Problem of Responsibility in Nineteenth-Century American Law," Law and History Review 26.1 (2008).
- Bode, Frederick, "'A Common Sphere': White Evangelicals and Gender in Antebellum Georgia," Georgia Historical Quarterly 79 (Winter 1995).
- Bradley, Harold C., "In Defense of John Cummings," Missouri Historical Review, 57.1 (January 1962).
- Buchanan, Thomas C., "Rascals on the Antebellum Mississippi: African American Steamboat Workers and the St. Louis Hanging of 1841," Journal of Social History 34.4 (Summer 2001).
- Buckley, Thomas E., "After Disestablishment: Thomas Jefferson's Wall of Separation in Antebellum Virginia," Journal of Southern History 61.3 (1995).
- Burnham, John C., "The Social Evil Ordinance: A Social Experiment in Nineteenth Century St. Louis," Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 27.3 (1971).
- Bynum, Cornelius L., "An Equal Chance in the Race for Life": Reverdy C. Ransom, Socialism, and the Social Gospel Movement, 1890-1920," Journal of African American History 93.1 Winter 2008).
- Carrigan, William D., "In Defense of the Social Order: Racial Thought among Southern White Presbyterians in the Nineteenth Century," American Nineteenth Century History 1.2 (Summer 2008).
- Carroll, Mark M., "'All for Keeping His Own Negro Wench': Birch v. Benton (1858) and the Politics of Slander and Free Speech in Antebellum Missouri," Law and History Review 29.3 (August 2011).
- Carter, Harvey L. and Norma L. Peterson, eds., "William S. Stewart Letters, January 13, 1861, to December 4, 1862," Missouri Historical Review 61.3 (April 1967).

Cater, Cater, "To Pick Up Again the Cross of Missionary Work: W. J. Northen's Politics of Race, Religion, and Reform, 1890-1911," Georgia Baptist History (2008).

Cheek, Jr., H. Lee, "Original Diversity: Bishops Allen, Asbury and Black Methodism," Methodist History 35.3 (April 1997).

Christensen, Lawrence O., "Schools for Blacks: J. Milton Turner in Reconstruction Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 76 (January 1982).

Cloud, Matthew W., "'One Nation, Under God': Tolerable Acknowledgment of Religion or Unconstitutional Cold War Propaganda Cloaked in American Civil Religion?," Journal of Church and State 36.2 (Spring 2004).

Colton, David L., "Lawyers, Legislation and Educational Localism: The Missouri School Code of 1825," Missouri Historical Review 59.2 (January, 1975).

Cristmon, Kenneth, "Historical Overview of Alcohol in the African American Community," Journal of Black Studies 25.3 (January 1995).

Crow, Jeffrey J., "Tory Plots and Anglican Loyalty: The Llewelyn Conspiracy of 1777," North Carolina Historical Review 55.1 (Jan. 1978).

Cummings, Melbourne S., "The Rhetoric of Bishop Henry McNeal Turner," The Journal of Black Studies 12.4 (June 1982).

Dart, Henry P., "The Colonial Legal Systems of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas," American Bar Association Journal 12 (1926).

Davis, Larry E., "'A Malignant Warfare': The Anti-Mission Controversy in Missouri, 1818-1840 and Beyond," American Baptist Quarterly 23.1 (Spring 2004).

Davis, J. Treadwell, "The Presbyterians and the Sectional Conflict," Southern Quarterly 8.2 (Winter 1970).

Dawson, Joseph M., "The Meaning of Separation of Church and State in the First Amendment," Journal of Church and State 50.4 (Fall 2008).

Doherty, Robert, "Social Basis for the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-38: The Philadelphia Case," Journal of Social History 2.1 (Autumn, 1968).

Dreisbach, Daniel, "Mr. Jefferson, A Mammoth Cheese, and the 'Wall of Separation between Church and State': A Bicentennial Commemoration," Journal of Church and State 3.4 (2001).

Dublin Thomas, and Angela Scheuerer, "Why Did African-American Women Join the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1880-1900?," Women & Social Movements in the United States, 1600-2000 4 (2000).

Durst, Dennis L., "The Reverend John Berry Meachum (1789-1854) of St. Louis: Prophet and Entrepreneurial Black Educator in Historiographical Perspective," The North Star: A Journal of African American Religious History 7.2 (Spring 2004).

Egerton, Douglas R., "'Why Did They Not Preach Up This Thing?' Denmark Vesey and Revolutionary Theology," South Carolina Historical Magazine 100.4 (October 1999).

Ellis, Cameron, "Church Factionalism and Judicial Resolution: A Reconsideration of Neutral-Principles," Ala. L. Rev. 60.4 (2009).

Essex, James, "Glimpses of the Past," Missouri Historical Society Journal 1 (June 1934).

Fahey, David M., "How the Good Templars Began: Fraternal Temperance in New York State," Social History of Alcohol Review 38-39 (1999).

Faltys, John H., "Constitutional Law – Elections – Validity of Candidate Oath and Pledge," Nebraska Law Review,31.1 (November 1951).

Fellman, Michael, "Emancipation in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 83.1 (Oct 1988).

Finke Roger, and Rodney Stark, "Turning Pews Into People, Estimating 19th Century Church Membership," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 25.2 (April 1986).

Fish, Peter G., "Secrecy and the Supreme Court: Judicial Indiscretion and Reconstruction Politics," William and Mary Law Review 8.2 (Winter 1967).

Fitzgerald, Michael, W., "The Ku Klux Klan: Property Crime and the Plantation System in Reconstruction Alabama," Agricultural History 71 (Spring 1997).

Foner, Eric, "The Causes of the American Civil War: Recent Interpretations and New Directions," Civil War History 20 (September 1974).

Fornieri, Joseph R., "Lincoln's Reflective Patriotism," Perspectives on Political Science 39.2 (April-June 2010).

Foster, Richard B., "Some Aspects of Black Education in Reconstruction Missouri: An Address by Richard B. Foster," edited by Antonio F. Holland and Gary R. Kremer, Missouri Historical Review 92.4 (July 1998).

Frey, Donald E., "Francis Wayland's 1830s Textbooks: Evangelical Ethics and Political Economy," Journal of the History of Economic Thought [Great Britain] 24.2 (2002).

Friedman, Alan, "Church Property Dispute Resolution: An Expanded Role for the Courts after Jones v. Wolf?" Geo. L. J. 68 (1980).

Gardner, Justin M., "Ecclesiastical Divorce in Hierarchical Denominations and the Resulting Custody Battle over Church Property: How the Supreme Court Has Needlessly Rendered Church Property Trusts Ineffectual," Ave Maria L. Rev. 6.1 (2007).

Gravelly, Will, "You must not kneel here," Christian History 18.2 (1999).

Griffin, Clifford S., "Religious Benevolence as Social Control, 1815-1860," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 44.3 (1957).

Haller, Charlotte A., "'And Made Us to Be a Kingdom': Race, Antislavery, and Black Evangelicals in North Carolina's Early Republic," North Carolina Historical Review 80.2 (April 2003).

Hamilton, W. J., "The Relief Movement in Missouri, 1820-1822," Missouri Historical Review 22.1 (October 1927).

Hamm, Thomas D., "A Quaker View of Black St Louis in 1841," Missouri Historical Review 98.2 (Jan. 2004).

Hanley, Mark Y., "The New Infidelity: Northern Protestant Clergymen and the Critique of Progress, 1840-1855," Religion and American Culture 1.2 (Summer 1991).

Harris, Troy, "Neutral Principles of the Law and Church Property in the United States," Journal of Church and State 30.3 (Summer 1988).

Haynes, Stephen R., "Race, National Destiny, and the Sons of Noah in the Thought of Benjamin M. Palmer," Journal of Presbyterian History 78.2 (May 2000).

Hettle, Wallace, "The Minister, the Martyr, and the Maxim: Robert Lewis Dabney and Stonewall Jackson Biography," Civil War History 49.4 (December 2003).

Hill, Leslie Gamblin. "A Moral Crusade: The Influence of Protestantism on Frontier Society in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review 45 (October 1950).

Hodder, F. H., "Some Phases of the Dred Scott Case," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 16.1 (June 1929).

Hogue, William M., "The Civil Disability of Ministers of Religion in State Constitutions," Journal of Church and State 36.2 (1994).

Horwitz, Morton, "The Rise of Legal Formalism," American Journal of Legal History 19 (1975).

Houle, Philip P., "Forgive and Forget: Honoring Full and Unconditional Pardons," Maine Law Review 41.2 (1989): 276-77.

Huston, James L., "Democracy by Scripture versus Democracy by Process: A Reflection on Stephen A. Douglas and Popular Sovereignty," Civil War History 43 (1997).

Illick, Joseph C., "The Reception of Darwinism at the Theological Seminary and the College at Princeton, New Jersey. Part I: The Theological Seminary," Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society 38.3 (1960).

Janney, Caroline E., "War Over a Shrine of Peace: The Appomattox Peace Movement and Retreat from Reconciliation," The Journal of Southern History 77.1 (February 2011).

Jervey, Edward, "Motives and Methods of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Period of Reconstruction," Methodist History 4.4 (July 1966).

Kedro, Milan James, "The Civil War's Effect upon an Urban Church: The St. Louis Presbytery Under Martial Law," Missouri Historical Society Bulletin 27 (April 1971).

Kremer, Gary R., "The World of Make-Believe: James Milton Turner and Black Masonry," Missouri Historical Review 74.1 (October 1979).

Kohl, Martha, "Enforcing a Vision of Community: The Role of the Test Oath in Missouri's Reconstruction," Civil War History 40.4 (December 1994).

Lamme, Meg Opdycke, "Shining a Calcium Light: The WCTU and Public Relations History," Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly 88.2 (Summer 2011).

Laughlin, S. B., "Missouri Politics During the Civil War," Missouri Historical Review 24 (October 1929).

Leman, Joseph P., "The Jefferson-Leman Anti-Slavery Pact," Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society for the Year 1908 (Springfield, 1909).

Lo Piccolo, Margaret, "St. Louis Ethnic Neighborhoods, 1850-1930: An Introduction," Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 33.2 (1977).

Lucas, Sean Michael, "'Old Times There are not Forgotten': Robert Lewis Dabney's Public Theology for a Reconstructed South," Journal of Presbyterian History 81.3 (August 2003).

- Luebbering, Ken, "The Emergence of Bureaucracy: The Missouri School Law of 1853," Missouri Historical Review 74.3 (April, 1980).
- MacCormac, Earl R., "Missions and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837," Church History 32.1 (March 1963).
- Magers, Roy V., "The Raid on the Parkville Industrial Luminary," Missouri Historical Review, 30.1 (October 1935).
- Mangold, George B., "Social Reform in Missouri 1820–1920," Missouri Historical Review 15.1 (1920).
- March, David D., "Charles D. Drake and the Constitutional Convention of 1865," Missouri Historical Review 48.2 (January 1953).
- McGarvie, Mark D., America's Early National Struggles to Separate Church and State (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004); Steven D. Smith, "Separation as a Tradition" Journal of Law and Politics 18.1 (2002).
- McKee, Howard I., "The Marion College Episode in Northeast Missouri History," Missouri Historical Review 36.3 (April 1942).
- _____, "The School Law of 1853, Its Origins and Authors," Missouri Historical Review 35.4 (July, 1941).
- McNamara, Vanessa, "The Evolution of Nineteenth-Century Women's Benevolence Work in South Carolina, Charleston: A Case Study" Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association (2009).
- Melton, J. Gordon, "African American Methodism in the M. E. Tradition: The Case of Sharp Street (Baltimore)," North Star: A Journal of African American Religious History 8.2 (January 2005).
- Meyer, D. H., "American intellectuals and the Crisis of Faith," American Quarterly 27 (December, 1975).
- Miller, Thomas P., "John Witherspoon and Scottish Rhetoric and Moral Philosophy in America," Rhetorica 10.4 (1992).
- Minick, A. A., "The Underground Railway in Nebraska," Collections of the Nebraska State Historical Society, ser. 2, vol. 2.
- "Missouri History Not Found in Textbooks," Missouri Historical Review 23.3 (April 1929).

“Missouri History Not Found in Textbooks,” Missouri Historical Review, 36.2 (January 1942).

Monaghan, Jay, Diplomat in Carpet Slippers - Abraham Lincoln Deals with Foreign Affairs (Indianapolis & New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1945).

Moon, Jr., David T., “Benevolence, Modernity, and Republicanism on the Georgia Frontier: The Yellow River Primitive Baptist Association, 1820-1840,” Viewpoints: Georgia Baptist History 20 (2006).

Moore, N. Webster, “John Berry Meachum (1789-1854): St. Louis Pioneer, Black Abolitionist, Educator, and Preacher,” Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 29.2 (1973).

Moore, R. Lawrence, “Bible Reading and Nonsectarian Schooling: The Failure of Religious Instruction in Nineteenth-Century Public Education,” The Journal of American History 86.4 (March, 2000).

Murray, Gail S., “Charity Within the Bounds of Race and Class: Female Benevolence in the Old South” South Carolina Historical Magazine 96.1 (Jan. 1995).

Nash, Gary B., “New Light on Richard Allen: The Early Years of Freedom,” William & Mary Quarterly 46.2 (April 1989).

Neem, Johan N., “Beyond the Wall: Reinterpreting Jefferson’s Danbury Address,” Journal of the Early Republic 27.1 (2007).

Nietz, John A., “Why the Longevity of the McGuffey Readers?” History of Education Quarterly 4.2 (June, 1964).

Quist, John W., “Slaveholding Operatives of the Benevolent Empire: Bible, Tract, and Sunday school societies in Antebellum Tuscaloosa, Alabama” Journal of Southern History 62.3 (August 1996).

Ogle, Natalie N., “Brother Against Brother: Baptists and Race in the Aftermath of the Civil War,” American Baptist Quarterly 23.2 (June 2004).

Olsen, Otto H., “Reconsidering the Scalawags,” Civil War History 12 (December 1966).

Paquette, Robert L., “From Rebellion to Revisionism: The Continuing Debate about the Denmark Vesey Affair,” Journal of the Historical Society 4.3 (September 2004).

Parrish, William E., “Moses Lewis Linton: Doctor of Epigrams,” Missouri Historical Review 59.3 (April, 1965).

Parsons, Elaine Franz, "Klan Skepticism and Denial in Reconstruction-Era Public Discourse," The Journal of Southern History 77.1 (February 2011).

Perry, Barbara A., "Jefferson's Legacy to the Supreme Court: Freedom of Religion," Journal of Supreme Court History 31.2 (2006).

Primm, James Neal, "The G. A. R. in Missouri, 1866-1870," Journal of Southern History 20.3 (August 1954).

Rader, Benjamin, "Richard T. Ely: Lay Spokesman for the Social Gospel," Journal of American History 53.1 (June 1966).

Randall, James G., "The Blundering Generation," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 27 (June 1940).

Rau, Donald, "Cummings v. Missouri: Three Cheers for Father Cummings," Supreme Court Historical Society. Yearbook, 1977.

Reichard, Maximilian, "Black and White on the Urban Frontier: The St. Louis Community in Transition, 1800-1830," Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 33.1 (1976).

Reimers, David M., "The Race Problem and the Presbyterian Union," Church History 31.2 (June 1962).

Riggs, S. R., "Memoir of Hon. Jas. W. Lynd," Minnesota Historical Society, Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society (St. Paul, 1880).

Riordan, Liam, "Passing as Black / Passing as Christian: African-American Religious Autonomy in Early Republican Delaware," Pennsylvania History 64 (1997 Special Issue).

Roberts, Wesley, "Rejecting the 'Negro pew,'" Christian History 14.1 (1995).

Rohrer, James R., "The Connecticut Missionary Society and Book Distribution in the Early Republic," Libraries & Culture 34.1 (Winter 1999).

_____, "Sunday Mails and the Church-State Theme in Jacksonian America," Journal of the Early Republic 7.1 (1987).

Russ Jr., William A., "The Lawyer's Test Oath During Reconstruction," Mississippi Law Journal 10.2 (February, 1938).

Ryan, Susan M., "Charity Begins at Home: Stowe's Antislavery Novels and the Forms of Benevolent Citizenship" American Literature 72.4 (Dec. 2000).

Schantz, Mark S., "Religious Tracts, Evangelical Reform, and the Market Revolution in Antebellum America," Journal of the Early Republic 17.3 (Fall 1997).

Schweiger, Beth Barton, "Mark A Noll's 'The Civil War as a Theological Crisis'," Fides et Historia, 39.2 (Summer 2007).

Seematter, Mary E., "Trials and Confessions: Race and Justice in Antebellum St. Louis," Gateway Heritage: The Magazine of the Missouri Historical Society 12.2 (Fall 1991).

Sharp, Walter Rice, "Henry S. Lane and the Formation of the Republican Party in Indiana," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 7.2 (Sept., 1920).

Shoemaker, Floyd, "Missouri's Proslavery Fight for Kansas, 1852-1855," Missouri Historical Review 48 (April, July 1954).

Simkins, Francis B., "New Viewpoints in Southern Reconstruction," Journal of Southern History 5 (February 1939).

Smith, Elwood, "Background and Consequences of Methodist Union," Methodist History 2.2 (April 1964).

Smith, Elwyn, "The Role of the South in the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-38" Church History 29.1 (March 1960).

Smith, Steven D., "Separation as a Tradition," Journal of Law and Politics 18.1 (2002).

Sneddeker, Duane R., "Regulating Vice -- Prostitution and the St. Louis Social Evil Ordinance, 1870-1874," The Magazine of the Missouri Historical Society 11.2 (Fall 1990).

Staiger, C. Bruce, "Abolitionism and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837-1838," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 36.3 (Dec. 1949).

Stern, Thomas Noel, "William Penn on the Swearing of Oaths: His Ideas in Theory and Practice," Quaker History 70.2 (Fall 1981).

Storey, John W., "Southern Baptists and the Racial Controversy in the Churches and Schools During Reconstruction," Mississippi Quarterly 31.2 (March, 1978).

Strasser, Mark, "When Churches Divide: On Neutrality, Deference, and Unpredictability," Hamline L. Rev. 32 (2009).

Sweet, William Warren, "Some Significant Factors in American Church History," Journal of Religion 7.1 (January 1927).

Trelease, Allan W., "Who Were the Scalawags?," Journal of Southern History 29.4 (November 1963).

Trendel, Robert, "The Expurgation of Antislavery Materials by American Presses," The Journal of Negro History 58.3 (July, 1973).

Volpe, Vernon L., "The Frémonts and Emancipation in Missouri," Historian 56.2 (Winter 1994).

Vorenberg, Michael, "Abraham Lincoln and the Politics of Black Colonization," Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association 14.2 (Summer 1993).

Wamble, Gaston H., "Negroes and Missouri Protestant Churches Before and After the Civil War," Missouri Historical Review 61.3 (April 1967).

Wasserman, Ira M., "Prohibition and Ethno-Cultural Conflict: the Missouri Prohibition Referendum of 1918," Social Science Quarterly 80.4 (December 1989).

Way, Frank, "Religious Disputation and the Civil Courts: Quasi-Establishment and Secular Principles," Western Political Quarterly 42.4 (1989).

Weitz, Mark A., "“I Will Never Forget the Name of You”: The Home Front, Desertion, and Oath Swearing in Wartime Tennessee," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 59.1 (March 2000).

Whitehead, John W., "Tax Exemptions and Churches: A Historical and Constitutional Analysis," Cumberland Law Review 22.3 (1991-92).

Whitney, Don, "Richard Fuller, Pt. 1 – A Biographical Sketch," The Founders Journal 7 (Winter 1992).

Williams, Burton, "Religion and Reconstruction: A Cleric’s Conception," Methodist History 9.3 (April 1973).

Windell, Marie George, "The Background of Reform on the Missouri Frontier," Missouri Historical Review 39 (1945).

_____, "Reform in the Roaring Forties and Fifties," Missouri Historical Review 39 (April 1845).

Winship, Win, "Oren Root, Darwinism and Biblical Criticism," Journal of Presbyterian History 62.2 (Summer 1984).

Winter, Hauser, "The Division in Missouri Methodism in 1845," Missouri Historical Review 37.4 (October 1942).

Witte Jr., John, "Facts and Fictions about the History of Separation of Church and State," Journal of Church and State 48.1 (2006).

Wood, Gordon, "The Enemy is Us: Democratic Capitalism in the Early Republic," Journal of the Early Republic 16.2 (Summer 1996).

Woodward, Earl F., "The Brooks-Baxter War in Arkansas, 1872–1874," Arkansas Historical Quarterly 30 (Winter 1971).

Wormuth, Francis D., "Legislative Disqualifications as Bills of Attainder," Vanderbilt Law Review 4.3 (April 1951).

Wunsch, James, "The Social Evil Ordinance," American Heritage 33.2 (Feb./Mar. 1982).

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram, "The Antimission Movement in the Jacksonian South: A Study in Regional Folk Culture," The Journal of Southern History 36.4 (November, 1970).

Yaw, Natalie L., "Cross Fire: Judicial Intervention in Church Property Disputes after Rasmussen v. Bunyan," Mich. St. L. Rev. (2006).

Zornow, William Frank, "Thee Missouri Radicals and the Election of 1864," Missouri Historical Review 45.4 (July 1951).

Dissertations, Theses and Conference Papers

Ayabe, John A., "Evangelicals and the Antimission Crisis: A Study of Religious Identity in the Central Mississippi Valley, 1820-1840," Unpublished Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, 2007.

Bates, Evelyn, "A History of the Presbyterian Church in Missouri to 1860," Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Missouri, 1939.

Bierbaum, Milton Eugene, "The Rhetoric of Union or Disunion in Missouri, 1844-1861," Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 1965.

Borchert, Catherine Glennan, "Excscinded!: The Schism of 1837 in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Role of Slavery," Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2009.

Brownlee, Jr., Henry T., "Keeping their Memory Green: The Pleasant Green Baptist Church in St. Louis, Missouri, 1866-1950," Unpublished Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, 2008.

Carroll, Mark M., "Religion, Public Morals, and the Supreme Court of Missouri, 1821-1860," Paper presentation at Forty-sixth Annual Missouri Conference on History, Capitol Plaza Convention Center, Jefferson City, Missouri, 22 April 2004.

March, David D., "The Life and Times of Charles Daniel Drake," Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 1949.

McAllister, Paul E., "Missouri Voters, 1840-1856: An Analysis of Ante-Bellum Voting Behavior and Political Parties," Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 1976.

McKivigan, John, "The Battle for the Border State Soul: The Slavery Debate in the Churches of the Middle States," presented 1 October 2008, Annual Meeting of the Filson Club.

Prinsloo, Oleta, "The Case of the 'Died-In-The-Wool Abolitionists' in Mark Twain Country, Marion County, Missouri: An Examination of a Slaveholders Community's Response to Radical Abolitionism in the 1830s and 1840s," Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 2003.

VITA

Lucas Volkman was born in Garland, Texas and grew up in central Illinois. After graduating with a degree in history from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 2004, he came to Columbia to study at the University of Missouri. He received his M.A. in 2006 and his Ph.D. in May of 2012, both in United States history. Volkman has published the third chapter of this dissertation as an article in the Journal of Law and Religion while books reviews he has written have appeared in the Journal of Religious History, Journal of Southern Religion and Methodist History. Besides teaching at Mizzou, Volkman has taught for the Online Campus of Columbia College, the Columbia Campus of Moberly Area Community College, and for William Woods University in Fulton.